

Guillermín Library
Liberty University
Lynchburg, VA 24502

JUSTIFICATION as *CHRISTUS IN NOBIS*
in
SIXTEENTH CENTURY PROTESTANTISM

A Thesis
Presented To
The Faculty of Religion
Of Liberty University

REFERENCE
DO NOT CIRCULATE

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Theology

by
Milo E. Zehr
April 1992

ABSTRACT

Purpose: A major issue in every religion is the meaning of salvation. Although post-Reformation Protestantism claims to follow its sixteenth century founders' understanding of soteriology, modern Protestants speak of justification solely as a forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the writings of Martin Luther, Andreas Osiander, John Calvin, and Menno Simons to discover whether they viewed justification as a substantial work of God in the soul of the believer or as a purely external declaration of God. The writer chose these four men for four reasons. First, all four have abundant references in their writings to *Christus in nobis*, union with Christ, and becoming "bone of Christ's bone and flesh of His flesh." Second, they accused each other of having wrong understandings of soteriology and christology. Third, they are major leaders of the Lutheran, Reformed, and Anabaptist camps. Fourth, modern Protestants claim to understand and follow these leaders' insights.

Methodology: The *Christus in nobis* motif in the writings of these four men is examined, especially in relation to regeneration, faith and works, christology, and ecclesiology. Chapter one evaluates Luther's reaction to Catholicism and his attempt to develop an alternative soteriology. The study of Osiander's soteriology in chapter two provides an opportunity to examine the diversity within early Lutheran soteriology. Osiander claims to be following Luther and accuses Melancthon of developing an un-Lutheran soteriology that emphasizes imputation. In chapter three the writer evaluates Calvin's attempts to distance himself from Osiander while speaking about both union with Christ and imputation. Chapter four looks at Menno Simons' non-traditional "celestial flesh" christology and its implications for soteriology and ecclesiology.

Conclusions: This study produced overwhelming evidence that each of these men rejects the notion that the past work of Christ, or the imputation of the alien righteousness of Christ to the believer "from a distance," is a sufficient basis for justification. Diversity among the four men can be attributed to differences in christology and ecclesiology. Especially pertinent in this regard were differences in Lutheran and Reformed christologies and Menno's different understanding of both the incarnation and the church's relationship to society. Finally, one finds more emphasis on *Christus in nobis*, regeneration, and good works in sixteenth century Protestantism than in modern Protestantism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS APPROVAL SHEET	i
TITLE PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: MARTIN LUTHER	5
CHAPTER II: ANDREAS OSIANDER	25
CHAPTER III: JOHN CALVIN	44
CHAPTER IV: MENNO SIMONS	77
CONCLUSION	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY	110

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important polemical issues within the theology of the Reformation concerned the meaning of justification. Does justification involve a substantial work of God in the soul of the believer or should it be construed as a purely external declaration of God? While many have depicted the doctrine of justification in the Reformation solely in terms of a forensic decree, the belief in a more substantial work of Christ did find its proponents. The purpose of this thesis will be to show the breadth of this tradition among the various wings of the Reformation, as seen in the writings of Martin Luther, Andreas Osiander, John Calvin and Menno Simons.

Luther's rejection of the Roman Catholic Church's understanding of salvation forced him to develop an alternate doctrine of justification. The difficulty of Luther's task is reflected in the differences that developed between Luther and Melanchthon as early as the 1530s and continued throughout Luther's life.¹ The Lutheran debate about the correct meaning of justification and exactly what Luther meant by justification reached its climax soon after Luther's death in the controversy surrounding Melanchthon and Osiander—the former providing a more forensic interpretation, and the latter a more substantial. The Formula of Concord finally established the correct Lutheran position for all of orthodoxy.²

¹See Michael Rogness, *Philip Melanchthon: Reformer Without Honor* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1969); Robert Stupperich, *Melanchthon*, trans. Robert H. Fischer (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 97-140; Clyde Leonard Manschreck, *Melanchthon The Quiet Reformer* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1975), 15; Reinhold Seeberg, *Text-book of the History Of Doctrines*, trans. Charles E. Hay, vol. I (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966), 357-390; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History Of The Christian Doctrine Of Justification*, vol. I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 22ff.

²Two of the eleven "false dogmas" condemned by the Formula Of Concord deal with christology. The Formula specifically denies both "that Christ is our righteousness only according to his divine nature" and "that Christ is our righteousness only according to his human nature" (Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, revised David S. Schaff [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985], vol. III, 119). The Formula also affirms justification through imputation: "He bestows and imputes to us the righteousness of the obedience of Christ; for the sake of that righteousness we are received by God into favor and accounted righteous." "Ille enim donat atque imputat nobis iustitiam obedientiae

Article III forcefully rejected Osiander's views and upheld Melancthon's position.³

Christi; propter eam justitiam a Deo in gratiam recipimur, et justi reputamur" (Schaff, 116). Also see Robert A. Kolb, "Historical Background Of The Formula Of Concord," A *Contemporary Look at the Formula Of Concord*, eds. Robert D. Preus and Wilbert Rosin (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), 85.

³Only a couple of cursory studies of Osiander's view of justification have been done in English. Except for Wilson-Kastner's article, these studies either show little evidence of direct access to Osiander's works or are biased. "The Historical Introduction to the Symbolical Books," *Concordia Triglotta*, F. Bente and W. Dau, ed., pp. 152-161; Ralph Frederick Fischer, "An Examination of Osiander's 'Imago Dei' in its Relation to Justification," (B. D. thesis presented to the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1949); Patricia Wilson-Kastner, "Andreas Osiander's Theology of Grace in the Perspective of the Influence of Augustine of Hippo" (*The Sixteenth Century Journal*. 10.2 [1979], 73-91); James Weis, "Calvin vs. Osiander on Justification" (*The Springfielder*. 29 [1965] 31-47). Carl J. Lawrenz, "On Justification, Osiander's Doctrine Of The Indwelling Christ," *No Other Gospel*, ed. Arnold J. Koelpin (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1980), 149. Lawrenz briefly outlines Osiander's view of the indwelling Christ but then rejects Osiander's understanding of justification because it departs "from the scriptural forensic understanding of justification within Lutheranism's own ranks. . . ." German works have generally been more tolerant. Emanuel Hirsch in *Die Theologie des Andreas Osiander* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1919) provides a detailed examination of Osiander's views and concludes that he was close to Luther. Gunter Zimmermann, in "Die Thesen Osianders zur Disputation 'de iustificatione'" (*Kerygma und Dogma* 33 [July-Sept., 1987]: 224-244) says Osiander's claim to be following Luther is legitimate since the theme found in Osiander's *Disputation* is developed in detail in Luther's commentary on Galatians. Martin Stupperich emphasizes the differences between Luther and Osiander in *Osiander in Preussen: 1549-1522* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973), 110-130. Space will permit only a cursory examination of the views of Lutheran and Reformed writers and theologians since the sixteenth-century. Lutheran orthodoxy followed Melancthon in its definition of justification. Heinrich Schmid, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, trans. Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), 424-434. Baier says justification has a "forensic sense." He asks "Why does God justify man?" and answers, "Because God imputes to man the righteousness or merit of Christ apprehended by faith, or so judges it to belong to man that he is on this account absolved from the guilt of his sins." Baier also says that imputation is not "an empty or imaginary transfer of the merit of one to another, destitute alike of a basis and fruit; but because it is an act of the intellect and will of him who exercises the judgment, by which he adjudges that the merit of one, which is offered for another, . . . can be legitimately accepted as if it were his own merit. . . ." Quenstedt refers to justification as the external act of God based on the merit of Christ, although he also includes a statement about union with Christ. He also declares that the "forensic signification (of the word *δικαιουν*) is proved . . . because it denotes a judicial act. . . ." Chemnitz speaks of justification as a "judicial process." In an attempt to keep justification and sanctification separate, Hollazius says that "this action" of justification "takes place apart from man, in God," and "cannot intrinsically change man." A perusal of Heppe's *Reformed Dogmatics* confirms that Reformed orthodoxy has done to Calvin what Lutheran orthodoxy has done to Luther. Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, trans. G. T. Thomson, ed. Ernst Bizer (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978), 543-564. Several modern writers note Calvin's emphasis on union with Christ as integral to imputation of

John Calvin (1509-1564) represents for our study the tensions reflected in sixteenth century Reformed theology over this doctrine.⁴ Three areas of conflict are identifiable in Calvin's 1559 edition of the *Institutes*. First, Calvin includes references to both forensic imputation and *Christus in nobis*. Second, Calvin vehemently attacks Osiander even though both men include references to *Christus in nobis*.⁵ Third, Calvin both unites and disjoins justification and sanctification.

Menno Simons is included as a representative of the "Radical Reformation," or Anabaptists. American Mennonites have generally ignored both Menno Simons' unorthodox christology and his *Christus in nobis* motif. William Keeney provides the most exhaustive examination of Menno's christology in English and outlines the connection between his christology and soteriology.⁶ Several cursory studies of Menno's view of justification connect his christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology.⁷

Christ's righteousness to the believer. See Victor A. Shepherd, *The Nature And Function Of Faith in the Theology Of John Calvin* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983), 29-34; Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Tyler, Texas: Geneva Divinity School Press, 1982), especially pages 17-27, 41-48; Thomas Coates, "Calvin's Doctrine Of Justification," (*Concordia Theological Monthly*, vol. 34 [June, 1963], 325-334) says that Calvin cannot "avoid this idea" of union with Christ even though he (Calvin) has "little room for the Pauline *Christus in nobis* that is so prominent in, and so characteristic of, Luther's theology" (327). Robert S. Franks criticizes the Protestant theory because of its legal formulation ("Justification," *A Dictionary Of Christ And The Gospels* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906], vol. I, 921). In his *Systematic Theology* Charles Hodge says that "the righteousness of Christ is in justification imputed to the believer. That is, is set to his account, so that he is entitled to plead it at the bar of God, as though it were personally and inherently his own" (*Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968, vol. III, 118). Even Lewis Chafer, who connects justification with union with Christ, denies any relationship between justification and the resurrection of Christ (*Systematic Theology*, Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948, vol. II, 273-278). Orthodox Protestantism has, to a large extent, developed the "legal fiction" or forensic understanding of justification and ignored the union with Christ motif in Luther.

⁴The major first generation Reformed theologians were Zwingli, Bullinger, and Bucer.

⁵John Calvin, *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, in *The Library of Christian Classics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), vol. XX, Book III, 5-12 (pages 729-743).

⁶William Echard Keeney, *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought And Practice From 1539-1564* (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1968), 89-98.

⁷Alvin J. Beachy, *The Concept of Grace In The Radical Reformation* (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1977), 70-77, 82, 83, 203-207, 216, 228; John R. Loesch, *The Divine Community: Trinity, Church, And Ethics In Reformation Theologies* (Kirksville, Missouri: The Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, Inc., 1981), 73ff; J. A. Oosterbaan, "The Theology of Menno Simons," *MQR* 35.3 (July 1961): 187-97, 237; J. A. Oosterbaan, "Grace in Dutch Mennonite Theology," in *A Legacy Of Faith*, ed. Cornelius J. Dyck

Among the questions to be raised by the thesis we may list the following. First, what is the relationship between the righteousness that justifies and the one who is justified? Is the righteousness that justifies the earned merits of Christ that are completely outside the believer and are imputed to the believer? Does righteousness depend on the believer becoming "a partaker of the divine nature" and thereby assuming a righteous "essence"? Is the believer united to Christ who is his righteousness? Is the believer united to Christ's body that is righteous? Second, what is the relationship between the Father and Son and between the divine and human in Christ? One's answer to this question influences what one says about the relationship between Christ and the believer. Or, perhaps better stated, one's view of the Eucharist and of justification informs one's christology. In either case, differences between Lutheran and Reformed christologies allowed Luther and Osiander to talk about a union of the believer and Christ in a different way than Calvin. Third, what is the correct view of Christ's atonement? The satisfaction theory of the atonement fits well with the forensic view of justification, whereas the *Christus victor* motif connects more closely the faith that justifies with the victory (works) which that faith produces. Fourth, what is the correct relationship between faith and works? Attacks against Osiander and Menno often reflect the concern that works not become the means of justification.

(Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1962); Willis M. Stoesz, "The New Creature: Menno Simons' Understanding of the Christian Faith," *MQR* 39.1 (Jan. 1965): 5-24.

CHAPTER I

MARTIN LUTHER

Pre-Reformation Catholicism embraced various understandings of salvation,¹ and previous research has shown that Luther (1483-1546) was familiar with most of them.² This introduction summarizes only briefly those positions in which Luther was trained and to which he eventually reacted—Thomism, Scotism, and Ockhamism.

Thomas Aquinas (1224?-1274) believed that a man who freely performed good works in a state of grace cooperated in the attainment of his salvation by doing *quod in se est*.³ For Aquinas justification is a process that proceeds logically from God's gratuitous infusion of grace to man's moral cooperation and finally terminates in God's reward of eternal life.⁴ The basic principle controlling this formulation is *facientibus quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam*. This principle, which Luther at first accepted,⁵ contained the

¹A thorough study of pre-reformation views of justification would include Augustine, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Scotus, Ockham, and Gabriel Biel (to name a few). See McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. I.

²E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther And His Times: The Reformation From A New Perspective* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950), 157. "Luther began with Gabriel Biel and Peter d'Ailly, who in turn led him to Occam, Scotus, and St. Thomas. Examining the very heart of the Schoolmen, he saw how they in turn had inherited their system from Peter Lombard, Hugo of St. Victor, and others, arriving finally at the writings of St. Augustine and Gregory the Great." For a thorough discussion of these positions in relation to Luther's theological development, see Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1985), 27-92, and McGrath's *Iustitia Dei*, vols. I & II; Steve Ozment, *The Age of Reform 1250-1550: An Intellectual And Religious History Of Late Medieval And Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 231-44.

³*Ibid.*, 233-36. *Facere quod in se est* means "doing the best that is in one" and is related to *facientibus quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam*, which means "to those who do what is in them, God will not deny grace." This definition is taken from Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 113. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. I, 83-86.

⁴Aquinas' position represents the traditional teaching of the medieval church.

⁵McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. I, 64-67, 87-90; McGrath, *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 85ff, 122ff. In the *Dictata* Luther spoke of our salvation in terms of *meritum de*

seeds of the *via moderna's* idea of a *pactum* between God and man. In this *pactum* a condition exists which the sinner must meet before receiving God's grace.⁶

Thomas' *acceptatio divina* views led to John Duns Scotus' voluntaristic view of God. Scotus (1265?-1308) maintained that many possibilities exist in God's *potentia absoluta*.⁷ The actualization of any one of those possibilities depends on the arbitrary willing of such by God according to His ordained power (*potentia ordinata*). God binds himself by *pactum* to honor whatever option he chooses.⁸ In relation to the sacrament of penance, Scotus' understanding of *acceptatio divina* allowed God to accept the sinner on the basis of either attrition (repentance based on fear) or contrition (repentance based on love).⁹

By using Scotus' *acceptatio divina*, William Ockam (1300?-1349?) and his followers were able to emphasize the *pactum* concept¹⁰ in such a way that God could be said to accept human acts or attitudes as being worthy of salvation even though they have no intrinsic value.¹¹ God's obligation to act in a certain way or to reward one form of behavior as opposed to another depends on a decision of the will that is unrelated in any way to His character.¹²

We have already noticed that Luther's early writings are sympathetic toward the solutions offered by the *via moderna*. However, sometime between 1515 and 1519 he

congruo, quod in se est, and pactum. WA VI.261-62; 312.38-41. See Walther von Loewenich, *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, trans. Herbert J. A. Bouman (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976), 50-58.

⁶McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, I, 63, 64. Aquinas based his argument on Aristotelian logic. Thomas also saw Christ's death as a satisfaction that is "most appropriate to right reason" and rejected Anselm's position that "God's justice demanded Christ's passion as a necessary satisfaction." Thomas' *acceptatio divina* concept allowed him to view Christ's death as being rooted in God's will rather than in His character.

⁷The seeds of these ideas appear already in Thomas Aquinas. See McGrath, *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 55, 56.

⁸Ozment, *The Age of Reform*, 34-36.

⁹McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. I, 96, 97. According to this formulation, by an attrition of sufficient intensity one could merit God's initial grace.

¹⁰Although Ockam does not use the term *pactum*, the concept is present.

¹¹Stephen Strehle, *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1988), 32; McGrath, *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 82-83; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. I, 114, 115.

¹²For a thorough discussion of this aspect of Ockam's theology, see Strehle, 43-63. Ockam also defended Scotus' view that "God rewards virtuous acts performed outside a state of grace with congruous merit" (McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. I, 116.)

rejected the idea that the sinner can do *quod in se est* out of his own human ability in order to receive the initial habitus of grace and subsequent justification.¹³

From a theological point of view Luther rejected the *via moderna* for two reasons.¹⁴ First, Luther felt that the *via moderna's pactum* concept produces a dilemma by requiring the sinner who is unrighteous to do something acceptable to God. Luther solved the dilemma by making the righteousness of Christ satisfy the *iustitia Dei*.¹⁵ God justifies

¹³Luther probably did not formulate a comprehensive alternate understanding of justification until 1518 or 1519. However, already in his lecture on Romans, no works—whether preceding or following the initial experience of salvation—are allowed to contribute to justification (WA 56.225.15-19). While he does continue to speak of some preparation in receiving grace, he now goes beyond the *Dictata* and rejects the Franciscan norm that God provides his grace for *facienti quod in se est*, as we in ourselves are said to be vain and totally depraved (WA 56.202-03). In his 4 September 1517 *Disputation Against Scholastic Theology*, Luther rejects the *via moderna's* (Occam's, d'Ailly's, and Biel's) view of God's freedom to accept those who *facientibus quod in se est* (Paul Vignaux, "On Luther and Ockham," ed. Steven Ozment, *The Reformation in Medieval Perspective* [Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971], 107-18; Jared Wicks, "Justification And Faith In Luther's Theology," *Theological Studies* 44 [March 1983], 7, 8. In his *Ninety-Five Theses* (October 31, 1517) Luther attacks the prevalent abuses of the indulgence system without setting forth a detailed alternative. The date for Luther's break with the traditional Catholic understanding of salvation is still being debated. Schwiebert, Dillenberger, Althaus, and George take the position that Luther had broken with the Catholic view by the 1517 *Theses* (E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther And His Times*, 314-20). Also see John Dillenberger, *Martin Luther: Selections From His Writings* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1961), 489; Paul Althaus, *The Theology Of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1966), 300; Timothy George, *Theology of the Reformers* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1988), 63. McGrath thinks Luther had broken with the *via moderna* view of justification by late 1515, although he cites U. Saarnivaara and Bizer as defending 1518-19 (*Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 129-33; 142-61). Lowell Green follows Saarnivaara, Bizer, Aland, and F. Edward Cranz in their 1518/19 date of Luther's break ("Faith, Righteousness, and Justification: New Light on Their Development Under Luther and Melancthon," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 4.1 [April 1973]: 65-86).

¹⁴McGrath, in *Luther's Theology Of The Cross* (129, 130), thinks one can distinguish three distinct areas of critique of the *via moderna* by Luther: 1) Luther sees man as passive toward justification; 2) man's will is held captive by sin and cannot attain righteousness unaided by grace; 3) the idea that man can do *quod in se est* is Pelagian.

¹⁵LW 34.337: "At last, by the mercy of God, meditating day and night, I gave heed to the context of the words, namely, 'In it the righteousness (*iustitia*) of God is revealed, as it is written, He who through faith is righteous shall live.' There I began to understand that 'the righteousness of God' is that by which the righteous lives by a gift of God, namely by faith. And this is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which merciful God justifies us by faith, as it is written, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.' " WA 54.186: "Donec miserente Deo meditabundus dies et noctes connexionem verborum attenderem, nempe: Iustitia Dei revelatur in illo, sicut scriptum est: Iustus ex fide vivit, ibi iustitiam Dei coepi intelligere

sinner, not those who have done *quod in se est*. Second, the *via moderna* fails to be Christocentric.¹⁶ The *moderni* see justification as a legal transaction based on *acceptatio divina*.¹⁷ Luther rejects the solution offered by the *moderni*. For Luther justification requires a resurrected Christ who lives *in nobis*.¹⁸

eam, qua iustus dono Dei vivit, nempe ex fide, et esse hanc sententiam, revelari per euangelium iustitiam Dei, scilicet passivam, qua nos Deus misericors iustificat per fidem, sicut scriptum est: Iustus ex fide vivit."

¹⁶McGrath, *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 60-61.

¹⁷Gordon Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1973), 170, 253. Rupp says Luther rejected the Nominalist *acceptatio* position. Bengt Haegglund ("Was Luther a Nominalist?" in *Concordia Theological Monthly* [vol. 28, June 1957], 441-52) likewise says Luther rejected the Nominalist/Occamist view, although he confuses Luther's and Melanchthon's positions.

¹⁸Rupp, 170. Other writers likewise find the *Christus in nobis* motif in Luther. (The following evaluation of writers in some cases discusses their interpretation of Luther's view of atonement because the satisfaction theory of the atonement is most conducive to the "forensic" or "legal transaction" understanding of Christ's work.) Wicks says "Luther's stress on the unmerited *extra nos* of righteousness and its imputation in no way prevented him from" saying "that justification entails a mystical union with Christ the Savior in the depths of the believing person" (24). Aulén emphasizes the *Christus victor* (Christ's victory over Satan and evil) motif (Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study Of The Three Main Types Of The Idea Of Atonement*, trans. A. G. Hebert [New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966], 120). See pages 101-2 for Aulén's evaluations of interpretations of Luther. Althaus rejects Aulén's interpretation and concludes that Luther "combines the classical and the Latin concepts . . . but in such a way that he decisively follows the Latin line" (the satisfaction theory) (Althaus, 222). Lienhard agrees with Althaus that Luther found the term *Genugtuung* (*satisfactio*) "inadequate to express the work of Christ," and suggests that Luther's view of justification was not simply forensic, but rather included a present union of the believer with Christ (Marc Lienhard, *Luther: Witness To Jesus Christ*, trans. Edwin H. Robertson [Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1982], 181, 188). According to Ritschl, ". . . Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin define the Kingdom of Christ as the inward union between Christ and believers" (Albrecht Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine Of Reconciliation And Justification*, trans. H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay [Clifton, New Jersey: Reference Book Publishers, Inc., 1966], 11). Green says Luther's mature view includes Christ dwelling within the believer (Lowell C. Green, *How Melanchthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel: The Doctrine of Justification in the Reformation* [Fallbrook, California: Verdict Publications, 1980], 97-99). Leaver says that "for Luther, justification is not a naked imputation nor a simple declaration that the sinner is accounted righteous" and finds in Luther references to union with Christ and the indwelling of Christ in the believer (Robin A. Leaver, *Luther On Justification* [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1975], 27, 62). Pelikan suggests that Althaus' understanding of Luther's "significant metaphor" of Christ as Conqueror was correct but overstated, and that this insight requires the inclusion of Luther's emphases on both the death and resurrection of Christ (Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther The Expositor* [Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959], 184). McGrath characterizes Luther's mature understanding of faith (which he dates between 1517 and 1519) as "the bond which unites the believer with Christ, in a spiritual marriage which far transcends any mere external or forensic imputation of the

From a practical point of view Luther's rejection of the *acceptatio divina* theory is connected to his personal struggle to find acceptance with God.¹⁹ Luther began to search for a merciful God because of his *Anfechtung*,²⁰ for even in the midst of fasting, prayer, and rigorous discipline Luther could not quiet his conscience.²¹ However, since the *iustitia*

righteousness of Christ to the believer" (McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 174). Also see McGrath's *Iustitia Dei*, vol. II, 12-14.) Strehle sees a connection between Luther's *Christus victor* and union with Christ motifs (83-89). The following evaluation of a number of writers' views of the importance of the *Christus in nobis* motif in Luther's writings is taken from Lienhard (303, footnote 113). "K. Bornkamm, *Luthers Auslegungen*, p. 98: 'The idea of the close bond of the believer with Christ is more strongly emphasized (from 1519 onwards) as the principal basis of his affirmations'; Pesch, *Die Theologie der Rechtfertigung*, pp. 234-248; Joest, *Ontologie bei Luther*, pp. 370-382; Althaus, *Die Theologie Martin Luthers*, pp. 186-190; 200-203. In opposition to this, E. Seeberg, *Grundzüge*, p. 118 says, 'It is only in his early period that Luther insisted on justifying faith as effective union (*Einigung*) with Christ.' M. Greschat also notes the importance for him of union with Christ, but he thinks that the expression of Luther's thought became more doctrinal than mystical: 'In contrast with his earlier statements, the description of the union of the believer with Christ has now to a considerable extent exchanged its mystical attire for a rational mode' (p. 101). Both Seeberg's and Greschat's theses prompt certain reservations, but they are both correct in noting that the concept of Christ as the 'alien' righteousness of the believer gained in significance and that the idea of conforming to Christ has less emphasis in the later writings of Luther."

¹⁹WA 5.163: "Vivendo, immo moriendo et damnando fit theologus, non intelligendo, legendo aut speculando." For evaluations of Luther's "search" see Rupp, pages 102-20; Karl Holl, *What Did Luther Understand by Religion?*, edited by James Luther Adams and Walter F. Bense, translated by Fred W. Meuser and Walter R. Wietzke (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 32-62; Heinrich Boehmer, *Martin Luther: Road To Reformation*, trans. John W. Doberstein and Theodore G. Tappert (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), 87-117; Ozment, *The Age Of Reform*, 223-31; Schwiebert, *Luther And His Times*, 128-96; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. II, 1. McGrath, in *Luther's Theology Of The Cross* (110), states that Biel taught that "man simply cannot know with certainty whether he is worthy of hate or love by God."

²⁰*Anfechtung* means "temptation" or "acute despair" and refers to man's existential condition before God. Rupp (102-20) translates *Anfechtung* as "temptation" and discusses *Anfechtung* in relation to Luther's "bruised conscience." George says "temptation" is too weak a translation and translates the term "dread, despair, a sense of foreboding doom, assault, anxiety" (60). See Althaus, 33.

²¹Rupp, 104. WA 44.819: "Sicut ego olim monachus sperabam fore, ut possem conscientiam meam pacare ieiuniis, oratione, vigiliis, quibus adfligebam corpus meum miserabiliter, sed quo magis sudabam, hoc minus tranquillitatis et pacis sentiebam, quia vera lux erat ex oculis remota, eram sine fide, et invocabam Sanctos et beatam Virginem, offerebam eis missas, donec iam immenso Dei beneficio ex hac caligine rursus emergimus, et agnoscimus Christum, quem sepelivit monstrum illud Romanum et Sophistae eius." WA 40^{II}.15: "Ego Monachus studebam summa diligentia vivere iuxta praescriptum Regulae, solebam, semper tamen ante contritus, confiteri et recensere omnia peccata mea et saepe iterabam confessionem ac poenitentiam iniunctam mihi sedulo praestabam. Et tamen conscientia mea nunquam poterat certa reddi, sed semper dubitabat et dicebat: Hoc non

Dei is hidden in Christ,²² the person who has Christ has peace with God.²³ The anxiety that drove young Luther to search for a merciful God compelled him to accept both a "for you" (*Christus pro nobis*) and an "in you" (*Christus in nobis*) view of salvation.²⁴

The above summary of Luther's rejection of the *via moderna's* understanding of salvation has outlined two important elements of Luther's alternative understanding of salvation that need detailed examination: justification is trust in Christ and union with

fecisti recte, non fuisti satis contritus, hoc inter confitendum omisisti etc. Quo igitur longius conabar humanis traditionibus mederi incertae, imbecilli et afflictae conscientiae, hoc indies magis reddebam eam incertiore, imbecilliore et perturbatiore."

²²This statement raises the question of the relationship between Luther's Christology and soteriology. We will return to this matter later. Rupp says (170): "But Luther cannot speak of faith . . . and . . . of the Righteousness of God without the theme of Jesus Christ. It is this christocentric emphasis which separates his treatment of justification from that of the Nominalists, with their discussion of a divine 'acceptance' and their persistent recourse to the dialectic of the 'potestas ordinata' and the 'potestas absoluta.'" WA 10^{III}.125: "Was ist aber inn Christum glauben? Es ist nicht gleüben das er ein gott ist oder mit gott dem vater in gleicher gewalt hirschet im himmel, dann das glauben auch vill ander. Sonder das heist inn Christum gelaubet, wenn ich glaub das er mir ein genediger Gott sey, meine sünd uss sich genomen und mich mit gott dem vater versünet hatt, das meine sünd sein seind unnd sein gerechtigkeit mein, das do ein vermischung sey, das Christus ein mittler zwischen mir und dem vater sey." WA 47.173: "Sonst unsere gnugthuung erfüllet nichts, unser menschliche weisheit und gerechtigkeit verblendet die menschen, das sie diese himmelische Gerechtigkeit des himmelischen menschs nicht sehen, den sie meinen, sie konnens mit ihren irdischen wercken thun." WA 47.196: "Den ehr ist viel ein ander und ein wunderlicher prediger und lerer, do der heilige Geist nicht stucklicher weise innen ist als in andern, sondern zun Colossem wird gesagt: in ihme sind die Schetze der Weisheit, des lebens, der seligkeit, gnade und barmhertzigkeit, den die Gottheit wohnt in ihme leibhaftig. Darumb so ist der heilige Geist gantz und gahr da on alle mass, den ehr ist der eingeborne sohn des vaters. Wir sind wohl auch Gottes kinder, aber nicht der, so da alles hat, und von des fulle wir alles nemen."

²³The compulsion Luther felt to search for a merciful God caused him to see justification as primarily personal. Although he at first found assurance through acceptance of the church's pronouncement of absolution, Luther rejected the Catholic Church's sacramental view of salvation, i.e., the view that grace is mediated to the individual through the church apart from personal faith. Although Luther continued to emphasize the church's role in teaching the Word and observing the sacraments, Luther's understanding of justification is primarily a personal religious experience.

²⁴Bengt R. Hoffman, *Luther and the Mystics* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976) 134, 135. Hoffman connects "imputes" with "for you" (an objective Christ) and "abides" with "in you" (a subjective Christ). George (59-61), in discussing Luther's rejection of a purely "rational" faith, observes that Luther did not have a consistent theory of atonement. The whole Person of Christ is everything. McGrath even sees in Luther a connection between the sinner's *Anfechtung* and Christ's *Anfechtung* (*Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 173). See also Marilyn J. Haran, *Luther On Conversion: The Early Years* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983).

Christ.²⁵ Justification is trusting a Person, not doing the best one can as a means to receiving grace. According to Luther, the righteousness of God is revealed "only in the Gospel . . . (that is, who is and becomes righteous before God and how this takes place) by faith alone, by which the Word of God is believed. . . ." ²⁶ The sinner becomes righteous by faith alone, not by *facientibus quod in se est*. In his "Theses Concerning Faith and Law" (1535) Luther outlines his understanding of faith and works in relation to salvation and Christ.

22. True faith with arms outstretched joyfully embraces the Son of God given for it and says, 'He is my beloved and I am his'. . . . 24. Accordingly, that 'for me' or 'for us,' if it is believed, creates that true faith and distinguishes it from all other faith, which merely hears the things done. 25. This is the faith that alone justifies us without law and works through the mercy of God shown in Christ.²⁷

Negatively one can say that the righteousness that justifies is neither the product of a human impulse nor the result of a human work of righteousness. Man does not earn righteousness through human effort.²⁸

²⁵McGrath, *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 174.

²⁶LW 25.151; WA 56.172: "Sed in solo euangelio reuelatur Iustitia Dei (i.e. quis et quomodo sit et fiat Iustus coram Deo) per solam fidem, qua Dei verbo creditur."

²⁷WA 39I.46: "Fides vera extensis brachiis amplectitur laeta filium Dei pro sese traditum et dicit: Dilectus meus mihi et ego illi. . . . 24. Igitur illud, pro Me, seu pro Nobis, si creditur, facit istam veram fidem et secernit ab omni alia fide, quae res tantum gestas audit. 25. Haec est fides, quae sola nos iustificat sine lege et operibus, per misericordiam Dei, in Christo exhibitam."

²⁸Rupp, 228. WA 5.311: "Ipse enim est saluberrimum unguentum, ipse consolatio nostra, seu ut Apostolus i. Cor. i. 'Ipse iustitia, sanctificatio, sapientia, redemptio nostra a deo nobis factus'. Quibus verbis optime energiam huius nominis, salutare et usum Christi et incorporationem nostri in Christum exposuit, modo vites somniatores sophistas, qui Christum nobis sic iusticiam et sapientiam faciunt, ut semper vel obiectum vel causam iustitiae nostrae statuant, usum vero eius, qui est per fidem in eum, penitus ignorantes, de quo solo loquitur Paulus. Fides enim in Christum facit eum in me vivere et moveri et agere, non secus atque salutare unguentum in aegrum corpus agit, efficimurque cum Christo una caro et unum corpus per intimam et ineffabilem transmutationem peccati nostri in illius iustitiam, sicut nobis repraesentat venerabile altaris sacramentum, ubi panis et vinum in Christi carnem et sanguinem transformantur." WA 56.298.22: "Vtilissime vtrunque Apostolus Coniungit, vtrunque 'per Christum', 'per fidem', Sicut et supra: 'Iustificati ex fide per Dominum nostrum' etc. Primo contra presumptuosos, qui sine Christo confidunt accedere ad Deum, quasi sufficiat eis credidisse ac sic sola fide, non per Christum, Sed Iuxta Christum, Velut Vltterius Christo non egentes post acceptam gratiam Iustificationis." WA 56.171.28: "Sed in solo euangelio reuelatur Iustitia Dei (i.e., quis et quomodo sit et fiat Iustus coram Deo) per solam fidem, qua Dei verbo creditur. Vt Marci Vltimo: 'Qui crediderit et baptisatus fuerit, saluus erit. Qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur.' Iustitia

However, the negative has a positive correlative. God reveals His righteousness in the Gospel, and this righteousness comes by faith in Christ. We are "made righteous by God . . . through faith in the Gospel."²⁹ The obvious question is what Luther means by "the Gospel." Luther says "faith . . . comes only through God's Word or gospel, which preaches Christ. . . ."³⁰ God's Word is equivalent to the gospel that preaches Christ. In his "Freedom of a Christian" Luther says the Word of God "is the gospel of God concerning his Son. . . . To preach Christ means to feed the soul, make it righteous. . . . Faith alone is the saving and efficacious use of the Word of God. . . ."³¹ "Faith, the Word, and Christ belong together. . . ."³² "Christ penetrates your heart through the medium of the gospel, by way of your hearing, and dwells there by your faith."³³ For Luther the Gospel is the preaching of the good news about Christ, whether that

enim Dei est causa salutis. Et hic iterum 'Iustitia Dei' non ea debet accipi, qua ipse Iustus est in seipso, Sed qua nos ex ipso Iustificamur, quod fit per fidem euangelii."

²⁹LW 25.151. WA 56.172: "Et hic iterum 'Iustitia Dei' non ea debet accipi, qua ipse Iustus est in seipso, Sed qua nos ex ipso Iustificamur, quod fit per fidem euangelii."

³⁰Luther's "Preface to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans," 1546. LW 35.368. WA, DB 7.3-27.

³¹WA 7.22.23-23.6: "Fragistu aber 'wilchs ist denn das wort, das solch grosse gnad gibt, Und wie sol ichs gebrauchen?' Antwort: Es ist nit anders, denn die predigt von Christo geschehen, wie das Evangelium ynnehelt. Wilche soll seyn, und ist also gethan, das du hörst deynen gott zu dir reden, Wie alle deyn leben und werck nichts seyn fur gott, sondern müßsist mit allen dem das ynn dir ist ewiglich vorterbien. Wilchs so du recht glaubst, wie du schuldig bist, so mustu an dir selber vortzweyffeln, und bekennen, das war sey der spruch Osee: 'O Israel, yn dir ist nichts, denn deyn vorterbien, alleyn aber yn mir steht deyn hulff'. Das du aber auß dir und von dir, das ist auß deynem vorterbien, kommen mügist, so setzt er dir fur seynen lieben soñ Jhesum Christum, und leßsit dir durch seyn lebendigs trostlichs wort sagen: Du solt ynn den selben mit festem glauben dich ergeben, und frisch ynn yhn vortrawen, So sollen dir umb desselben glaubens willen alle deyne sund vorgeben, alle deyn vorterbien überwunden seyn, und du gerecht, warhafftig, befridet, frum und alle gebott erfüllet seyn, von allen dingen frey sein." See Julius Köstlin, *The Theology Of Luther In Its Historical Development And Inner Harmony*, trans. Charles E. Hay, vol. I (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1897), 412. He says Luther "conceives of God directly as revealing Himself in the Word . . . as a proclamation of grace."

³²Ian D. Kingston Siggins, *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 149.

³³Siggins, 70. WA 10¹.48.16: "Sihe also geht er durchs Euangeli zu den oren ey n ynn deyn hertz und wonet alda durch deynen glawben, da bistu denn reyn und gerecht, nit durch deyn thun, sondern durch den gast, den du ym hertzen durch den glawbenn hast empfangen." WA 19.490.3: "Über yhene sehen der dinge keines, wie gros es ist, das Christus also ym hertzen wonet und sich teilet ynn eines iglichen hertz gantz und gar und wird durchs wort ausgebreitet."

proclamation comes through the Scripture or through the preaching of the Scripture by man.³⁴ In either case the Gospel is the proclamation of Christ by which **faith** is formed in man. For Luther this is the same as saying that **Christ** is formed in man, for the person who receives the Word and faith receives Christ.³⁵

This implies that the eternal Word serves the purpose of engendering faith and of imparting the Holy Spirit. For God has decreed that no one can or will believe or receive the Holy Spirit without that Gospel which is preached or taught by word of mouth. . . . In Rom. 10:17 the apostle declares: 'Faith comes from preaching, and preaching by the Word of God.'³⁶

Christ is present in faith and dwells and works in our hearts.³⁷ Faith is as an empty container or as a husk while Christ is the kernel.³⁸ According to Luther, faith is both founded on and given in the Word.

Many of the passages in Luther's writings that speak of receiving Christ and his benefits refer also to union with Christ. Since faith is *fides Christi*,³⁹ faith justifies because

³⁴Althaus, 47-53; Siggins, 68-75; Lienhard, 286-287; Loewenich, 102-103.

³⁵Since faith receives Christ, the faith that justifies is not faith in faith.

³⁶LW 22.54; WA 46.538ff. LW 29.224; WA 57^{III}.222: "For if you ask a Christian what the work is by which he becomes worthy of the name 'Christian,' the hearing of the Word of God, that is, faith." WA 21.538.34ff: "Sondern es ist diese newe geburt, so Gottes kinder machet, oder die gerechtigkeit fur Gott ein ander ding, so in des Menschen hertzen geschicht, nicht durch menschlich eigen furnemen und thun, Denn das ist alles Fleisch und kan Gottes Reich nicht sehen, sondern durch das Wort des Euangelii, so da dem herzen zeigt und offenbaret beide, Gottes zorn uber den Menschen zur Busse und seine gnade durch den Mittler Christum zu trost und friede des gewissens fur Gott." LW 23.250; WA 33.398: "Wir werden durch das wort zu Christen und durch das wortt wirdt die sunde undterlassen, den es prediget vergebung der sunde. Seine wortt gehen dohin, das man von sunden loss werde, die seligkeit und ewige leben erlange. Wir werden dardurch erloset vom Teuffle und tode, dan seine wortt gehen alle darwider. Man hat vergebung der sunde und alles gutths darbon. Ihr macht uns auch gerecht, den sein wortt gehet wit gerechtigkeit umb. Als dan weiss ein Christ, das Christus Gottes Sohn sei und von einer Jungfrauen geborn."

³⁷WA 10^I.160.22-161.5: ". . . wer da glewbt ynn yhn, das er solchs fur unß than hatt, durch und umb desselben glawbenß willen wonet er selb ynn unß und reynigett unß teglich durch seyn selbs eygen werck alßo, das tzur reynigung der sunden nichts mag helfen oder gethan werden, denn alleyn Christus selbs. Nu mag er nit ynn unß seyn noch solch reynigung durch sich selbs wircken, denn nur ynn unnd durch den glawben."

³⁸WA 21.48.38ff.

³⁹Faith is of Christ, or belongs to Christ, or comes with Christ.

it unites with Christ and receives the righteousness of Christ.⁴⁰ The sinner is righteous because Christ is his righteousness.⁴¹ The righteousness of the Christ who lives in us covers sin.⁴² Since faith and Christ belong together, Christ is not so much an object of faith as present in the faith itself. Both faith and Christ are present in the believer.⁴³ Christ is present in the believer and is therefore the believer's present life.⁴⁴ By faith the believer and Christ become one.⁴⁵ Luther even speaks of Christ and the believer as "one cake" (*unus kuch*).⁴⁶

In his "Freedom of a Christian" Luther discusses in detail the relationship between Christ and the Christian by using the image of marriage.⁴⁷

⁴⁰Althaus, 227-33. Althaus maintains, however, that righteousness is both "alien" and "imputed" to the believer despite this union with Christ. We will return to this matter later.

⁴¹LW 21.60; WA 32.349: "Denn wenn ich das dehalte, das Christus allein meine gerechtigkeit und heiligkeit ist. . . ." WA 40I.229.28: "Ergo fide apprehensus et in corde habitans Christus est iustitia Christiana propter quam Deus nos reputat iustos et donat vitam aeternam."

⁴²Lienhard, 59. WA 56.278.1-5: "Tegitur, inquam, per Christum in nobis habitantem, Sicut in figura dixit Ruth ad Boos: 'Expande pallium tuum super famulam tuam, quia propinquus es.' 'Et leuato pallio proiecit se ad pedes eius' i. e. anima proiicit se ad humanitatem Christi et tegitur ipsius Iustitia."

⁴³Loewenich, 104. See McGrath's discussion in *Iustitia Dei*, vol. II, 14.

⁴⁴WA 2.502.12ff; LW 27.238: "The righteous man himself does not live; but Christ lives in him, because through faith Christ dwells in him and pours His grace into him, through which it comes about that man is governed, not by his own spirit but by Christ's."

⁴⁵Loewenich, 104. Loewenich is aware of the issues this kind of language can raise. He hastens to add that the believer and Christ are "as if one person." See Siggins, 226-227. LW 26.168; WA, 40I.284.26: "Quia ergo vivit in me Christus, necesse est simul cum eo adesse gratiam, iustitiam, vitam ac salutem aeternam et abesse legem, peccatum, mortem. . . ." WA 40I.443.23ff; LW 26.283f.

⁴⁶WA 20.677.3-7: "Christus ist sein herr, qui teilt im die selben salben et spiritum sanctum mit, et sic trauet er auf yn, et unus kuch, eandem iusticiam habeo quam ille. Ergo ex sola fide Christiani finus, per quam induo eum et econtra ipse me et per hunc leg ich all mein ungluck auff ynn, econtra omnia bona ipse auff mich." WA 47.172.34.

⁴⁷Köstlin, vol. I, 414 notes that "the third and incomparable 'virtue of faith' consists, finally, in the *union with Christ Himself* which it effects." Köstlin believes that Luther's emphasis on union with Christ and Christ in us in "Freedom of a Christian" represents an early position which to some extent is less prominent in Luther's later writings, although his later writings present the same truth in the same way (vol. II, 428-29).

The third incomparable benefit of faith is that it unites the soul with Christ as a bride is united with her bridegroom. By this mystery, as the Apostle teaches, Christ and the soul become one flesh [Eph. 5:31-32]. And if they are one flesh and there is between them a true marriage—indeed the most perfect of all marriages, since human marriages are but poor examples of this one true marriage—it follows that everything they have they hold in common, the good as well as the evil. Accordingly the believing soul can boast of and glory in whatever Christ has as though it were its own, and whatever the soul has Christ claims as his own. Let us compare these and we shall see inestimable benefits. Christ is full of grace, life, and salvation. The soul is full of sins, death, and damnation. Now let faith come between them and sins, death, and damnation will be Christ's, while grace, life, and salvation will be the soul's; for if Christ is a bridegroom, he must take upon himself the things which are his bride's and bestow upon her the things that are his. If he gives her his body and very self, how shall he not give her all that is his? And if he takes the body of the bride, how shall he not take all that is hers?⁴⁸

Luther writes of union of the soul with Christ as the basis of grace, life, and salvation, and refers to it as the means by which the believer is endowed with the eternal life, righteousness, and salvation of Christ the bridegroom. One benefit of faith is its union of the soul with Christ in the same way as the bride is united with her bridegroom. He even says that Christ and the soul become one flesh. For this reason they hold in common the good as well as the evil so that whatever Christ possesses becomes the believer's possession. Of course, Christ also takes upon Himself all that the believer possesses, including sin. However, this creates no problem for Christ because He swallows up both sin and its consequences.⁴⁹

⁴⁸"Rit allein gibt der glaub Sovil, das die seel dem gottlichen wort gleych wirt aller gnaden voll, frey und selig, sondern voreynigt auch die seele mit Christo, als eyne bramt mit yhrem breudgam. Auß wilcher ehe folget, wie S. Paulus sagt, das Christus und die seel eyn leyb werden, so werden auch beyder gutter fall, unfall und alle ding gemeyn, das was Christus hatt, das ist eygen der glaubigen seele, was die seele hatt, wirt eygen Christi. So hatt Christus alle güter und seligkeit, die seyn der seelen eygen. So hatt die seel alle untugent und sund auff yhr, die werden Christi eygen. Hie hebt sich nu der frölich wechßel und streytt. Die weyl Christus ist gott und mensch, wilcher noch nie gesündigt hatt, und seyne frumkeyt unübirwindlich, ewig und almechtig ist, so er denn der glaubigen seelen sund durch yhren braudtring, das ist der glaub, ym selbs eygen macht und nit anders thut, denn als hett er sie gethan, so müssen die sund ynn yhm vorschlundenn und erseufft werden, denn sein unübirwindlich gerechtigkeit ist allenn sunden zustark, also wirt die seele von allen yhren sunden, lauterlich durch yhren malschatzts, das ist des glaubens halben, ledig und frey, und begabt mit der ewigen gerechtikeit yhrs breüdgamß Christi." Martin Luther, "Von der Freyheyte ynsiz Christen menschen," in WA 7.25-26; LW 31.351.

⁴⁹We see here Aulén's *Christus Victor* motif. Aulén contends that Luther "spoke very severely about the use of this word" satisfaction and used "merit" and "satisfaction" in "direct relation to Christ's conflict and His victory over the 'tyrants'" (118).

In his 1535 commentary on Galatians Luther says peace, comfort, righteousness, and justification itself depends on Christ living in the believer.

When he says: "Nevertheless, I live," this sounds rather personal, as though Paul were speaking of his own person. Therefore he quickly corrects it and says: "Yet not I." That is, "I do not live in my own person now, but Christ lives in me" (*Christus in me vivit*). The person does indeed live, but not in itself or for its own person. But who is this "I" of whom he says: "Yet not I"? It is the one that has the Law and is obliged to do works, the one that is a person separate from Christ. This "I" Paul rejects; for "I" as a person distinct from Christ, belongs to death and hell. This is why he says: "Not I, but Christ lives in me." Christ is my "form" (*forma*) which adorns my faith as color or light adorns a wall. This fact has to be expounded in this crude way, for there is no spiritual way for us to grasp the idea that Christ clings and dwells in us (*haerere et manere in nobis*) as closely and intimately as light or whiteness clings to a wall. "Christ," he says, "is fixed and cemented to me and abides in me (*inhaerens et conglutinator mihi et manens in me hanc vitam quam ago, vivit in me*). The life that I now live, He lives in me. Indeed, Christ Himself is the life that I now live. In this way, therefore, Christ and I are one."

Living in me as he does, Christ abolishes the Law, damns sin, and kills death; for at His presence all these cannot help disappearing. Christ is eternal Peace, Comfort, Righteousness, and Life, to which the terror of the Law, sadness of mind, sin, hell, and death have to yield. Abiding and living in me, Christ removes and absorbs all the evils that torment and afflict me. This attachment to Him causes me to be liberated from the terror of the Law and of sin, pulled out of my own skin, and transferred into Christ and into His kingdom, which is a kingdom of grace, righteousness, peace, joy, life, salvation, and eternal glory. Since I am in Him, no evil can harm me.⁵⁰

⁵⁰WA 40^I.283.19-284.19: "Quod dicit: 'Vivo autem', sonat personaliter, quasi Paulus loquatur de sua persona. Ideo mox corrigit, dicens: 'Iam non ego', id est: Non ego iam in mea persona vivo, sed 'Christus in me vivit.' Persona quidem vivit, sed non in se aut pro sua persona. Sed quis est ille Ego, de quo dicit: 'Iam non Ego'? Is ego est qui legem habet et operari debet quique est persona quaedam segregata a Christo. Illum Ego Paulus reiicit, Quia Ego ut distincta persona a Christo pertinet ad mortem et Infernum. Ideo inquit: 'Iam non Ego, sed Christus in me vivit'; Is est mea forma ornans fidem meam, ut color vel lux parietem ornat. (Sic crasse res illa exponenda est; Non enim possumus spiritualiter comprehendere tam proxime et intime Christum haerere et manere in nobis, quam lux vel albedo in pariete haeret.) Christus ergo, inquit, sic inhaerens et conglutinator mihi et manens in me hanc vitam quam ago, vivit in me, imo vita qua sic vivo, est Christus ipse. Itaque Christus et ego iam unum in hac parte sumus.

Vivens autem in me Christus abolet legem, peccatum damnat, mortem mortificat, quia ad praesentiam ipsius illa non possunt non evanescere. Est enim Christus aeterna pax, consolatio, iustitia et vita; His autem cedere oportet terrorem legis, moerorem animi, peccatum, Infernum, mortem. Sic Christus in me manens et vivens tollit et absorbet omnia mala quae me cruciant et affligunt. Quare haec inhaerentia facit, ut liberer a terroribus legis et peccati, eximar e cute mea et transferar in Christum ac in illius regnum, quod est regnum gratiae, iustitiae, pacis, gaudii, vitae, salutis et gloriae aeternae; in illo autem agens, nihil mali potest nocere mihi."

Meanwhile my old man (Eph. 4:22) remains outside and is subject to the Law. But so far as justification is concerned, Christ and I must be so closely attached that He lives in me and I in Him. What a marvelous way of speaking! Because He lives in me, whatever grace, righteousness, life, peace, and salvation there is in me is all Christ's; nevertheless, it is mine as well, by the cementing and attachment that are through faith, by which we become as one body in the Spirit. Since Christ lives in me, grace, righteousness, life, and eternal salvation must be present with Him; and the Law, sin, and death must be absent. . . . Paul seeks to withdraw us completely from ourselves, from the Law, and from works, and to transplant us into Christ and faith in Christ, so that in the area of justification we look only at grace, and separate it far from the Law and from works, which belong far away. . . .

But faith must be taught correctly, namely, that by it you are so cemented to Christ that He and you are as one person, which cannot be separated but remains attached to Him forever and declares: "I am as Christ." And Christ, in turn, says: "I am as that sinner who is attached to Me, and I to him. For by faith we are joined together into one flesh and one bone." Thus Eph. 5:30 says: "We are members of the body of Christ, of His flesh and of His bones," in such a way that this faith couples Christ and me more intimately than a husband is coupled to his wife.⁵¹

When "faith grasps and embraces Christ . . . we have righteousness and life"⁵² because "Christ is eternal Peace, Comfort, Righteousness, and Life. . . ." Christianity is Christ, for without Christ there is no spiritual life or victory. Forgiveness and justification depend on a living Christ who is joined to the believer by faith. As far as justification is concerned, Luther says explicitly that "Christ and I must be so closely attached that He lives in me and I in Him." The believer must withdraw completely from himself, and for that to happen God must "transplant us into Christ and faith in Christ, so that in the area of justification we look only at grace." By faith "you are so cemented to Christ that He and

⁵¹LW 26.167-8; WA 40I.284-6: "Interim foris quidem manet vetus homo, subiectus legi; sed quantum attinet ad iustificationem, oportet Christum et me esse coniunctissimos, ut ipse in me vivat et ego in illo (Mirabilis est haec loquendi ratio). Quia vero in me vivit, ideo, quidquid in me est gratiae, iustitiae, vitae, pacis, salutis, est ipsius Christi, et tamen illud ipsum meum est per conglutinationem et inhaesionem quae est per fidem, per quam efficimur quasi unum corpus in spiritu. Quia ergo vivit in me christus, necesse est simul cum eo adesse gratiam, iustitiam, vitam ac salutem aeternam et abesse legem, peccatum, mortem, Imo legem a lege, peccatum a peccato, mortem a morte, Diabolum a Diabolo crucifigi, devorari et aboleri. . . . Verum recte docenda est fides, quod per eam sic conglutineris Christo, ut ex te et ipso fiat quasi una persona quae non possit segregari sed perpetuo adhaerescat ei et dicat: Ego sum ut Christus, et vicissim Christus dicat: Ego sum ut ille peccator, quia adhaeret mihi, et ego illi; Coniuncti enim sumus per fidem in unam carnem et os, Eph. 5.: 'Membra sumus corporis Christi, de carne eius et de ossibus eius.' Ita, ut haec fides Christum et me arctius copulet, quam maritus est uxori copulatus."

⁵²Luther even speaks sometimes of the believer being united with God. See Hoffman, 176, 177.

you are as one person. . . ." In an attempt to explain how Christ dwells in the believer, Luther says that "there is no spiritual way for us to grasp the idea that Christ clings and dwells *in nobis*," although he adds that "Christ clings and dwells *in nobis* as closely and intimately as light or whiteness clings to a wall."⁵³ Christ and the believer are cemented to each other.⁵⁴

Luther's *Christus in nobis* understanding of justification is integral to his Christology.⁵⁵ In Christ the human and divine are united to constitute one person.⁵⁶ "The man Christ is a divine person who assumed human nature."⁵⁷ For this reason "the two distinct natures of God and man are united in the undivided person of Christ"⁵⁸ in the same way that the believer is both *simul iustus et peccator* and *semper iustus et peccator*.⁵⁹ "The Christian is at the same time (*simul*) wholly and partly sinner and justified."⁶⁰ God (divinity) is hidden in Christ in the same way that Christ (divinity) is hidden in man. This

⁵³WA 40I. 283: "Sic crasse res illa exponenda est; Non enim possumus spiritualiter comprehendere tam proxime et intime Christum haerere et manere in nobis, quam lux vel albedo in pariete haeret."

⁵⁴Ibid.: "Christus ergo, inquit, sic inhaerens et conglutinator mihi et manens in me hanc vitam quam ago, vivit in me, imo vita qua sic vivo, est Christus ipse. Itaque Christus et ego iam unum in hac parte sumus."

⁵⁵Lienhard, 123; Aulén, 108.

⁵⁶Lienhard, 329, 330. WA 39II.98.6ff.: "Sunt illae naturae coniunctae personaliter in unitate personae. Non sunt duo filii, non duo iudices, non duae personae, non duo Iesus, sed propter unitam coniunctionem et unitatem duarum naturarum fit communicatio idiomatum, ut, quid uni naturae tribuitur, tribuitur et alteri, quia fit una persona." WA 39II.100.17ff.: "Nego consequentiam, et ratio est, quia humanitas et divinitas in Christo constituunt unam personam. Sed illae duae naturae sunt distinctae in theologia, scilicet secundum naturas, sed non secundum personam. Nam tum sunt indistinctae, sed duae distinctae naturae, sed indistinctae personae. Non sunt duae personae distinctae, sed sunt distinctae indistinctae, id est, sunt distinctae naturae, sed indistinctae personae." WA 39II.110.22; 101.8; 101.19; 102.3; 106.26ff.; 114.15ff.

⁵⁷Lienhard, 330. WA 39II.117-18: "Ergo aliter significat in Christus homo; Christus homo, id est, persona divina, quae suscipit humanam naturam, persona enim non suscipit personam."

⁵⁸Siggins, 222. WA 26.326.31: "Jhesus Christus ist wesentlich naturlicher, warhafftiger, volliger Gott und mensch ynn einer person unzurtrennet und ungeteilet." WA 33.232.6; 45.467.33; 45.556.20; 47.52.20.

⁵⁹George, 71.

⁶⁰John R. Loeschen, *Wrestling With Luther* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1976), 75-77. See also Althaus, 240-45.

divinity gives the sinner life although he is a sinner and unrighteous.⁶¹ The righteousness of the believer is extrinsic to him while Christ is really present within.⁶²

Luther's Christology is also integral to his ecclesiology. "The Spirit can only be in us through physical (corporal) things, such as the Word, water, the body of Christ and his saints on earth."⁶³ As one writer affirms, "Even the development of an ecclesiology from the doctrine of the humanity of Christ . . . in which Jesus is present in his members on earth is hinted at in Luther's writings."⁶⁴ God is not only present, but also both hidden and revealed in the despised human Christ.⁶⁵ "Where you place God, you must also place his humanity. These two can be neither separated nor divided."⁶⁶ Christ is not only God but man, and the church in some way continues Christ's incarnation.⁶⁷ As the body of Christ the church represents Christ's humanity.⁶⁸ Since believers lose neither their humanity nor their propensity to sin,⁶⁹ the church always expresses the humanity both of

⁶¹Lienhard, 159, 160.

⁶²McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, II, 14. WA 10^I.199.14; 202.15.

⁶³Translation taken from Neal Blough, "Pilgrim Marpeck, Martin Luther, And The Humanity Of Christ," *MQR* 61 (April, 1987): 211. WA 23.193: ". . . der geist bei uns nicht sein kan anders denn in leiblichen dingen als im wort, wassen und inn seiner heiligen auff erden."

⁶⁴Blough, 211. WA 33.81-82: Christ can be found "in the manger, on the cross, in baptism, in the Lord's Supper, in preaching, or in my neighbor or brother."

⁶⁵Althaus, 183; Aulén, 219. In Luther "discourse on God's relations with the world must be considered discourse on God's real incarnation in flesh, else the humanity of Christ is in doubt" (Loeschen, *Wrestling With Luther*, 177).

⁶⁶Blough, 211. WA 26.333: "Wo du wir Gott hinsetzest, da mustu mir die menscheit mit ihm setzen, Sie lassen sich nicht sondern und von einander trennen."

⁶⁷Lienhard, 49.

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 49, 382. WA 4.406.22-31. See also Rupp: "Luther thought of Christ as head of the Church in his humanity" (311).

⁶⁹Robert E. Webber, *The Secular Saint* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Pub. House, 1979), 125. "Luther's view of the church in the world follows the same pattern as his view of the Christian in the world. The church is to be found in two realms of existence. In the heavenly realm it is totally just before God, but in its earthly and visible manifestation it expresses itself simultaneously in both the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world. Consequently, its existence in Christ is as a spiritual and internal communion while its existence in the world is as an external communion." Luther's understanding of justification is integral to his ecclesiology. Both the Christian and the church are hidden in society in the same way that Christ is hidden in man.

Christ and of its members.⁷⁰ In the same way that God is hidden in Christ and Christ is hidden in man, both the Christian and the church are hidden in society because "the Church is invisible and is recognizable by faith alone."⁷¹

The faith that grasps Christ and thereby justifies is not, however, merely historical faith. Luther contrasts "historical faith" with "true faith."⁷² Historical faith is an "intellectual acceptance of the facts concerning the life, work, and death of Jesus of Nazareth without a personal commitment to that Lord Jesus Christ, the object of faith."⁷³ Historical or acquired faith views Christ and His work from a distance as objects to be analyzed and fails to embrace the Son of God. Historical faith observes the Christ of the cross but fails to embrace the Christ who is alive and present in the preached Word and in faith. Christ's death on the cross once for all is not enough for forgiveness. Sinners must now receive Christ in the Word. This is true faith.⁷⁴ Christ's resurrection means that the events of Christ's life are new every day for me.⁷⁵ True faith embraces the risen

⁷⁰WA 4.406.22.

⁷¹Rupp, 317. WA 3.124.36. Rupp also quotes from WA 7.710.1: "Therefore, as this rock (Christ) is invisible and only to be grasped by faith, so too the Church (apart from sin) must be spiritual and invisible, to be grasped only by faith." Luther's understanding of the Church as invisible contributed to his *corpus christianum* view of the Church's relationship to society. This does not mean, of course, that Luther did not emphasize the local church. He did emphasize the local church, and at times he even spoke of a church within a church (LW 40.7ff., WA 12.169ff.; WA 11.406ff; LW 53.63f.; WA 19.75; LW 51.73; WA 1.19). However, Luther never saw the church as a "separatist conventicle" (George Huston Williams, "Congregationalist Luther And The Free Churches," *Lutheran Quarterly* 19 [1967], 293). C. Cyril Eastwood, "Luther's Conception of the Church," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 11.1 (March 1958): 26. Also see Clarence Bauman, "The Theology Of 'The Two Kingdoms:' A Comparison Of Luther And The Anabaptists," *MQR* 38.1 (Jan. 1964): 46-49.

⁷²Hoffman, 51. WA 40.III.738.4ff. (1544). LW 22.153; 23.144; 26.168, 269; 27.28; 34.109; 8.193.

⁷³Leaver, 29.

⁷⁴"For even if Christ gave himself for us a thousand times and were a thousand times crucified for us, all would be in vain if the Word of God did not come to distribute it and to offer it to me, saying: It is for you, take it, receive it. . . . If then I want my sins forgiven, I must not run to the cross, for there I do not find the forgiveness of sins attributed. Neither must I simply cling to the remembrance and knowledge of the suffering of Christ . . . but to the sacrament or the gospel; it is there that I find the Word which attributes it to me, offers it to me, presents it to me and gives me that pardon acquired on the cross" (WA 18.203.27-29).

⁷⁵Loewenich, 102. WA.40^I.523.30ff.; LW 26.340.

Lord.⁷⁶ Christ's present life and Person are the believer's life, righteousness, justification, and victory.

Although Luther spoke of Christ living *in nobis* and of true faith embracing and uniting the believer with Christ, he also spoke of Christ and His righteousness as being alien. "Christ or Christ's righteousness is outside of us and alien . . . to us."⁷⁷ "All become righteous by another's righteousness."⁷⁸ "To be outside of us means to be beyond our powers. Righteousness is our possession, to be sure, since it was given to us out of mercy. Nevertheless, it is alien to us, because we have not merited it."⁷⁹ By these statements Luther attempts to show that the righteousness that believers possess is not their own. Luther also uses the terms *reputare* and *imputare* to express the relationship between the righteousness that justifies and the one who is justified,⁸⁰ although he does not develop a theology of *iustitia imputata*.⁸¹ It is obvious that Luther uses the terms "alien" and

⁷⁶LW 43.65 (1522).

⁷⁷In his "Disputation concerning Justification" Luther says "it is certain that Christ or the righteousness of Christ, since it is outside of us and foreign to us, cannot be laid hold of by our works" (LW 34.153; WA 39I.83: "Iam certum est, Christum seu iustitiam Christi, cum sit extra nos et aliena nobis, non posse nostris operibus comprehendere.") WA 40I.229; LW 26.130: "Ergo fide apprehensus et in corde habitans Christus est iustitia Christiana propter quam Deus nos reputat iustos et donat vitam aeternam. Ibi certe nullum est opus legis, nulla dilectio, sed longe alia iustitia et novus quidam mundus extra et supra legem; Christus enim vel fides non est Lex nec opus legis."

⁷⁸LW 27.222: "This is a righteousness that is bountiful. . . . Indeed, since it is directed toward Christ and His name, which is righteousness, the result is that the righteousness of Christ and of the Christian are one and the same, united with each other in all inexpressible way. . . . Thus it comes about that just as all became sinners because of another's sin, so by Another's righteousness all become righteous. . . ." WA 2.491: "Haec est iusticia liberalis. . . . Immo cum sit in Christum et nomen eius, quod est iusticia, fit, ut Christi et Christiani iusticia sit una eademque ineffabiliter sibi coniuncta. . . . Ita fit, ut, sicut alieno peccato omnes facti sunt peccatores, ita aliena iusticia omnes fiant iusti."

⁷⁹Quoted from Althaus, 228. LW 34.178; WA 39I.109: "Est phrasis grammatica. Extra nos esse est ex nostris viribus non esse. Est quidem iustitia possessio nostra, quia nobis donata est ex misericordia, tamen est aliena a nobis, quia non meruimus eam." WA 39I.235.

⁸⁰McGrath, *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*, 135, 136. WA 56.287.16-22: "Patet, Quia illi qualitatem asserunt anime etc. Sed 'Iustitia' Scripture magis pendet ab imputatione Dei quam ab esse rei. Ille enim habet Iustitiam, non qui qualitatem solam habet, immo ille peccator est omnino et Iniustus, Sed quem Deus propter confessionem iniustitiae suae et implorationem Iustitiae Dei misericorditer reputat et voluit Iustum apud se haberi."

⁸¹McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. II, 14.

"imputed" to emphasize the fact that Christ and His righteousness do not become qualities of the human soul. Christ and his righteousness are alien in the sense that they are neither earned by works nor become a part of one's "essence." This does not mean, however, that Christ is not joined to the believer. "This is a peculiar righteousness: it is strange indeed that we are to be called righteous or to possess a righteousness which is in us but is entirely outside us in Christ and yet becomes our very own, as though we ourselves had achieved and earned it."⁸² This righteousness is in us because Christ is in us, not because we earned it. Luther's assertion "that those who reduce justification to mere imputation render the cross of Christ superfluous" supports this view of what Luther means by "alien righteousness."⁸³ Luther does not use these terms in the same way Melancthon and orthodox Lutheranism did after the Formula of Concord.⁸⁴

Philip Melancthon (1497-1560), Luther's coworker, did not follow Luther's understanding of justification.⁸⁵ Despite an emphasis in his earliest writings on personal

⁸²Quoted from Althaus, 228. LW 24.347; WA 46.44: "Das ist jhe eine Wunderliche Gerechtigkeit, das wir sollen gerecht heissen oder Gerechtigkeit haben, welche doch kein werck, kein gedancken und kurtz gar nichts in uns, sondern gar ausser uns in Christo ist und doch warhafftig Unser wird durch sein gnade und geschenck, Und so gar unser eigen, als were sie durch uns selbs erlangt und ertworben."

⁸³Strehle, 87. WA 10^I.468, 469: "Es sind ettlich zuuor unter den newen hohen schullerern, die da sagen, Es lige die vorgebung der sund und rechtfertigung der gnaden gantz und gar ynn der gottlichen imputation, das ist: an gottis tzurechen, das es gnug sey, wilchem gott die sund tzrechne odder nit tzurechne, derselb sey dadurch rechtfertigett odder nit rechtfertigt von seynen sunden, wie die .31. psalm unnd Ro. 3. sie dunckt lauten, da er sagt: Selig ist der mensch, dem gott nit tzurechnet seyne sunde. Wo ditz war were, sso ist das gantz new testament schon nichts unnd vorgebens. Unnd Christus hatt nerrisch und unnutzlich geerbeytet, das er fur die sund geliden hatt. Auch gott selb hett damit eyin lautter spiegelfechten und tauckelspiell on alle nott getrieben. Syntemal on Christus leyden er wol hette mugen vorgeben unnd nitt tzurechnen die sund, und also mochte auch wol eyn ander glawbe, denn ynn Christum, rechtfertig und selig machen. Nemlich, der auff solch gnedige gottis barmhertzickeytt sich vorliesse, das yhm seyn sund nit wurden gerechnet. Widder dissen grewlichen, schrecklichenn vorstandt unnd yrthum hatt der heylig Apostell den brauch."

⁸⁴We will return to the Formula of Concord and orthodox Lutheranism after discussing Osiander.

⁸⁵McGrath thinks Melancthon is primarily responsible for the development of the forensic position. See Alister E. McGrath, "Forerunners of the Reformation," *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (April 1982): 224. According to McGrath, Luther did not separate justification and regeneration, but rather subsumed regeneration under justification (225). McGrath says Calvin followed Melancthon, not Luther, and that Melancthon did not follow Luther (226).

union with Christ,⁸⁶ as time passed Melanchthon placed increasing emphasis on Christ working for us and "in us and giving us his righteousness, whereas Luther constantly pointed to the fact that the person of Christ and the believer had become joined together."⁸⁷ The dissimilarity in their emphases became more obvious after 1530 as Melanchthon increasingly emphasized the imputation of *iustitia aliena* to the believer and *gerecht sprechen* as the correct meaning of justification.⁸⁸ Andreas Osiander rejected

⁸⁶McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. II, 23

⁸⁷Rogness, 49. Rogness also notes that for Melanchthon the Gospel was not so much Christ as the truth about Christ (62). As proof of this fact Rogness cites part of a letter written by Melanchthon outlining his understanding of justification, to which Luther added a postscript stating that Christ in us is our salvation (63, 64).

⁸⁸McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. II, 23ff. For an examination of Melanchthon's dependence on Erasmus' use of *imputatum* in Romans 4:5, see Rogness, 31-32. See Strehle for a brief examination of Melanchthon's view of justification (92-97). Also see Strehle's unpublished paper, "*Imputatio Iustitiae*: Its Origin In Melanchthon, Its Opposition In Osiander." A major reason for the disagreement between Melanchthon and Osiander was Melanchthon's emphasis on the imputation of *iustitia aliena* to the believer on the basis of the satisfaction of Christ and his de-emphasis of the eternal or essential righteousness of Christ. According to Melanchthon, God imputes Christ's active and passive obedience to the believer. Melanchthon opposed anyone who claimed that Christ's satisfaction by itself is not an adequate basis of justification. Melanchthon maintained that we are not righteous because the Son of the Eternal is righteous, but because his merit is credited to us for the forgiveness of sins and for reconciliation. Melanchthon's use of *imputatio* and *acceptilatio* comes from two sources. First, Erasmus, in his Greek text of Rom. 4:3 (and elsewhere in the passage), had changed the Greek verb *logizomai* (λογίζομαι, reckon) from the Latin Vulgate's *reputo* (repute) to read *imputo* (impute). In his explanation for this change Erasmus defines the word in terms of *acceptilatio* and *imputatio*. This definition provides the basis for the notion of a legal fiction which Melanchthon and later Orthodox Protestants emphasize. This term *acceptilatio* is said to be a forensic concept that reckons a debt as if paid through a verbal agreement. A formal, verbal release or acquittance of the debt is provided, just as if the obligation had been paid. Second, the Nominalists had used *acceptatio* to speak of the divine will as the ultimate arbitrator in the matter of justification. Man's true condition had no claim upon God's favor, but instead was subject to the unconstrained verdict of God's most free will or acceptance. God merely accepted what was not acceptable, or made acceptable (righteous) through a simple act of the will, with no regard to man's actual condition. Both Melanchthon and the Nominalists speak of justification as God accepting what has not been made acceptable through his grace (regeneration), and both separate the forgiveness of sin from what God does in us. For them God's justification of man depends on a declaration by God that is separated from the inner conversion. Melanchthon tries to connect the work of Christ to this declaration, but he always concludes that the obedience or merit of Christ is imputed to us so as to reconcile the demands of divine justice, without this work materially changing us in any substantive way. Nor does Melanchthon emphasize the present work of Christ in us. God's declaration is said to be separated from any quality or newness produced by divine grace within the soul of man. In the end God must accept as righteous what is not righteous and

Melanchthon's *gerecht sprechen* as inadequate⁸⁹ and found support in Luther both for a *gerecht machen* understanding of justification and for connecting justification with union with Christ.

what we did not do (Christ's work) as if we had done it.

⁸⁹Ibid., 26.

CHAPTER II

ANDREAS OSIANDER

Andreas Osiander was born November 22, 1498, at Gunzenhausen in Franconia (in Frankish Brandenburg) and died of a stroke at Königsberg on October 17, 1552, during a period of heated debate about his views.¹ He was an outspoken,² fearless Lutheran preacher and reformer and participated in the colloquies/diets at Marburg, Augsburg, Schmalkalden, Hagenau, Worms, and Regensburg.

Osiander's views and writings on justification are in part the result of his disagreements with Melancthon.³ At Regensburg Melancthon was forced to support a

¹This summary of Osiander's life is taken from *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. X (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), "Andreas Osiander," by E. G. Schwiebert; J. D. Douglas, ed. *Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), "Andreas Osiander," by Carl S. Meyer; John McClintock and James Strong, eds. *Topical, Theological, And Ecclesiastical Literature* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1877), "Andreas Osiander," by J. H. W.; *The Westminster Dictionary Of Church History*, ed. Jerald C. Brauer (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), "Andreas Osiander"; Lawrenz, 149-153; Kolb, 12-87.

²In a letter to Melancthon in 1545 Calvin expresses displeasure at "a certain apology of Osiander" and his habit of assaulting people with "contemptuous reproaches" (John Calvin, *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, ed. by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet, trans. by Henry Beveridge, vol. 2, part 2 (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1851; reprint Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1983), 437.

³According to Lawrenz, whose views are biased against Osiander, already at Augsburg in 1530 Osiander had apparently tried to influence Melancthon's understanding of justification (156). How successful Osiander was is unclear. One should note, however, that article IV of the Augsburg Confession does not refer to the imputation of the alien righteousness of Christ to the believer (McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, II, 24). "Also they teach that men can not be justified [obtain forgiveness of sins and righteousness] before God by their own powers, merits, or works; but are justified freely [of grace] for Christ's sake through faith, when they believe that they are received into favor, and their sins forgiven for Christ's sake, who by his death hath satisfied for our sins. This faith doth God impute for righteousness before him. Rom. iii. and iv." Found in Schaff, vol. III, 10. R. Klann, who represents a false and biased position, says "Osiander was present at some of these debates and argued for a different formulation, but he did not prevail." Richard Klann, "Righteousness And Holiness: A Study of Articles III-VI of the Formula of

union formula that he found unacceptable. In these discussions Melanchthon tried to effect conciliation by ignoring minor differences and emphasizing fundamental points of agreement.

In 1546, soon after Luther's death, Emperor Charles V banned the evangelicals of Germany. The following year he defeated the Protestant rulers. In January of 1548 Charles called for a colloquy to promote unity of doctrine based on a Roman Catholic interpretation. He ordered three men—John Agricola, a Protestant; Julius von Pflug, an Erasmian; and Michael Helding, a medieval historian—to prepare a document that would make possible the union of the different factions. This statement of belief, which forced Protestants to accept a Catholic formulation of doctrine, became known as the Augsburg Interim of May 15, 1548. Melanchthon accepted what he could in good conscience, but he resented its Catholic doctrine of justification that included works as a means of salvation. Unity on non-essentials was one thing; capitulation on the essentials was another. In view of his own willingness to leave Nuremberg after twenty-seven years rather than submit to the Interim's impure doctrine, Osiander perceived Melanchthon's position as capitulation.⁴ After leaving Nuremberg Osiander went to Königsberg by invitation of Duke Albrecht of Prussia and became the leading professor of the theological faculty. Osiander wrote his *Disputation* in 1550 in reaction to what he perceived as Melanchthon's forensic position.⁵

A major reason for the disagreement between Melanchthon and Osiander was Melanchthon's emphasis on the imputation of *iustitia aliena* to the believer on the basis of the satisfaction of Christ and his de-emphasize of the eternal or essential righteousness of Christ.

It is one thing to speak of the righteousness of a person and another to speak of the righteousness of works. The righteousness of a person is the *imputatio* or acceptance of that person in the judgment of God which comes on account of the Mediator through faith alone. . . . Although a renewal (*novitas*) follows, and it is true that man becomes the temple of God and God dwells in the one who has been converted or regenerated, still this consolation must be retained that the just are converted or regenerated freely by faith, on account of the obedience of the Mediator,

Concord," *Concordia Journal*, 5 [1979]: 102.

⁴Lawrenz, 152, 159. Osiander's reaction to Melanchthon's position raises questions because Osiander was accused of entertaining a Catholic view of justification. We will return to this matter later.

⁵Zimmermann, 225. Lawrenz, 160.

not on account of the renewal or essential righteousness.⁶

According to Melanchthon, God imputes Christ's active and passive obedience to the believer.⁷ Haikola notes that Melanchthon opposed anyone who claimed "that Christ's satisfaction by itself is not an adequate basis of justification. . . ."⁸ Melanchthon maintained that "we are not righteous because the Son of the Eternal is righteous, but because his merit is credited to us for the forgiveness of sins and for reconciliation. . . ."⁹

Osiander in turn lists four errors of those who "go astray" in their understanding of justification: they divorce the declaration of righteousness from the fact of righteousness; they make no difference between redemption and justification; they divorce the righteousness of Christ from the righteousness that must be in us; they separate the divine nature of Christ from the righteousness of sinners and so divide the divinity and humanity of Christ.¹⁰

⁶CR 15, 810, 880.

⁷According to Haikola, Melanchthon believed that "justification takes place completely outside man and is based on the alien righteousness of Christ which is imputed to him and which he grasps in faith. . . . Christ's alien righteousness is imputed to the sinner and on the basis of this imputed righteousness God pronounces the sinner righteous." Lauri Haikola, "A Comparison Of Melanchthon's And Luther's Doctrine Of Justification," *Dialog* (Spring, 1963), 35.

⁸Ibid. Haikola mentions Osiander as one of Melanchthon's opponents without explaining Osiander's views. "The more Melanchthon was required to oppose the doctrine of habitual grace in Catholicism and Osiander, the more he needed to emphasize forcefully the purely legal character of reconciliation and justification."

⁹Melanchthon, quoted in Clyde L. Manschreck, *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), xxxix. Stupperich, *Melanchthon*, 137: "While Melanchthon emphasized the cross as the foundation of acquired righteousness, Osiander taught the indwelling of Christ, the substantial righteousness of Christ, and rejected the imputed righteousness as a fiction." For Melanchthon's role in the introduction of the concept of imputation into Reformation theology, see Green, *How Melanchthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel*, 204-5.

¹⁰Andreas Osiander, *Von dem Einigen Mitler Jhesu Christo und Rechtfertigung des Glaubens* (Königsberg: September, 1551), 69, 70: "Sölche irren all sehr gewlich / Erstlich das sie das wörtlein Rechtfertigen verstehen und auslegen / allein fur gerecht halten / und sprechen / und nicht mit der that und in der warheit gerecht machen / Darnach auch in dem / das sie gar kein unterscheid halten / zwischen der Erlösung / und zwischen der rechtfertigung / so doch ein grosser unterscheid ist / wie man darbey wol kan verstehen / das menschen einen Dieb vom Galgen können erlösen / können in aber nicht from und gerecht machen / ferner auch in dem / das sie nichts bestendigs können setzen / was doch die gerechtigkeit Christi sey / die durch den Glauben in uns müß sein / und uns zugerechnet wer den / und entlich irren sie auch in dem / am allgrobsten / das sie die Göttliche natur Christi / von der Gerechtigkeit absundern / und Christum zertrennen / und

Osiander rejects the idea that God declares someone to be righteous who is not also made righteous through union with Christ. Rather, the righteousness of the indwelling Christ is the basis of God's declaration of justification.¹¹ "In his *Inaugural* he declared that we are justified not by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but by union with Christ, in that Christ dwells in us."¹² The righteousness that justifies is within the believer.

So it must also of necessity follow that righteousness will not be accounted to them in whom Christ and His Holy Spirit do not dwell, for such are unqualified, depraved, belong not to Christ, but rather belong to the devil's kingdom. Therefore is here also refuted, conquered and overthrown the error of those who say, teach, and write that righteousness is outside us and is poured into each life.¹³

He asserts that "the righteousness of Christ will indeed be counted to us, but not until it is in us,"¹⁴ and this righteousness is in us only if we are united to Christ.

But we do not understand reconciliation according to common knowledge of how a man may be reconciled with another, but rather theologically. If one wants to be reconciled with God he must be united with Christ and be born again by him. We are counted righteous because we are in him and live through him, and because this same righteousness lives in us. For Christ our bridegroom portrays us as being his bride, a pure young woman, that is, which is confused with no ungodly teaching, and unites us to him eternally in righteousness, in judgment, in grace, in compassion, and unites us with him through faith. For this reason we are one flesh with him, members of his body, flesh of his flesh, bone of his bone.¹⁵

aufflösen / welchs gewislich des leidigen Teuffels werk ist."

¹¹Both Melanchthon and Calvin rejected Osiander's view that the indwelling of the essential righteousness of Christ is the basis of justification. See Wilson-Kastner, 88.

¹²James William Richard, D.D., *Philip Melanchthon: The Protestant Preceptor Of Germany, 1597-1560* (New York: Burt Frandlin Reprints, 1974), 357. Richard implies that imputation and union with Christ are mutually exclusive. However, Luther and Calvin speak of both imputation and union with Christ.

¹³Osiander, *Von dem Einigen Mitler*, 108: "So mus von nöten das auch volgen / das die Gerechtigkeit keinem wirt zugerechnet / in dem Christus und sein heiliger Geist nicht wonen / dan solche sein untüchtig / verworffen / gehören Christum nicht an / sonder gehören ins Teuffels reich / Darumb ist alhie auch widerlegt / überwunden / und gestürzt / der irthumb der ienigen / die da sagen / lehren / und schreiben / die gerechtigkeit sey ausserhalb unser / und werd und erst in ienem leben eingegossen." All translations from Osiander's works are my own.

¹⁴Osiander, *Ein Disputation von der Rechtfertigung des Glaubens* (Oct. 1550), thesis 76: "Dann die Gerechtigkeit Christi / wirt uns ja zugerechnet / aber doch nicht / dann wan sie in uns ist."

¹⁵Ibid., theses 31-33: "Die versionung aber / verstehn wir nicht auff die gemeinen Weiss / wie ein Mensch mit dem andern versionet wirt / sonder Theologisch / also / das mit

Osiander's insistence on the indwelling of Christ as the source of righteousness (and therefore as the basis of justification) suggests a rejection of Christ's vicarious atonement as the sole basis of justification, although he also refers to the atonement as a "preparation" (*zuperaitung* [*zubereitung*]). Several theses in the *Disputation* point toward the *Christus in nobis* view of justification as opposed to a declaration based only on the vicarious atonement of Christ.

26. Rather only our Lord Jesus Christ, who has fulfilled the law and all righteousness is righteous. . . . 27. He is not therefore righteous because He has fulfilled the law. Rather, He is righteous because He was born a righteous son out of the righteous Father from eternity until now. . . . 28. Therefore is righteousness of the Father and Son so that you may also your beloved self stand by the Holy Spirit in the same kind of righteousness with which the righteous One makes righteous the ungodly, namely the righteousness of God, which also even itself is the righteousness of faith.¹⁶

Christ's righteousness did not depend on His perfect fulfillment of the law, for Christ is righteous simply because He is the Son of God. Implicit in this statement is the idea that the righteousness "by which you stand" is the eternal or "essential" righteousness of God and Christ. Osiander then identifies righteousness of faith as this righteousness of God,¹⁷ thereby suggesting that God makes the ungodly righteous by giving them Christ,¹⁸ or by

Gott versionet werden / so vil sey / als mit Christo vereinigt / und aus im wider geporn werden / das er in uns und wir in im seien / und durch in leben / und von desselben Gerechtigkeit wegen / der in uns wohnt / gerecht geschetzt werden. 32. Dan Christus unser Breutigam vermahelt uns ime / ein reine Jungfrawen / das ist / die mit keiner Abgöttischen Lehr verrückt ist / und vermahelt uns im ewiglich / in Gerechtigkeit / un Gericht / in Gnad un barmhertzigkeit / und vermahelt uns ime / durch den Glauben. 33. Daher sein wir mit im ein fleisch / glider seines Leibs / fleisch vom seinem fleisch / und gepein / von seien gepein."

¹⁶Ibid., theses 26-28: "Sonder allein unser HERR Jhesus Christus / der das Gesetz / und alle Gerechtigkeit erfüllet hat / der ist gerecht / wie Zacharias sagt / Sihe dein künig kombt dir / ein gerechter. 27. Er ist aber nicht darumb gerecht / das er das Gesetz erfüllet hat / sonder darumb / das er aus dem Gerechte Vater von ewigkeit her / ein gerechter son geporn ist / wie er dan spricht / Gerechter Vater / die Welt kennet dich nicht. 28. Darumb ist die Gerechtigkeit des Vaters / und Sons / darzu magstu auch so dirs geliebt / setzen / des heiligen Geists / einerley Gerechtigkeit / mit der er / der Gerechte / den Gottlosen gerecht macht / Nemlich / die Gerechtigkeit Gottes / welche auch / eben selbs / die Gerechtigkeit des Glaubens ist."

¹⁷Lawrenz, 158.

¹⁸Osiander rejects the idea that one is saved by faith apart from Christ. "Therefore must one understand the one place where Paul says in Romans 4, 'faith will be counted to us for righteousness' as the other passages, which all say that he who receives Christ receives Christ into himself, and faith brings Him into our hearts. He is our righteousness, and God will credit His righteousness to us, and not only bare faith. Not that we reject or

giving them the righteousness of God. Although the *Disputation* does not explicitly outline the value of Christ's vicarious atonement, the implication is that Christ's "essential" righteousness takes precedence over and is the basis for His "acquired" righteousness. God declares the sinner righteous and destroys sin in us on the basis of Christ's essential righteousness, a divine righteousness that He had from eternity. God does not justify the sinner on the basis of Christ's fulfillment of the law. Christ's essential righteousness is the basis of justification; His acquired righteousness is the basis of forgiveness.

In his *Von dem einigen Mitler* Osiander explains and defends what was only implicit in the *Disputation*. Osiander spends the first ten pages of the work defending the view that no person can suffer enough to satisfy the holiness of God or the demands of the law. Even if one could suffer enough for his sins and free himself from hell, he still could not completely fulfill the law. He uses Adam, the one who came into the world without sin but sinned anyway, as proof that we, who are born sinners, will fall into God's wrath and death.¹⁹ Since we can neither bear the punishment of sins nor fulfill the

cast away this faith. For through it and in it comes Christ, the true righteousness. Rather it is like an empty cup that does nothing to quench the thirst, though it is not itself the drink, rather holds it together and bears it to our mouth, that we therewith may be refreshed. So also faith, if it were possible that it remains empty and receives not Christ, thus it would do nothing for us in relation to justification. But since it receives Christ and encloses Him in itself, so it is of great benefit, so that we become righteous. It brings Christ into our hearts and keeps him therein, that He is our righteousness, and we through Him and in Him become alive and righteous." Osiander, *Von dem Einigen Mitler*, 81: "Darumb muss man das enig Ort / da Paulus spricht zun Rom. 4. Der Glaub werd uns zur gerechtigkeit zugerechnet / auch also verstehen / wie die andern Sprüche alle lauten / Nemlich / das Christus / den der Glaub ergreiff / in sich schleust / und in ihn unser hertzen bringt / sey unser gerechtigkeit / und werd uns seine gerechtigkeit zugerechnet / und gar nicht der blosser Glaub / nicht das wir den glauben ver achten oder verwerffen / Dan durch ihn / und in ihn kümpt Christus / die wahre Gerechtigkeit / sonder das gleich wie ein lerer becher / nichts thut den durst zuleschen / wann aber getrank darin ist / so dienet er gar fein darzu / das man den durst mit dem getrank lesche / ob er wol selbs das getrank nicht ist / sonder helt es zusammen / und tregts zu unserem munde / das wir darmit erquikt werden / Also auch der Glaub / wan es möglich wer / das er leer blib / und Christum nicht ergriff / so thet er warlich gar nichts uns zu rechtfertigen. Dieweil er aber Christum ergreiff / und in sich scheust / so dienet er gar fein darzu / das wir gerecht werden / dann er bringt Christum in unsere hertzen / und erhelt in darin / das er unser gerechtigkeit sey / und wir durch im / und in im lebendig und gerecht werden."

¹⁹Osiander, *Von dem Einigen Mitler*, 18-19: "Und ob wir schon (das doch allerding unmöglich) fur unser Sünd genug thun und leiden / und aus der Helle wider ledig werden konten / So were doch das gesetz als bald wider da / und wolt aller dinge vollkommenlich furohin erfullet sein / Dann so Adam / da er noch gerecht war / kont durch ubertretung des gepots in die Sünde / Gottes zorn / und in den Todt fallen / wieuill mer würden wir / die wir sunder geporen sein / wann wir das gesetz furohin nicht hielten / durch ubertretung des gesetz / von newen widerumb in Gottes zorn / und in den Todt

law,²⁰ Christ "suffered for our sins and all that we are guilty of."²¹ Osiander also explicitly states that forgiveness of past sins does not free one from the law, for the believer must still completely comply with the law.²² Perfect obedience, however, is impossible both before and after we are born again "because of sin that still lives in us."²³ For this reason "our beloved Lord Jesus Christ, the only mediator, came in our place and fulfilled the law purely and completely for us and for our benefit, that it will not be accounted to us. Nor therefore must we be accursed, we that do not completely fulfill the law in this life."²⁴ As a faithful mediator, by completely fulfilling the law and by his suffering and death, Christ has negotiated with the Father for our sins against God so our sins can be forgiven.²⁵

Osiander concludes that Christ's perfect life and death only make this forgiveness possible.²⁶ Osiander, who lived in the sixteenth century, argues that Christ did not justify anyone by His work on the cross. Rather, Christ made justification possible for all who would later believe. Christ did this work more than fifteen hundred years before, "when

fallen."

²⁰Ibid., 20: "Dieweil wir dan weder die straff der Sunden ertragen / noch das gesetz aus eignen krefften erfüllen konten / So ist unser lieber Herr Jhesus Christus / der einige Mitler fur uns an unser stadt getreten / und hat zum ersten aller welt Sünde auff sich genommen."

²¹Ibid., 20: "Und hat also fur unser Sünde gelitten / alles das wir darmit verschüldet hetten."

²²Ibid., 21: "Dieweil nach vergebung der vergangnen Sünden / das gesetz dennoch vollkommen wil und muss gehalten sein."

²³Ibid., 21: "Und wir es doch im alten wesen / unserer ersten geburt / ehe dan wir aus wasser und geist Gottes Kinder new geboren werden / zu halten keins wegs vermögen / nach der neuen geburt aber / dieweil wir in diesem leben sein / von wegen der Sünde / die noch in uns wonet Rom. 7. und uns hefftig anklebt."

²⁴Ibid., 22: "So ist unser lieber Herr Jhesus Christus / der einige Mitler alhie auch fur uns an unser stadt getreten / und hat das Gesetz rein un vollkommenlich fur uns / und uns zugut erfüllet / auff das es uns nicht zugerechnet werde / noch darumb verflucht sein müssen das wir das gesetz in diesem leben."

²⁵Ibid., 23: "Wie er nun als ein getrewer mitler / durch vollkommene erfüllung des gesetzes / un durch sein leiden und sterben / fur unser Sünde gegen Got seinem himlischen Vater / von unsers wegen gehandelt / und erworben hat / das er uns die Sünde vergeben / und nicht mehr darumb verdammen wil / uns auch unser schwacheit und schuld / das wir das Gesetz in disem leben keins wegs erfüllen / dieweil es Christus fur uns erfüllet hat / nicht zurechnet."

²⁶Lawrenz rejects Osiander's views because on this point Osiander does not hold the "scriptural forensic understanding of justification" as understood by Lawrenz (149).

we were not yet born. Therefore, to speak properly it could not have been our *Rechtfertigung* (justification), nor be called our justification, rather only the redemption and satisfaction (*erlösung und gnugthuun*) for us and our sin. Then he who desires to be justified must believe."²⁷ "Therefore Christ has not justified us who now live and others before us through fulfilling the law and through His suffering and death." Christ cannot make someone righteous who is not yet born. Osiander rejects the idea that the "fulfilling of the law and the suffering and death of our Lord Jesus Christ as a work" is our justification or righteousness. Rather, a present faith in Christ makes us righteous.²⁸

On page 31 of *Von dem Einigen Mitler* Osiander moves to a discussion of the relationship between the inner and outer word in an attempt to show that the divine Christ (the inner word) enters the believer.

The outer word is the language that begins in our mouth, travels through the air to the ears of the hearers, and then again vanishes away. And the outer word is the same as a wagon, wherein the inner word rides to this place, and through the ears also comes to another, which he perhaps had not had beforehand. Then when I in my heart believe that Christ has died for our sin, this is an inner word that lives hidden in me.²⁹

²⁷Osiander, *Von dem Einigen Mitler*, 24-25: "Es ist aber offenbar / das alles das jenig / das Christus als der getrewe Mitler / von unsern wegen durch erfüllung des gesetzes / und durch sein leiden und sterben / mit Gott seinem himlischen Vater gehandelt hat / das ist für funffzehen hundert Jaren / und lenger geschehen / da wir noch nicht geporen gewest sein / Darumb kan es eigentlich zu reden / nicht unser Rechtfertigung gewest sein / noch genennet werden / sonder nur unser erlösung und gnugthuung für uns / un unser Sünde / Dann wer gerechtfertigt sol werde / der mus glaube / Sol er aber glauben / so mus er schon geporen sein / und leben. Darumb hat Christus uns die wir itzo leben / und andere vor uns / durch erfüllung des gesetzes / und sein leiden und sterben / nicht gerechtfertigt / Aber erlöset sein wir dardurch / von Gotts zorn / Todt und Helle / Dann man kan ein menschen wol erlösen und befreien / der auch noch nicht geboren ist. Als wan man ein leibeignen man / aus der Türcke mit Gelt erlöset / so wird nicht allein er von der leibeigenschaft ledig / sonder auch alle seine Kinder / so noch von im geboren sollen werden / die doch sonst / wan ir Vater in der leibeigenschaft bliebe / alle leibeigen geporen würden / Aber man kan keinen gerecht und from machen / ehe dann er geporen wird."

²⁸Ibid., 26, 27: "Das aber die erfüllung des gesetzes und das leiden und sterben unsers Herren Jhesu Christi / als ein werck / solten unser Rechtfertigung oder Gerechtigkeit sein / das hab ich in der heiligen schrift / meines wissens / all mein tage noch nie gefunden / kan auch nicht begreifen / das es sich nach rechter eigenschaft der sprachen / also reden las. . . . Sondern uns auch noch durch den Glauben an Christum wil rechtfertigen / das ist gerecht machen / oder gerechtigkeit eingiessen / und durch wirkung seines Geists / und durch den Tod Christi / darein wir durch die Tauff Christo eingelebt sein / die Sünde so uns schon vergeben / aber doch in unsern / fleisch noch wonet / und anklebt / abtöden / ausfegen / und gantz vertilgen / so ferne wir nur wollen folgen."

²⁹Ibid., 31-32: "Das recht zuuerstehen / sol man merken das zweierley wort ist /

Osiander says that the inner Word in us is Christ, and Christ is the divine One. When faith grasps and believes the outer word, "in this way is this entire inner divine word Jesus Christ present in our hearts today, for it is indivisible."³⁰ Since the "divine exists inseparable," the "humanity of Christ is a temple of the entire divine essence," which suggests that the Father and the Holy Spirit live in us also.³¹ Osiander then quotes pages of verses³² to prove "that God according to His true divine being abides in the true believer."³³ "We cannot meet, find, or have the Father, the Word, or the Spirit except in

Nemlich ein innerlichs wort / und ein eusserlichs wort / Das innerlich wort / ist alles / was wir wissen / und gedenken / Wann wir gleich still schweigen / Das eusserlich wort ist die rede / die in unserm munde anhebt / durch den lufft dahin fehret / in die ohren der zuhörer / und verschwindet dann wider / Un ist das eusserliche wort gleich wie ein Wagen / darinnen das innerlich wort daher fehret / Und durch die ohren zu einem andern auch kumpt / der es vileicht vorhin nicht hat / Als wan ich in meinem hertze glaub / Das Christus fur unser Sünde sey gestorben / das ist ein innerlich wort / das in mir verborgen lebet."

³⁰Ibid., 37: "Aber nichts dester weniger / wo Gottes innerlichs wort gleich nur stükweis durch die eusserlichen predig zu uns kompt / und durch den Glauben ergriffen wird / da ist das gantz innerlich Göttlich Wort Jhesus Christus / in unsern hertzen gegenwertig / dan es ist unzertrenlich."

³¹Ibid., 44-45: "Bringt das heilige Euangelion / im eusserlichen Wort / das innerlich Wort Gottes des Vaters / welchs erbey im selbs / und aus im selbs von ewigkeit her gepiret / Das auch wahrer GOTT / und Gott selbs ist / wie Johan. am 1. Cap. spricht / Im anfang war das Wort / und das Wort / war bey Gott / und Gott war das Wort / Solchs Wort aber kompt nicht gantz und gar blos / wie es in seiner Göttlichen Natur allein ist / Dann also könnten wirs nicht fassen / sonder wie es ist Mensch worden / und ist unserlieber Herr / heilandt und einiger MITLER JHESUS CHRISTUS / GOTTES un Marie Son / wahrer Gott und Mensch / fur unser Sünd gestorben / und umb unser Gerechtigkeit willen wider aufferstand / Der wohnet dan durch den Glauben in unserm hertzen / Seel / und Geist / als warer Gott und Mensch. Und dieweil das einig / ewig / Göttlich wesen / des Vater / Sons / und heiligen Geists / unzerteilet und unzertrenlich ist / So wonen auch der Vater und der heilig Geist in uns.

Dan ob wol das Wort / das ist / der Son Gottes allein ist Mensch worden / und nicht der Vater / noch der heilig Geist / So wohnen doch der Vater und der heilige Geist auch in Christo / dieweil das Göttlich wesen unzertrenlich / und die Menscheit Christi / ein tempel des gantzen Göttlichen wesens ist."

³²Ibid., 46-51 contains a list of verses under the following three headings: That Christ truly God and man lives in us through faith; That the Father and the Son through faith live in us; That the One eternal true God who is Father, Son and Holy Spirit lives in us through faith.

³³Ibid., 51-52: "Dise Sprüche alle / geben einerley einfeltige mainung / Nemlich / das Gott nach seinem waren Göttlichen wesen / in den recht gleubigen WONET / denn wo Christus ist / da ist auch sein Göttliche Natur / und götlichs wesen / wo aber der Son Gottes / nach seinem Göttlichen wesen ist / da sein auch der Vater und der heilig Geist unzertrennet / denn Vater / Son / un heiliger Geist / sein ein einigs Ewigs unzertrennets Göttlichs wesen."

Christ Jesus when we become members of Him."³⁴

Christ's humanity is the temple of the divine essence. We "receive divine life out of God in the Word through the human nature of Christ, whose members we are."³⁵

There is no life outside this word and Son of God; in Him only is life. If the man Christ was devoid and without God, then He was no benefit, and soon thereafter Luther says also: in the beginning was the Word, and God himself must be our life, bread, light, and salvation. Therefore we are not to attribute the bare humanity of Christ, that it makes us alive. Rather, the life is in the Word, which lives in the flesh and through flesh makes alive.³⁶

Osiander does not deny that the human nature of Christ is important in salvation, but humanity alone cannot save.³⁷ We become partakers of the divine nature, which is our life, light, and righteousness, as the divine nature proceeds from Christ's humanity and flows to us as His members. The bare humanity of Christ does not give spiritual life. Christ's divine nature, which is present and lives in His flesh (humanity), brings spiritual

³⁴Ibid., 129: "Darumb hab ich auch den Spruch Pauli zun Colossern / so fleissig und schier in allen Predigen getriben / Den er am 2. Cap. setzet und spricht. Es wone in Christo die gantze fulle der Gottheit leibhafftig / das ist / wiewol das Wort allein ist fleisch worden / un nicht der Vater / noch der heilig Geist / so sein doch der Vater und der heilelig Geist / auch in Christo / dann das Göttlich wesen kan nicht zurtrennet werden / und die Menscheit Christi ist eine leibliche wonunge / und Tempel der gantzen Gottheit / das trib ich darumb so fleissig / das jederman lernen solt / das wir weder den Vater / noch das Wort / noch den heiligen Geist antreffen / finden / oder haben könnten / dan in Christo JHESU / wan wir seine glider würden."

³⁵Ibid., 55: "Und gleich wie wir das Göttlich leben aus Gott im Wort / durch die Menschliche Natur Christi / dero glieder wir sein."

³⁶Ibid., 58: "Das alles hat auch D. Martinus Luther in der Auslegung des Euangelions am Christag / auff's aller klerist dargeben / dan da selbst schreibt er unter andern also / Es ist kein leben ausser disem Wort / und Son Gottes / in im allein ist das Leben / Der Mensch Christus / so er ledig und on Gott wehre / so were er kein nütz / und bald darnach spricht er also / Das Wort Gottes im Anfang / und Gott selbst / mus unser leben / Speis / Liecht und Seligkeit sein / Darumb ists nicht der blossen Menscheit Christi zu zuschreiben / das sie uns lebendig mache / Sonder in dem Wort ist das Leben / welchs in dem fleisch wonet / un durchs fleisch lebendig machet."

³⁷Ibid., 170: "Darumb ists nicht der blossen Menscheit Christi zu zuschreiben / das sie uns lebendig mache / sonder in dem Wort ist das leben / welchs im fleisch wonet / Aus disen worten D. Luthers ist zuschliessen / das / dieweil uns die blosse Menscheit Christi / das leben aus Gott nicht gibt / noch lebendig macht / sonder das Wort Gottes / das Gott selbs ist / und im fleisch wonet / ist unser leben / so wirt uns gewisslich die blosse Menscheit CHRISTI / die Gerechtigkeit aus GOTT / auch nicht geben / noch uns gerecht machen / sonder das Wort Gottes / das Gott selbs ist / und fleisch worden / ist unser Gerechtigkeit / die aus Gott ist."

life. Christ had two natures, but He was "only one individual person in which neither nature may be ever separated."³⁸ We become partakers of the divine nature by becoming flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone.

Whence then have we this grace, that we should be born of God, and be partakers of the divine nature? Paul answers, In Christ Jesus, for are we not through faith and baptism into Jesus Christ placed into the body so that we are members of His body, flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone, and are one flesh with Him, as Paul writes in Ephesians 5. If we cannot be partakers of the divine nature—for just as a branch of a grape vine when cut off cannot partake of the nourishment from the vine, or as a member severed from the body has no life—so we also cannot receive or become partakers of the divine nature or divine essence that is our life, light, and righteousness unless it proceeds from His humanity and flows to us as His members.³⁹

We are united with both Christ's humanity and divinity.⁴⁰ We become bone of Christ's bone and flesh of His flesh,⁴¹ and his divine wisdom and righteousness "flow then from His humanity as from the head into us as His members and manifest themselves in our life."⁴² Osiander concludes that Christ is our righteousness according to His divine nature,

³⁸Ibid., 110: "Der Herr Jhesus Christus hat zwei natur / Nemlich die Göttlichen und die menschlichen / Er ist aber nur ein einige Person / in der kein Natur von der andern immer und ewiglich mehr kan geschiden werden."

³⁹Ibid., 128-29: "Aus dem selben seit auch ir / woher haben wir dan dise gnad / das wir aus Gott geborn / der Gött lichen Natur teilhaftig sein? Antwort Paulus / In Christo Jhesu / dann weren wir nicht durch den Glauben und die Tauff / in Jhesum Christum also eingeleibt / das wir glider seines Leibs / fleisch von seinem fleisch / und gebein von seinem gebein / und mit im ein fleisch weren / wie Paulus zun Ephesern am 5. Cap. schribet / so könnten wir seiner Gött lichen Natur nicht teilhaftig werden / Dan gleich wie ein Weinrebe / der vom Weinstok abgeschniten ist / nicht kan des Safft des Weinstokts teilhaftig sein / und wie ein glid vom Leib abgehawen / kein leben von der Seele empfangen kan / Also können auch wir der Göttlichen Natur / oder des Göttlichen wesens / das unser Leben / Liecht / und Gerechtigkeit ist / nicht teilhaftig werden / Wan es nicht aus seiner Menschheit / als aus dem heubt / in uns / als seine glider / herflusse."

⁴⁰Ibid., 130: "Dan es neben andern vil fruchten / die es bey uns wurket / auch darumb furnemlich eingesetzt were / das es uns ein gewisses zeugnis und pfand were / das Jhesus Christus warer Gott und Mensch / durch den Glauben warlich in uns wonen / und uns also in sich ziehen / und ein leiben wolt / das wir warlich seine glider / fleisch von seinem fleisch / und gepein von seinem gepein werden / Auff das so wir mit seiner Menschheit vereinigt / auch seines Gött lichen wesens / Lebens / un Gerechtigkeit möchten teilhaftig werden."

⁴¹Of the four people included in this study, Osiander gives the clearest statements on the relationship between being bone of Christ's bone and flesh of His flesh and being justified. This statement by Paul is taken by Osiander as an explanation of how the believer is united to the humanity of Christ and thereby receives the divine righteousness.

⁴²Ibid., 136: "Dan wan der durch den Glauben in unsern hertzen wonet / so bringt

although we cannot find that divine nature outside His human nature.⁴³

Although we become partakers of the divine nature, we do not become divine.

So then the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the entire divinity exists in us, and the Father begets us anew through his seed, that is, he transforms our old man entirely so that we are a new creation. A creature we are, and a creature we will remain no matter how wonderfully we have been renewed. But the seed of God and the entire divine essence that also is in us by grace and is in Christ by nature, and remains in us forever, that is God himself and no creature, is in us. The true God will ever remain in us.⁴⁴

The believer remains human and never becomes God. However, the essential righteousness of God is in us because we are joined to Christ and are "flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone."

Osiander ties sanctification and good works closely to redemption and faith, and herein lies one source of contention concerning Osiander's views. Sometimes Osiander's statements about Christ's righteousness making us righteous seem to suggest that we are made righteous because of the good works produced by union with Christ.⁴⁵ Osiander's

er dise seine Göttliche Weisheit / mit sich in uns / die wirt uns dan zugerechnet / als wer sie unser eigen / ja sie wirt uns auch geschenkt / und fleust dann aus seiner Menschheit / als aus dem heubt / auch in uns / als seine glider / und eroffnet sich uns in disem leben / durch den Glauben."

⁴³Ibid., 137: "So ist nu die frag / nach welcher Natur er unser Gerechtigkeit sey? Gleich wie man fragt / nach welcher Natur er Schepffer Himmels und der Erden sey? Oder nach welcher Natur er gestorben sey?

Hie ist nun mein lautere / richtige / und klare Antwort / das er nach seiner Göttlichen Natur unser Gerechtigkeit sey / und nicht nach der Menschlichen Natur / Wiewol wir solche Göttliche Gerechtigkeit ausserhalb seiner Menschheit nicht können finden / erlangen oder ergreifen / sonder wan Er durch den Glauben in uns wonet / so bringt Er seine Gerechtigkeit / die seine Göttliche Natur ist / mit sich in uns / die wirt uns dann auch zugerechnet / als wer sie unser eigen."

⁴⁴Ibid., 127: "So ist nun Vater / Son / und heliger Geist / das gantz Göttliche wesen in uns / und der Vater gebirt uns / durch seinen Samen / wider von nemen / das ist / er vernewet unsern alten Menschen gantz und gar / das wir eine neue Creatur werden / Ein Creatur sein wir / und bleiben wol ein Creatur / wie köstlich wir auch vernewert werden / Aber der Same GOTTES / und das gantze Göttlich wesen / das also aus gnaden in uns ist / wie in CHRISTO von Natur / und bleibt ewiglich in uns / das ist GOTT selbs / und kein Creatur / wirt auch in uns / oder von unsern wegen / nimmermehr kein Creatur werden / sonder wol warer GOTT ewiglich in uns bleiben."

⁴⁵This tendency in Osiander is the reason he was at times accused of being Catholic. "Obviously Melanchthon had not grasped the view of Osiander clearly enough; its mystical character was beyond his comprehension, and thus he treated it as approximating Roman Catholic doctrine" (Stupperich, *Melanchthon*, 137). Buchanan says Osiander attempted "to revive the essential principle of the Romish doctrine" (James

statement that "faith makes us alive from the death of sin and makes us righteous, and the sin is in this way already forgiven us" seems to refer to forgiveness of sins at salvation, although in the next sentence he says that through union with Christ we die in Christ's death and our sins become entirely rooted out and mortified. The latter statement refers to the result of Christ's inner presence.⁴⁶ Osiander compares the believer's union with Christ to the relationship between a vine and its branches. Just as the branches receive sap and life from the vine, "the divine life that is in the Word, in Christ Jesus who is the Word," flows through the believer, producing in him a walk that is pleasing to the Lord.⁴⁷ God not only declares we are righteous but also makes us righteous "with the deed and in the truth."⁴⁸ The righteousness of faith "moves the righteous to do right, and without this he can neither be righteous nor do right."⁴⁹ Here being declared righteous seems to imply

Buchanan, *The Doctrine Of Justification* [Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1867; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977], 155. Buchanan outlines Osiander's views as follows: "It consisted in affirming, that the righteousness by which we are justified is the eternal righteousness of God the Father, which is imparted to us, or infused, through His Son Jesus Christ;—that it is not the meritorious work, or vicarious righteousness, of the Redeemer imputed to us, but an internal principle implanted. This is the radical principle of the doctrine of Trent; and, as such, it was at once denounced and rejected both by Calvin and Melancthon."

⁴⁶Osiander, *Von dem Einigen Mitler*, 27: "Darumb ist nun das ander teil / des Ampts unsers lieben getrewen HERREN / und Mitlers Jhesu Christi / das er sich itzo zu uns herumb wende / wie gesagt ist / und mit uns armen Sündern / als mit der schuldigen party auch handele / das wir solche grosse gnad erkennen / durch den glauben mit dank annemen / auff das er uns durch den Glauben / von dem Tode der Sünde / lebendig und gerecht mache / und die Sünde / so schon vorgeben ist / aber doch noch in unserm fleisch wonet und anlebet / so wir in seinem Tode absterben / in uns gantz und gar abgetödtet / und vertilget werde."

⁴⁷Ibid., 54, 56-57: "Wie nun das Natürlich leben des menschen / aus dem hertzen entspringt / und durch alle glider des leibs durch dringt / also entspringt auch das Göttlich leben das im Wort ist / in Christo Jhesu der das Wort ist / Und durchleuchtet / alle seine glider seins Geistlichen leibs / das ist die gemeine der gleubigen / und macht sie alle lebendig / in im selbs / der da ist wahrer Gott und das ewig leben. . . . Also auch die gleubigen / die durchs Wort Gottes erleuchtet sein / und im Liecht wandeleu / furen ein feinen unstrefflichen / erbaren / Gottseligen wandel / Die ungleubigen aber / die solchs Göttlichs leben und Liecht / in inen nicht haben / sonder noch im finsternus der unwissenheit sein / und in allerley irthumb wandeln / die thun viel greulich der Sünd / die sie auch zum teil nicht fur unrecht noch Sünd / sonder fur eitel recht und tugent halten."

⁴⁸Ibid., 71: "Dan Gott spricht uns nicht allein gerecht / umb des Glaubens willen / Sonder macht uns auch mit der that / und in der Warheit gerecht in Christo Jhesu / durch den Glauben."

⁴⁹Ibid., 73-74: "Darnach wirt es auch gantz off / und schir durch die gantze heilige Schrifft durchaus / fur frommikeit genommen / und gebraucht / Also das in solcher frömmkeit alle andere Tugent gemeint / und eingeschlossen sein / und auff dise weiss /

doing righteous, but soon afterward Osiander says that although "the word righteousness was used at times in relation to the works and fruit of righteousness, righteousness is no work, no deed, no suffering, nor can be. Rather it is the *art* that makes righteous anyone who receives and has it, and moves him to do correctly and to suffer, and must always precede the work and fruit of righteousness before it may break forth and grow."⁵⁰ When discussing the relationship between having spiritual life and righteousness, Osiander says:

Only that which gives life can impart righteousness. And again, that which gives us life makes us truly righteous. Life and righteousness are truly united in the divine being of Jesus Christ our Lord. The Scripture does not say whether life proceeds from righteousness or righteousness from life. But as I have said, it is impossible that we should have the divine life in us, and it should not be a righteous life, or that we should have God's righteousness in us in Christ Jesus and not have life, but still be dead in transgression and sin.⁵¹

No one would reject Osiander's assertion that "that which gives us life makes us truly righteous." The question is this: does "righteousness" refer to the righteousness of

prauchen wirs auch hie / wan wir von der Gerechtigkeit des glaubens reden / Und ob jemand wolte fragen / was doch dise gerechtigkeit / und frömmikeit sey / So antwort ich / Gerechtigkeit ist eben das / das den gerechten recht zuthun bewegt / und on das er weder gerecht sein / noch recht thun kan."

⁵⁰Ibid., 77-78: "Noch eins ist not zuwissen / Nemlich / das / das wörtlein gerechtigkeit / zu zeiten gepraucht wirt / fur die werk und frucht der gerechtigkeit / so doch die Gerechtigkeit kein werk / kein thun / kein leiden ist noch sein kan / Sonder sie ist die art / die den jenigen / der sie bekümpft und hat / gerecht macht / und recht zu thun / und zu leiden bewegt / und muss alwege zuuor da sein / ehe dann die Werk und frucht der Gerechtigkeit heraus prechen / und wachsen / dan es kan kein böser Baum gutte früchte tragen / es bleibt auch solche art / das ist / die Gerechtigkeit / on unterlas in uns / wan wir schon schlaffen / und nichts thun / leiden / noch gedenken / Es sey dan / das wirs durch den unglauben / oder andere Sünde / verlieren."

⁵¹Ibid., 122-23: "Darumb spricht auch Paulus zun Gal. am 3. Wan ein Gesetz gegeben wer / das da lebendig machen könte / so keme warhafftiglich die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Gesetz / und bezeugt gewaltigklich darmit / das uns nichts gerecht machen könne / dan das da lebendig mache / und widerumb / was uns lebendig mache / das mache uns auch warhafftiglich gerecht / Und sein also Leben und Gerechtigkeit / so gar in dem einigen Göttlichen wesen / unsers HERREN JHESU CHRISTI / vereiniget / das auch die heilige Schrifft nicht erkleret / ob das Leben aus der Gerechtigkeit / oder die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Leben komme / Dan da Paulus spricht / Wan das Gesetz lebendig machet / So keme die Gerechtigkeit warhafftiglich daraus / da lest sichs ansehen / als solte die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Leben volgen / Aber da er spricht / der gerechte wirt seins Glaubens leben / da lautet es eben / als müssen wir vor durch den Glauben die Gerechtigkeit / und darnach durch die Gerechtigkeit das leben erlangen / Aber / wie ich gesagt hab / so ist es unmüglich / das wir das Göttlich leben solten in uns haben / und es solte doch nicht ein gerechtes leben sein / oder das wir solten Gottes Gerechtigkeit in uns haben / in CHRISTO JHESU / und solten doch noch nicht leben / sonder noch in Sünden und ubertretungen Todt sein."

Christ that we have because we have Christ, or does "righteousness" refer to the holy life that the believer lives because he is righteous?⁵²

Here is now the question. When the Scripture says that man will be justified through faith, . . . whether God in deed and in truth makes us righteous through faith with its deeds and cleanses us from sins . . . or whether he only because of faith declares us righteous though we are not righteous, and does not make us righteous.⁵³

He answers his own question by saying that no one "would be so foolish that he should believe that God should also be mistaken, that He would hold the ungodly to be righteous, as if He did not know that the ungodly were ungodly, or if He knew, then He would be a false judge and a friend of a rogue and would say he was righteous when he was yet godless."⁵⁴ A few pages later he says that one does not become righteous simply by the law declaring him to be innocent. The guilty person remains "a scoundrel and a thief as he was before" he was pronounced innocent.⁵⁵ Osiander concludes that God declares as righteous only those who are righteous, or as he often says, only those whom God makes righteous.

Although Osiander does connect justification, regeneration, and sanctification, he maintains that "all the witness of Holy Scripture says that the Word of God, God himself that has become flesh, is Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our life. They also witness just as

⁵²Lawrenz accuses Osiander of practically identifying "justification, regeneration, renewal and gradual sanctification" (165).

⁵³Osiander, *Von dem Einigen Mitler*, 64. "Hie ist nun die frag / wan die Schrifft spricht / der Mensch werd gerechtfertigt / durch den Glauben / zun Römern am 3. Ob man das wörtlein rechtfertigen / in dem Ersten / oder Andern verstand sol vernemen / das ist / ob uns Gott / dieweil wir in Sünden und Gottlos geporn sein / durch den Glauben mit der that / und der Warheit gerecht mache / und von der Sünd reinige / oder ob er uns allein von wegen des glaubens / als umb eins geschenks oder werks willen / gerecht sprech / so wir doch nicht gerecht sein / und Er uns auch nicht gerecht mache." On pages 82-99 of the same work Osiander quotes Luther extensively in support of his own views.

⁵⁴Ibid., 65: "Dan wer wolt so nerrisch sein (werden sie sagen) das er solt glauben / das Gott also solt irren / das er einen Gottlosen fur gerecht hielt / gleich als wüste er nicht / das der Gottlos / Gottlos were / oder so ers müste / das er als ein falscher Richter und schalks freundt / solt spreche / er were gerecht / so er doch Gottlos were."

⁵⁵Ibid., 66: "Ist er aber ungerecht und untrew gewest / so hat im das Römische volk mit seinem Urteil und ledig zelen / wol aus der gefahr geholffen / hat in aber keins wegs gerecht und from gemacht / Sonder einen schalk und Dieb lassen bleiben / wie er vorhin war."

strongly that this same Word, Christ Jesus, is also our righteousness."⁵⁶ When discussing Abraham, Osiander says that one is not accounted righteous because of works.

Since Abraham's faith also obtained the righteousness that is God himself, and this same righteousness produces such an abundance of excellent fruit, Paul says it was imputed unto him for righteousness. One is not to understand from this that Abraham was accounted righteous because of his works. But the good works were evidence that Abraham by faith had received the righteousness of God and so had become a good tree.⁵⁷

At the end of both *Von dem Einigen Mitler* and the *Disputation*, Osiander discusses the relationship between justification and its fruit.

It is also necessary to know that even though we by faith have all things in us that are necessary for our justification and redemption, yet it does not work perfectly in us, for we are the righteousness of God that is in us, yet we are not fully obedient to it, and the sin that dwells in our flesh has not completely died. For it is day by day and more and more, and will only become perfect when we die and through the power of Him that is in us are resurrected, as Paul says in Romans 8, "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwells in you."⁵⁸

⁵⁶Ibid., 123: "Daher kumbts auch / das Christus so fleissig predigt und lehret / wie er das Leben sey / und so wenig sagt von der Gerechtigkeit / dann wer eins verstehet / der verstehet das ander auch / Wer eins erlangt / der hat das ander auch. Darumb alle die gezeugnus der heiligen Schrifft / so da sagen / das das Wort Gottes / das Gott selbs / und fleisch worden ist / Jhesus Christus unser Herr sey unser Leben / die zeugen auch aus der volge / eben so stark / das eben dasselbig Wort / sey auch unser Gerechtigkeit in Christo Jhesu."

⁵⁷Ibid., 164: "Dieweil aber Abrahams Glaub / die Gerechtigkeit / die Gott selbs ist / also het ergriffen / und die selbige Gerechtigkeit / solche grosse herrliche frucht in im wirkete / spricht Paulus / Es sey im zur Gerechtigkeit gerechnet / Aber das sol man nicht also verstehen / das Abraham umb der Werk willen / gerecht wer gehalten / sonder das die werk / als die güthen frucht zeugen / das Abraham die Gerechtigkeit GOTTES / durch den Glauben / recht ergriffen / und also ein gutter Baum worden sey."

⁵⁸Ibid., 206: "Das ist aber auch noth zu wissen / das / ob wir wol durch den Glauben / alles schon volkomlich in uns haben / was zu unser Rechtfertigung und Erlösung gehört / so wirkt es doch noch nicht volkommenlich in uns / dan wir sein der Gerechtigkeit Gottes / die in uns ist / noch nicht gar gehorsam / und die Sünd / die in unserm fleisch wonet / ist noch nicht gar gestorben / sonder es nimbt beides von tag zu tag zu / je lenger je mer / und wirt alles erst vollkommen / wan wir nun sterben / und durch die krafft des / der in uns wonet / vom Todt wider aufstehen / wie Paulus Rom. 8. spricht / Der Christum von den Todten aufferweckt hat / der wirt auch emre sterbliche Leibe wider lebendig machen / umb des willen / das sein Geist in euch wonet."

77. Because of this righteousness of Christ we are indebted to obey completely, to offer our members as weapons of righteousness to God the Lord for our sanctification. But since we do not completely fulfill the selfsame in this life, we should pray that our guilt be forgiven us as we also forgive.

78. Our works, as good as they also are, make one neither righteous nor living nor glorious, for that belongs to God alone and is rather fulfilled by them who are already made righteous, living, and glorious because a bad tree cannot bear good fruit.

79. Although he who is justified shall not become more justified, surely not through our works, yet by the knowledge of the Son of God through faith we from day to day become purified in Him increasingly until we come up and become a perfect man who is the full measure of the complete Christ.

80. There is no teaching that moves men more to do good deeds than this heavenly teaching of our justification.

81. For God has been motivating the children of God through His Holy Spirit who is mighty in the believers, and they obey him from the heart and seek not to offend God while they believe that He is to them so entirely and inwardly present that they will not leave Him and again fall in death. End.⁵⁹

Osiander's position is clear. Those who have Christ are righteous because the righteous Christ lives in them. Faith, not works, is the basis of justification.⁶⁰ Faith brings Christ into the heart, and the believer is united with the undivided Christ, i.e., the

⁵⁹Osiander, *Disputation*: "77. Diser Gerechtigkeit Christi / sein wir vollkommenen gehorsam schuldig / das wir unser glider dargeben / zu waffen der Gerechtigkeit / Gott dem HERRN / zu unserer heiligung / dieweil wir aber die selbigen / in disem leben / nicht vollkommenlich leisten / sollen wir Bitten / das uns unser schuld vergeben werden / als auch wir vergeben. 78. Unsere Werk / wie gut sie auch sein / machen weder Gerecht / noch lebendig noch herrlich / dan das gehört Gott allein zu / sonder geschehen von denen die schon Gerecht / lebendig / und herrlich gemacht sein / dan ein böser Baum / kan nicht gute frucht tragen. 79. Und wiewol der / so da Gerechtfertigt ist soll noch weiter Gerechtfertigt werden / so geschicht es doch nicht durch unsere werk / sonder mit dem Erkenntnus des Sons Gottes / durch den glauben / durch den wir im / von tag je lenger je mehr vereinigt werden / bis wir all hinan kommen / und ein vollkommen man werden / der da sey der masse / des vollkommenen alters Christi. 80. Es ist kein Lehr / die den Menschen mer treibet / guts zu thun / dan dise himelische Lehr / von unserer Rechtfertigung. 81. Dan GOTT ist durch sein heiligen Geist / von dem die Kinder GOTTES getriben werden / trefftig in den gleubigen / und sie sein von hertzen gehorsam / und forchten sich Gott zubeleidigen / weil sie glauben / das er inen so gantz gegenwertig und innerlich sey / pamit sie nicht von im verlassen / widerumb in tod fallen. ENDE."

⁶⁰For an opposing view of Osiander's position, see Green, *How Melancthon Helped Luther Discover The Gospel*, 228-31. Also see G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies In Dogmatics: Faith and Justification*, trans. Lewis B. Smedes (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), 98, 99. "For us, the difference between Rome's infused righteousness and Osiander's 'essential righteousness' is of comparatively slight consequence. What is significant is that for Osiander, Christ, according to His divine nature, dwells in our hearts, and there constitutes our righteousness. With Osiander, as with Rome, sanctification is the ground of justification" (98).

believer is united with Christ's humanity, and Christ's righteousness (deity, which includes life, righteousness, etc.) is the basis of God's declaration that the sinner is righteous. "As the humanity of Christ became righteous through union with God as the essential righteousness, so we also become righteous by virtue of such a union with Christ."⁶¹ The declaration of righteousness depends on forgiveness and union with Christ. Although Osiander talks about imputation,⁶² he connects justification with regeneration and union with Christ. God's declaration is based on fact, not fiction. Good works are the result of union with the righteous Christ. Those who are united with the righteous Christ have entered into His death and resurrected life. Christ produces in them the fruit that pleases God.

Despite Osiander's constant appeal to Luther for support, the Formula of Concord (1577) condemned Osiander's theology.⁶³ The Formula rejects both Osiander's view that Christ justifies because of his divinity alone (their understanding of Osiander's soteriology) and the position taken by some of Osiander's opponents that Christ justifies according to the human nature alone. The Formula affirms Melancthon's view of forensic justification by imputation by saying that Christ justifies according to both his human and divine natures, and not because he lives in us. Seventeenth century Protestants accepted and expanded Melancthon's definition.

One can detect several differences between Luther and Osiander. Osiander views the believer's works as really good. By this Osiander means neither that one can be saved on the basis of good works nor that good works are uncontaminated by evil motives, but Osiander is convinced that the righteous Christ who lives within will produce good works that please God. As a result of his view of good works, Osiander also connects sanctification more closely to redemption than Luther. Some interpreter's also see a distinction between Luther's and Osiander's understanding of what is imputed to the believer.

Luther had expounded Christ's dwelling in our hearts by faith as a blessed fruit of the imputation of Christ's vicarious righteousness, giving us strength for our sanctification. Osiander on the other hand had maintained that Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith with his essential divine righteousness is our righteousness, our

⁶¹Seeberg, vol. I, 370.

⁶²Ibid., 371.

⁶³Schaff, "*Formula Concordiae*," in *The Creeds of Christendom*, vol. III, 93-180.

CHAPTER III

JOHN CALVIN

One writer says that "Calvin, in his cold, abstract, systematic approach to doctrine, has little room for the Pauline *Christus in nobis* that is so prominent in, and so characteristic of, Luther's theology" and concludes, despite the *Christus in nobis* motif one finds in Calvin, that "the dominant emphasis in Calvin's exposition of the doctrine of justification is its *forensic* character."¹ This evaluation highlights the tension in Calvin between the *Christus in nobis* and the formal imputation motifs.

Calvin, like Luther, saw justification by faith as "the main hinge on which religion turns."² Both men believed "that Christian righteousness is in fact Christ's righteousness and not man's own."³ Calvin also agrees with Luther and Osiander that the faith which justifies is the faith which receives the righteousness of Christ. Even while attempting to

¹Coates, 327. *Institutes* III.xi.10. Alister E. McGrath, "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification," *Archiv Fur Reformationsgeschichte* 73(1982): 14, 15. McGrath says Calvin interprets "both justification and sanctification as aspects of the believer's incorporation into Christ in a mystical union. For Calvin, justification is a purely forensic concept. Justification is an act of judgement (sic) on the part of God by which he recognises that sinners have communion with the one true righteous man, Jesus Christ. As there is no basis in man for such a judgement, man having no righteousness of his own, the righteousness necessary for such a judgement must come from outside man. God can therefore only acquit man by attributing to him the righteousness of Christ. 'We are righteous in Christ alone.' Calvin is therefore in agreement with Luther and Melancthon concerning the external and imputative nature of justifying righteousness. However, Calvin takes the idea a stage further, developing the idea of the Christian life—i.e. after justification—as involving a mystic union with Christ. This idea, of course, is present in Luther's works, although it is not well developed. Calvin developed the idea of the *unio mystica* to such an extent that it becomes central to his doctrine of justification, linking together both the act of justification and the process of sanctification."

²Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison, Wisconsin: Madison Univ. Of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 223. See Calvin, *Institutes* III.xi.1.

³Armstrong, 223. Armstrong concludes that Amyraut was correct in his complaint that the focus in justification "had shifted from a concrete, existential doctrine to an abstract, speculative formulation" between the early reformers and his day (p. 223, note 6).

distance himself from Osiander, Calvin says faith is an empty vessel that receives Christ.

I willingly concede Osiander's objection that faith of itself does not possess the power of justifying, but only in so far as it receives Christ. For if faith justified of itself or through some intrinsic power, so to speak, as it is always weak and imperfect it would effect this only in part; thus the righteousness that conferred a fragment of salvation upon us would be defective. Now we imagine no such thing, but we say that, properly speaking, God alone justifies; then we transfer this same function to Christ because he was given to us for righteousness. We compare faith to a kind of vessel; for unless we come empty and with the mouth of our soul open to seek Christ's grace, we are not capable of receiving Christ. From this it is to be inferred that, in teaching that before his righteousness is received Christ is received in faith, we do not take the power of justifying away from Christ.⁴

Faith justifies because it receives Christ,⁵ and Christ is given to us for righteousness. The benefits of Christ's righteousness and life are possessed by faith alone.⁶ Furthermore, the faith that receives Christ also unites us to Christ.⁷

We ought not to separate Christ from ourselves or ourselves from him. Rather we ought to hold fast bravely with both hands to that fellowship by which he has bound himself to us. . . . But he [Paul] speaks far otherwise, for he teaches that that condemnation which we of ourselves deserve has been swallowed up by the salvation that is in Christ. And to confirm this he uses the same reason I have brought forward: that Christ is not outside us but dwells within us. Not only does he cleave to us by an indivisible bond of fellowship, but with a wonderful communion, day by day, he grows more and more into one body with us, until he becomes completely one with us.⁸

⁴*Institutes* III.xi.7. Ioannis Calvini, *Opera Omnia Quae Supersunt* (hereafter referred to as *Institutes*): "Quod obiicit, vim iustificandi non inesse fidei ex se ipsa, sed quatenus Christum recipit, libenter admitto. Nam si per se, vel intrinseca, ut loquuntur, virtute iustificaret fides, ut est semper debilis et imperfecta, non efficeret hoc nisi ex parte. Sic manca esset iustitia, quae frustulum salutis nobis conferret. Nos quidem nihil tale imaginamur, sed proprie loquendo Deum unum iustificare dicimus; deinde hoc idem transferimus ad Christum, quia datus est nobis in iustitiam; fidem vero quasi vasi conferimus, quia nisi exinaniti ad expetendam Christi gratiam aperto animae ore accedimus, non sumus Christi capaces. Unde colligitur, non detrahare nos Christo vim iustificandi, dum prius eum fide recipi docemus quam illius iustitiam."

⁵John H. Leith, *John Calvin's Doctrine Of The Christian Life* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989), 90. CR 49:60.

⁶*Institutes* III.xiv.17.

⁷Shepherd, 25.

⁸*Institutes*. III.ii.24: "Sic est sane: Christum a nobis separare, aut nos ab ipso, minime convenit: sed utraque manu fortiter retinere oportet eam qua se nobis agglutinauit societatem. . . . Docet enim eam quam a nobis meremur damnationem Christi

We must now examine this question. How do we receive those benefits which the Father bestowed on his only-begotten Son—not for Christ's own private use, but that he might enrich poor and needy men? First, we must understand that as long as Christ remains outside of us, and we are separated from him (*quamdiu extra nos est Christus et ab eo sumus separati*), all that he has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race remains useless and of no value for us. Therefore, to share with us what he has received from the Father, he had to become ours and to dwell within us (*nostrum fieri et in nobis habitare oportet*). For this reason, he is called "our Head" [Eph. 4:15], and "the first-born among many brethren" [Rom. 8:29]. We also, in turn, are said to be "engrafted into him" [Rom. 11:17], and to "put on Christ" [Gal. 3:27]; for, as I have said, all that he possesses is nothing to us until we grow into one body with him. It is true that we obtain this by faith. Yet since we see that not all indiscriminately embrace that communion with Christ which is offered through the gospel, reason itself teaches us to climb higher and to examine into the secret energy of the Spirit, by which we come to enjoy Christ and all his benefits. . . . To sum up, the Holy Spirit is the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself (*Huc summa redit, spiritum sanctum vinculum esse, quo nos sibi efficaciter divincit Christus.*).⁹

It is our intention to make only these two points: first, that faith does not stand firm until a man attains to the freely given promise; second, that it does not reconcile us to God at all unless it joins us to Christ. . . . But how can there be saving faith except in so far as it engrafts us in the body of Christ?¹⁰

If "Christ remains outside of us," if "we are separated from Him," if he does not "dwell within us," if we are not "engrafted into Him," if we do not "put on Christ," if we do not "grow into one body with Him," if Christ is not truly ours, what Christ "has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race remains useless and of no value for us." Just as faith cannot receive Christ unless the Spirit unites us with Christ, Christ's work on the cross cannot effect reconciliation unless we are united to Christ. "Mortification of the flesh and vivification of the spirit" are possible only if we participate in Christ.¹¹ By faith Christ

salute absorptam esse; atque ad id confirmandum, ea quam attuli ratione utitur: quia Christus non extra nos est, sed in nobis habitat, nec solum individuo societatis nexu nobis adhaeret, sed mirabili quadam communione in unum corpus nobiscum coalescit in dies magis ac magis, donec unum penitus nobiscum fiat."

⁹*Institutes* III.i.1.

¹⁰*Institutes* III.ii.30: "Tantum enim indicare haec duo volumus, nunquam scilicet ipsam concistere, donec ad gratuitam promissionem pervenerit; deinde non aliter nos per ipsam conciliari Deo, nisi quia nos Christo copulat."

¹¹*Institutes* III.iii.8, 9. In this passage Calvin connects union with Christ with power for victorious living. Christ died for sin and to sin. The believer participates both in Christ's death and resurrection. One can also find the *Christus Victor* motif in Calvin. Robert A. Peterson, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Atonement* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1983), 46, note 1: "The concept of Christ's saving work as a mighty victory occupied a large place in Calvin's thought and deserves a place in any consideration of his doctrine of the atonement." Peterson acknowledges, however, that there is little recognition of the *Christus Victor* element in Calvin by Calvin's

dwells within us and engrafts us into himself. Furthermore, unless one knows that Christ dwells in him, he is reprobate.¹²

We have already noted that Luther felt that the *via moderna's pactum* concept produces a dilemma by requiring the sinner who is unrighteous to do something acceptable to God, and that Luther solved the dilemma by making the righteousness of Christ satisfy the *iustitia Dei*.¹³ Calvin likewise concludes that in Christ God gives to man the righteousness that God requires.¹⁴

I confess that we are deprived of this utterly incomparable good until Christ is made ours. Therefore, that joining together of Head and members, that indwelling of Christ in our hearts—in short, that mystical union—are accorded by us the highest degree of importance, so that Christ, having been made ours, makes us sharers with him in the gifts with which he has been endowed. We do not, therefore, contemplate him outside ourselves from afar in order that his righteousness may be imputed to us but because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body—in short, because he deigns to make us one with him. For this reason, we glory that we have fellowship of righteousness with him.¹⁵

Christ and believers are joined by a "mystical union." This mystical union makes it

scholars.

¹²Shepherd, 24. *Institutes* III.ii.39.

¹³See note 16 in Chapter I.

¹⁴See Holmes Rolston, III, *John Calvin Versus The Westminster Confession* (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1972), 72-85. " 'Righteousness of God' has to do with the status of man; a righteousness of God, 'that which is approved at his tribunal.' But, insists Calvin, the expression has to do initially with the divine perfection, God's righteousness, which communicates itself to man and makes him righteous. The righteousness which God confers has its ground in the righteous character of God.

At the beginning, man was established to live by his participation in divine righteousness. Rather than living through his own self-righteousness, he was to receive righteousness from God. So when righteousness is gifted again in the gospel, the primal order is but re-established. Calvin conceives of these two participation processes as being somewhat different. That there are now offenses to be canceled and that the justified man remains still a sinner in part means that imputation is involved, whereas in Adam, as integral man, there was but impartation. But imputed and imparted righteousness are in thrust the same, in that never is righteousness of human authorship; it always rests in, flows from, and is borrowed from God, the source of righteousness" (75, 76).

¹⁵*Institutes* III.xi.10: "Porro ne suis cavillis decipiat imperitos, fateor hoc tam incomparabili bono nos privari donec Christus noster fiat. Coniunctio igitur illa capitis et membrorum, habitatio Christi in cordibus nostris, mystica denique unio a nobis in summo gradu statuitur, ut Christus noster factus, donorum quibus praeditus est nos faciat consortes. Non ergo eum extra nos procul speculamur, ut nobis imputetur eius iustitia; sed quia ipsum induimus, et insiti sumus in eius corpus, unum denique nos secum efficere dignatus est, ideo iustitiae societatem nobis cum eo esse gloriamur."

possible for us to share in all Christ's gifts, and Christ's righteousness is one of His gifts. Christ's righteousness is not imputed to us from afar; instead, we are "engrafted into his body" and have become "one with him." This union with Christ produces "fellowship of righteousness" with Christ. We do not receive Christ's righteousness unless we receive Christ.¹⁶

In his discussion of the Lord's Supper Calvin says that since the "mystery of Christ's secret union with the devout is by nature incomprehensible, he shows its figure and image in visible signs best adapted to our small capacity."¹⁷ The Lord's Supper, then, tells us how we are united to Christ.¹⁸ This Sacrament is "a witness of our growth into one body with Christ such that whatever is his may be called ours."¹⁹ The Lord's Supper "is a help whereby we may be engrafted into Christ's body, or engrafted, may grow more and more together with him, until he perfectly joins us with him in the heavenly life."²⁰ Calvin maintains that the bread and wine are symbols that represent Christ's spiritual presence, and our spiritual nourishment depends on Christ's spiritual presence. We are "quickened by the true partaking of him; and he has therefore designated this partaking by the words 'eating' and 'drinking,' so that no one should think that the life that we receive

¹⁶Shepherd, 29.

¹⁷*Institutes* IV.xvii.1. *Institutes* IV.xvii.11: "I therefore say (what has always been accepted in the church and is today taught by all of sound opinion) that the sacred mystery of the Supper consists in two things: physical signs, which, thrust before our eyes, represent to us, according to our feeble capacity, things invisible; and spiritual truth, which is at the same time represented and displayed through the symbols themselves." "Dico igitur (quod et semper in ecclesia receptum fuit, et hodie docent quicunque recte sentiunt) duabus rebus constare sacrum coenae mysterium: corporeis signis, quae ob oculos proposita, res invisibiles secundum imbecillitatis nostrae captum nobis repraesentant; et spirituali veritate, quae per symbola ipsa figuratur simul et exhibetur."

¹⁸*Institutes* IV.xvii.3: "And so as we previously stated, from the physical things set forth in the Sacrament we are led by a sort of analogy to spiritual things. Thus, when bread is given as a symbol of Christ's body, we must at once grasp this comparison: as bread nourishes, sustains, and keeps the life of our body, so Christ's body is the only food to invigorate and enliven our soul. When we see wine set forth as a symbol of blood, we must reflect on the benefits which wine imparts to the body, and so realize that the same are spiritually imparted to us by Christ's blood."

¹⁹*Institutes* IV.xvii.2.

²⁰Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine Of The Word And Sacrament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Company, 1957), 150. *Institutes* IV.xvii.33: "Dignitas vero satis magnifice commendatur, ubi tenemus, adminiculum esse quo inseramur in corpus Christi, vel insiti magis ac magis coalescamus, donec solide nos secum uniat in coelesti vita."

from him is received by mere knowledge."²¹ We "eat Christ's flesh in believing, because it is made ours by faith. . . ." ²² By truly partaking of Christ, "his life passes into us and is made ours—just as bread when taken as food imparts vigor to the body."²³ This is an eating of faith, "not of the mouth. . . . By faith we embrace Christ not as appearing from afar but as joining himself to us that he may be our head, we his members."²⁴ The "Source of life" is no longer hidden and distant but rather dwells within us and "quickens our very flesh in which he abides."²⁵ Although we do not eat Christ's flesh when we partake of the

²¹*Institutes* IV.xvii.5.

²²*Ibid.*: "We admit indeed, meanwhile, that this is no other eating than that of faith, as no other can be imagined. But here is the difference between my words and theirs: for them to eat is only to believe; I say that we eat Christ's flesh in believing, because it is made ours by faith, and that this eating is the result and effect of faith. Or if you want it said more clearly, for them eating is faith; for me it seems rather to follow from faith. This is a small difference indeed in words, but no slight one in the matter itself. For even though the apostle teaches that 'Christ dwells in our hearts through faith' [Eph. 3:17, cf. Vg.], no one will interpret this indwelling to be faith, but all feel that he is there expressing a remarkable effect of faith, for through this believers gain Christ abiding in them. In this way the Lord intended, by calling himself the "bread of life" [John 6:51], to teach not only that salvation for us rests on faith in his death and resurrection, but also that, by true partaking of him, his life passes into us and is made ours—just as bread when taken as food imparts vigor to the body." "Nam etsi docet apostolus (Eph. 3, 17), Christum in cordibus nostris habitare per fidem, nemo tamen habitationem istam, fidem interpretabitur; sed eximium fidei effectum explicari omnes sentiunt, quod per ipsam fideles consequuntur ut Christum in se habeant manentem. In hunc modum voluit Dominus, panem vitae se nuncupando, non tantum docere in mortis resurrectionisque suae fide repositam esse nobis salutem; sed vera etiam sui communicatione fieri, ut vita sua in nos transeat, ac nostra fiat: non secus ac panis, dum in alimentum sumitur, vigorem corpori administrat."

²³*Institutes* IV.xvii.5.

²⁴*Institutes* IV.xvii.6: "And Augustine (whom they appeal to as their patron) did not write that we eat by believing in any other sense than to show that this eating is of faith, not of the mouth. I too do not deny this. At the same time, however, I add that by faith we embrace Christ not as appearing from afar but as joining himself to us that he may be our head, we his members." "Nec alio sensu Augustinus, quem illi patronum sibi advocant, credendo nos manducare scripsit, quam ut manducationem istam fidei esse, non oris, indicaret. Quod neque ipse nego; sed simul tamen addo, nos fide complecti Christum non eminus apparentem, sed se nobis unientem, ut ipse caput nostrum, nos vero eius membra simus."

²⁵*Institutes* IV.xvii.8: "But when the Source of life begins to abide in our flesh, he no longer lies hidden far from us, but shows us that we are to partake of him. But he also quickens our very flesh in which he abides, that by partaking of him we may be fed unto immortality. . . . It is therefore a special comfort for the godly that they now find life in their own flesh." "At vero, ubi fons ille vitae habitare in carne nostra coepit, iam non procul nobis absconditus latet, sed coram se participandum exhibet. Quin et ipsam, in qua residet, carnem vivificam nobis reddit, ut eius participatione ad immortalitatem pascamur. .

Lord's Supper, Christ does make his abode in our flesh.

After explaining the limitations of Christ's flesh, Calvin explains how the spiritual blessings of Christ are transmitted to believers through the flesh of Christ. "The flesh of Christ does not of itself have a power so great as to quicken us" because his flesh is mortal and "does not live through itself," but "in his humanity there also dwells fullness of life, so that whoever has partaken of his flesh and blood may at the same time enjoy participation in life."²⁶ The flesh of Christ has value for the believer because the righteousness of Christ is communicated to us by or through His humanity.

Union with Christ means one is "made flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone..."²⁷

This is the purport of the apostle's statements: "The church . . . is the body of Christ, and the fullness of him" [Eph. 1:23]; but he is "the head" [Eph. 4:15] "from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by . . . joints . . . makes bodily growth" [Eph. 4:16]; "our bodies are members of Christ" [I Cor. 6:15]. We understand that all these things could not be brought about otherwise than by his cleaving to us wholly in spirit and body. But Paul graced with a still more glorious title that intimate fellowship in which we are joined with his flesh when he said, "We are members of his body, of his bones and of his flesh" [Eph. 5:30]. Finally, to witness to this thing greater than all words, he ends his discourse with an exclamation: "This," he says, "is a great mystery" [Eph. 5:32]. It would be extreme madness to recognize no communion of believers with the flesh and blood of the Lord, which the apostle declares to be so great that he prefers to marvel at it rather than to explain it."²⁸

.. In hoc ergo sita piis eximia consolatio, quod vitam in propria carne nunc reperiunt."

²⁶*Institutes* IV.xvii.9: ". . . ita Christi caro instar fontis est divitis et inexhausti, quae vitam a divinitate in se ipsam scaturientem ad nos transfundit. Iam quis non videt, communionem carnis et sanguinis Christi necessariam esse omnibus qui ad coelestem vitam aspirant?"

²⁷*Institutes* III.i.3: "Hoc quidem iam clare expositum est, donec intentae sint in spiritum mentes nostrae, Christum iacere quodammodo otiosum: quia frigide eum extra nos, adeoque procul a nobis speculamur. Scimus autem non aliis prodesse nisi quorum est caput et primogenitus inter fratres, qui denique eum induerunt. Facit sola haec coniunctio, ne inutiliter, quoad nos, cum salvatoris nomine venerit. Quo spectat sacrum illud coniugium quo efficimur caro de carne eius, et ossa ex ossibus (Eph. 5, 30), adeoque unum cum ipso: solo autem spiritu unit se nobiscum. Eiusdem spiritus gratia et virtute efficimur illius membra, ut nos sub se contineat vicissimque illum possideamus."

²⁸*Institutes* IV.xvii.9: "Huc spectant illae apostoli sententiae (Eph. 1, 23 et 4, 15; I Cor. 6, 15): ecclesiam corpus esse Christi et eius complementum, ipsum vero esse caput, ex quo totum corpus, coagmentatum et compactum per commissuras, incrementum corporis facit; corpora nostra membra esse Christi. Quae omnia non posse aliter effici intelligimus, quin totus spiritu et corpore nobis adhaereat. Sed arcissimam illam societatem, qua eius carni copulamur, splendidiore adhuc elogio illustravit quum dixit, nos esse membra corporis eius, ex ossibus eius et ex carne eius (Eph. 5, 30). Tandem ut rem omnibus verbis maiorem testetur, sermonem exclamatione finit: magnum, inquit, istud arcanum. Extremae ergo dementiae fuerit, nullam agnoscere cum carne et sanguine Domini fidelium communionem, quam tantam esse declarat apostolus, ut eam admirari quam

Members of the church "are members of his body, of his bones and of his flesh." The church is joined and knit to Christ as Christ cleaves to us "wholly in spirit and body." Several sections later Calvin even says that "in the mystery of the Supper" believers have "been made partakers of his substance, that we may also feel his power in partaking of all his benefits."²⁹ This does not mean that believers literally partake of the physical flesh of Christ in communion. Neither does this mean, as we shall soon see in more detail, that Christ's essence is mingled with ours.³⁰ Rather, "it is enough for us that Christ out of the substance of His flesh brings life to our souls, indeed pours out His own life into us, although the flesh of Christ itself does not enter into us."³¹ "We are united with Christ but not fused with Him."³² Calvin says that "Christ in His body is far from us, but by His spirit He dwells within us and draws us upwards to Himself in the heavens in such wise that He pours out upon us the life-giving power of His flesh."³³

Calvin wants believers to be united to Christ and to partake of Christ. The nature and means of that partaking need further clarification. Although "Christ's body is limited by the general characteristics common to all human bodies, and is contained in heaven, . . . yet he does not take away that communion of his flesh and blood which we are now discussing [Rom. 8:9], but teaches that the Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ

explicare malit."

²⁹*Institutes* IV.xvii.11: "Dico igitur, in coenae mysterio per symbola panis et vini Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeoque corpus et sanguinem eius, in quibus omnem obedientiam pro comparanda nobis iustitia adimplevit; quo scilicet primum in unum corpus cum ipso coalescamus, deinde participes substantiae eius facti in bonorum omnium communicatione virtutem quoque sentiamus."

³⁰Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine Of The Word And Sacrament*, 153.

³¹*Institutes* IV.xvii.32: "Ingenue interea confiteor, mixturam carnis Christi cum anima nostra, vel transfusionem qualis ab ipsis docetur me repudiare: quia nobis sufficit Christum e carnis suae substantia vitam in animas nostras spirare, imo propriam in nos vitam diffundere, quamvis in nos non ingrediatur ipsa Christi caro."

³²Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology Of Calvin*, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956), 226. H. Stob says Calvin sees the believer's relationship with Christ as "a vital connection, by which the merits of Christ are transferred to ourselves. An ontological identification between Christ and the sinner there cannot be, but a living union is indispensable. As Calvin conceives of it, this union is not a *unio mystica* in the technical sense, but it is an *insitio in Christum*, a veritable participation in the Savior's life" that can be described either as "Christ dwelling in us, or we dwelling in Christ" (Henry Stob, *Ethical Reflections: Essays on Moral Themes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978], 57).

³³CR 9:33.

completely and have him dwelling in us."³⁴ We "are nourished by the real body of Christ, which was crucified for us" that the spiritual life of Christ may be "transferred into us from the substance of his body."³⁵ "The body of Christ is given us for food by the secret energy of the Spirit."³⁶ "By the incomprehensible agency of the Spirit, spiritual life is infused into us from the substance of the flesh of Christ."³⁷ Although Calvin discards "the gross fiction of a local intermingling," he "constantly" admits "that we are substantially fed on the flesh and blood of Christ."³⁸ When Calvin says "the flesh and blood of Christ are substantially offered and exhibited to us in the Supper," he means "that the flesh of Christ becomes vivifying to us, inasmuch as Christ, by the incomprehensible agency of his Spirit, transfuses his own proper life into us from the substance of his flesh, so that he himself lives in us, and his life is common to us."³⁹ Calvin says he "uniformly assert[s] a substantial communion, and only discard[s] a local presence and the figment of an immensity of flesh."⁴⁰ "In the bread and wine we seek a spiritual aliment, which may quicken our souls to the hope of a blessed resurrection. We ask Christ that we may be united to him, that he may dwell in us and be one with us."⁴¹ Calvin denies that the body of Christ is eaten by the mouth, but he affirms that the believer can partake "of the substance of the flesh of Christ" without eating it with the mouth.⁴²

According to Calvin, the Holy Spirit is the medium by which the believer is united to Christ.

For as we do not doubt that Christ's body is limited by the general characteristics common to all human bodies, and is contained in heaven (where it was once for all received) until Christ returns in judgment [Acts 3:21], so we deem it utterly unlawful to draw it back under these corruptible elements or to imagine it to be present everywhere.

³⁴Niesel, 228. *Institutes* IV.xvii.12.

³⁵Calvin, *Selected Works*, 501.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 502.

³⁷*Ibid.*

³⁸*Ibid.*

³⁹*Ibid.*, 506.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 529.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 546.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 507.

And there is no need of this for us to enjoy a participation in it, since the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of Christ, with whom we are joined in unity, and is like a channel through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us.⁴³

We say Christ descends to us both by the outward symbol and by his Spirit, that he may truly quicken our souls by the substance of his flesh and of his blood. . . . There is nothing more incredible than that things severed and removed from one another by the whole space between heaven and earth should not only be connected across such a great distance but also be united, so that souls may receive nourishment from Christ's flesh.⁴⁴

To summarize: our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ in the same way that bread and wine keep and sustain physical life. For the analogy of the sign applies only if souls find their nourishment in Christ—which cannot happen unless Christ truly grows into one with us, and refreshes us by the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood.

Even though it seems unbelievable that Christ's flesh, separated from us by such great distance, penetrates to us, so that it becomes our food, let us remember how far the secret power of the Holy Spirit towers above all our senses, and how foolish it is to wish to measure his immeasurableness by our measure. What, then, our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive: that the Spirit truly unites things separated in space.

Now, that sacred partaking of his flesh and blood, by which Christ pours his life into us, as if it penetrated into our bones and marrow, he also testifies and seals in the Supper—not by presenting a vain and empty sign, but by manifesting there the effectiveness of his Spirit to fulfill what he promises. . . .

For why should the Lord put in your hand the symbol of his body, except to assure you of a true participation in it? But if it is true that a visible sign is given us to seal the gift of a thing invisible, when we have received the symbol of the body, let us no less surely trust that the body itself is also given to us.⁴⁵

⁴³*Institutes* IV.xvii.1: "Siquidem ut finitum esse, pro perpetua corporis humani ratione, minime ambigimus, coeloque contineri, quo semel receptum est, donec ad iudicium redeat: ita sub haec corruptibilia elementa retrahere ipsum, aut ubique praesens imaginari, prorsus ducimus nefas esse. Neque id sane opus est, quo ipsius participatione fruamur; quando hoc beneficii per spiritum suum nobis Dominus largitur, ut unum corpore, spiritu et anima secum fiamus. Vinculum ergo istius coniunctionis est spiritus Christi, cuius nexu copulamur; et quidam veluti canalis, per quem quidquid Christus ipse et est et habet, ad nos derivatur."

⁴⁴*Institutes* IV.xvii.24: "Dicimus Christum tam externo symbolo quam spiritu suo ad nos descendere, ut vere substantia carnis suae et sanguinis sui animas nostras vivificet. . . . Nihil magis incredibile quam res toto coeli et terrae spatio dissitas ac remotas, in tanta locorum distantia non solum coniungi, sed uniri, ut alimentum percipiant animae ex carne Christi."

⁴⁵*Institutes* IV.xvii.10: "Nec est quod obiciat quispiam, figuratam esse loquutionem, qua signatae rei nomen signo deferatur. Fateor sane fractionem panis symbolum esse, non rem ipsam. Verum hoc posito, a symboli tamen exhibitione rem

For the fact that it comes about through the power of the Holy Spirit that we grow together with Christ, and he becomes our Head and we his members, he [Osiander] reckons of almost no importance unless Christ's essence be mingled with ours.⁴⁶

Calvin cannot explain how the Spirit unites "things separated in space," but he is convinced that the bread is placed in the hand as a sign that those who receive the symbol will likewise "trust that the body itself" will also be given to them. Participation in Christ's physical body does not require, however, that Christ's body leave heaven, for the Spirit makes us one in "body, spirit, and soul with him." The believer's union or sacred marriage with Christ is effected by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is the "bond" and the "channel." Christ "unites himself to us by the Spirit alone. By the grace and power of the same Spirit we are made his members, to keep us under himself and in turn to possess him."⁴⁷

Calvin's christology influences—if not controls—his view of the Lord's Supper and of the manner of Christ's presence in the believer.⁴⁸ Calvin's contention is that God was both wholly within Jesus and wholly outside Him.⁴⁹ He rejects the idea that the Godhead is fused or merged with the manhood of Christ. Calvin teaches the *extra Calvinisticum* in two places in the *Institutes*.⁵⁰ The first occurs in a discussion about the Eucharist. Christ's body cannot be in heaven and on the earth at the same time.

ipsam exhiberi, rite colligemus. . . . Atque omnino isthaec piis tenenda regula est, ut quoties symbola vident a Domino instituta, illic rei signatae veritatem adesse certo cogitent, ac sibi persuadeant. Quorsum enim corporis sui symbolum tibi Dominus in manum porrigat, nisi ut de vera eius participatione te certiores faciat? Quod si verum est praeberi nobis signum visibile, ad obsignandam invisibilis rei donationem, accepto corporis symbolo, non minus corpus etiam ipsum nobis dari certo confidamus."

⁴⁶*Institutes* III.xi.5: "Multa quidem scripturae testimonia accumulatur, quibus Christum probet unum esse nobiscum, et nos vicissim cum ipso, quod probatione non indiget; sed quia non observat huius unitatis vinculum, se ipsum illaqueat. Nobis vero omnes eius nodos expedire facile est, qui tenemus, nos cum Christo uniri areana spiritus eius virtute."

⁴⁷*Institutes* III.i.3.

⁴⁸The opposite is also true: Calvin's view of christology is influenced by his understanding of the Lord's Supper and Christ's presence in the believer. See Trevor Hart, "Humankind In Christ And Christ In Humankind: Salvation As Participation In Our Substitute In The Theology Of John Calvin," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 42 (1989): 67-84. Trevor says Calvin's "christology is determinative for his soteriology" (71).

⁴⁹*Institutes* IV.xvii.30; II.xiii.4; CR 47:62.

⁵⁰Peterson, 13.

Now, although we concede to them what they chatter about the invisible presence, yet that immeasurableness will still not be proved, without which they will try in vain to enclose Christ under bread. Unless the body of Christ can be everywhere at once, without limitation of place, it will not be credible that he lies hidden under the bread in the Supper. To meet this necessity, they have introduced the monstrous notion of ubiquity.

But as we have proved by firm and clear testimonies of Scripture, Christ's body was circumscribed by the measure of a human body. Again, by his ascension into heaven he made it plain that it is not in all places, but when it passes into one, it leaves the previous one.⁵¹

Calvin wrote the second passage in an attempt to refute Menno Simons. Menno had said that the "Almighty Word" which had filled heaven and earth could not have "united itself with such a little body of the flesh of Mary. . . ." ⁵² Calvin suggests by his response that "the Son of God descended from heaven" and entered into the virgin's womb

⁵¹*Institutes* IV.xvii.30: "And surely certain men would rather manifest their ignorance to their great shame than yield even the least particle of their error. I am not speaking of the papists, whose doctrine is more tolerable or at least more modest. But some are carried away with such contentiousness as to say that because of the natures joined in Christ, wherever Christ's divinity is, there also is his flesh, which cannot be separated from it. As if that union had compounded from two natures some sort of intermediate being which was neither God nor man! So, indeed, did Eutyches teach, and Servetus after him. But from Scripture we plainly infer that the one person of Christ so consists of two natures that each nevertheless retains unimpaired its own distinctive character. . . . What sort of madness, then, is it to mingle heaven with earth rather than give up trying to drag Christ's body from the heavenly sanctuary? . . .

Therefore, since the whole Christ is everywhere, our Mediator is ever present with his own people, and in the Supper reveals himself in a special way, yet in such a way that the whole Christ is present, but not in his wholeness. For, as has been said, in his flesh he is contained in heaven until he appears in judgment." "Et certa quidam cum magno dedecore proderi inscitiam suam malunt quam vel minimum de errore cedere. Non loquor de papistis: quorum tolerabilior, vel saltem magis verecunda est doctrina. Sed quosdam ita abripit contentio, ut dicant, propter unitas in Christo naturas, ubicunque est divinitas Christi, illic quoque esse carnem, quae ab illa separari nequit. Quasi vero unio illa conflaverit ex duabus naturis medium nescio quid, quod neque Deus esset, neque homo. . . . Cuius ergo amentiae est, coelum terrae potius miscere quam non extrahere Christi corpus e coelesti sanctuario? . . . Mediator ergo noster quum totus ubique sit, suis semper adest; et in coena speciali modo praesentem se exhibet, sic tamen ut totus adsit, non totum: quia, ut dictum est, in carne sua coelo comprehenditur donec iudicium appareat."

⁵²Menno Simons, *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons* [hereafter referred to as *CWMS*], ed. J. C. Wenger (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1956), 881: "It follows rigidly if the doctrine of the learned ones is right, that the Almighty Word whereby heaven and earth are filled must have united itself with such a little body of the flesh of Mary and must have sighed, wept, eaten, drunk, suffered, and died with it and must have lain dead with it in the grave. . . ." Also see *CWMS* 909. See Peterson, 18. Also see Karl H. Wyneken, "Calvin And Anabaptism," *Corcordia Theological Monthly* 36.1 (Jan. 1965): 28.

"without leaving heaven."

They thrust upon us as something absurd the fact that if the Word of God became flesh, then he was confined within the narrow prison of an earthly body. This is mere impudence! For even if the Word in his immeasurable essence united with the nature of man into one person, we do not imagine that he was confined therein. Here is something marvelous: the Son of God descended from heaven in such a way that, without leaving heaven, he willed to be borne in the virgin's womb, to go about the earth, and to hang upon the cross; yet he continuously filled the world even as he had done from the beginning!⁵³

Calvin believed that the "Eternal Son of God was united to but not restricted to his humanity."⁵⁴ Even though Christ is only one Person, the human and divine each retains its distinctive nature.

On the other hand, we ought not to understand the statement that 'the Word was made flesh' [John 1:14] in the sense that the Word was turned into flesh or confusedly mingled with flesh. Rather, it means that, because he chose for himself the virgin's womb as a temple in which to dwell, he who was the Son of God became the Son of man—not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For we affirm his divinity so joined and united with his humanity that each retains its distinctive nature unimpaired, and yet these two natures constitute one Christ.⁵⁵

Although he does not reject Osiander's view of the believer's union with Christ and Christ's presence in the believer, Calvin's christology forced him to accuse Osiander of mingling Christ with believers. Calvin's attack of Osiander on this point reflects the difference between Lutheran and Calvinist christology.

Indeed, he [Osiander] accumulates many testimonies of Scripture by which to prove that Christ is one with us, and we, in turn, with him—a fact that needs no proof. . . . For we hold ourselves to be united with Christ by the secret power of his Spirit. . . .

⁵³*Institutes* II.xiii.4. See *Institutes* xvi.12; commentaries on Ps. 22:14; Dan. 7:13; Matt. 8:3; Luke 1:31, 35; 2:40; 23:43; John 11:33; 14:12; Rom. 8:3; 9:5; Heb. 1:14; 2:16; 4:15; Acts 1:11; II Tim. 2:8.

⁵⁴Peterson, 13, note 12.

⁵⁵*Institutes* II.xiv.1. *Institutes* IV.xvii.29: "These men teach that he is everywhere in space but without form. They object that it is wrong for the nature of the glorious body to submit to the laws of common nature. But this answer drags with it that insane notion of Servetus (which all godly men rightly find abhorrent), that His body was swallowed up by his divinity. I do not say that they think so. But if to fill all things in an invisible manner is numbered among the gifts of the glorified body, it is plain that the substance of the body is wiped out, and that no difference between deity and human nature is left."

He [Osiander] says that we are one with Christ. We agree. But we deny that Christ's essence is mixed with our own. Then we say that this principle is wrongly applied to these deceptions of his: that Christ is our righteousness because he is God eternal, the source of righteousness, and the very righteousness of God. . . . Although he may make the excuse that by the term "essential righteousness" he means nothing else but to meet the opinion that we are considered righteous for Christ's sake, yet he has clearly expressed himself as not content with that righteousness which has been acquired for us by Christ's obedience and sacrificial death, but pretends that we are substantially righteous in God by the infusion both of his essence and of his quality. For this is the reason why he contends so vehemently that not only Christ but also the Father and the Holy Spirit, dwell in us. Although I admit this to be true, yet I say that it has been perversely twisted by Osiander; for he ought to have considered the manner of the indwelling—namely, that the Father and Spirit are in Christ, and even as the fullness of deity dwells in him [Col. 2:9], so in him we possess the whole of deity. Therefore, all that he has put forward separately concerning the Father and the Spirit tends solely to seduce the simple-minded from Christ.

Then he throws in a mixture of substances by which God—transfusing himself into us, as it were—makes us part of himself. For the fact that it comes about through the power of the Holy Spirit that we grow together with Christ, and he becomes our Head and we his members, he reckons of almost no importance unless Christ's essence be mingled with ours. But in his treatment of the Father and the Holy Spirit he more openly, as I have said, brings out what he means: namely, that we are not justified by the grace of the Mediator alone, nor is righteousness simply or completely offered to us in his person, but that we are made partakers in God's righteousness when God is united to us in essence.⁵⁶

⁵⁶*Institutes* III.xi.5: "Sed quia brevitati studeo, in praesenti causa insistam. Dicit nos unum esse cum Christo. Fatemur: interea negamus misceri Christi essentiam cum nostra. Deinde perperam in hoc principium trahi dicimus ad illas eius praestigias: Christum nobis esse iustitiam, quia Deus est aeternus, fons iustitiae, ipsaque Dei iustitia. Ignoscent lectores si nunc tantum attingo, quae ratio docendi in alium locum differri postulat. Quamvis autem excuset se voce iustitiae essentialis non aliud intendere quam ut huic sententiae occurrat, nos propter Christum iustos reputari, dilucide tamen exprimit se non ea iustitia contentum, quae nobis obedientia et sacrificio mortis Christi parta est, fingere nos substantialiter in Deo iustos esse tam essentia, quam qualitate infusa. Haec enim ratio est cur tam vehementer contendat, non solum Christum, sed patrem et spiritum in nobis habitare. Quod etsi verum esse fateor, perverse tamen ab eo torqueri dico. Modum enim habitandi expendere decebat, nempe quod pater et spiritus in Christo sunt; et sicut in ipso habitat plenitudo divinitatis, ita in ipso possidemus totum Deum. Quidquid ergo seorsum de patre et spiritu profert, non alio tendit nisi ut simplices abstrahat a Christo. Deinde substantialem mixtionem ingerit, qua Deus se in nos transfundens quasi partem sui faciat. Nam virtute spiritus sancti fieri ut coalescamus cum Christo, nobisque sit caput, et nos eius membra, fere pro nihilo ducit, nisi eius essentia nobis misceatur. Sed in patre et spiritu apertius, ut dixi, prodit quid sentiat: nempe iustificari nos non sola mediatoris gratia, nec in eius persona iustitiam simpliciter vel solide nobis offerri, sed nos fieri iustitiae divinae consortes dum essentialiter nobis unitur Deus."

We do not, therefore, contemplate him outside ourselves from afar in order that his righteousness may be imputed to us but because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body—in short, because he deigns to make us one with him. For this reason, we glory that we have fellowship of righteousness with him. Thus is Osiander's slander refuted, that by us faith is reckoned righteousness. As if we were to deprive Christ of his right when we say that by faith we come empty to him to make room for his grace in order that he alone may fill us! But Osiander, by spurning this spiritual bond, forces a gross mingling of Christ with believers. And for this reason, he maliciously calls "Zwinglian" all those who do not subscribe to his mad error of "essential righteousness" because they do not hold the view that Christ is eaten in substance in the Lord's Supper. I consider it the highest glory to be thus insulted by a proud man, and one entangled in his own deceits; albeit he attacks not only me but world-renowned writers whom he ought modestly to have respected. It makes no difference to me, for I am not pleading my own private cause. I am the more sincerely pleading this case for the reason that I am free from all perverted motives.

The fact, then, that he insists so violently upon essential righteousness and essential indwelling of Christ in us has this result: first, he holds that God pours himself into us as a gross mixture, just as he fancies a physical eating in the Lord's Supper; secondly, that he breathes his righteousness upon us, by which we may be really righteous with him, since according to Osiander this righteousness is both God himself and the goodness or holiness or integrity of God.⁵⁷

Calvin agrees with Osiander that the believer is united with Christ, but then Calvin attacks Osiander's view of **how** the godhead dwells in man through Christ. Osiander has accused Calvin of separating Christ and His righteousness from the believer to the extent that Christ is "outside ourselves." Such a position would require that Christ's righteousness be "imputed" (*imputetur*) to the believer, a position which Osiander despises. Calvin rejects Osiander's accusation that "by us faith is reckoned righteousness" (*fidem a*

⁵⁷*Institutes* III.xi.10: "Non ergo eum extra nos procul speculamur, ut nobis imputetur eius iustitia; sed quia ipsum induimus, et insiti sumus in eius corpus, unum denique nos secum efficere dignatus est, ideo iustitiae societatem nobis cum eo esse gloriamur. Ita refellitur Osiandri calumnia, fidem a nobis censi iustitiam; quasi Christum spoliemus iure suo, quum dicimus fide nos ad eum vacuos accedere, ut eius gratiae locum demus, quo nos ipse solus impleat. Sed Osiander, hac spirituali coniunctione sprete, crassam mixturam Christi cum fidelibus urget; atque ideo Zuinglianos odiose nominat, quicunque non subscribunt fanatico errori de essentiali iustitia, quia non sentiant Christum in coena substantialiter comedi. Mihi vero probum hoc audire ab homine superbo suisque praestigiis dedito summa gloria est. Quanquam non me solum, sed quos modeste venerari debuerat scriptores orbi satis cognitos perstringit. Mea vero nihil refert, qui privatam causam non ago, quo sincerius hanc causam ago, qui liber sum ab omni pravo affectu. Quod ergo essentialem iustitiam et essentialem in nobis Christi habitationem tam importune exigit, huc spectat, primum ut crassa mixtura se Deus in nos transfundat, sicuti in coena carnalis manducatio ab ipso fingitur, deinde ut iustitiam suam nobis inspiret, qua realiter simus cum ipso iusti; quandoquidem secundum ipsum iustitia haec tam est Deus ipse quam probitas, vel sanctitas, vel integritas Dei."

nobis censeri iustitiam), or faith is reckoned from "outside ourselves." Calvin responds to Osiander's accusation by saying that we come empty to Christ "in order that he alone may fill us" and accuses Osiander of "a gross mingling of Christ with believers." Calvin says the believer is joined to Christ through a miraculous work of the Holy Spirit. Calvin accuses Osiander of mixing Christ or of uniting us with Christ in such a way that we become "really righteous" by partaking of the divine essence.

It is difficult to see any substantial difference between Calvin and Osiander concerning how Christ is present. Osiander nowhere says that man becomes divine or that the divine and human essences are mixed in the believer. Calvin cites the different views of the Eucharist as one reason he opposes Osiander. In the previous quotation Calvin says Osiander "maliciously calls 'Zwinglian' all those who do not subscribe to his mad error of 'essential righteousness' because they do not hold the view that Christ is eaten in substance in the Lord's Supper" and accuses Osiander of believing that "God pours himself into us as a gross mixture, just as he fancies a physical eating in the Lord's Supper." Calvin rejected the idea that the Godhead is fused or merged with the manhood of Christ. The human and divine each retains its distinctive nature in Christ and cannot be fused. In the same way Calvin is willing to allow the whole Christ to dwell spiritually within the believer as long as there is no mixing of the "essences." Calvin uses his differences with Lutheran views of the Eucharist and christology as the basis to attack Osiander. While there are differences in Calvin's and Osiander's views of the Eucharist and christology, there is no proof that Osiander has mixed the human and divine essences. In this matter Calvin has misrepresented Osiander in an attempt to distance himself from Osiander.

Calvin also attacked Osiander's christology when discussing the relationship between justification and sanctification. Although Calvin placed more emphasis on sanctification than Luther,⁵⁸ Calvin accused Osiander of combining faith and works and of basing justification on sanctification. In the following quotations Calvin says Osiander mixes regeneration and its fruit (good works) with forgiveness and justification and accuses Osiander of making justification depend not only on Christ's work as mediator

⁵⁸Alan C. Clifford, "The Gospel and Justification," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 57.3 (July, 1985): 255. According to Clifford, whereas Luther tried to keep justification and sanctification separate, Calvin joined the two. Calvin even suggested that "Paul is . . . concerned with the 'imputation of righteousness' whereas James is concerned with its 'manifestation' " (Clifford, 257). See Coates, 331. See W. Stanford Reid, "Justification By Faith According To John Calvin," *Westminster Theological Journal* 42.2 (Spring 1980), 301.

(His work of satisfaction on the cross) but on His divine essence also.

Suppose he [Osiander] had only said that Christ, in justifying us, by conjunction of essence becomes ours, not only in that in so far as he is man is he our Head, but also in that the essence of the divine nature is poured into us. Then he would have fed on these delights with less harm, and perhaps such a great quarrel on account of this delusion would not have had to arise. But . . . we must bitterly resist. For in this whole disputation the noun "righteousness" and the verb "to justify" are extended in two directions; so that **to be justified is not only to be reconciled to God through free pardon but also to be made righteous, and righteousness is not a free imputation but the holiness and uprightness that the essence of God, dwelling in us, inspires** [emphasis added]. Secondly, he sharply states that Christ is himself our righteousness, not in so far as he, by expiating sins as Priest, appeased the Father on our behalf, but as he is eternal God and life.

To prove the first point—that God justifies not only by pardoning but by regenerating—he asks **whether God leaves as they were by nature those whom he justifies, changing none of their vices**. This is exceedingly easy to answer: as Christ cannot be torn into parts, so these two which we perceive in him together and conjointly are inseparable—namely, righteousness and sanctification. . . . Here is a mutual and indivisible connection. Yet reason itself forbids us to transfer the peculiar qualities of the one to the other. In this confusion of the two kinds of grace that Osiander forces upon us there is a like absurdity. For since God, for the preservation of righteousness, renews those whom he freely reckons as righteous, Osiander mixes that gift of regeneration with this free acceptance and contends that they are one and the same. Yet Scripture, even though it joins them, still lists them separately in order that God's manifold grace may better appear to us. . . . [Paul] clearly indicates that to be justified means something different from being made new creatures.⁵⁹

⁵⁹*Institutes* III.xi.6: "Si tantum diceret, Christum nos iustificando essentiali coniunctione nostrum fieri, nec solum quatenus homo est esse caput nostrum, sed divinae quoque naturae essentiam in nos diffundi, minore noxa deliciis se pasceret, nec forte propter hoc delirium tanta esset excitanda contentio: sed quum principium hoc sit instar sepiae, quae egestionem atri turbidique sanguinis multas caudas occultat, nisi velimus scientes et volentes pati nobis iustitiam illam eripi, quae sola de salute gloriandi fiduciam nobis adfert, acriter resistere necesse est. Nam in hac tota disputatione nomen iustitiae et verbum iustificandi ad duas partes extendit, ut iustificari sit non solum reconciliari Deo gratuita venia, sed etiam iustos effici: ut iustitia sit non gratuita imputatio, sed sanctitas et integritas quam Dei essentia in nobis residens inspirat. Deinde fortiter negat, quatenus Christus sacerdos peccata expiando patrem nobis placavit, ipsum esse iustitiam nostram, sed ut est Deus aeternus, et vita. Ut probet illud primum, Deum non tantum ignoscendo, sed regenerando iustificare, quaerit an quos iustificat, relinquat quales erant natura, nihil ex vitiis mutando. Responsio perquam facilis est: sicut non potest discerpi Christus in partes, ita inseparabilia esse haec duo, quae simul coniunctim in ipso percipimus, iustitiam et sanctificationem. Quoscunque ergo in gratiam recipit Deus, simul spiritu adoptionis donat, cuius virtute eos reformat ad suam imaginem. Verum si solis claritas non potest a calore separari, an ideo dicemus luce calefieri terram, calore vero illustrari? Hac similitudine nihil ad rem praesentem magis accommodum. Sol calore suo terram vegetat ac foecundat, radiis

Calvin accuses Osiander of connecting justification and regeneration in such a way as to make justification depend on "the holiness and uprightness that the essence of God, dwelling in us, inspires."⁶⁰ Calvin thinks Osiander's tendency to connect justification, regeneration, and sanctification makes him guilty of making regeneration (by which Calvin seems to mean the fruit of justification) the basis of justification. Calvin makes this accusation even though Osiander says that no one is accounted righteous because of works.⁶¹ Calvin has two reasons for accusing Osiander of mixing faith and works.

First, Calvin says Osiander's wrong christology has caused him to do two things: Osiander has made justification depend in part on Christ's divine nature, and he has mixed the divine and human in man. Calvin does not deny that Christ "by conjunction of essence becomes ours" both in his humanity and by "the essence of the divine nature [that] is

suis illustrat et illuminat. Hic mutua est ac individua connexio; transferre tamen quod unius peculiare est ad alterum, ratio ipsa prohibet. In hac duplicis gratiae confusione, quam obtrudit Osiander, similis est absurditas: quia enim re ipsa ad colendam iustitiam renovat Deus, quos pro iustis gratis censet, illud regenerationis donum miscet cum hac gratuita acceptatione, unumque et idem esse contendit. Atqui scriptura utrumque coniungens distincte tamen enumerat, quo multiplex Dei gratia melius nobis pateat. Neque enim supervacuum est illud Pauli (I Cor. 1, 30), datum fuisse nobis Christum in iustitiam et sanctificationem. Et quoties a salute nobis parta, a paterno amore Dei, a Christi gratia ratiocinatur nos ad sanctitatem et munditiam vocatos esse, aperte indicat aliud esse iustificari quam fieri novas creaturas."

⁶⁰Berkouwer contrasts Osiander and Calvin by saying that "the basic issue is whether justification is the ground of sanctification so that sanctification is continually rooted in justification, or whether justification itself takes the form of an infused, sanctifying grace." According to Berkouwer, Calvin preserved the forensic nature of justification by connecting justification with forgiveness of sins and excluding conversion and renewal of life (Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 100). Hart says there are two related issues in Calvin's attack of Osiander: "firstly that the only 'righteousness' which Christ bestows upon us is intrinsic to us (i.e. a quality of our being), and secondly that it is *divine* and not human righteousness that is infused into us in this action of grace. Calvin is strongly opposed to both propositions" (*Faith and Justification*, 77). Hart says Calvin would have agreed with both of Osiander's propositions "that grace imparts a real salvation to humanity, and that this in some sense involves us in a union with God, or a sharing in the divine life" (*Faith and Justification*, 77). However, "Calvin cannot subscribe to Osiander's view of *how* we receive" the human righteousness of Christ (78).

⁶¹Osiander, *Disputation*: "78. Our works, as good as they also are, make one neither righteous nor living nor glorious, for that belongs to God alone and is rather fulfilled by them who are already made righteous, living, and glorious because a bad tree cannot bear good fruit. 79. Although he who is justified shall not become more justified, surely not through our works, yet by the knowledge of the Son of God through faith we from day to day become purified in Him increasingly until we come up and become a perfect man who is the full measure of the complete Christ."

poured into us."⁶² Calvin does, however, accuse Osiander of a "desire to transfuse the essence of God into men" and of mixing Christ's essence with our own,⁶³ an accusation which seems overstated in view of Calvin's own affirmation that Christ's humanity and divinity are "poured into us."⁶⁴ This accusation is based in part on Osiander's idea that Christ's work on the cross provides redemption and satisfaction, while Christ's essential righteousness is our justification. According to Calvin, the righteousness that is imputed to us is the righteousness "Christ acquired for us by His obedience and especially by His death and resurrection."⁶⁵ According to Calvin, justification is not, as Osiander claimed, dependent on the eternal righteousness Christ possessed because of His divine nature.

The second reason Calvin gives for why Osiander mixes faith and works is that Osiander includes regeneration in justification. This is an interesting accusation because Calvin himself speaks of regeneration as both an initial experience and a process.

In the third place it remains for us to explain our statement that repentance consists of two parts: namely, mortification of the flesh and vivification of the spirit...

⁶²Berkouwer says Osiander makes sanctification the ground of justification by infusing the essential righteousness of Christ into man (*Faith and Justification*, 98). Berkouwer should have accused Calvin of the same thing. Calvin does not reject Osiander's idea that both the humanity and divinity of Christ dwell in the believer. Also see Niesel, 124, 126. Shepherd says "Calvin rejects Osiander's opinion whereby faith is the means of commingling of the *essence* of Christ with the essence of believers" (31). According to Shepherd, "the two words which Calvin most often uses in speaking of the believer's relationship to Christ—'participation' and 'fellowship' (*participatio* and *societas*)—are both needed: the fellowship is not that of mere proximity, nor is the participation that of mystical absorption" (Shepherd, 33.) Calvin repudiates absorption in *Comm. II Pet. 1:4*.

⁶³*Institutes* III.xi.5. Reid says Calvin accused Osiander of setting forth "a conception of justification which depended upon a mixture of the divine and human essences" and confusing "regeneration and justification, since he held that justification was not only reconciliation with God through free pardon, but also meant to be made righteous" (298).

⁶⁴Calvin's attack of Osiander on this point seems to be an attempt to distance himself from Osiander even when they are saying substantially the same thing. Calvin agrees with Osiander that the essence of the divine nature is poured into us. However, Calvin says Christ is united to the believer by the Spirit, not through union of the respective essences. In *Institutes* III.xi.5, 6, and 10 Calvin accuses Osiander of mixing Christ's essence with human essence. There is no evidence that this is Osiander's meaning.

⁶⁵Niesel, 133.

Both things happen to us by participation in Christ. For if we truly partake in his death, "our old man is crucified by his power, and the body of sin perishes" [Rom. 6:6 p.], that the corruption of original nature may no longer thrive. If we share in his resurrection, through it we are raised up into newness of life to correspond with the righteousness of God. Therefore, in a word, I interpret repentance as regeneration, whose sole end is to restore in us the image of God that had been disfigured and all but obliterated through Adam's transgression. . . . Accordingly, we are restored by this regeneration through the benefit of Christ into the righteousness of God; from which we had fallen through Adam. In this way it pleases the Lord fully to restore whomsoever he adopts into the inheritance of life. And indeed, this restoration does not take place in one moment or one day or one year; but through continual and sometimes even slow advances God wipes out in his elect the corruptions of the flesh, cleanses them of guilt, consecrates them to himself as temples renewing all their minds to true purity that they may practice repentance throughout their lives and know that this warfare will end only at death.⁶⁶

Even though we have taught in part how faith possesses Christ, and how through it we enjoy his benefits, this would still remain obscure if we did not add an explanation of the effects we feel. With good reason, the sum of the gospel is held to consist in repentance and forgiveness of sins [Luke 24:47; Acts 5:31]. Any discussion of faith, therefore, that omitted these two topics would be barren and mutilated and well-nigh useless. Now, both repentance and forgiveness of sins—that is, newness of life and free reconciliation—are conferred on us by Christ, and both are attained by us through faith. As a consequence, reason and the order of teaching demand that I begin to discuss both at this point. However, our immediate transition will be from faith to repentance. For when this topic is rightly understood it will better appear how man is justified by faith alone, and simple pardon; nevertheless actual holiness of life, so to speak, is not separated from free imputation of righteousness. Now it ought to be a fact beyond controversy that repentance not only constantly follows faith, but is also born of faith. For since pardon and forgiveness are offered through the preaching of the gospel in order that the sinner, freed from the tyranny of Satan, the yoke of sin, and the miserable bondage of vices, may cross over into the Kingdom of God, surely no one can embrace the grace of the gospel without betaking himself from the errors of

⁶⁶*Institutes* III.iii.8, 9: "Tertio loco explicandum restat quale sit istud, quod dicimus poenitentiam duabus partibus constare: mortificatione scilicet carnis et spiritus vivificatione. . . . Utrumque ex Christi participatione nobis contingit. Nam si vere morti eius communicamus, eius virtute crucifigitur vetus noster homo, et peccati corpus emoritur, ne amplius vigeat primae naturae corruptio. Si resurrectionis sumus participes, per eam suscitamur in vitae novitatem, quae Dei iustitiae respondeat. Uno ergo verbo poenitentiam interpretor, regenerationem, cuius non alius est scopus nisi ut imago Dei quae per Adae transgressionem foedata, et tantum non oblitterata fuerat, in nobis reformetur. . . . Proinde ista regeneratione in Dei iustitiam Christi beneficio instauramur, a qua per Adam excideramus; quo modo in integrum restituere placet Domino quoscunque in vitae haereditatem cooptat. Atque haec quidem instauratio non uno momento, vel die, vel anno impletur, sed per continuos, imo etiam lentos interdum profectus abolet Deus in electis suis carnis corruptelas: repurgat eos sordibus, sibi in templa consecrat, sensus eorum omnes ad veram puritatem renovans, quo se tota vita exerceant in poenitentia: sciantque huic militiae nullum nisi in morte esse finem."

his past life into the right way, and applying his whole effort to the practice of repentance.⁶⁷

Calvin interprets "repentance as regeneration," says repentance is equal to newness of life, says he is aware "that the whole of conversion to God is understood under the term 'repentance,' " and says this conversion occurs both at conversion and throughout life. He defines repentance as "the true turning of our life to God, a turning that arises from a pure and earnest fear of him; and it consists in the mortification of our flesh and of the old man, and in the vivification of the Spirit."⁶⁸ For Calvin repentance and regeneration (and justification) are both an initial experience and a process. By repentance and forgiveness of sins Calvin means newness of life and free reconciliation. "Newness of life" refers both to initial regeneration and the new life produced by continued repentance. However, Calvin also separates repentance, by which he means regeneration and the fruit it produces, from forgiveness or pardon, which he always connects with justification. He also separates justification and newness of life when he says "to be justified means something different from being made new creatures."⁶⁹ On the one hand he says that regeneration is unrelated to justification and that justification involves "free imputation of righteousness." On the other hand he says that although man is justified by faith alone, actual holiness of life, or repentance, is not separated from "free imputation of righteousness" because justification and sanctification cannot be separated. One sees in Calvin an attempt to both unite and disjoin justification and sanctification.

⁶⁷*Institutes* III.iii.1: "Etsi iam aliqua ex parte docuimus quomodo fides Christum possideat, et per ipsam fruamur eius bonis: hoc tamen adhuc obscurum esset nisi effectuum, quos sentimus accederet explicatio. Non abs re summa evangelii statuitur in poenitentia et remissione peccatorum. Ergo duobus illis capitibus omissis, ieiuna et mutila erit adeoque prope inutilis quaelibet de fide disputatio. Iam quum utrumque nobis conferat Christus, et utrumque fide consequamur, vitae scilicet novitatem et reconciliationem gratuitam, ratio et docendi series postulat ut de utroque hoc loco disserere incipiam. Proximus autem a fide ad poenitentiam nobis erit transitus; quia hoc capite probe cognito, melius patebit quomodo sola fide et mera venia iustificetur homo, neque tamen a gratuita iustitiae imputatione separetur realis, ut ita loquar, vitae sanctitas. Poenitentiam vero non modo fidem continuo subsequi, sed ex ea nasci, extra controversiam esse debet. Quum enim venia et remissio per evangelii praedicationem ideo offeratur, ut a tyrannide satanae, peccati iugo, et misera servitute vitiorum liberatus peccator in regnum Dei transeat, certe evangelii gratiam nemo amplecti potest quin ex erroribus vitae prioris in rectam viam se recipiat, totumque suum studium applicet ad poenitentiae meditationem."

⁶⁸*Institutes* III.iii.5.

⁶⁹See footnote 59.

Take note that we do not justify man by works before God, but all who are of God we speak of as being "reborn" [cf. I Peter 1:3], and as becoming "a new creation" [II Cor. 5:17], so that they pass from the realm of sin into the realm of righteousness; and we say that by this testimony they confirm their calling [II Peter 1:10], and, like trees, are judged by their fruits [Matt. 7:20; 12:33; Luke 6:44].⁷⁰

This, in one word, is enough to refute the shamelessness of certain impious persons who slanderously charge us with abolishing good works. . . .

For we dream neither of a faith devoid of good works nor of a justification that stands without them. This alone is of importance: having admitted that faith and good works must cleave together, we still lodge justification in faith, not in works. We have a ready explanation for doing this, provided we turn to Christ to whom our faith is directed and from whom it receives its full strength.

Why, then, are we justified by faith? Because by faith we grasp Christ's righteousness, by which alone we are reconciled to God. Yet you could not grasp this without at the same time grasping sanctification also. For he "is given unto us for righteousness, wisdom, sanctification, and redemption" [I Cor. 1:30]. Therefore Christ justifies no one whom he does not at the same time sanctify. These benefits are joined together by an everlasting and indissoluble bond, so that those whom he illumines by his wisdom, he redeems; those whom he redeems, he justifies; those whom he justifies, he sanctifies.

But, since the question concerns only righteousness and sanctification, let us dwell upon these. Although we may distinguish them, Christ contains both of them inseparably in himself. Do you wish, then, to attain righteousness in Christ? You must first possess Christ; but you cannot possess him without being made partaker in his sanctification, because he cannot be divided into pieces [I Cor. 1:13]. Since, therefore, it is solely by expending himself that the Lord gives us these benefits to enjoy, he bestows both of them at the same time, the one never without the other. Thus it is clear how true it is that we are justified not without works yet not through works, since in our sharing in Christ, which justifies us, sanctification is just as much included as righteousness.⁷¹

Calvin's goal is to refute "certain impious persons" who "slanderously charge us with abolishing good works." Calvin assures us that sinners, who are justified by faith alone, become "a new creation" and "pass from the realm of sin into the realm of righteousness." Calvin's statement that by "this testimony" of righteous deeds "they confirm their calling" implies that by "righteousness" Calvin means the good works of the believer. Since Christ contains both righteousness and sanctification "inseparably in himself," "Christ justifies no

⁷⁰*Institutes* III.xv.8: "Itaque quod neque mors, neque praesentia, neque futura separabunt nos a caritate Dei, quae est in Christo (ibid. v. 35); quin potius in bonum ac salutem cedent omnia. Ecce, non iustificamus hominem ex operibus coram Deo; sed omnes qui ex Deo sunt, dicimus regenerari, et novam creaturam fieri, ut ex regno peccati transeant in regnum iustitiae, atque hoc testimonio certam facere suam vocationem, et tanquam arbores a fructibus iudicari."

⁷¹*Institutes* III.xvi.1. Also see *Institutes* III.xi.6.

one whom he does not at the same time sanctify." Those who want to attain righteousness in Christ "must first possess Christ; but you cannot possess him without being made partaker in his sanctification." All those who receive Christ receive these two benefits. Calvin even adds that "we are justified not without works yet not through works. . . ." However, although Calvin argues that justification and sanctification cannot be separated, and although, as noted above, he makes "righteousness" in the first part of the passage refer to the righteousness of sanctification, in the last part of the quotation he separates justification and sanctification when he says that "sanctification is just as much included [in our sharing with Christ and justification] as righteousness." Here "righteousness" is connected to initial justification and distinguished from the righteousness of sanctification. Calvin seems unaware of having made such a distinction. He goes on to say that faith and good works must stand together because they are united in Christ, and those who have Christ's justifying righteousness also have His sanctification.

Although one finds many signs of the *Christus in nobis* motif in Calvin, one also finds many references to imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers. Passages that attack Osiander or distinguish between repentance and justification refer to imputation of righteousness. In these passages one can detect two reasons for imputation of Christ's righteousness. First, imputation frees the sinner from the need to try to earn forgiveness and allows righteousness to come to man from a source outside himself. Second, imputation allows the believer to be declared righteous because of the "real righteousness" of Christ despite the believer's own unrighteous deeds.

Osiander laughs at those men who teach that "to be justified" is a legal term; because we must actually be righteous. Also, he despises nothing more than that we are justified by free imputation. . . . First, I conclude that they are accounted righteous who are reconciled to God. Included is the means: that God justifies by pardoning, just as in another passage justification is contrasted with accusation. This antithesis clearly shows that the expression was taken from legal usage. . . . Where Paul says that righteousness without works is described by David in these words, "Blessed are they whose transgressions are forgiven" [Ps. 32:1; Vg.; Rom. 4:7], . . . surely, Paul does not make the prophet bear witness to the doctrine that pardon of sins is part of righteousness, or merely a concomitant toward the justifying of man; on the contrary, he includes the whole of righteousness in free remission, declaring that man blessed whose sins are covered, whose iniquities God has forgiven, and whose transgressions God does not charge to his account. Thence, he judges and reckons his happiness because in this way he is righteous, not intrinsically but by imputation.

Osiander objects that it would be insulting to God and contrary to his nature that he should justify those who actually remain wicked. Yet we must bear in mind what I have already said, that the grace of justification is not separated from regeneration, although they are things distinct. But because it is very well known by experience that the traces of sin always remain in the righteous, their justification must be very different from reformation into newness of life [cf. Rom. 6:4]. For God so begins

this second point in his elect, and progresses in it gradually, and sometimes slowly, throughout life, that they are always liable to the judgment of death before his tribunal. But he does not justify in part but liberally, so that they may appear in heaven as if endowed with the purity of Christ. . . . For faith totters if it pays attention to works, since no one, even of the most holy, will find there anything on which to rely.

This distinction between justification and regeneration, which two things Osiander confuses under the term "double righteousness," is beautifully expressed by Paul. Speaking of his own real righteousness, or of the uprighteous that had been given him, which Osiander labels "essential righteousness," he mournfully exclaims: "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from the body of this death?" [Rom. 7:24]. But fleeing to that righteousness which is founded solely upon God's mercy he gloriously triumphs over both life and death, reproaches and hunger, the sword and all other adverse things. . . . He clearly proclaims that he has a righteousness which alone entirely suffices for salvation before God, so that he does not diminish his confidence before God. . . . This is a wonderful plan of justification that, covered by the righteousness of Christ, they should not tremble at the judgment they deserve, and that while they rightly condemn themselves, they should be accounted righteous outside themselves.⁷²

⁷²*Institutes* III.xi.11: "Ridet eos Osiander qui iustificari docent esse verbum forense: quia oporteat nos re ipsa esse iustos. Nihil etiam magis respuit quam nos iustificari gratuita imputatione. . . . Primum obtineo, iustos censi qui Deo reconciliantur; modus inseritur, quod Deus ignoscendo iustificet; sicuti alio loco iustificatio accusationi opponitur. Quae antithesis clare demonstrat sumptam esse loquendi formam a forensi usu. . . . Iam vero mihi respondeat Osiander, ubi dicit Paulus describi a Davide iustitiam sine operibus in his verbis (Rom. 4, 7; Psal. 32, 1): beati quorum remissae sunt iniquitates; sitne plena haec definitio, an dimidia? Certe prophetam non adducit testem, ac si doceret partem iustitiae esse veniam peccatorum, vel ad hominem iustificandum concurrere, sed totam iustitiam in gratuita remissione includit, beatum hominem pronuntians cuius tecta sunt peccata, cui remisit Deus iniquitates, et cui transgressionem non imputat; felicitatem eius inde aestimat et censet, quia hoc modo iustus est non re ipsa, sed imputatione. Excipit Osiander, contumeliosum hoc fore Deo, et naturae eius contrarium, si iustificet qui re ipsa impii manent. Atqui tenendum memoria est quod iam dixi, non separari iustificandi gratiam a regeneratione, licet res sint distinctae. Sed quia experientia plus satis notum est, manere semper in iustis reliquias peccati, necesse est longe aliter iustificari quam reformantur in vitae novitatem. Nam hoc secundum sic inchoat Deus in electis suis, totoque vitae curriculo paulatim, et interdum lente in eo progreditur, ut semper obnoxii sint apud eius tribunal mortis iudicio. Iustificat autem non ex parte, sed ut libere, quasi Christi puritate induti, in coelis compareant. . . . Unde Paulus (Gal. 3, 18) a repugnantibus arguit, haereditatem non esse ex lege: quia hoc modo exinanita esset fides, quae si operum respectum habeat, labascit; quando nemo ex sanctissimis illic reperiet in quo confidat. Hoc discrimen iustificandi et regenerandi (quae duo confundens Osiander, duplicem iustitiam nominat) pulchre exprimitur a Paulo. Nam de reali sua iustitia loquens, vel de integritate qua donatus erat (cui Osiander titulum imponit essentialis iustitiae) flebiliter exclamat (Rom. 7, 24): miser ego, quis me liberabit ex corpore mortis huius? Ad iustitiam vero confugiens quae in sola Dei misericordia fundata est, magnifice et vitae, et morti, et probis, et inediae, et gladio rebusque omnibus adversis insultat. . . . Iustitiam sibi esse clare praedicat quae sola ad salutem in solidum sufficiat coram Deo. . . . Sed haec est mirabilis iustificandi ratio, ut Christi iustitia tecti non exhorreant iudicium quo digni sunt, et dum se ipsos merito damnant, iusti extra se censeantur."

According to Calvin, Osiander despises justification by "free imputation" and includes in justification the idea that "we must actually be righteous." At first one might conclude that Calvin is falsely attacking Osiander for making people righteous by mixing the human and divine essences in the believer. However, the following insights show that Calvin is accusing Osiander of basing justification on works. Calvin says justification depends on forgiveness of sins, and forgiveness of sins does not make one "intrinsically" righteous. According to Calvin, one becomes righteous by imputation, not by forgiveness of sins.⁷³ Osiander objects that this kind of justification lets God "justify those who actually remain wicked." Calvin answers that "justification is not separated from regeneration," but then he adds that "justification must be very different from reformation into newness of life." Justification cannot be connected to a righteous life because the believer does not live a perfect life.⁷⁴ God justifies us "freely" and fully so we can "appear in heaven as if endowed with the purity of Christ" even though on earth we can never have a "real righteousness" better than that of the wretched man of Romans 7:24. The "wonderful plan of justification" is that we are covered by the righteousness of Christ and will not receive the judgment we deserve because we are "accounted righteous outside" ourselves, or apart from any consideration of how we live.

Calvin also speaks of imputation of righteousness in a section that outlines the relationship between justification and forgiveness of sins.

Now let us examine how true that statement is which is spoken in the definition, that the righteousness of faith is reconciliation with God, which consists solely in the forgiveness of sins. . . . We are told that sin is division between man and God, the turning of God's face away from the sinner; and it cannot happen otherwise, seeing that it is foreign to his righteousness to have any dealings with sin. For this reason, the apostle teaches that man is God's enemy until he is restored to grace through Christ [Rom. 5:8-10]. Thus, him whom he receives into union with himself the Lord is said

⁷³Calvin says this in *Institutes* III.xi.11 even though in III.xi.10 he had said Christ's righteousness is imputed to us "because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body. . . ."

⁷⁴Hart, 78-81. Hart attempts to resolve the tension between the union with Christ and imputation motifs in Calvin. Hart concludes that by imputation Calvin does not mean justification is a fiction, but rather it involves "a real sharing or fellowship in the righteousness of this man" so that what is external to us (does not originate in us) becomes ours "because we are partakers in Christ" (79). Hart's valuable insights are marred, however, by his conclusion that Osiander is guilty of making justification depend on sanctification (78).

to justify, because he cannot receive him into grace nor join him to himself unless he turns him from a sinner into a righteous man. We add that this is done through forgiveness of sins; for if those whom the Lord has reconciled to himself be judged by works, they will indeed still be found sinners, though they ought, nevertheless, to be freed and cleansed from sin. It is obvious, therefore, that those whom God embraces are made righteous solely by the fact that they are purified when their spots are washed away by forgiveness of sins. Consequently, such righteousness can be called, in a word, "remission of sins."⁷⁵

Paul's words, which I have already quoted, express both of these points very beautifully: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting men's trespasses against them, and has entrusted to us the word of reconciliation" [II Cor. 5:19, cf. Comm. and Vg.]. Then Paul adds the summation of Christ's embassy: "Him who knew not sin he made to be sin for us so that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" [II Cor. 5:21]. Here he mentions righteousness and reconciliation indiscriminately, to have us understand that each one is reciprocally contained in the other. Moreover, he teaches the way in which this righteousness is to be obtained: namely, when our sins are not counted against us. Therefore, doubt no longer how God may justify us when you hear that he reconciles us to himself by not counting our sins against us. Thus, by David's testimony Paul proves to the Romans that righteousness is imputed to man apart from works, for David declares that man "blessed whose transgressions are forgiven, whose sins are covered, to whom the Lord has not imputed iniquity" [Rom. 4:6-8; Ps. 32:1-2]. . . . The apostle so connects forgiveness of sins with righteousness that he shows them to be exactly the same. From this he duly reasons that the righteousness that we obtain through God's kindness is free to us.⁷⁶

⁷⁵*Institutes* III.xi.21: "Nunc illud quam verum sit excutiamus, quod in finitione dictum est, iustitiam fidei esse reconciliationem cum Deo, quae sola peccatorum remissione constet. . . . Audimus peccatum esse divisionem inter hominem et Deum, vultus Dei aversionem a peccatore. Nec fieri aliter potest: quandoquidem alienum est ab eius iustitia quidquam commercii habere cum peccato. Unde apostolus inimicum esse Deo hominem docet (Rom. 5, 8), donec in gratiam per Christum restituitur. Quem ergo Dominus in coniunctionem recipit, eum dicitur iustificare; quia nec recipere in gratiam, nec sibi adiungere potest quin ex peccatore iustum faciat. Istud addimus fieri per peccatorum remissionem. Nam si ab operibus aestimentur quos sibi Dominus reconciliavit, reperientur etiamnum revera peccatores, quos tamen peccato solutos purosque esse oportet. Constat itaque, quos Deus amplectitur, non aliter fieri iustos nisi quod abstersis peccatorum remissione maculis purificantur: ut talis iustitia uno verbo appellari queat peccatorum remissio."

⁷⁶*Institutes* III.xi.22: "Utrumque horum pulcherrime liquet ex istis Pauli verbis quae iam recitavi: erat Deus in Christo mundum sibi reconcilians, non imputans hominibus sua delicta, et deposuit apud nos verbum reconciliationis (2 Cor. 5, 19 seqq.). Deinde summam suae legationis subdit: eum qui peccatum non noverat, pro nobis peccatum fecit, ut iustitia Dei efficeremur in illo. Iustitiam et reconciliationem hic promiscue nominat, ut alterum sub altero vicissim contineri intelligamus. Modum autem assequendae huius iustitiae docet, dum nobis delicta non imputantur. Quare ne posthac dubites quomodo nos Deus iustificet, quum audis reconciliare nos sibi, non imputando delicta. Sic ad Romanos (4, 6) Davidis testimonio probat, homini imputari iustitiam sine operibus, quia ille beatum pronuntiat hominem cuius remissae sunt iniquitates, cuius tecta sunt peccata, cui Dominus non imputavit delicta. . . . Sic remissionem peccatorum connectit apostolus cum iustitia, ut

From this it is also evident that we are justified before God solely by the intercession of Christ's righteousness. This is equivalent to saying that man is not righteous in himself but because the righteousness of Christ is communicated to him by imputation—something worth carefully noting. Indeed, that frivolous notion disappears, that man is justified by faith because by Christ's righteousness he shares the Spirit of God, by whom he is rendered righteous. This is too contrary to the above doctrine ever to be reconciled to it. And there is no doubt that he who is taught to seek righteousness outside himself is destitute of righteousness in himself. Moreover, the apostle most clearly asserts this when he writes: "He who knew not sin was made the atoning sacrifice of sin for us so that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" [II Cor. 5:21 p.].

You see that our righteousness is not in us but in Christ, that we possess it only because we are partakers in Christ; indeed, with him we possess all its riches. And this does not contradict what he teaches elsewhere, that sin has been condemned for sin in Christ's flesh that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us [Rom. 8:3-4]. The only fulfillment he alludes to is that which we obtain through imputation. For in such a way does the Lord Christ share his righteousness with us that, in some wonderful manner, he pours into us enough of his power to meet the judgment of God. It is quite clear that Paul means exactly the same thing in another statement, which he had put a little before: "As we were made sinners by one man's disobedience, so we have been justified by one man's obedience" [Rom. 5:19 p.]. To declare that by him alone we are accounted righteous, what else is this but to lodge our righteousness in Christ's obedience, because the obedience of Christ is reckoned to us as if it were our own?

For this reason, it seems to me that Ambrose beautifully stated an example of this righteousness in the blessing of Jacob: noting that, as he did not of himself deserve the right of the first-born, which gave out an agreeable odor [Gen. 27:27], he ingratiated the blessing while impersonating another. And we in like manner hide under the precious purity of our first-born brother, Christ, so that we may be attested righteous in God's sight. Here are the words of Ambrose: "That Isaac smelled the odor of the garments perhaps means that we are justified not by works but by faith, since the weakness of the flesh is a hindrance to works, but the brightness of faith, which merits the pardon of sins, overshadows the error of deeds."

And this is indeed the truth, for in order that we may appear before God's face unto salvation we must smell sweetly with his odor, and our vices must be covered and buried by his perfection.⁷⁷

idem prorsus esse ostendat; unde merito ratiocinatur gratuitam esse nobis iustitiam quam indulgentia Dei obtinemus."

⁷⁷*Institutes* III.xi.23: "Hinc et illud conficitur, sola intercessione iustitiae Christi nos obtinere, ut coram Deo iustificemur. Quod perinde valet ac si diceretur, hominem non in se ipso iustum esse, sed quia Christi iustitia imputatione cum illo communicatur. Quod accurata animadversione dignum est. Siquidem evanescit nugamentum illud, ideo iustificari hominem fide, quoniam illa spiritum Dei participat quo iustus redditur, quod magis est contrarium superiori doctrinae quam ut conciliari unquam queat. Neque enim dubium quin sit inops propriae iustitiae, qui iustitiam extra se ipsum quaerere docetur. Id autem clarissime asserit apostolus (2 Cor. 5, 21), quum scribit, eum qui peccatum non noverat, pro nobis hostiam peccati expiatrix esse factum, ut efficeremur iustitia Dei in ipso. Vides non in nobis, sed in Christo esse iustitiam nostram: nobis tantum eo iure competere quia Christi sumus participes: siquidem omnes eius divitias cum ipso possidemus. Nec obstat quod alibi docet (Rom. 8, 3), damnatum esse de peccato

Justification involves forgiveness of sins, union with Christ, and being "made righteous" by having our "spots . . . washed away by forgiveness of sins." "For Calvin, 'forgiveness of sins' and 'justification' are 'altogether the same.'" ⁷⁸ "By a daily forgiveness God receives us into his favour."⁷⁹ The presence of sin places us under God's condemnation. Forgiveness of sins frees us from condemnation and brings us into God's favor. We are reconciled to God because the condemnation is removed, and this condemnation is removed by the free forgiveness of sins. This forgiveness of sins is made possible by the death of Christ. Through Christ's death the righteousness of Christ was made available "so that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Righteousness is obtained when our sins are not counted against us. Calvin refers to this righteousness as imputed to the believer because it is "apart from works" and "free to us,"⁸⁰ by which Calvin means the righteousness of faith is an imputed righteousness because it is not the result of works of righteousness.⁸¹ Calvin speaks of imputation of righteousness because he wants to keep forgiveness and justifying righteousness from

peccatum in Christi carne, ut iustitia legis compleretur in nobis; ubi non aliud complementum designat quam quod imputatione consequimur. Eo enim iure communicat nobiscum Dominus Christus suam iustitiam, ut mirabili quodam modo, quantum pertinet ad Dei iudicium, vim eius in nos transfundat. Aliud non sensisse abunde liquet ex altera sententia, quam paulo ante posuerat (ibid. 5, 19): quemadmodum per unius inobedientiam constituti sumus peccatores, ita per obedientiam unius iustificari. Quid aliud est in Christi obedientia collocare nostram iustitiam, nisi asserere eo solo nos haberi iustos, quia Christi obedientia nobis accepta fertur, ac si nostra esset? Quare mihi elegantissime videtur Ambrosius huius iustitiae paradigma in benedictione Iacob statuuisse; nempe, quemadmodum ille primogenituram a se ipso non meritis, habitu fratris occultatus, eiusque veste indutus, quae optimum odorem spirabat, se ipsum insinuavit patri, ut suo commodo sub aliena persona benedictionem acciperet: ita nos sub Christi primogeniti nostri fratris pretiosa puritate delitescere, ut testimonium iustitiae a conspectu Dei referamus. Verba Ambrosii sunt: quod Issac odorem vestium olfecit, fortasse illud est, quia non operibus iustificamur, sed fide; quoniam carnalis infirmitas operibus impedimento est, sed fidei claritas factorum obumbrat errorem, quae meretur veniam delictorum. Et sane ita res habet. Nam quo in salutem coram facie Dei compareamus, bono eius odore fragrare nos necesse est, et eius perfectione vitia nostra obtegi ac sepeliri."

⁷⁸Clifford, 256. *Institutes* III.xi.4; iii.1.

⁷⁹Clifford, 259. *Institutes* III.xiv.11. Commentaries on II Corinthians 5:20; I John 1:7.

⁸⁰Clifford says Calvin nowhere outlines the "theory that both Christ's *passive* and *active* righteousness, i. e. the merit of his *life* and *death* are imputed to the believer in justification" (257). Clifford says this in an attempt to remove Calvin from the charge of antinomianism. However, in *Institutes* II.xvi.5 Calvin speaks of the passive and active obedience as the basis of redemption without referring to imputation.

⁸¹Leith, 89.

originating within man. Christ's righteousness is not imputed in the sense that it comes apart from forgiveness of sins, but rather in the sense that Christ shares his righteousness with us and pours it into us "as if it were our own." Calvin makes it clear that this righteousness that justifies is Christ's and originates with Christ, not with man. "Believers are righteous not in themselves, but through the righteousness of Christ, which is communicated to them by imputation by virtue of their participation in the life of the Redeemer."⁸² Calvin believed that "imputation was no mechanical exchange of righteousness, but the consequence of the believer's union with the life of the Redeemer through faith."⁸³

However, one can detect another reason Calvin refers to imputed righteousness. By imputation Calvin not only delivers sinners from the need to earn justification by good works, but he has also, despite his claims to the contrary, separates justification and sanctification.⁸⁴ For Calvin imputation not only means that righteousness comes to us from a source outside ourselves, but that we are "accounted righteous" despite our "error of deeds" and "our vices." Since the "weakness of the flesh is a hindrance to works," God must account the believer righteous despite his vices. Calvin uses Jacob's deception of Isaac as an example of Biblical justification. The garments Jacob wore hid or covered his true identity.⁸⁵ In the same way Christ's righteousness hides the believer's sins, thereby

⁸²Ibid. *Institutes* III.xi.1, 23; CR 23:692; 49:60. H. Paul Santmire contends that for Calvin justification includes both the death and resurrection of Christ, both Christ's perfecting fulfilling of the law and our "coalesce with Christ." In relation to imputation, Santmire says that "the fact that the believer's imputed righteousness is not his own should not be allowed to obscure his actual participation in perfect righteousness through his communion with Christ." According to Santmire, these two are never separated in Calvin (H. Paul Santmire, "Justification in Calvin's 1540 Romans Commentary," *Church History* 33 [Sept. 1964]: 294-313).

⁸³Ibid., 91; Niesel, 134.

⁸⁴Stob presents the following analysis of the relationship between justification and sanctification in Calvin. "What is especially to be noted here is that, though Calvin makes a conceptual distinction between justification and sanctification, he never allows a real separation between them. The two are indeed logically distinct and mutually independent; sanctification is not the basis of justification, **and justification is not the basis of sanctification**. But one never appears without the other" (58, emphasis mine). According to Stob, justification and sanctification cannot be separated, yet they are logically distinct and mutually independent. Neither is the basis of the other. Stob's analysis, although sounding like a word game, accurately reflects Calvin's attempt to combine and disjoin the two at the same time.

⁸⁵*Institutes* III.xi.23.

making it possible for God to consider the believer righteous even though he is unrighteous in his behavior.

In a section of the *Institutes* where he discusses the relationship between faith and works, Calvin says we receive Christ's righteousness by imputation.

On the contrary, justified by faith is he who, excluded from the righteousness of works, grasps the righteousness of Christ through faith, and clothed in it, appears in God's sight not as a sinner but as a righteous man.

Therefore, we explain justification simply as the acceptance with which God receives us into his favor as righteous men. And we say that it consists in the remission of sins and the imputation of Christ's righteousness.⁸⁶

Justification requires the exclusion of any righteousness of works. The believer is clothed in the righteousness of Christ and appears in God's sight as a righteous man even though he still lives as a sinner. This declaration of righteousness is based on "remission of sins and imputation of Christ's righteousness" apart from any change within the person.

In the four sections preceding his major attack of Osiander, Calvin defines justification as the imputation of the righteousness of Christ and the freeing of people "from that condemnation which their impiety" deserves.

But because it pertains to the present case, when Paul says that Scripture foresaw that God would justify the Gentiles by faith [Gal. 3:8], what else may you understand but that God imputes righteousness by faith? Again, when he says that God justifies the impious person who has faith in Christ [Rom. 3:26 p.], what can his meaning be except that men are freed by the benefit of faith from that condemnation which their impiety deserved? . . . Therefore, "to justify" means nothing else than to acquit of guilt him who was accused, as if his innocence were confirmed. Therefore, since God justifies us by the intercession of Christ, he absolves us not by the confirmation of our own innocence but by the imputation of righteousness, so that we who are not righteous in ourselves may be reckoned as such in Christ. Thus it is said in Paul's sermon in the thirteenth chapter of The Acts: Through Christ is forgiveness of sins announced to you, and everyone who believes in him is justified of all things from which the law of Moses could not justify him [Acts 13:38-39]. You see that, after forgiveness of sins, this justification is set down, as it were, by way of interpretation. You see that it is plainly understood as absolution, you see that it is separated from the works of the law. You see it as the mere benefit of Christ, and you see that it is received by faith. You see finally that a satisfaction is introduced where he says that

⁸⁶*Institutes* III.xi.2: "Contra iustificabitur ille fide, qui operum iustitia exclusus Christi iustitiam per fidem apprehendit, qua vestitus in Dei conspectu non ut peccator, sed tanquam iustus apparet. Ita nos iustificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem qua nos Deus in gratiam receptos pro iustis habet. Eamque in peccatorum remissione ac iustitiae Christi imputatione positam esse dicimus."

we are justified from our sins through Christ.⁸⁷

God justifies or acquits sinners because of the intercession of Christ. Christ's intercession is the basis of our absolution or forgiveness. This forgiveness, then, is effected by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, not by the presence of any righteousness in ourselves. Justify "means nothing else than to acquit of guilt him who was accused, as if his innocence were confirmed," even though he is "not righteous in" himself. We can infer from these statements that Calvin is not only contrasting "imputation of Christ's righteousness" with justification by our own righteousness, but is also separating justification and sanctification, regeneration and God's declaration of righteousness, faith and works, righteousness through Christ's obedience and our obedience, free imputation and holiness of life, the righteousness of Christ and the righteousness God wants to produce in the believer's life, and the judgment of God and our true condition.

Calvin also connects imputation with being made righteous.

And to avoid contention over a word, if we look upon the thing itself as described to us, no misgiving will remain. For Paul surely refers to justification by the word "acceptance" when in Eph. 1:5-6 he says: "We are destined for adoption through Christ according to God's good pleasure, to the praise of his glorious grace by which he has accounted us acceptable and beloved" [Eph. 1:5-6 p.]. That means the very thing that he commonly says elsewhere, that "God justifies us freely" [Rom. 3:24]. Moreover, in the fourth chapter of Romans he first calls justification "imputation of righteousness." And he does not hesitate to include it within forgiveness of sins. Paul says: "That man is declared blessed by David whom God renders acceptable or to whom he imputes righteousness apart from works, as it is written: 'Blessed are they whose transgressions have been forgiven'" [Rom. 4:6-7 p.; Ps. 32:1]. There he is obviously discussing not a part of justification but the whole of it. Further, he

⁸⁷*Institutes* III.xi.3: "Quod vero ad causam praesentem attinet, ubi Paulus ait (Gal. 3, 8) scripturam praevидisse quod ex fide iustificet gentes Deus, quid aliud intelligas quam Deum iustitiam ex fide imputare? Item, quum dicit (Rom. 3, 26) Deum iustificare impium, qui est ex fide Christi, quis sensus esse potest, nisi fidei beneficio a damnatione liberare quam ipsorum impietas merebatur? . . . Iustificare ergo nihil aliud est, quam eum qui reus agebatur, tanquam approbata innocentia a reatu absolvere. Quum itaque nos Christi intercessione iustificet Deus, non propriae innocentiae approbatione, sed iustitiae imputatione nos absolvit, ut pro iustis in Christo censeamur, qui in nobis non sumus. Sic Actorum 13 (v. 38) in concione Pauli: per hunc vobis annuntiatur remissio peccatorum, et ab omnibus iis a quibus non potuistis iustificari in lege Mosis, omnis qui credit in eum iustificatur. Vides post remissionem peccatorum iustificationem hanc velut interpretationis loco poni; vides aperte pro absolutione sumi; vides operibus legis adimi; vides merum Christi beneficium esse; vides fide percipi; vides denique interponi satisfactionem, ubi dicit nos a peccatis iustificari per Christum." Also see commentaries on II Cor. 5:21; Rom. 5:19.

approves the definition of it set forth by David when he declares those men blessed to whom free pardon of sins is given [Ps. 32:1-2]. From this it is clear that the righteousness of which he speaks is simply set in opposition to guilt. But the best passage of all on this matter is the one in which he teaches that the sum of the gospel embassy is to reconcile us to God, since God is willing to receive us into grace through Christ, not counting our sins against us [II Cor. 5:18-20]. Let my readers carefully ponder the whole passage. For a little later Paul adds by way of explanation: "Christ, who was without sin, was made sin for us? [II Cor. 5:21], to designate the means of reconciliation [cf. vs. 18-19]. Doubtless, he means by the word "reconciled" nothing but "justified." And surely, what he teaches elsewhere—that "we are made righteous by Christ's obedience" [Rom. 5:19 p.]—could not stand unless we are reckoned righteous before God in Christ and apart from ourselves."⁸⁸

Calvin says believers are "made righteous by Christ's obedience" because "we are reckoned righteous . . . in Christ and apart from ourselves." Calvin always connects "made righteous" with forgiveness of sins, which he says is the reason the sinner does not have his sins counted against him. Furthermore, in this passage Calvin connects "imputation of righteousness," "forgiveness of sins," "reconcile[s] us to God," "not counting our sins against us," "made righteous by Christ's obedience," and "reckoned righteous before God in Christ and apart from ourselves." Christ's work for us, which was outside us and did not depend on our work, is the basis of our righteousness, forgiveness of sins, and justification before God. We are justified freely, and to be justified freely means to be forgiven and not to be considered guilty. By imputation Calvin means that the source of righteousness is outside us and in Christ. Through union with

⁸⁸*Institutes* III.xi.4: "Atque ut omittamus contentionem de voce, rem ipsam si intuemur qualiter nobis describitur, nulla manebit dubitatio. Nam Paulus acceptionis nomine certe iustificationem designat, quum dicit ad Ephesios 1, 5: destinati sumus in adoptionem per Christum, secundum beneplacitum Dei in laudem gloriosae ipsius gratiae, qua nos acceptos vel gratiosos habuit. Id enim ipsum vult quod alibi dicere solet, Deum nos gratuito iustificare (Rom. 3, 24). Quarto autem capite ad romanos (v. 6), primum appellat iustitiae imputationem; nec eam dubitat in peccatorum remissione collocare. Beatus homo, inquit, a Davide dicitur cui Deus accepto fert vel imputat iustitiam sine operibus; sicut scriptum est: beati quorum remissae sunt iniquitates, etc. Illic sane non de iustificationis parte, sed de ipsa tota disputat. Eius porro definitionem a Davide positam testatur, quum beatos esse pronuntiat quibus datur gratuita peccatorum venia. Unde apparet, iustitiam hanc de qua loquitur, simpliciter reatui opponi. Sed ad hanc rem locus ille est omnium optimus, ubi hanc esse summam docet legationis evangelicae, ut reconciliemur Deo (2 Cor. 5, 18), quia ipse nos per Christum vult in gratiam recipere, non imputando nobis peccata. Sedulo expendant lectores totum contextum, nam paulo post exegetice addens, Christum, qui peccati expers erat, factum esse pro nobis peccatum, ut modum reconciliationis designet, non aliud haud dubie reconciliandi verbo intelligit quam iustificari. Nec sane quod alibi tradit (Rom. 5, 19), staret, obedientia Christi nos constitui iustos, nisi in ipso et extra nos iusti reputamur coram Deo."

Christ we are made righteous in ourselves by forgiveness of sins.⁸⁹ This righteousness and forgiveness depends both on the work of Christ for us and on the work of Christ within us.⁹⁰

⁸⁹In reaction to the Council of Trent Calvin maintains that righteousness is outside of us "because it is in Christ only." Calvin, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, part 3, 116: "The whole dispute is as to The Cause of Justification. The Fathers of Trent pretend that it is twofold, as if we were justified partly by forgiveness of sins and partly by spiritual regeneration; or, to express their view in other words, as if our righteousness were composed partly of imputation, partly of quality. I maintain that it is one, and simple, and is wholly included in the gratuitous acceptance of God. I besides hold that it is without us, because we are righteous in Christ only."

⁹⁰This conclusion must be tempered by the realization that Calvin's tendency to disjoin justification and sanctification raises questions about the sense in which Christ lives in the believer and the practical value of His presence. Calvin wants the believer to produce the works that regeneration, repentance, and justification should bring forth, but he does not want God's evaluation or declaration of the believer's righteousness or "position" to depend in any way upon those righteous works. As a result one wonders if the righteous Christ who lives within us is not disjoined from us in the same way that the divine and human are disjoined in Christ. One must admit, of course, that Calvin is correct when he says God's determination of whether a believer is indeed righteous cannot depend simply on whether he lives a holy life.

CHAPTER IV

MENNO SIMONS (1496-1561)

Menno Simons represents a mid-sixteenth century Anabaptist understanding of justification. He was born in 1496 in Witmarsum, a Dutch province of Friesland.¹ Little is known about his youth or when and where he was educated.² He entered the Roman Catholic priesthood at the age of 28 in March of 1524.³ He became an Anabaptist in January, 1536 only after a prolonged period of inner turmoil that was marked by "three important clusters of events and ideas":⁴ rejection of the dogma of transubstantiation,⁵ rejection of infant baptism,⁶ and reaction to the Münsterite disaster and its doctrines

¹This biography is taken primarily from "Menno Simons," by Cornelius Krahn, *Mennonite Encyclopedia* [hereafter referred to as *ME*] (Scottsdale: Mennonite Pub. House, 1957, Vol. III), 577ff; "A Brief Biography of Menno Simons" by Harold S. Bender, in *CWMS*, 4-29.

²Bender suggests that Menno's parents probably sent young Menno to the Franciscan Monastery at Bolsward (*CWMS*, 4), but Krahn thinks Menno may have made the decision himself as a young man, and received his training in a monastery at Friesland or a neighboring province (*ME*, vol. III, p. 577). The most recent research by George K. Epp suggests that Menno received his practical training at Vinea Domini in Pingjum (although the abbey was later transferred to Bolsward). See George K. Epp, "The Premonstratensian Connection of Menno Simons: Confirmations, Revisions and New Evidence," *MQR* 62.3 (July 1988): 349-55.

³In his first parish Menno served as vicar with two of his colleagues for seven years at Pingjum near Witmarsum (1524-1531). Toward the end of his life he wrote with disgust about his lack of Bible knowledge and the time spent during this period of his life "empty in playing [cards] together, drinking, and in diversions as, alas, is the fashion and usage of such useless people" (*CWMS*, 668), although these comments must be tempered by the truth that his knowledge of Scripture was probably greater than these comments indicate and his sins fewer. See Egil Grisli, "Menno Simons' Account of His Conversion and Call in the Light of the Bible," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 3 (1985): 73-82. In 1531 Menno was transferred to his hometown of Witmarsum where he served as parish pastor until he left the Catholic church five years later (*CWMS*, 4).

⁴George, 259.

⁵Menno had begun to doubt transubstantiation in 1525 while celebrating mass. For two years he tried to attribute his doubts to the devil, but finally, in desperation, he began to read the Bible carefully. He decided that he had been deceived, but fear kept him from

and lifestyle.⁷

According to his own words, Menno's foremost concern was "to reclaim this adulterous bride, the erring church, from her adulterous actions, and return her to her first husband to whom she was so unfaithful, notwithstanding he did her such great service."⁸ In another place Menno writes that he desires and seeks "sincere teachers, true doctrines,

discarding the teachings of the church because he had been taught that rejection of the teachings of the church meant eternal death. The conviction that he had been deceived, however, raised doubts in his mind about the authority of the church.

⁶CWMS, 668-9. Menno had heard that a tailor named Sicke Snijder was beheaded for being rebaptized. A second baptism sounded strange to Menno, but he could find no evidence for infant baptism in Scripture. After a careful study of the writings of the church fathers, Luther, Bucer, and Bullinger, most of whom accepted infant baptism, Menno felt compelled to reject infant baptism.

⁷ "Münsterite" refers to revolutionary Anabaptists who attempted to establish an earthly kingdom of God in Münster in 1534-5. They seized Münster on February 9, 1534, but the bishop and his army recaptured the city in June, 1535. Those of the group who were not killed suffered grievously from hunger and disease. Leaders of this movement included Jan Matthys and Jan van Leiden. These men had assumed the leadership of Melchoir Hofmann's followers when Hofmann was put in prison in Strasbourg in May, 1533. Münsterite doctrine and practices included fantastic visions, autocratic leadership, the Old Testament practice of polygamy, and the use of revolutionary methods for self-defence and the establishment of God's kingdom on earth. Menno was greatly troubled by Münsterite doctrines, and while still a Catholic he began to warn people about Jan van Leiden's revolutionary tactics. After Hofmann's imprisonment the Philips' brothers, who had been followers of Hofmann, resisted the revolutionary tactics without success. They finally sought assistance from Menno, but although he was very much interested in Anabaptism and attacked Leiden out of concern for the Anabaptists, he still did not join them. The climax came when his brother was killed during an attack on the Old Cloister near Bolsward. Menno said that the blood of these people, and especially that of his brother, was upon his own soul, and he thereupon left the Catholic Church. Menno's beliefs reflect a concern for pure doctrine and life and are the result of reaction to Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Münsterite beliefs and lifestyles, as well as his own pre-conversion beliefs and lifestyle as a Catholic.

⁸CWMS, 300; *Opera Omnia Theologica, of alle de Godtgeleerde Wercken van Menno Symons* [hereafter referred to as *Omnia*] (Amsterdam: Joannes van Veen, 1681), 442: "Terwijl en nu die voorberoerde Gemeente / aldusdanige liefelijcke gehoorsame Bruyt niet en is / maer is van haren echten Man Christo Jesu afgeweken / en jaegt soo schandelijcken nae vreemde boelen / gelijkmen door oogen sien magh / ende dat door de blintheit / onverstandigheit / ende het verleyden haerder Leeringe / so en doe ick immers anders niet in alle mijn schrijven / roepen ende leeren / nae de gabe die my van Godt gegeven is / dan dat ick de selfde boelerende ende overspelende Bruyt / namelick / de verdooide Gemeente / wederomme magh aftrecken van hare onnutte hulpeloose boelen / ende maghse wederomme leyden tot haren eersten gettouden Man / daer sy soo ontrouwelijcken tegen gehandelt heeft / alhoewel dat hy soo groote weldaden aen haer beweesen heeft / het welcke dat is Christus Jesus."

true faith, true sacraments, true worship, and an unblamable life."⁹ These quotations summarize both Menno's doctrinal and practical concerns and his unifying theological principle. A correct relationship with Christ effects unsullied belief and unblamable life.¹⁰

Menno's understanding of what man needs in order to be justified corresponds to his understanding of the creation and fall of man. At creation Adam and Eve received both a divine and a human nature, and both of these were corrupted by the fall.¹¹ Menno begins his short tract on "Justification" by explaining how Adam and Eve fell into sin and the results of that fall for all humanity.

Honorable reader, it is plain and manifest from Scripture that Adam and Eve, our common parents, were in the beginning created after the image of God by God through Christ; pure, good, sinless, righteous, and immortal, as the Scriptures teach. They remained pure and righteous as long as they did not sin against their Creator's word and commandment. God had said unto them, Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die. This also came true, for as soon as Adam and Eve, deceived by the serpent, ate the forbidden fruit, they became impure, unrighteous, subject to corruption, of a sinful nature, yes, children of death and of the devil. And by their disobedience they lost their sonship and the purity in which they were created.¹²

⁹CWMS, 311; *Omnia* 449: "Ick begeere ende soecke oprechte Leeraers / rechte leeringe / recht Geloove / rechte Sacramenten / rechten Godts-dienst / ende een onstraffelijck leven."

¹⁰Both Luther and Menno attacked the theological and doctrinal errors and the corruption of the church. Menno was concerned primarily with the immoral living produced by (as he saw it) impure doctrine, not with impure doctrine *per se*. Abraham Friesen, "The Radical Reformation Revisited," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 2 (1984): 132-3. Menno's concerns were also similar to, although not identical with, the Swiss Brethren. Menno emphasizes justification by faith, removal of guilt and forgiveness of sins, with discipleship and sanctification being seen as the result of justification. See Cornelius J. Dyck, "The Life Of The Spirit In Anabaptism," *MQR* 47.4 (Oct. 1973): 309-26.

¹¹William Echard Keeney, *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought*, 67f.

¹²CWMS, 503; *Omnia* 461: "Het is door die Schrift kennelijck en openbaer / Eersame Leeser / hoe onser aller Vader ende Moeder Adam en Eva in't beginne na Godts gebeelte en gelijkenisse van Godt door Christum geschapen zijn / reyn / goet / sonder sonde / gerechtigh en onverderffelijck / gelijck de Schrift leert / Gen. cap. 1.2 vs 5. Sap.2.23. Eccles.17.9. En datse oock reyn en gerechtigh gebleven zijn / soo lange als sy niet tegen haet Scheppers woordt en gebodt en sondigden: Want Godt hadde tot haer gesproocken / van den Boom der kennisse des goedts en quaedts en sult ghy niet eten / in wat dage ghy daer af etet / sult gy den doodt sterven / als't oock geschiet is / want so haest als Adam en Eva van der slangen bedrogen / van den verboden Boom aten / soo zijnsse onreyn / ongerechtigh / verderffelijck / sondelijcker aert / ja kinderen des doodts en des duyvcels geworden / en hebben alsoo de kintschap Godts / en die vroomheydt / in welcken sy

The presence of the divine nature is explained as being "created after the image of God by God through Christ; pure, good, sinless, righteous, and immortal. . . ." These characteristics were lost (the divine nature was lost) and Adam and Eve received a "sinful nature" when they disobeyed, or as Menno describes it later in the same tract, when they were "bitten and poisoned by the Satanic serpent."¹³ All descendants of Adam and Eve are likewise "born of sinful nature [and] poisoned by the serpent. . . ."¹⁴

The serpent's bite also corrupted the human nature.¹⁵

In the first place, they teach that we are all the children of wrath and of sinful nature; born of the sinful seed of Adam, and that therefore children must be purified and washed from original sin by baptism.

To this we reply with the Word of the Lord. We also believe and confess that we are all born of unclean seed, that we through the first and earthly Adam became wholly depraved and children of death and of hell: with this understanding, however, that

geschapen waren."

¹³CWMS, 504; *Omnia* 461: "Gelijck van Adam ende Eva van der helscher slange zijn gebeten / vergiftiget / sondelijcker aert geworden / en den eeuwigen doot moesten gestorven hebben / soo haer Godt niet wederomme door Christum in genade hadde aengenomen / als door geseyt is / also worden wy ook alle die van haren zade voort komen / sondelijcker aert van haer gebooren / van det slange vergistiget / tot den quaeden geneyget / en alsoo uyt eygen aengeboorender natueren kinderen der Hellen / des Duyvels / en des eeuwigen Doods."

¹⁴CWMS, 504; *Omnia* 461.

¹⁵Menno's view of the extent of this corruption is different than Luther's view. Whereas Luther rejected the idea that the sinner can "freely respond" to the Holy Spirit, Menno has a more positive view of the enabling power of grace. In fact, it is unclear at times whether man's "free choice" is "grace-enabled" freedom or human capacity. One writer suggests "that instead of accepting only one of the options, Menno writes as if he had accepted them both" (Egil Grislis, "'Good Works' According to Menno Simons," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 5 [1987]: 131). Grislis concludes that Menno partially avoided the issue by concentrating on the outward activities of the believer (132). Stoesz concludes that Menno sees both faith and repentance as gifts of God. Both are the result of the work of the Spirit (Stoesz, 8). Detweiler compares Menno's and Luther's understanding of Law and Gospel and suggests that both men see Law as preparing men for the Gospel. Menno, however, goes beyond Luther by affirming that the Spirit uses the Law to bring man to repentance "not by driving him to despair, but by causing him to turn from his sins and to 'die to sin'." In this way "Menno can place repentance through the Law in a position prior to faith in Christ" and still make all of initial salvation dependent on the grace of God (Richard C. Detweiler, "The Concept of Law and Gospel in the Writings of Menno Simons, Viewed Against the Background of Martin Luther's Thought," *MQR* 43.3 [July 1969]: 204-5). Detweiler concludes that "Menno's main emphasis is on the life-changing power of the gospel rather than its message of forensic justification" (206). Also see Egil Grislis, "The Concern for Christian Liberation According to Menno Simons" *MQR* 55.4 (Oct. 1981): 275-88.

even as we fell and became sinners in Adam, so we also believe and confess that through Christ, the second and heavenly Adam, we are graciously helped to our feet again and justified.¹⁶

To be born of "sinful nature" is to be born of "unclean seed." This correlation is made when Menno agrees with the paedobaptists that children are born of sinful nature. Menno restates the problem and says "we are all born of unclean seed." Human nature is corrupted because it comes from unclean or human seed. All people are corrupted because they are born of the corruptible seed of flesh and blood. Menno refers to this condition as "sin" and "original sin."

The Scriptures as I see it speak of different kinds of sin. The first kind is the corrupt, sinful nature, namely, the lust or desire of our flesh contrary to God's Law, and contrary to the original righteousness; sin which is inherited at birth by all descendants and children of corrupt, sinful Adam, and is not inaptly called original sin. Of this sin David says, Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.¹⁷

Second, we are not cleansed in baptism of our inherited sinful nature which is in our flesh, so that it is entirely destroyed in us, for it remains with us after baptism. But since the merciful Father, from whom descend all good and perfect gifts, has graciously given us the most holy faith, through His holy Word; therefore we declare in the baptism we receive that we desire to die unto the inherent, sinful nature, and destroy it, so that it will no longer be master in our mortal bodies (Rom. 6:12), even though such true believers are often overcome by sin.¹⁸

¹⁶CWMS, 130; *Omnia* 17: "Ten eersten / dat wy alle kinderen des toorens / en de sonderlijcken aert / uyt dat sonderlijcke Zaet van Adam geboren worden / ende daerom (seggen sy) moeten de kinderen door den Doop van de Erf-sonde gereynight ende gewasschen worden / Ec. Hier op antwoorden wy in dese wijze met des Heeren woordt: Wy gelooven ende bekennen wel / hoe dat wy alle te samen uyt eenen onreynen Zade voort gekomen ende gebooren worden / dat wy in den eersten aertschen Adam heel verdorven ende kinderen des Doodts ende der Hellen geworden zijn: jae doch met alsucken bescheydt / gelijk wy door den eersten Adam gevallen / ende tot Sondaers geworden zijn / alsoo gelooven ende bekennen wy oock wederom / dat wy in den tweeden ende Hemelschen Adam Christo in der genaden opgeholpen ende gerechtigh geworden zijn."

¹⁷CWMS, 563; *Omnia* 507-8: "De Schrift spreeckt (na mijn verstant) van veelderley aert der sonden. De eerste aert is / die verdorven sonderlijcke natuere / namelijk / de lust oft dat begeeren onses vleeschtes tegen de Wet Godts / ende tegen die aenvanckelijcke gerechticheyt / die van den verdorven sonderlijcken Adam or alle sijn nakomelingen ende kinderen met der geboorten ge-erft is: ende wert niet onbillick die Erfsonde genoemt. Van dese sonde spreeckt David Psal. 51. also: siet / ick ben uyt sondelicken zade geboren / ende mijn Moeder heeft my in sonden ontfangen."

¹⁸CWMS, 245; *Omnia* 406: "Ten anderen / soo wortmen in den Doopsel also niet gewasschen van die aengeboren aert der sonden / die in onsen vleesche is / alsoo dat sy geheel in ons vernietet wordt / dan sy blijft oock nae den Doopsel al evenwel in ons

According to Menno, every person is born both **of** and **with** a sinful nature. Man inherits this sinful condition at birth. Menno's statement that he was conceived in sin even seems to imply that sin is transmitted by the act of conception or is connected to the seed that produces conception. This sinful nature remains—even with a believer—throughout life because it is connected to the flesh. People inherit this sinful condition because the sinful nature is in our flesh, or more precisely, because it is attached to the human seed that procreates it.

The nature of man was first created pure and good, but was corrupted through Adam's disobedience. And since he was thus corrupted in his nature, all his children were born corrupted. . . . Adam and his seed were helpless because of the weakness of their flesh.¹⁹

To have a fuller account of this resurrection and regeneration, we must bear in mind that all creatures bring forth after their kind, and every creature partakes of the properties, propensities, and dispositions of that which brought it forth. As Christ says, That which is born of flesh is flesh, . . . That which is born of flesh and blood is flesh and blood and is carnally minded . . . [and] has nothing of the divine nature dwelling in him. . . .²⁰

As said above, every creature has the nature and disposition of that of which it is

vleesch. Maer overmits die barmhertige Vader / van den welcken alle goede ende volmaecte gaven uytvloepen ende nederdalen / ons dat alderheylighste geloove uyt genade gegeven heeft door sijn heylige woordt / soo bewijzen wy nu in den Doopsel dat wy ontfangen / dat wy die aengeboren aert der sonden in ons vleesch also begeeren te sterven ende te vernieten / dat sy die overhant niet meer en sal hebben in onse sterffelijcke lichamen / Rom. 6.12. Jae al hoewel aldusdanige recht geloovige menighmael van de sondern dootlijcken verwonnen worden."

¹⁹CWMS, 804; *Omnia* 365: "De natuere was van den begin reyn ende goet geschapen / maer in Adam met sijner ongehoorsaemheyt wertse verdorven. Ende de wijle hy in sijner natueren alsoo verdorven was / soo werden oock alle sijn kinderen verdorven van hem gebooren. . . . O neen / Adam met sijnen geheelen Zade en vermocht niet door de swackheydt sijns vleeschs."

²⁰CWMS, 54, 55; *Omnia* 180: "Om nu wat breder bescheyds van dese vertijsenisse en wedergeboorte te hebben / soo salmen weten / hoe dat alle geschapen creaturen door haer zaed voortbrengen ende baren haers gelijk / en dat selbe is gesint / geaert / of genatureert uyt sijnen aengeboren wesen / als het gene is / waer van't voortgebragt ende geboren wort / als Christus seyt: wat geboren is uyt der vleesch / dat is vleesch / ende en mag het eeuwig leven niet sien. . . . Wat van vleesch en bloed geboren is / dat is vleesch en bloed / en oock vleeschelijk gesint te zijn / is een vyandschap tegen God / om dat'et der Met Gods niet onderdanig en is. . . . Want een vleeschelijk mensche en begrijpt niet dat des Geests is / immers hy en mag niet / want hy van naturen een kind des duyvels is / en niet van Godlijker aerd / daerom en wort oock niet Godlijks van hem begrepen noch verstaen / want sijn wesen na sijnder geboorten is een af wesen / een vervremdinge Gods / ende en heeft niet van der eygenschap of aerd Gods / in hem niet gemeyns hebbende met God / maer heeft veel meer een tegenaert Gods in hem."

born, and is disposed in the same way as is the seed from which it comes. Therefore we will speak a few words concerning the nature, properties, and effects of the seed of the divine Word whereby we are begotten by God from His bride the Holy Church, like unto His image, nature, and being, for where this seed is sown upon good ground into the heart of man, there it grows and produces its like in nature and property.²¹

Now Paul exhorts those who are born of the corruptible seed of flesh and blood, who are of the earth, earthy, carnal, without understanding and blind in divine things, yea, children of wrath, that they should mortify and bury the body of sin, namely, the lusts and desires of the first birth in the flesh, and then rise in the power of the heavenly seed from the sleep and death of sin, and be regenerate and walk in newness of life, which is the first resurrection.²²

Menno believes that "every creature partakes of the properties, propensities, and dispositions of that which brought it forth," and that which is born of flesh is flesh and is carnal. Since the natural or carnal man can produce only that which is natural and carnal, the sinner must be reborn of God by the heavenly seed which is uncontaminated by evil. By becoming flesh of Christ's flesh and bone of His bone the sinner becomes united with Christ in such a way that a new nature is produced in the believer.

For Menno the rebirth is effected in the same way as the first birth. Adam became corrupted by the bite of the serpent. Adam's descendants are contaminated by Adam's contaminated seed. Those who wish to be saved must be born again by the seed of God. Justification, therefore, requires being transplanted from the evil nature of Adam into the good, heavenly nature of Christ.

We must be born from above, must be changed and renewed in our hearts, and must be transplanted from the unrighteous and evil nature of Adam into the true and good nature of Christ, or we can never in all eternity be saved by any means, be they

²¹CWMS, 57; *Omnia* 181-82: "Also boven gesydt is / hoe dat alle Creaturen haren aerdt en natuure of aengeboren wesen hebben des genes / daer sy uyt voortkomen en gebaert worden / en zijn gelijk geaerd en eenwesigh als't zaed / waer door sy geboren worden / soo willen wy nu hier een weynig van der aert en eygenschap / en werkinge des zaeds des Godlijken Woords verhalen / waer door God de Vader met onuytsprekelijker lusten uyt sijne Bruyd / sijne heylige Gemeente / zijn kinderen baert en voortbrengt / sijnen beelde / aert / en wesen gelijkformig / want so wanner dit zaed valt en ontfangen word in een goede aerde des menschen herte / daer wast'et / en wort gebaert sijns gelijk van naturen en wesen."

²²CWMS, 58; *Omnia* 182: "Gelijk nu Paulus den genen / die door vergankelijk zaed / uyt vleesch en bloed geboren zijn / die uyt der aerden aertsch / vleeschelijk / onverstandig en blind in Godlijke saken / jae kinderen des toorns Gods zijn / vermanende / dat sy dat lichaem der sonden / dat is / den aerd / lust en begeerte nae der eerster geboorten in den vleesche sterven / vernieten / dooden en begraven sullen / ende daer na door kracht des Hemelschen Zaeds uyt den slaep en dood der sonden herboren worden ende op staen en verrijzen sullen tot een nieuwe leven en wandeling / d' welck is die eerste verrijzenisse."

human or divine.²³

All who by the grace of God have been transplanted from Adam into Christ, have become partakers of the divine nature. . . .²⁴

In full confidence it [Christian faith] approaches the Father in the name of Christ, receives the Holy Ghost, becomes partaker of the divine nature, and is renewed after the image of Him who created him.²⁵

According to Menno, Christ the second Adam was like the first Adam had been before the Fall.

The counsel, purpose, will, and decree of the Almighty, eternal God continued unchanged: that He would make manifest His glory and have a man after His own image and likeness. This was foreseen and decreed by God, as has been said, but with Adam it was all over, as also with all his descendants, he being full of venom, and disgraced before his God. Therefore if the unchangeable will, counsel, and decree of the unchangeable God was to be established, there must be another who was like the corrupted Adam before his fall; for it was upon such a man that God's will was urging; and with Adam all was lost.

Therefore the incomprehensible, eternal Word, by which Adam and Eve were created . . . must become man, that He might bruise the head of the deceiving serpent for the salvation of the condemned Adam and all his descendants. . . .²⁶

²³CWMS, 92; *Omnia* 125: "Wy moeten van boven geboren zijn / in onse herten omgekeert / verandert / ende vernieuwt zijn / ende alsoo uyt der ongerechten boosen aerdt en natuere van Adam / in Christus gerechte goede aert en natuere verset zijn / of wy en mogen met geen en middelen (sy zijn Godlijck ofte menschelijck) geholpen worden eeuwelijck / want soo waer de oprechte waerachtige boete ende nieuwe Creatuere niet en zijn (ick spreke van den verstandigen) daer moetmen eeuwich verloren zijn / is klaerder als men tegenspreken kan."

²⁴CWMS, 139; *Omnia* 22: "Alle die dan door Gods genade / uyt Adam in Christum verset sijn / der Godlijcker nature deelachtigh zijn / ende met een geest ende vuur der Hemelscher liefde van Godt gedooft zijn."

²⁵CWMS, 396; *Omnia* 115: "Want een oprecht Christen Geloove / en mag niet ledig staen / maer het verandert / verniet / reynigt / heylicht en rechtveerdigt al meer ende meer. Het maekt vrede en vrolijk / want het bekent / dat Helle / Duyvel / Sonde / en Doot door Christum overwonnen zijn. Genade / barmhertigheyt / quijscheldinge der sonden en dat eeuwich Leven door hem verworven zijn."

²⁶CWMS, 816-7; *Omnia* 373: "Hier stonden evenwel des Almachtigen ende eeuwigen Godts raet / opfet / wille ende besluyt noch onderandert / als dat hy sijn Heerlijckheyt wilde openbaren / ende dat hy eenen mensche wilde hebben nae sijn beelt ende gelijknisse. Aengesien het dan also by Godt / ende van Godt besloten ende voorsien was / als geseyt is / ende het met den armen Adam ende sijnen geheelen Zade so geheel uyt was / want hy in den gront vol fenijns / ende voor sijnen Godt te schande geworden was / soude nu des onveranderlijcken Gods onveranderlijken wille / raet ende besluyt genoeg geschieden / so moest' er een ander voor die den verdorven Adam voor den val moghte

He was like unto Adam before the fall.²⁷

Yes, dear reader, if He had received His flesh from the flesh of His children, as John `a Lasco and his followers insist, then the children must have begotten the father! Christ, the new Adam, would say to His new Eve [the church]: I am flesh of thy flesh—and not, Thou art flesh of my flesh.²⁸

Christ is the "new Adam." As the second Adam Christ had flesh and blood like the first Adam, but not the flesh and blood of Adam's descendants. Christ came of "pure" and "holy flesh" because He could not be born of the unclean flesh and seed of the children, nor assume human nature from them. The flesh of the second Adam must be pure and holy so those who are joined to Christ by the new birth can likewise be holy and pure. By becoming bone of this kind of bone and flesh of this kind of flesh the believer is delivered from the corruption of sin and transformed into a new creature.

Just as each person is born by natural birth of "unclean seed" and thereby partakes of human properties and sinful flesh, everyone who is born again of the seed of Christ becomes a partaker of the divine nature.

Just as the wife cannot bear legitimate children to her husband without his procreative seed, so the church cannot bring forth true children to its husband, Christ, except from His seed, that is, His holy Word.²⁹

Behold this is the nature, property, and effect of the seed of the Word of God.

gelijck zijn / want op sulck een mensche drangh Gods wille / ende met Adam en was't niet meer. Daerom moeste dat onbevindelijcke eeuwige woort / door welck Adam ende Eva geschapen waren / daer't alle in bestaet / ende eeuwich (segge ick) in bestaen moet / de Almachtige kracht ende wijsheydt Godts mensche worden / op dat hy de vervoerische Slange / den verdoemden Adam ende sijnen geheelen Zade tot Saligheyt haren kop vertreden moght."

²⁷CWMS, 818-9; *Omnia* 374.

²⁸CWMS, 823; *Omnia* 376: "Ja mijn Leeser / so hy sijn vleesch van sijnder kinderen vleesch ontfangen hadde, gelijk a Lasco met den sijnen dringt / soo moesten de kinderen den Vader gebaert hebben / Christus de nieuwe Adam moeste ook tot sijn nieuw Evam seggen: ick ben vleesch van uwen vleesche / ende niet seggen: Gy zijt vleesch van mijnen vleesche. Vreest gy Godt / soo denket na / en richtet / Gen. 2.23. Mal. 2.14."

²⁹CWMS, 164-65; *Omnia* 37: "Want dat Euangelium (Godts Woordt) onvermengt in's Geests kracht gepredickt / is alleen dat rechte waerachtige Zaet daer uyt de waerachtige geloovige ende gehoorsaemige Gods kinderen gebooren werden / gelijck een echte Vrouwe sonder dat zaet haers Mans gerechte kinderen baren kan / soo en kan oock de Gemeente Christo haren Man geen echte kinderen baren / dan uyt sijn eygen Zaet / dat sijn Heyligh Woordt is: Maer is't dat de vrouwe uyt een vreemt zaet ontfanght / ende niet uyt dat zaet haers mans / soo is sy een Overspeelster / ende dat gewonnen kint een Bastaert. Alsoo oock met de Gemeente Christi: Want soo sy haere kinderen uyt menschen leere baert / ende niet uyt Gods Woordt / soo en is sy Christo niet getrouw / ende haer kinderen en zijn sijn Zaet niet."

By it man is renewed, regenerated, sanctified, and saved through this incorruptible seed, namely, the living Word of God which abides eternally. He is clothed with the same power from above, baptized with the Holy Ghost, and so united and mingled with God that he becomes a partaker of the divine nature and is made conformable to the image of His Son. . . .

He that has this genuine renewed nature and disposition has put on Christ Jesus. He is become like unto Him; he has the image of God in himself, is spiritually minded, and is led by the Spirit in his spirit, from whose spiritual body spiritual fruits are brought forth, as a well springing up unto life eternal.³⁰

People are born of Christ by His seed, the Word,³¹ in the same way that a baby is born of a woman by the husband's procreative seed. Through this "incorruptible seed" the sinner is renewed, regenerated, sanctified and "so united and mingled with God that he becomes a partaker of the divine nature." People who have the renewed nature have "put on Christ Jesus," have the image of God in themselves, are one with the Father since they have "the divine nature of their Father who has begotten them," and are led by the Spirit in their spirit. It is unclear in Menno's reference to the spiritual body that produces spiritual fruit whether the "spiritual body" refers to Christ's body or to the believer's body which is united to Christ. In either case, union with Christ produces spiritual fruit.

One cannot understand Menno's view of justification without examining his christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology, for the three are closely connected.³² The

³⁰CWMS, 58; *Omnia* 182: "Siet / dit is den aerd / eygenschap / en werkinge des zaeds des Woords Gods / als dat die menschen door dit onvergankelijke zaed / te weten / dat levendige Woord Gods / dat daer eeuwiglijk blijft / vernieuwet / herboren / geheylygt / en saligh gemaect worden / en worden met een gelijke kracht van boven neder gedaelt / aengedaen / en met den Heyligen Geest overgoten / en also met God vereenigt ende vermengt / dat sy der Godliker aerd en naturen deelachtig worden / en den beelde sijns Soons gelijkformig worden. . . . Wie nu des oprechten wesens in den Geest / Gemoed / en Aerd heeft / die heeft Christum Jesum aengetogen / en is hem gelijkformig geworden / en heeft dat beeld of de gestalte Gods in hem / en is Geestelijck gesint / van den Geest in den Geest gedreven / uyt wiens Geestelijck lichaem / Geestelijcke vruchten voortgebraght worden / als Fonteynen springende tot in't eeuwich leven."

³¹Regeneration is the result of hearing and believing the Word or gospel that is preached (CWMS, 164, 265, 267, 271, 274).

³²Keeney, in *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought*, takes the position that Menno's Christology is central to his theology. See pages 44, 98. Oosterbaan also sees a direct connection between Menno's understanding of justification and his view of the incarnation. "The doctrine of justification by faith only, which Menno accepted in a much more radical sense than Luther, was based, according to Menno, on this doctrine of the incarnation" (J. A. Oosterbaan, "The Theology of Menno Simons," 194). Harold S. Bender, on the other hand, rejected the idea that Menno's view of the incarnation was integral to his ecclesiology. See Walter Klaassen, "Menno Simons Research, 1937-1986,"

following quotations demonstrate the intimate relationship between Menno's christology and soteriology.

Similarly, I say that He is not flesh of our flesh as they have it, but that the regenerate are flesh of His flesh as the Scripture says. For if He were flesh of our flesh as they assert, then Christ must have been a sinful, accursed, and death-guilty Christ. This, according to God's everlasting righteousness, is too clear to deny.³³

As said above, every creature has the nature and disposition of that of which it is born, and is disposed in the same way as is the seed from which it comes.³⁴

Our confession is endorsed by the Lord Himself when He says, I am that living bread that came down from heaven. . . . Christ says that His flesh came from heaven, and the learned ones say that it came of Adam's flesh. . . . Quite probably our opponents will attempt an evasion at this point and say, Christ speaks of the most worthy element in Him, for His deity is from heaven, and it assumed Adam's flesh. . . . No, the Word is descended from heaven! It became flesh or man, here below on earth, and has thereafter ascended again to highest heaven where He was at the first.

Seeing then that in the quoted passage Christ Jesus speaks not merely of His deity, but of His humanity (for He speaks of the Son of man), therefore it is clear, is it not, that the man Christ did not have His origin on earth but in heaven. . . . Therefore we must refer this saying to the entire Christ, both as to His deity and to His humanity.³⁵

Thus I believe and confess that the pure Word of God, Christ Jesus, the Creator, who Himself issued commandments to Adam and condemned him, has instituted Himself in Adam's stead, that is, in his condemnation, death, and promised curse, and

MQR 60.4 (Oct. 1986): 485.

³³*CWMS*, 772; *Omnia* 318: "Item / desselven gelijcken segge ich / dat hy niet vleesch van onsen vleesche, gelijck sy seggen / maer dat de wedergeborene vleesch van sijnen vleesche zijn / gelijck de Schrift seght / want soo hy vleesch van onsen vleesche ware, gelijck sy seggen / soo moeste Christus een sondelijcke / vervloecte / ende doodschuldige Christus geweest zijn / is na Gods eeuwigduerende rechtveerdigheyt klaerder / dan men't wederspreken kan."

³⁴*CWMS*, 57; *Omnia* 181-82.

³⁵*CWMS*, 796-97; *Omnia* 360-61: "Dese onse bekentenisse bekrachtigt ook de Heere selve / ende spreekt: Ick ben dat levende Broot van den Hemel afgekomen. . . . Christus seyt / dat sijn vleesch van den Hemel / ende de Geleerden seggen / dat het van Adams vleesch gekomen is. . . . Veellicht sullen onse wederpartyen hier eenen uitvlucht soeken / en seggen: Christus spreekt na den weerdigsten deel, want sijn Godheyt is van den Hemel, en die heeft Adams Vleesch aengenomen. &c. . . . Och neen. Maer dat Woordt is van den Hemel geklommen / is in dese onderste deelen der Aerden vleesch oft mensche geworden / ende is daer nae weder boven alle Hemelen opgeklimmen / Daer hy te vooren was. . . . Soo is't immers daer mede openbaer / dat de Mensche Christus oorspronckelijck niet van der Aerden / maer van den Hemel is: Want nae sijner eeuwiger Godtheyt, als die so onverseert gebleven ware, als de Geleerde seggen / en kan hy niet des menschen Sone heeten."

has, by His great compassion, love, and mercy, taken upon Himself the condemning burden of His erring creatures. I believe He Himself became Adam in the flesh. . . . For God has not reconciled the world unto Himself by Adam's flesh. . . . God has sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh.³⁶

But even as the first and earthly Adam testified of Eve, who was taken from his body, that she was flesh of his flesh; so also the second and heavenly Adam.³⁷

The flesh of Christ is holy, pure, spotless, it knows no sin, it makes pious and saves. It is a true bread of souls, as is the Word. . . .³⁸

For Menno justification and its fruits requires that Christ have a fully human but entirely heavenly body not contaminated by sin.³⁹ If Christ had been "flesh of our flesh" he would have been "sinful, accursed, and death-guilty" because He would have partaken of the sin that is attached to the flesh of Adam's descendants.⁴⁰ Such a Christ would have been unable to deliver us from sin. Menno therefore refers to Christ as the "second and

³⁶CWMS, 428; *Omnia* 526: "Aldus geloove ende bekenne ick / het reyne Woordt Godts / namelijck / Christus Jesus een Schepper / Gebodt-gever ende Verdoemer Adae / in Adams plaetse / namelijck / in sijnen toorn / doot ende toegeseydt de maledictie selve ingetreden is / ende heeft door groot medelijden / liefde ende harmhertigheydt sijns dolende Creatuers / verdoemelijcke last op hem selfs geladen: Selve / Jae selve Adam in den vleesche gelijk geworden. . . . Want Godt en heeft hem de Werelt door Adams vleesch niet versoent / want het was door Godts rechtveerdigheydt den toorn ende vloeck onderworpen / ende wat magh door toorn ende vloeck versoent worden? . . . Siet mijn lieve Heeren / Vrienden en Broeders / aldus geloove ende bekenne ick dat Godt sijnen gebenedijden Sone gesonden heeft in de gelijckenisse eens sondigen vleeschs."

³⁷CWMS, 772; *Omnia* 318: "Neen / mijn Leser / niet soo / maer gelijk die eerste ende aerdsche Adam van sijne Eva (die van sijnen lijve genomen wert) getuyghde / datse vleesch van sijnen vleesche ware / alsoo getuyght oock nu die tweede ende Hemelsche Adam van sijne nieuwe Eva die gemeynthe / die van sijnen aldeheylichsten ende levendigh-makende vleesch / Geest ende Woort / hem tot eener Vrouwe in den Geest van Godt bereydt wert / datse vleesch van sijnen vleesche / ende been van sijnen beenen is / Ephes.5.30."

³⁸CWMS, 805; *Omnia* 365: "O neen / Christus vleesch is heyligh / reyn / sonder vleck / kent geen sonde / maekt vroom ende saligh / is een waerachtige spijs der zielen / gelijk het Woort is."

³⁹The source of Menno's "celestial flesh" position is beyond the scope of this study. See Alvin J. Beachy, "The Grace of God in Christ as Understood by Five Major Anabaptist Writers," *MQR* (Jan. 1963): 27, 28; Joyce Irwin, "Embryology and the Incarnation: A Sixteenth-Century Debate," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9.3 (1978), 93-104; Egil Grislis, "The Doctrine of Incarnation According to Menno Simons," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 8(1990): 16-33.

⁴⁰Cornelius Krahn, *Dutch Anabaptism: Origin, Spread, Life and Thought (1450-1600)* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968), 259.

heavenly Adam," and by this he obviously means that Christ brought His whole Person, both His humanity and His deity, from heaven. Menno's goal is to present a Christ who can deliver from both the guilt and practice of sin.⁴¹ Christ is our perfect Savior from sin and victor over sin because He has heavenly and pure flesh.⁴² Christ cannot have flesh that is contaminated by Adam's sin. Christ came to earth in the likeness of sinful flesh, but not in sinful flesh.⁴³ The Word became flesh, but the Word did not take unto itself the flesh of Mary.⁴⁴

Menno defended his position by distinguishing between the prepositions *van* (from), *door* (through), *uit* (out of), and *in* (in).⁴⁵

⁴¹Menno claimed that he had never preached about his theory of the incarnation before the congregations and that many of the people had never even heard about it (*CWMS*, 430), but Menno must have stated his views whenever he taught on the new birth and its significance.

⁴²Menno's view of the relationship between sin and the flesh results in his denial that Christ was born of the "unclean flesh of Adam" or took upon himself the flesh of Mary (*CWMS*, 801-5). These statements raise the question whether Menno held the position that the flesh of man was evil in itself, or whether he only thought evil is attached to or resides in the body. I. E. Burkhardt, in several articles in the *MQR* titled "Menno Simons on the Incarnation," suggested that "Menno held to the opinion that the flesh of man was evil in itself," but later Burkhardt wrote "A Correction" in which he took the opposite position for the following reasons: "(1) his opponents in debate did not maintain this point against him; (2) reformers such as Luther, Zwingli [Burkhardt ignores the fact that Zwingli was dead before Menno became an Anabaptist or began writing.], and Calvin did not hold that the flesh is evil per se, and Menno was never charged with a view different from theirs; (3) Menno's own writing can best be interpreted to mean that 'the flesh' is the evil nature which was Adam's after the fall, rather than the material body" (*MQR* 4.2 [April 1930]: 113-139; 4.3 [July 1930]: 178-207; 6.2 [April 1932]: 122-3). It is clear that Menno cannot talk about sinful flesh or the evil that resides in man without connecting it to the body in which he lives. This is especially obvious when Menno discusses how children become sinful or why Christ received his human body *in* Mary but not *of* Mary (*CWMS*, 865). See Keeney, *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought*, 69. Many modern theologians question the traditional view that original sin (sin nature) makes the flesh itself evil, or that its presence can be accounted for by propagation. See G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies in Dogmatics: Sin*, trans. Philip C. Holtrop (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971), 528-30.

⁴³Oosterbaan concludes that Menno's view of the incarnation is similar to Karl Barth's. Barth rejected the orthodox view "that Mary made any positive contribution whatever to the incarnation. There did not occur a marriage of a sort between God or the Holy Spirit and Mary" (192). For Klaassen's brief evaluation of Oosterbaan's methodology, see Klaassen, 488.

⁴⁴*CWMS*, 431; *Omnia* 527-28: "Het Woort is vleesch geworde / Jo.1.14. Hy en seyt niet: Het wordt heeft vleesch aengenomen."

⁴⁵For a more detailed listing of references and further discussion, see Keeney, *The*

... He did not become flesh of Mary, but in Mary; ...⁴⁶

Mary believed the word of the Lord; the Holy Ghost overshadowed her, etc. The Word became flesh, in her.⁴⁷

For the Scriptures say that Mary the pure virgin by faith conceived the eternal Word of God which in the beginning was with God, and was God, that it became flesh, conceived and descended from the Holy Spirit (Matt. 1:20); that it was nourished in her; and was in due time born as a natural child is born of its mother. In this way Christ Jesus remains the precious blessed fruit of the womb of Mary, according to the words of Elisabeth, conceived not of her womb but in her womb, wrought by the Holy Spirit through faith, of God the omnipotent Father, from high heaven, as we have frequently shown.⁴⁸

You see, this is the strongest and most important passage wherewith John `a Lasco (in regard to this matter) sets the whole Scriptures against themselves, divides Christ and makes Him into two persons and sons and, as he thinks, brings unity into his whole work, argument, saying, and glosses.⁴⁹ And this is his real position: As the

Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought, 99, 207-209. See also William Echard Keeney, "The Incarnation, A Central Theological Concept," in *A Legacy Of Faith*, ed. Cornelius J. Dyck (Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1962), 56. Beachy, in *The Concept of Grace in the Radical Reformation*, says the following about Menno's use of prepositions: "The English translation of this formula partially hides a very careful distinction between the Dutch prepositions, *door*, *uit*, and *van*, which was already present in Hoffmann and later taken up by Menno and Dirk, where it was used with even greater care. The distinction between *van* and *uit* was particularly crucial for their understanding of the incarnation. According to their view Jesus is born out of (*uit*) Mary but not from (*van*) Mary" (85).

⁴⁶CWMS, 432; *Omnia* 528: "... hy niet van Maria / maer in Maria mensche oft vleesch geworden is." The CWMS translation reads "He did not become flesh of Mary, but in Mary." A more consistent translation would be "He did not become flesh from Mary, but in Mary."

⁴⁷CWMS, 435; *Omnia* 530: "Gabriel is uytgesonden van Godt tot eender Jonckvrouwe met namen Maria / beloovet eenen Man / Ec. Maria heeft geloofd haers Heeren woordt / de Heylige Geest is neder gedaelt in haer / Ec. Het woordt is in haer Vleesch geworden."

⁴⁸CWMS, 436. *Omnia* 531: "Want de Schrifteure seydt: Dat Maria de onbevleekte Jonckvrouwe dat eeuwige woordt Godts / dat in den beginne by Godt was / ende Godt selve was / door dat geloove heeft ontfangen / Luc. 1.31. dat selfde vleesch geworden / Joan.1.14. ontfangen en hergekomen van den Heyligen Geest / Matth.1.20. menschelijker ende natuerlijker wijze in haer gegeneert / gevoet en gewassen / ende tot bequamer tijdt uyt haer gebooren / als een natuerlijck kindt uyt sijnder moeder. Aldus blijft Christus Jesus de edele ende gebenedijde vrucht des lichaems Mariae na den woorden Elizabeths / welcke sy niet van haren lichaem / maer in haren lichaem door den Geloove werckende in haer den Heyligen Geest / uyt Godt den Almoogenden Vader / van boven uyt den hoogen Hemel heeft ontfangen / gelijk wy dickwils bewesen hebben."

⁴⁹John `a Lasco was a Reformed pastor and superintendent of the East Friesland churches. The ruler, Countess Anna of Oldenburg, was a very tolerant ruler. But Emperor Charles V put pressure on Countess Anna to do something about the numerous religious

children are partakers of flesh and blood, so also has the Word or Son of God received or assumed this flesh and blood from the flesh and blood of the children; and has thus in our flesh vanquished hell, sin, death, and the devil.

Inasmuch as he [John `a Lasco] works the above saying so relentlessly, therefore I have by adducing many Scriptures enlarged upon the inherent, unclean, sinful flesh and nature of the children, and their deserved death and condemnation on the one hand; and the pure, holy flesh and nature of Christ, His undeserved death and judgment on the other, so that the reader might thereby rightly understand and comprehend that the Lord Jesus Christ could not come of such unclean flesh and seed of the children, nor assume human nature from them. For the flesh of the children is unclean and sinful, but the flesh of Christ is pure and holy.⁵⁰

Menno says Christ is spoken of as being fruit of Mary's womb because Mary nourished and fed Christ while He was in her womb. Menno assures us that Mary was a "receptive field."⁵¹

groups in her domain. She said that anyone whom John `a Lasco designated as heretical would be expelled. In January, 1544 Menno had a theological discussion with John `a Lasco. They discussed the incarnation, baptism, original sin, justification, and the call of ministers. They separated in a friendly manner. Menno then sent a promised explanation of his views on the incarnation to John `a Lasco (CWMS, 420-454). John `a Lasco had Menno's response printed in 1544 without Menno's knowledge and used it against Menno. The "above saying" which John `a Lasco worked "so relentlessly" reads as follows: "Since the children partake of flesh and blood, so He, in the same manner, partook of the same that He might through death take the power from him who had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver those who, of necessity, were in servitude all their lives. For He does not accept the seed of angels, but of Abraham; therefore He must become like unto His brethren in all things" (CWMS, 823).

⁵⁰CWMS, 823; *Omnia* 377: "Siet / dit is de wichtigste ende sterckste spreucke / daer mede Johannes `a Lasco de geheele Schrift (aengaende desen Artijckel) in twist set / Christum deylt, tot twee personen ende sonen maeckt, ende soo hy meynt alle sijn Argumenten / spreucken / glosen / ende dat geheel werk in een sluyt. Ende't is sijnen eygentlijcken gront ende meyninge / gelijk de kinderen vleesch ende bloet hebben, soo heeft ook dat woort, oft de Sone Gods na gelijker maeten sijn vleesch ende bloet van der selver kinderen vleesch ende bloet aengenomen oft ontfangen, ende heeft alsoo Helle, Zonde, Doot ende Duyvel in onsen vleesche overwonnen, &c. Aengesien hy dan de gemelde spreucke soo heftig dringt / daerom heb ick oock in aengetogene aenwijssinge soo rickelijck uyter Schrift voorgebragt der gemelder kinderen aengeboren / onreyn / sondelijck vleesch ende natuere / haren verdienden doot ende verdoemenisse / daer tegen Christus reyne / heylige vleesch ende natuere / sijnen onverdienden doot ende gericht / op dat de Lezer met sulks recht bekenne ende bate / dat de Heere Jesus Christus van alsulcken onreynen vleesch ende Zaet der kinderen niet en konde afkomen / oft soo een Mensche van haer aennemen / want der kinderen vleesch (segge ick) is onreyn ende sondelijck / maer Christus vleesch reyn ende heylig."

⁵¹CWMS, 767-68; *Omnia* 316: "Dat beyde de Man ende de Vrouwe door dat woordt / wast en vermeert u / bequaem tot der Baringe van Godt verordineert sijn / is klaerder dan men loochenen kan / nochtans een yegelijck in sijner Ordeninge / die man / quasi seminator, en die vrouwe / quasi excipiens ager, quae seminanti viro tot Teelinge oft wasdom van Godt bereydt is / sine qua etiam vir non potest fructum ferre unquam."

I do certainly think that we can gather from these passages that the father is the real origin of his child and the mother the prepared field, as has been related. Even as a field does not receive its own, but the sower's seed, to sprout, feed, and increase it and bring it to fruition so that it is called, although sown upon it, that field's seed (as indeed it is), so also the woman conceives seed, not of her own body but of that of her husband, to nurture it from her own flesh after God's ordinance, to carry it, and at the proper time to bring forth the fruit. The fruit is then called the mother's seed, fruit, and son, no less than the father's from whom she at the first received it, exactly as the before-mentioned sown seed is called the seed and fruit of the field for the reason given.⁵²

Christ was not fruit of Mary's womb in the sense that she contributed anything to Christ's conception because the mother functions only as a receptive field. Christ took flesh upon himself *in* Mary, but that flesh was derived from (*van*) and through (*door*) the Holy Spirit. Christ conceived *in* and out of (*uit*) Mary's womb, not from (*van*) Mary's womb. Christ had true flesh and blood, but that flesh and blood came from (*van*) heaven.⁵³ At conversion we become flesh of Christ's flesh, and since His flesh is pure and sinless, He is able to deliver us from the guilt and power of sin in our flesh.

Union with this pure Christ is the source of justification.⁵⁴ Through union with

⁵²CWMS, 768; *Omnia* 316: "Ick meyne jae / men kan hier uyt dese spreucken wel verstaen / dat die Man de eygentlijke oorspronck en seminator sijnes kindts / en die Vrouwe de bereyde Acker is / soo verhaelt is. Item / gelijk als ook een Acker niet sijn eygen / maer des zaeyers zaet in haer ontfangt / dat selvige vochtight / geneeret / wassen doet / en tot sijnen rijpe vruchten brengt / en alsoo (hoewel daer in gezeydt) des Ackers vrucht en zaedt genoemt werdt / en oock is / Ita etiam Mulier, non ex suo ipsius corpore, sed sui viri concipit semen, rigat idipsum, geneert het en voet het van haren vleesche / na Godts Ordeninge / parit hoc ipsum in se seminatum semen, atque enatum fructum tot sijner tijdt / en werdt alsoo niet weyniger des Moeders als des Vaders (quamvis a Patre originaliter conceptum) zaedt / vrucht / en Soone genoemt / gelijck (segge ick) als dat voornoemde ingezaeyde zaet / een zaet ende vrucht des Ackers genoemt werdt / oorsake / als gehoort is."

⁵³CWMS, 428, 797. Menno defended this position by saying that "a woman has no procreative seed but only a menstrual flux" (CWMS, 868). For a discussion of sixteenth century views of embryology and the incarnation in relation to Menno, see Irwin, 93-104; Willem Blake, *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals*, trans. by William Heynen (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1981), 205-7.

⁵⁴Grislis discusses the tension between sanctification and justification in Menno and concludes that Menno expressed an "apparent lack of concern for justification" (" 'Good Works' According to Menno Simons," 127). Hendrick W. Meihuizen highlighted the emphasis on repentance and faith of individual believers in Menno's early writings (Klaassen, 487). Klaassen says Meihuizen sees a shift in Menno to a "stronger emphasis on the church which gives birth to believers by the bridegroom Christ" (487).

Christ the regenerate become flesh of his flesh,⁵⁵ and only by union with the altogether heavenly Christ can the sinner become pure and heavenly.⁵⁶ In his short tract on "Justification" Menno connects justification and its fruit with union with Christ.

In short, they [believers] regulate themselves in their weakness to all words, commandments, ordinances, Spirit, rule, example, and measure of Christ, as the Scripture teaches; for they are in Christ and Christ is in them; and therefore they live no longer in the old life of sin after the earthly Adam (weakness excepted) but in the new life of righteousness which comes by faith, after the second and heavenly Adam, Christ, as Paul says, I do not now live, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. . . . They are partakers of His Spirit and nature, and live according to the Word of the Lord by the power of Christ which is in them. This is according to Scripture to be really believing, to be Christian, to be in Christ and Christ in us.⁵⁷

Christ brought both His deity and His humanity from heaven,⁵⁸ and believers "are by

⁵⁵CWMS, 772; *Omnia* 318. See note 33.

⁵⁶CWMS, 428; *Omnia* 525: "Waerachtigh Godt ende Mensche / Mensche ende Godt niet gedeylt noch gestuckt / als in half Hemelsch ende half Aertsch, half menschen zaet ende half Godts zaet, gelijk sommige seggen / maer een ongemengde geheele Christus / namelijk / Geest / Ziele ende Lichaem / gelijk Paulus seyt dat alle menschen zijn."

⁵⁷CWMS, 506-7; *Omnia* 462-63: "Summa / sy rechten haer in haerder zwackheydt na alle woorden / geboden / ordinantien / Geest / regel / worbeelt ende mate Christi / gelijk de schrift leert / want sy zijn in Christo / ende Christus is in haer / ende daerom en leven sy nu niet langer in dat oude leven der sonden nae den eersten aerdschen Adam / (zwackheydt uytgenomen) maer in dat nieuwe leven der gerechtigheydt / dat uyt den geloove komt / nae den tweeden en Hemelschen Adam Christum / gelijk Paulus seyd / ick en leve nu niet / maer Christus Jesus leeft in my / dat leven dat ik nu leve in den vleesche / dat leve ist door den geloove des Soons Godts / die my heeft lief gehadt / ende heeft hem selven over gegeven voor my. . . . sy zijn in Christo / ende Christus is in haer / sy zijn synen Geest / aert / ende natuere deelachtigh / ende leven also uyt die kracht Christi / die in haer is / na des Heeren Woort: Ende dat heet recht na der schrift / geloovigh zijn / Christen zijn / in Christo zijn / ende Christus in ons zijn."

⁵⁸CWMS, 797: "For if he asserted this descending and ascending of His deity only and not of His humanity, how then is to be harmonized the afore-mentioned witness of Christ in which He says, No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven. . . . No, the Word is descended from heaven! It became flesh or man, here below on earth, and has thereafter ascended again to highest heaven where He was at the first. . . . The man Christ did not have His origin on earth but in heaven." *Omnia* 361: "Dese aengewesen woorden Pauli overdenkt neerstelijck / want heeft hy dit afklommen ende opklommen alleen van sijnder Godtheyt gesproken / ende niet van sijnder Menschheyt / hoe wilt hem dan met het verhaelde getuygenisse Christi rijmen / dat hy seyt: Niemand en klimt op ten Hemel / dan die daer af geklommen is van den Hemel / des Menschen Sone / die daer is in den Hemel / Joan.3.13. Ephes.4.9. . . . Och neen. Maer dat Woordt is van den Hemel geklommen / is in dese onderste deelen der

virtue of their new birth so joined to Christ, are become so like unto Him, so really implanted into Him, so converted into His heavenly nature," that they believe and live that which is pure and heavenly, not that which is unholy and earthly.⁵⁹ The believer who is united to this altogether heavenly Christ lives a holy life, "for all who are in Christ are new creatures, flesh of His flesh, bone of His bone, and members of His body."⁶⁰

Menno's view of justification is different than Luther's *simul iustus et peccator*.⁶¹ Menno is looking for a more radical inner change which gives man a changed nature and a new life.⁶²

Aerden vleesch oft mensche geworden / ende is daer nae weder boven alle Hemelen opgeklommen / Daer hy te vooren was. . . . Soo is't immers daer mede openbaer / dat de Mensche Christus oorspronckelijck niet van der Aerden / maer van den Hemel is: Want nae sijner eeuwiger Godtheyt, als die so onverseert gebleven ware, als de Geleerde seggen. "

⁵⁹CWMS, 409-10; CWMS, 139: "The regenerated are one mind with Christ Jesus. All who by the grace of God have been transplanted from Adam into Christ, have become partakers of the divine nature, and are baptized of God with the spirit and fire of heavenly love. . . ." Also see CWMS, 798, 807, 854, 870.

⁶⁰CWMS, 402; *Omnia* 118: "Och neen: Christus kerke zijn de uytverkorene Gods / zijn geheyligde en beminde / die haer kleederen hebben gewit in't bloet des Lams / die uyt Godt geboren zijn / ende van Christus Geest gedreven worden / die in Christo zijn en Christus in haer is: die zijn Woordt hooren en gelooven / na zijn geboden in haerder zwakheyt leven / en zijn voetstappen in der verduldigheyt ootmoedelijck navolgen. Die dat quaet haten en dat goet liefhebben / en met voller ernste daer na staen / datse Christum mogen begripen gelijk sy van hem begrepen zijn / want alle die in Christo zijn / zijn nieuwe creatueren / vleesch van Christus vleesch / ende been van Christus beenen / lidmaten aen zijn Heylige Lichaem."

⁶¹John Tonkin, *The Church and the Secular Order in Reformation Thought* (New York and London: Columbia Univ. Press, 1971), 137-38. Menno sees justification as new birth. One is right with God because of forgiveness of sins and a new heart. But Menno constantly affirms that man always retains his human nature. Man never becomes God. See Hans Georg Fischer, "Lutheranism and the Vindication of the Anabaptist Way," *MQR* 28.1 (Jan. 1954), 36, where Fischer is critical of "Luther's theological formula, 'Man is just and a sinner at the same time,' " and concludes that this position "cannot possibly be defended." Man did not receive God's grace so he could continue to sin with a good conscience. The Anabaptist view is that justification involves forgiveness and a clear conscience and produces works that please God. According to Bender, the difference between Luther and the Anabaptists lies in Luther's emphasis on "the status of forgiveness and peace achieved through justification, whereas the Anabaptists conceived the chief thrust of God's grace to be in regeneration following forgiveness, and this regeneration is understood as a vital change, not primarily as conferring status. . . . Luther's view of faith, combined with his doctrine of *Anfechtung*, resulted in a radically difference (sic) concept of the center of the Christian life" (Harold S. Bender, "Walking in the Resurrection: The Anabaptist Doctrine of Regeneration and Discipleship," 104-105).

⁶²CWMS, 54.

Christ Jesus dwells in the hearts of the believers. . . . For whosoever has put on Christ Jesus does not live himself, but Christ lives in him. If they then have put on Christ by their baptism as they say, Christ lives in them and must impel them, according to Paul's teaching. They nevertheless being found to continue still in every manner of carnal and godless conduct, it must follow that they have not put on Jesus Christ nor (sic) He does not work in them.⁶³

Menno's statement that "every creature partakes of the properties, propensities, and dispositions of that which brought it forth"⁶⁴ is made in the context of the sinner being reborn by the seed of God at regeneration as opposed to the first birth which was the result of being born of the seed of contaminated flesh.⁶⁵ Such a view might imply a metaphysical change,⁶⁶ although Menno denies that the new birth removes the inherited sinful nature.⁶⁷

⁶³Ibid., 269; *Omnia* 421-22: "Seggen sy dan / in den geloovigen, soo is' er recht geoordeelt / want Christus Jesus woont in die herten der geloovgen / Ephes. cap.3. vers 17. . . . Want soo wie dat Christum Jesum aengetogen heeft / die en leeft nu niet langer / maer Christus Jesus leeft in hem / Gal. 3. 27. Rom. 6.3. So sy dan Christum in haer Doopsel aengetogen hebben, gelijck sy seggen / ende Christus daerom in haer leven / ende sijn werck in haer drijven moet / nae Paulus leere / sy nochtans alle wegen aldusdanige vleeschelijcke / Godtlose wercken bevonden worden: so volget daer uyt met alle geweld / dat sy Christum Jesum niet aengetogen en hebben / want hy sijn werck in haer niet en drijft."

⁶⁴See footnote 21.

⁶⁵CWMS, 54.

⁶⁶Keeney, *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought*, 74. Beachy uses the terms "ontological" and "metaphysical" to explain the Anabaptist view of salvation in contrast to Luther's and Calvin's "forensic" view. One must remember that such terms are imposed on the Anabaptists and may not at all accurately reflect their own concepts.

⁶⁷CWMS, 233: "If they can find an error in our walk, as alas they often can (for we are all of the sinful, failing flesh of Adam); then they rejoice that the evangelical truth is all deceit, and has no power over the flesh." *Omnia* 398: "Maer dese soeken met allen vlijt s' nachts ende daeghs niet na den rechten wegh, maer na den krommen wegh, verhopende dat sy yet sullen bevinden, het sy in Gods Woort, ofte in onsen leven, t'welk sy alsoo mogen draejen, buygen, breken, en verstaen, dat sy daer mede die oprechte Euangelische waerheyt mogen vertreden en te niet doen, recht even of die eeuwige waerheyt Christus Jesus gebenedijt, met twee tongen gesproken en geleert hadde, en ofter eenige ziel in onsen leven waer, alser wel menighmael (leyder) in ons bevonden wort, want wy alle van Adam geboren zijn sondigh ende gebreckelijck, dat alsdan die Euangelische waerheyt enkel bedrogh zy, soo verblijden sy haer, ende voor Godt geen krachten en hadden van vleesch, overmits sy dan so neerstelijken soecken tegen alle Gods gerechticheyt, ende laten haer der leugen gelusten, daerom slaetse Godt met alsulcke dulle ende onverstandige blintheyt, dat sy over al niet van Godtlijke leeringe mogen begripen ende oordeelen, en begeeren nochtans alle wegen hare saken, hoe schandigh sy ook zijn, metter Schrift soo te bekleeden, op dat sy des te beter onder alsulcken schriftelijcken heyligen schijn mogen bedriegen dat sotte onverstandige volk, dat soo geerne will bedrogen ende verleyt zijn." CWMS, 245: "We are not cleansed in baptism of our inherited sinful nature which is in our

In the new birth one is born of the heavenly seed, partakes or receives a new (divine) nature, and puts on Christ. The one who puts on Christ no longer lives out of his own strength, but Christ lives in him. Christ living in the believer produces a new life in the believer.

By justification, then, Menno means regeneration, and regeneration "involves repentance, faith, and a new quality of life."⁶⁸

We must be born from above, must be changed and renewed in our hearts, and must be transplanted from the unrighteous and evil nature of Adam into the true and good nature of Christ, or we can never in all eternity be saved by any means, be they human or divine. . . .

The regenerate, therefore, lead a penitent and new life, for they are renewed in Christ and have received a new heart and spirit. Once they were earthly-minded, now heavenly; once they were carnal, now spiritual; once they were unrighteous, now righteous; once they were evil, now good, and they live no longer after the old corrupted nature of the first earthly Adam, but after the new upright nature of the new and heavenly Adam, Christ Jesus, even as Paul says: Nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.⁶⁹

flesh, so that it is entirely destroyed in us, for it remains with us after baptism." *Omnia* 406: "Ten anderen / soo wortmen in den Doopsel also niet gewasschen van die aengeboren aert der sonden / die in onsen vleesche is / alsoo dat si geheel in ons vernietet wordt / dan sy blijft oock nae den Doopsel al evenwel in ons vleesch." Keeney, "The Incarnation, A Central Theological Concept" (59, 60), says Menno thought "men could become gods in a restricted sense. . . ." Man can never become God because the "divine nature is a conferred nature and so can never become identical to God's or to the divine nature in Jesus Christ. There is never a mystical, pantheistic absorption of man into the divine nature."

⁶⁸Menno defines repentance as "a converted, changed, pious, and new heart, a broken and contrite, sad and sorrowful spirit, from which come the sorrowful tear and lamenting mouth, a genuine forsaking of the evil in which we were held, an earnest and hearty hatred of sin, and an unblamable pious Christian life; a repentance that will stand before God" (*CWMS*, 977). William R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story* (Grand Rapids: William Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), 185. "For if He could save an unrighteous carnal man without regeneration, faith, and repentance, then He did not teach us the truth. . . . If you do not repent there is nothing in heaven or on earth that can help you, for without true repentance we are comforted in vain" (*CWMS*, 92). See Sjouke Voolstra, "Free and Perfect: Justification and Sanctification in Anabaptist Perspective," *Conrad Grebel Review* 5.3 (Fall 1987): For Menno it was unthinkable that "faith in the merits of Christ alone saves man without the addition of the works which testify to a moral 'improvement of life' " (225). One should note, however, that neither did Menno lapse into a religion of works righteousness. See John C. Wenger, "Grace And Discipleship In Anabaptism," *MQR* 35.1 (Jan. 1961): 50-69.

⁶⁹*CWMS*, 92, 93; *Omnia* 125: "My moeten van boven geboren zijn / sn onse herten omgekeert / verandert / ende vernieuwt zijn / ende alsoo uyt der ongerechtigen boosen aerdt en natuere van Adam / in Christus gerechtige goede aert en natuere verset zijn / of wy en mogen met geen en middelen (sy zijn Godlijck ofte menschelijck) geholpen worden eeuwelijck / want soo waer de oprechte waerachtige boete ende nieuwe Creatuere niet en

Therefore we testify before you and all the world that we do not in the first place agree with those who teach and introduce a mere historical faith which is dead, which knows no conversion, spirit, and fruit. In the second place, that we do not agree that we can be saved by our own merits and works, for reasons above stated.⁷⁰

For Christ's sake we are in grace. . . . For it is He who stands between His Father and His imperfect children, with His perfect righteousness, and with His innocent blood and death, and intercedes for all those who believe on Him and who strive by faith in the divine Word to turn from evil, follow that which is good, and who sincerely desire with Paul that they may attain the perfection which is in Christ. . . . For they are believing, born of God, are in Christ and Christ in them; they are partakers of His Spirit and nature, and live according to the Word of the Lord by the power of Christ which is in them. This is according to Scripture to be really believing, to be Christian, to be in Christ and Christ in us.⁷¹

The sinner must experience an inner change in which he receives a new heart and spirit. This inner change occurs when the person is united with the heavenly or "good nature" of Christ.⁷² One is not justified simply because he boasts of Christ's blood, death, merits,

zijn (ick spreke van den verstandigen) daer moetmen eeuwich verloren zijn / is klaerder als men tegenspreken kan. . . . soo moet gy van nieuws geboren zijn / want de wedergeboren zijn onder de genade / ende hebben de belofte / als gehoord is / ende voeren daerom een voetveerdigh nieuw leven / want sy zijn in Christo nieuw geworden / ende hebben een nieuw hert ende geest ontfangen / te voren waren sy aertsch gesint / nu hemelsch / te voren vleeschelijck / nu geestelijck / te voren ongerechtigh / nu gerechtigh / te vooren quaedt / nu goedt / ende en leven nu niet langer na dat oude verdorven wesen / van den eersten ende aertschen Adam / maer na dat nieuwe oprtechte wesen van den nieuwen ende hemelschen Adam / Christus Jesus / gelijk Paulus seyde: Ick en leve nu niet langer / maer Christus leeft in my."

⁷⁰CWMS, 507-8; *Omnia* 464: "Wy betuygen daerom hier mede door u / ende door een yegelijck / dat wy ten eersten met dit niet en stemmen / die naer een Historisch doot geloove leeren ende invoeren / dat sonder veranderinge, Geest, kracht ende vrucht is, Ten anderen / oock niet met die / die door haer verdiensten ende wercken willen saligh worden, oorsake / so geroert is."

⁷¹CWMS, 506-7; *Omnia* 463: "Maer om Christus wille zijn wy in genaden / om Christus wille werden wy verhoort / om Christus wille soo worden ons onse misgrijpingen ende zwachheden / die sonder onse bewillinge geschien / quijt-gelaten / want hy staet met sijner volkomen gerechtigheyt / ende met sijnen onschuldigen doot ende bloet tusschen sinen Vader ende tusschen sijne onvolkomene kinderen / ende biddet voor alle die / die aen hem gelooven / ende die haer door den geloove des Godtlijcken Woordts bevljtigen / van het quade afkeeren / ende dat goede nakomen / ende met voller herten met Paulo begeeren / datse dat volkomen wesen dat in Christo is / in voller kracht grijpen mogen. . . . Sy zijn in Christo / ende Christus is in haer / sy zijn sijnen Geest / aert / ende natuere deelachtigh / ende leven also uyt die kracht Christi / die in haer is / na des Heeren Woort: Ende dat heet recht na der schrift / geloovigh zijn / Christen zijn / in Christo zijn / ende Christus in ons zijn."

⁷²According to Bender, Anabaptists emphasized the "resurrection side of the cross." Bender cites the first sentence of Menno's first book, "The Spiritual Resurrection":

grace, and Gospel.⁷³ Neither is man merely given a new status before God.⁷⁴ It is true that those who trust in Christ become sons of God and are justified.⁷⁵ But this is not "a mere historical faith which is dead, which knows no conversion, spirit, and fruit." The faith that saves is a living faith in a living Savior who is at work today to cleanse from sin, intercede, and produce a righteous life. Menno cannot discuss justification without at the same time emphasizing the righteous life that justification by faith produces. By faith Christ lives in the believer, and "Christ Jesus cannot be without fruits."⁷⁶

Menno sees the same relationship between christology and ecclesiology as he does between christology and soteriology. Just as believers are "flesh of Christ's flesh," the church is likewise the body of Christ and flesh of His flesh.⁷⁷

We say that the position and doctrine of the Holy Scriptures is that the regenerated church of Christ is flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone, even as Adam testifies of his Eve that she was flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone.⁷⁸

the spiritual resurrection is a "resurrection from sin and death to a new life and a change of heart" ("Walking in the Resurrection: The Anabaptist Doctrine of Regeneration and Discipleship," 96).

⁷³CWMS, 110-11; *Omnia* 6: "Ach lieve Heere / het en wil ons niet een hayr baten / dat wy Christenen genaemt werden / ende ons van des Heeren doot / bloet / verdienste / genade ende woort beroemen / soo lange als wy ons van dit Godtloos / ontuchtigh / schandigh leven niet [en bekeeren. Het is al om niet] dat wy Christenen heeten / dat Christus gestorven is / dat wy in den genaden tijt geboren / ende met water gedoopt zijn / so lange wy na sijn bevel / raet / vermaninge / wille ende geboden niet en wandelen / ende sijn woort niet gehoorsaem en zijn." Menno rejects the idea that works such as baptism or the Lord's Supper can cleanse one from sin (CWMS, 79, 123). "The righteousness which avails before God consists not in any ceremony and outward work, but exclusively in a true, pious, and fruitful faith" (CWMS, 267).

⁷⁴Keeney, *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought*, 74. Stoesz says Menno's view of union with Christ means "justification is more than a mere imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the account of man" (11).

⁷⁵CWMS, 115; *Omnia* 9: "Dit neemt dat geloove aen door den Heyligen Geest / ende en siet niet op sijn voorleden gerechtigheyt of ongerechtigheyt / maer het hoopt de dingen die niet te hoopen en zijn / ende worpt hem met volder herten op des Heeren genade / woort ende belofte / dewijle het wel weet dat Godt waerachtigh is / ende in sijn beloften niet faljeeren en kan / waer door dat herte vernieuwet / omgekeert / rechtveerdigh / vroom / vredigh ende vrolijck wordt / Een kint Gods geboren wort. Met vollen betrouwen tot den Throon der genaden gaet. Ende wort also een mede-genoot Christi / ende des eeuwigen levens."

⁷⁶CWMS, 269. See note 66.

⁷⁷Stoesz, 14, 15.

⁷⁸CWMS, 867; *Omnia* 566: "Wy seggen dat der H. Schrifts gront ende leere ist /

In the fifth place it is evident that the procreative seed is found with men and not with women from a consideration of the mystery or glory which Paul indicates of Christ and His church. Eph. 5:23. Christ our spiritual Father begets His spiritual children through preaching accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit and of His spiritual seed, that is, His Word, and of or through His spiritual wife, the church. And this same spiritual wife has no other spiritual seed of spiritual procreation than that which she receives of her spiritual husband.⁷⁹

And so it is in the new reality of Christ, for His church is a congregation of saints and an assembly of the righteous, even as the Nicene fathers have for centuries confessed with us. Even as Adam had but one Eve, who was flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, even as Isaac had but one Rebecca who was of his own tribe, and even as Christ had but one body which was heavenly and from heaven, and was righteous and holy in all its members, so also He has but one Eve in the spirit, but one new Rebecca, who is His spiritual body, spouse, church, and bride, namely, those who are believers, the regenerate, the meek, merciful, mortified, righteous, peaceable, lovely, and obedient children in the kingdom and house of His peace; pure, chaste virgins in the spirit, holy souls, who are of His divine family and holy flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone.⁸⁰

Menno's interpretation of the incarnation is closely connected to his understanding of what it means to live a holy life in a corrupt society and to establish a pure church which

dat Christus wedergebaerde Gemeeynte vleesch van sijn vleesch / en been van sijnen beenen is. Want gelijk als Adam van sijn Eva getuyghde dat sy vleesch van sijn vleesch ende been van sijnen beenen was."

⁷⁹CWMS, 889; *Omnia* 581: "Ten vijftien is't oock openbaer / dat het geneerlick zaet by den mannen is / ende niet by den vrouwen / ende day uyt de verholentheydt oft alle glorie die Paulus van Christo ende sijn Gemeeynte aenwijst / Eph. 5.23. Want gelijk Christus onse geestelijcke Vader / Esai. 9.5. Hebr. 2.13. sijn geestelijcke kinderen door de predicatie / overmits de kracht sijns Heyligen Geests / uyt sijn geestelicke zaet / sijn woort / Luc. 8.11. by sijn Geestelicke vrouwe / oft door sijn Geestelijcke vrouwe / welcke de Gemeeynte is / Joan. 3.29. Apoc. 12.6. genereert. Ende dese selfve Geestelijcke vrouwe oock geen ander Geestelijck (zaet) der Geestelijcker generationen aen haer en heeft / dan alleene dat sy van haren Geestelijcken Man ontfanght."

⁸⁰CWMS, 967-68; *Omnia* 194: "Des selven gelijken ook nu in't Nieuwe wesen Christi alsoo: want sijne gemeeynte of kerke is een geineynschap der heyligen / ofte vergaderinge der Gerechten / gelijk ook de Niceenissche Patres al over veele hondert jaren met ons bekend hebben. Gelijk dan Adam maer een Evam en hadde / die vleesch van sijn eygen vleesch was / ende been van sijn beenen / Isaac een Rebecca die van sijn eygen geslachte was / ende Christus een lichaem / dat Hemelsch van den Hemel / ende in alle sijn lidmaten gerechtigh ende heyligh was: alsoo en heeft hy nu ook maer een Evam / in den geest een nieuwe Rebecca / die sijn geestelijk lichaem / Vrouwe / Gemeeynte / kerke / ende Bruydt is / te weten die / die geloovige / wedergeborene / ootmoedige / barmhertige / afgestorvene / gerechtige / vreedsamige / liefvelijcke en gehoorsamige kinderen in dat rijke ende huys sijnes vredes sijn. Suyvere / kuyssche Jonkvrouwen in den geest / heylige zielen / die van sijn Godlijke geslachte ende heyligh vleesch van sijn vleesch / en heylige beenen van sijn beenen zijn."

is "bone of Christ's bone and flesh of His flesh." The church is the new Eve just as Christ is the new Adam. Adam was not flesh of Eve's flesh. Neither is Christ flesh of Mary's flesh. The second Adam (Christ) is not flesh of the church's flesh. Rather, the second Eve (the church) is flesh of the second Adam. Christ is born of God as a baby, and the church is born of the seed of Christ and His Word.⁸¹ The church is the wife of Christ and is flesh of His flesh. Since the church is the body of Christ, that body must be pure and holy.

The key to Menno's ecclesiology is his view of the two births and what it means to be united to the heavenly body of Christ.⁸² A person is born a sinner by the seed of his earthly father; he is reborn as a saint by the heavenly seed.⁸³ This new birth brings one into union with Christ, and through baptism one is united with the body of Christ, the community of believers. For Menno the church is the spotless bride of Christ, "flesh of Christ's flesh and bone of His bone."⁸⁴ The body of Christ is the "assembly of the

⁸¹Keeny maintains that Menno's used *van* and *uyt* in reference to soteriology in such a way that "man cannot be considered essentially as God in regeneration" (Keeny, *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought*, 219). See pp. 99, 219-20.

⁸²Tonkin, 140.

⁸³CWMS, 92, 93, 416, 889, 234.

⁸⁴Ibid., 299-300; *Omnia* 441-42: "Ten derden / als ick meynte te vinden een onbestraffelijcke Gemeynthe / die daer is sonder rumpel ende sonder vleck / die den Heere dient met beyden schouderen / gelijkformigh sijnen woorde. . . . Christus Jesus en wil noch en bekent aldusdanige Bruyt / Gemeynthe / ende kercke niet. Maer Christus Bruyt is vleesch van sijnen vleesche / ende been van sijnen beenen / Ephes. 5.30. sy is hem gelijkformigh / Rom. 8.29. sy is nae sijnen Beelde geschapen / Col. 3.10. sy is deelachtigh sijner natueren / 2 Petr. 1.4. sy is also gesint / gelijk als hy gesint is / Phil. 2.5. niet soeckende dan Hemelsche dingen / daer Christus Jesus is / sittende tot sijns Vaders rechter hand / Colo. 3.1. Jae in Godts Gemeynthe en hoortmen / sietmen ende vintmen anders niet dan alleen oprechte leeringe onses lieven Heeren Jesus Christi ende sijner Apostelen / met een toestemminge der Heyliger Bybelscher Schriften." CWMS 441; *Omnia* 534-35: "Die also aenkeeren haers Heeren woort ende waerheyt / dat sy niet een letter anders en derven leeren oft gebruyken / dan Christus Jesus selve geleert / gebruykt en bevolen heeft / namelijk / dat reyne onvervalschte Bybelsche woordt in den rechten sin ende verstant Christi en sijnder Apostelen. Die de Sacramentelijke teeken gebruycken gelijkformigh den Euangelio Christi / namelijk den Doop der geloovigen / (ende niet der onmondiger) kinderen / ende dat Avontmael onder beyde gedaenten in alsodanige Gemeynthe / die vleesch is van Christus vleesche / ende been van Christus beenen / die uytwendigh onstraffelijck zijn / ende inwendigh een hert / geest / ziele ende lichaem in Christo Jesu zijn." CWMS 1023; *Omni* 639: "Want de gemeente Christi is de Bruyt Christi: nu en wil Christus niet dat sijn Bruyt ontfangen sal / of vruchtbaer worden / dan van dat rechte zaet des mans / I Pet. 1.23. gelijk Paulus spreekt / ick hebbe u een man toegevoeght / op dat ick Christus een reyne Maeght soude toebrengen / 2 Cor. 11.4."

righteous," a communion of saints.⁸⁵ These members of the pure body of Christ must separate themselves from all that is evil or fleshly, whether that evil be found in the world or in the church.⁸⁶ This separation is necessary because of the "heavenly marriage bond between Christ and our souls" which takes precedence over any earthly relationship, marriage included.⁸⁷ When a marriage partner is no longer married to Christ, such a person should be separated both from the holy body of Christ and the holy body of the marriage partner since husband and wife are one flesh.⁸⁸ Implied here is the idea that sin resides in the flesh, and the unbelieving partner is now of evil flesh. The believing partner, on the other hand, is united to the sinless flesh of Christ. Since in marriage they become one flesh, the husband and wife should not continue living together after one of them is excommunicated.⁸⁹

⁸⁵*CWMS*, 235; *Omnia* 400: "Maer gedenkt gy altydt in uwer herten, datter geen heylige Kercke ende Gemeynthe Christi en is, dan alleene de vergaderinge der gerechtigen en de Gemeynthe der Heyligen, de welcke haer seer vlijtighlyk schickt na haers Heeren Woort en Ordinantie." *CWMS*, 99; *Omnia* 129: "De Heylige Schrift / ende ons gemeen geloove leeren ons / hoe de Heylige Christelijke kercke een vergaderinge der gerechtigen ende een gemeenschar der Heyligen is."

⁸⁶"From all this, according to the doctrine of the holy apostles, it is plain that the obstinate schismatic or sectary who causes offense and discord contrary to the doctrine of godliness, and those who do not abide in the doctrine of Christ, who lead an offensive life, or greedy people who lead a soft and easy life at the expense of others, shall not be allowed a place in the holy house, camp, city, temple, church, and body of Christ, the church, but that we with common voice must exclude and shun and avoid them according to the Scriptures, unto the salvation of our own souls, and unto their reformation" (968).

⁸⁷*CWMS*, 970, 971; *Omnia* 195, 196: "De eerste oorsake is / om dat wy waerachtighlyck door Gods geest ende woort bekennen / als dat de Hemelsche Echt tusschen Christum ende onse zielen in dat voorkomen van sijn onschuldige doot ende dierbbaer bloet mits het geloove in den Geest gemaect / in gewilliger gehoorsaemheyt des selfden eenigen en eeuwigen Bruydegoms vast ende ongebroken moet gehouden worden. . . . De tweede oorsake is / om dat de getrouwe Apostelen / Joannes ende Paulus / ons soo grondighlycken leeren / datmen ten eersten de afvallige daeromme mijden sal / om dat sy ons met hare onreyne vervoerische leere / noch met haer ongoddelyck vleeschelijck leven / niet en versueren / noch in de gemeynschap haerder booser wercken invluchten sullen / gelijk oock in de oorsaken van den Ban boven al verklaert is. Ende wy nu met oogen sien / ende met handen tasten / dat ons niemant eer noch meer en versuert / noch versueren en kan / dan ons onse eygen Vader / Moeder / Man / Vrouwe oft kinderen doen / als sy verdorven zijn / ende dat bysonder / om de dagelijcsche versellinge ende de natuerlijcke liefde diemen onder malkanderen heeft / ende oock dat noch meer is / dewijle Man ende Vrouwe een ligchaem zijn."

⁸⁸*CWMS*, 971; *Omnia* 196. See previous note.

⁸⁹At the end of his life, however, Menno says that the husband and wife should not be forced to separate if the believing partner feels "bound or troubled in his conscience

Menno's view of justification, the incarnation, and the church requires a people of God who are separated from society. This separation demands that a pure church be maintained through the use of the ban.⁹⁰ And the ban (church discipline) can be practiced only when a visible church is present in—but separated from—society.⁹¹ The point is that Menno's soteriology, christology, and ecclesiology required a rejection of the *corpus christianum* view of society.⁹² Menno sees a close connection between the presence of Christ's kingdom in the world today and the victory of believers over sin.⁹³ This kingdom

touching the Scriptures" which say that the husband and wife should not be separated except for fornication. Neither should they be forced to separate "in the event that any adultery or fornication or some other evil should result from it" (CWMS, 1061). Menno did allow divorce in cases of adultery, presumably for the same reason that he calls for excommunication for sin, i.e., because the person has broken his or her "one flesh" relationship with the pure body of Christ or with the husband or wife. He does not allow divorce when a marriage partner is banned. Banning is not a Scriptural grounds for divorce.

⁹⁰J. Denny Weaver has written several articles which attempt to demonstrate the direct relationship between ecclesiology and christology. He concludes that the "believers' church" position is best served by a christology which calls for separation from sin, Satan, and the world, and makes ethics an integral part of faith in Christ. See J. Denny Weaver, "A Believers' Church Christology," *MQR* 57.2 (April 1983): 112, 113, 130, 131; J. Denny Weaver, "Christology in Historical Perspective," in *Jesus Christ and the Mission of the Church: Contemporary Anabaptist Perspectives*, comp. Erland Waltner; ed. Maynard Shelly (Newton, KS.: Faith and Life, 1990), 83-105; J. Denny Weaver, "Atonement for the Nonconstantinian Church," *Modern Theology* 6.4 (July 1990): 307-23; J. Denny Weaver, "The Christology of Atonement," in *Radical Catholicity*, eds. Stanley Hauerwas and Mark Nation (book forthcoming).

⁹¹For Menno Christianity or Biblical discipleship demands an upright or "disciplined" life. The form or pattern this disciplined life should take should, according to the Anabaptist view, be determined by all true believers, not by the ordained, the theologians, the canon lawyers, or the private individual. Discipleship meant putting into practice the commands of Christ despite the influence of Satan and the world. The ban is a natural result of these ideas. See Franklin H. Littell, "The Discipline of Discipleship In The Free Church Tradition," *MQR* 35.2 (April 1961): 117-19.

⁹²*Corpus christianum* is contrasted with *corpus Christi*. The former refers to the medieval view of the church that said the church is composed of all of society. The latter refers to those (Anabaptists) who said the church is composed only of those who are members of the body of Christ, or are truly born again.

⁹³"Now is the time sincerely to lament before God our past reckless and willful manner of life, and in the fear of God to crucify and mortify our wicked, sinful flesh and nature. Now is the time to arise with Christ in a new, righteous, and penitent existence, even as Christ says, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent and believe the gospel" (CWMS, 108). For Menno true Christian liberty includes both deliverance from sin and obedience to Christ. Both of these require dying with Christ to sin, self, and Satan and resurrection with Christ to a new person and a new existence. See Grislis, "The Concern for Christian Liberation According to Menno Simons," 282, 283.

is a spiritual kingdom, not a physical or natural kingdom, and it is not established by carnal force.⁹⁴ Rather, the believer has died with Christ to sin and risen with Him to a new way of life.⁹⁵ Christ's kingdom is ushered in through suffering, not through retaliation. Only through union with the heavenly Christ can sinners be delivered from a carnal existence in a heathen society.

As Voostra has noted, one's understanding of justification and the incarnation determines the form of one's Christian discipleship, both in its relationship to other believers and to society.⁹⁶ For Menno the incarnation provides the theological basis for a new creation based on radical dualism that has, from a Biblical perspective, both strengths and weaknesses. One strength of Menno's position is highlighted by Voostra's comment that "the justification of the sinner, reduced to the forensic aspect, can function as an ideological cover for an indeed baptized, but actually unchristian society."⁹⁷ Menno's emphasis on a visible community as a new creation that makes decisions independent of society is another strength. The major weakness (apart from the biological errors of his incarnation position) is the dualism that leads Menno, and especially his followers, toward a structured church life that attempts at times to effect separation from sin and the world through legislation.

Menno's unifying theological principle is the person and work of Christ. One can summarize Menno's christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology as follows: Christ had a human but heavenly body which was not contaminated by sin. The church is the body of Christ. Individual believers are united both with Christ and with the church. By union with Christ at conversion believers become flesh of Christ's flesh and bone of His bone. Union with the pure and heavenly Christ infuses spiritual life which in turn produces spiritual fruit because the sinner has partaken of the nature and disposition of Christ. The church is also flesh of Christ's flesh and bone of His bone. Those who are united with the

⁹⁴"Christ has not taken His kingdom with the sword, but He entered it through much suffering" (CWMS, 49).

⁹⁵CWMS, 269; *Omnia* 422: "Want soo wie dat Christum aengetogen heeft / die is sijnen sonden gestorven / die leeft der gerechtigheyt."

⁹⁶Sjouke Voolstra, *Het Woord is Vlees Geworden* (Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok-Kampen, 1982), 213. Also see J. Denny Weaver, "Discipleship Redefined: Four Sixteenth Century Anabaptists," *MQR* 54.4 (Oct. 1980): 255-79. "The solidarity principle thus also includes, in some form, the idea of the present body of Christ as an extension of the incarnation of its head" (256).

⁹⁷Voolstra, *Het Woord is Vlees Geworden*, 213.

uncontaminated Christ and with His uncontaminated body (the church) must likewise be uncontaminated by sin. Union with Christ's body on earth produces the life of holiness which God requires as the church instructs and disciplines those who are united to it. This view of the church requires a rejection of responsibility for the maintenance of a stable society and a focus on developing an alternate society (the church, a society within a society) which opposes and disciplines evil within its membership.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis was to examine the writings of Luther, Osiander, Calvin, and Menno Simons to determine whether these four major sixteenth century Reformers saw justification as a purely forensic declaration of God or as a more substantial work of God in the soul of the believer. This study has produced overwhelming evidence that each of these men rejects the notion that the past work of Christ, or the imputation of the alien righteousness of Christ to the believer "from a distance," is a sufficient basis for justification. All four men include *Christus in nobis* in their discussion of the meaning of salvation. For each of them justification includes union with the present living Christ who is our righteousness. Christ's present righteous life and work for, in, and through us is the basis for both our justification and our holy life.

However, we must not allow these similarities to cloud the differences among these four Reformers. Although all four men agree that justification includes union with Christ, they do not agree on the sense in which Christ is in the believer. For Luther Christ is present in the believer in the same way the divine is present in Christ—both hidden and revealed. The believer is saint and sinner in the same sense that Christ is human and divine. Osiander follows Luther in his view that Christ has two natures which are united to form one person in which neither nature may be separated. To this fundamental Lutheran assumption Osiander adds the idea that the humanity of Christ becomes righteous through union with Christ's divinity and that sinners become righteous through union with Christ's humanity. For Osiander the divine nature, which is the believer's righteousness, proceeds from Christ's humanity and flows to believers because they are united to Christ's humanity. Calvin places the same value on union with Christ's humanity that Osiander does—the righteousness of Christ is communicated to us through Christ's humanity. Calvin differs with Osiander and Luther when he says that God was wholly within Jesus and wholly outside Him. The Godhead does not merge with the manhood of Christ. Rather the human and divine each retains its distinctive nature. Calvin's christology forces him to separate the divinity and humanity in Christ, thereby separating the divinity of Christ from believers even though believers are united with Christ's humanity. Menno's christology reflects his practical concerns. Menno says Christ's body was fully human but

entirely from heaven. Christ brought both His humanity and deity from heaven. Union with this wholly heavenly Christ justifies the believer, gives him a heavenly mind and heart, and produces in him the works that please God. Christ, the second Adam, transforms into new creatures all those who are united to Him.

All four of these Reformers agree that Christ and His righteousness are joined to the believer. They do not agree, however, on the extent to which Christ and His divine qualities become a part of the human soul. Luther says there is no substantial change in man—no change in substance and no change in "nature" or "essence." Luther's emphasis on the *simul iustus et peccator* points toward a disjoining of the righteous character of Christ from those united to Him. Osiander goes beyond Luther by connecting justification more closely with renewal. Justification (righteousness) is connected to the life of Christ, and this union means that believers likewise have a new life, or are being renewed by the life of Christ. Osiander also says that both regeneration and union with Christ are the basis of justification. Regeneration renews the believer and makes him a new person. For Calvin repentance or regeneration restores in us the image of God. This restoration occurs throughout life as God removes the corruptions of the flesh as believers practice repentance. Sometimes Calvin equates repentance, regeneration, newness of life, conversion, and justification. But Calvin also can separate repentance (regeneration and its fruit) from forgiveness and speak of justification as free imputation of righteousness. Calvin accuses Osiander of confusing justification and regeneration. Although it is difficult to evaluate all the tensions in Calvin, in the end Calvin seems to be saying that justification depends on forgiveness, but nothing has happened intrinsically to the inner person. Unlike Calvin, Melancthon's statements reflect no tension: justification is unrelated to renewal. Justification depends on the obedience of the Mediator, not on any renewal or change in the person. Menno goes beyond all the others in this study by speaking of justification almost exclusively in terms of renewal. For Menno the sinner is reborn by the heavenly seed which is uncontaminated by sin. This new birth produces in the believer a new nature. This happens as the sinner is "transplanted" from the evil nature of Adam into the heavenly nature of Christ. Those who are joined to Christ by the new birth become bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh and are thereby delivered from the corruption of sin and transformed into new creatures. The new creature becomes a partaker of the divine nature and is changed into the image or character of Christ.

Only Luther and Menno make christology integral to ecclesiology. Luther did so unconsciously, Menno intentionally. Both men believed that the church continues Christ's incarnation. For Luther the church represents Christ's humanity. Christ did not lose His

humanity, and neither does the church lose its humanity. God is hidden in Christ, Christ is hidden in man, and man is hidden in the world. Luther's primary interest was soteriology—how the individual can find peace with God.¹ The church is important because it preaches the Word that brings individuals to salvation.² It is true that Luther saw union with Christ as including fellowship with other members of Christ's body.³ But it is also true that by following the *corpus christianum* view of the church Luther was unable to effect the same kind of separation from sin that Menno spoke of. Menno's christology and soteriology produce an ecclesiology that is directly opposed to Luther. Menno's emphasis on a visible community that is separated from fallen humanity—a *corpus Christi* view of the church—provides the basis for an integrated christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology. For Menno union with Christ means that the church is the body of Christ, and since Christ's body was sinless and heavenly, the church must likewise be separate from sin, the unredeemed, and the control of civil authorities. By way of contrast, although Luther and Calvin also attempted to establish a church that was free of government control, by following the medieval *corpus christianum* they were sometimes forced to let the leaders of society protect, promote, and participate in the life of the church.⁴ Menno's ecclesiology requires that the church be an entity entirely apart from society, and his definition of justification reinforces that position by requiring that the believer be separated from evil. On the other hand, Luther and Calvin's definition of justification is compatible with their *corpus christianum* view of the church: they define justification in terms that allow a person to be called righteous without requiring him to be different from society as a whole. Of the four Reformers used in this study, only Menno sees the church as an entity entirely apart

¹T. M. Parker, *Christianity And The State In The Light Of History* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), 146.

²Ritschl, 109. Ritschl even suggests that Luther's idea of the church as the kingdom of Christ does not include the concept of fellowship that influences ethics (288).

³Rupp, 312-322. Rupp quotes Luther as follows: "Christ and all the saints are one spiritual body, just as the inhabitants of a city are one community and body, each citizen being a member of the other and a member of the entire city" (314; quoted from *Works of Martin Luther*, 6 vols. [Philadelphia, 1943], 2.10). See Lienhard, 114.

⁴Lewis W. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements* (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1971), 423; Earle E. Cairns, *Christianity Through The Centuries* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 311-12. Luther's life and movement depended on the protection of civil authorities. Calvin used the state to inflict punishment for those who violated codes of behavior or rejected doctrinal statements (fifty-eight people executed and seventy-six exiled by 1546).

from society. Although all four men speak of union with Christ, Luther, Osiander, and Calvin are forced to separate the example and Person of Christ from the righteous works produced in the believer. The fact that these three Reformers did not apply the *Christus in nobis* principle to ethics the way Menno did seems to indicate three things: that soteriological discussions are influenced by other theological and practical considerations—in this case, ecclesiology; that there is a direct relationship between soteriology and ecclesiology; and that an ethical christology depends on an ecclesiology that sees the church as distinct from the rest of society.

All the Reformers in this study except Menno speak of imputation. Luther uses imputation to emphasize the fact that righteousness is not our own and is not produced by our good works. This does not mean that righteousness is outside us. Rather, since we are joined to Christ, and since righteousness is in Christ, God can declare us righteous because Christ is our righteousness. There is little difference between Luther and Osiander on this point. Osiander says that those who are declared righteous are indeed righteous through union with Christ. God's declaration depends on the fact of Christ's presence. The major difference between Luther and Osiander is that Luther (and Calvin) places more emphasis on forgiveness and daily purging. Osiander speaks more about Christ's divine righteousness as the basis of justification and says less about daily cleansing. As mentioned before, one finds more tension in Calvin. Calvin denied that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer from outside. The believer is united to Christ and Christ dwells in the believer. But Calvin also speaks of "free imputation" of alien righteousness in the same way Osiander and Luther do, and for the same reason—to keep the righteousness of Christ from becoming a quality of the human soul. Calvin's attempt to explain rationally how justification and sanctification relate to each other and yet are separate produces ambiguity. Menno's failure to discuss imputation may reflect his attempt to connect closely the righteousness that justifies and the righteousness produced by justification.

Finally, modern protestant theology focuses on the meaning of the death of Christ and attempts to answer the question, "Why did Jesus die?" By contrast, the material used in this study had very few references to the meaning of the atonement. I have no explanation for this neglect on the part of these Reformers except that they seemed to assume the satisfaction theory, although one also finds a "*Christus victor*" motif. In any case, no particular view of Christ's atonement is defended or discussed. Only further study will reveal whether the satisfaction theory is incompatible with their view of justification as *Christus in nobis*. This study demonstrates that these four Reformers were

more concerned about the presence of Christ in the believer than the work of Christ on the cross. For each of them the historical Jesus who had lived, died, and risen is living and working in the believer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Althaus, Paul. *The Theology Of Martin Luther*. Trans. by Robert C. Schultz. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1966.
- Armstrong, Brian G. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Prottestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Madison, Wisconsin: Madison Univ. Of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Aulén, Gustaf. *Christus Victor: An Historical Study Of The Three Main Types Of The Idea Of Atonement*. Trans. A. G. Hebert. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.
- Bauman, Clarence. "The Theology Of 'The Two Kingdoms': A Comparison Of Luther And The Anabaptists." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 38.1 (Jan. 1964): 37-49.
- Beachy, Alvin J. *The Concept of Grace in the Radical Reformation*. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1977.
- . "The Grace of God in Christ as Understood by Five Major Anabaptist Writers." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 37.1 (Jan. 1963): 27, 28.
- Bender, Harold S. " 'Walking in the Resurrection': The Anabaptist Doctrine of Regeneration and Discipleship." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 35.2 (April 1961): 96-110.
- Berkouwer, G. C. *Studies in Dogmatics: Faith and Justification*. Trans. Lewis B. Smedes. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954.
- . *Studies in Dogmatics: Sin*. Trans. Philip C. Holtrop. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971.
- Blake, Willem. *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals*. Trans. by William Heynen. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1981.
- Blough, Neal. "Pilgrim Marpeck, Martin Luther, And The Humanity Of Christ." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 61 (April, 1987): 203-212.
- Boehmer, Heinrich. *Martin Luther: Road To Reformation*. Trans. John W. Doberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Brauer, Jerald C., ed. *The Westminster Dictionary Of Church History*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971. "Andreas Osiander."
- Buchanan, James. *The Doctrine Of Justification*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1867; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.

- Burkhart, Irvin E. "Menno Simons on the Incarnation I and II." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 4.2 (April 1930): 113-139; 4.3 (July 1930): 178-207.
- . "Note: Menno Simons on the Incarnation. A Correction." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 6.2 (April 1932): 122-123.
- Cairns, Earle E. *Christianity Through The Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- Calvin, John. *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*. John T. McNeill, ed. Volume XXI of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Two Volumes. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.
- . *Opera Omnia Quae Supersunt*. 59 vols. Brunswick, 1863-1900.
- . *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*. Edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet, trans. by Henry Beveridge. 7 Vol. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1851; reprint Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1983.
- Chafer, Lewis. *Systematic Theology*. Vol. II. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948.
- Clifford, Alan C. "The Gospel and Justification." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 57.3 (July, 1985): 248-67.
- Coates, Thomas. "Calvin's Doctrine of Justification." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 34.6 (June 1963): 325-334.
- Detweiler, Richard C. "The Concept of Law and Gospel in the Writings of Menno Simons, Viewed Against the Background of Martin Luther's Thought." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 43.3 (July 1969): 191-212.
- Dillenberger, John. *Martin Luther: Selections From His Writings* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1961).
- Douglas, J. D., ed. *Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978. "Andreas Osiander," by Carl S. Meyer.
- Dyck, Cornelius J. "The Life of the Spirit in Anabaptism." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 47.4 (Oct. 1973): 309-26.
- Eastwood, C. Cyril. "Luther's Conception of the Church." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 11.1 (March 1958): 22-36.
- Epp, George K. "The Premonstratensian Connection of Menno Simons: Confirmations, Revisions and New Evidence." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 62.3 (July 1988): 349-55.
- Estep, William R. *The Anabaptist Story*. Grand Rapids: William Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.
- Fischer, Hans Georg. "Lutheranism and the Vindication of the Anabaptist Way." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 28.1 (Jan. 1954): 27-38.

- Fischer, Ralph Frederick. "An Examination of Osiander's 'Imago Dei' in its Relation to Justification." B. D. thesis presented to the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1949.
- Franks, Robert S. "Justification." *A Dictionary Of Christ And The Gospels*. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906.
- Friesen, Abraham. "The Radical Reformation Revisited." *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 2 (1984): 124-76.
- George, Timothy. *Theology of the Reformers*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1988.
- Green, Lowell. "Faith, Righteousness, and Justification: New Light on Their Development Under Luther and Melanchthon." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 4.1 (April 1973): 65-86.
- _____. *How Melanchthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel: The Doctrine of Justification in the Reformation*. Fallbrook, California: Verdict Publications, 1980.
- Grislis, Egil. "'Good Works' According to Menno Simons." *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 5 (1987): 120-37.
- _____. "Menno Simons' Account of His Conversion and Call in the Light of the Bible." *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 3 (1985): 73-82.
- _____. "The Concern for Christian Liberation According to Menno Simons." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 55.4 (Oct. 1981): 275-288.
- _____. "The Doctrine of Incarnation According to Menno Simons." *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 8(1990): 16-33.
- Haeggglund, Bengt. "Was Luther a Nominalist?" *Concordia Theological Monthly* 28 (June 1957): 441-52.
- Haikola, Lauri. "A Comparison Of Melanchthon's And Luther's Doctrine Of Justification." *Dialog*, Spring 1963: 32-39.
- Harran, Marilyn J. *Luther On Conversion: The Early Years*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1983.
- Hart, Trevor. "Humankind In Christ And Christ In Humankind: Salvation As Participation In Our Substitute In The Theology Of John Calvin." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 42 (1989): 67-84.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics*. Trans. G. T. Thomson; ed. Ernst Bizer. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.
- Hirsch, Emanuel. *Die Theologie des Andreas Osiander*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1919.
- Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968, vol. III.

- Hoffman, Bengt R. *Luther and the Mystics*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976.
- Holl, Karl. *What Did Luther Understand by Religion?* Eds. James Luther Adams and Walter F. Bense. Trans. Fred W. Meuser and Walter R. Wietzke. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Irwin, Joyce. "Embryology and the Incarnation: A Sixteenth-Century Debate." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9.3 (1978): 93-104.
- Keeney, William Echard. *The Development of Dutch Anabaptist Thought And Practice From 1539-1564*. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1968.
- _____. "The Incarnation, A Central Theological Concept." *A Legacy Of Faith*. Ed. Cornelius J. Dyck. Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1962.
- Klaassen, Walter. "Menno Simons Research, 1937-1986." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 60.4 (Oct. 1986): 483-96.
- Klann, Richard. "Righteousness And Holiness: A Study of Articles III-VI of the Formula of Concord." *Concordia Journal* 5 (1979): 44-54; 95-106.
- Kolb, Robert A. "Historical Background Of The Formula Of Concord." *A Contemporary Look at the Formula Of Concord*. Eds. Robert D. Preus and Wilbert Rosin. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978.
- Köstlin, Julius. *The Theology Of Luther In Its Historical Development And Inner Harmony*. Trans. Charles E. Hay. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1897.
- Krahn, Cornelius. *Dutch Anabaptism: Origin, Spread, Life And Thought (1450-1600)*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1968.
- _____. "Menno Simons." *Mennonite Encyclopedia, The*. Four Volumes. Edited by H. S. Bender, et. al. Mennonite Publishing House, 1955-1959.
- Lawrenz, Carl J. "On Justification, Osiander's Doctrine of the Indwelling Christ." *No Other Gospel*. Ed. Arnold J. Koelpin. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1980.
- Leaver, Robin A. Leaver. *Luther On Justification*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1975.
- Leith, John H. *John Calvin's Doctrine Of The Christian Life*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989.
- Lienhard, Marc. *Luther: Witness To Jesus Christ*. Trans. Edwin H. Robertson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1982.
- Littell, Franklin H. "The Discipline of Discipleship In The Free Church Tradition." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 35.2 (April 1961): 117-19.

- Loeschen, John R. *The Divine Community: Trinity, Church, And Ethics In Reformation Theologies*. Kirksville, Missouri: The Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, Inc., 1981.
- _____. *Wrestling With Luther*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1976.
- Loewenich, Walther von. *Luther's Theology Of The Cross*. Trans. Herbert J. A. Bouman. Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. Co., 1976.
- Luther, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Weimarer Ausgabe. Hermann Böhlau, 1907ff.
- _____. *Luther's Works*. ed. by Jaroslav Pelikan. Vols. 1-54. St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1958.
- Manschreck, Clyde Leonard. *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982.
- _____. *Melanchthon The Quiet Reformer*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1975.
- McClintock, John, and James Strong, eds. *Topical, Theological, And Ecclesiastical Literature*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1877. "Andreas Osiander," by J. H. W.
- McGrath, Alister E. "Forerunners of the Reformation." *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (April 1982): 219-42.
- _____. "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification." *Archiv Fur Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982): 5-20.
- _____. *Justitia Dei: A History of the Doctrine of Justification*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- _____. *Luther's Theology of the Cross*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1985.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Melanchthon On Christian Doctrine: Loci communes 1555*. Trans. and ed. by Clyde L. Manschreck. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982.
- Muller, Richard A. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Niesel, Wilhelm. *The Theology Of Calvin*. Translated by Harold Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956.
- Oosterbaan, J. A. "Grace in Dutch Mennonite Theology." *A Legacy Of Faith*. Ed. Cornelius J. Dyck. Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1962.
- _____. "The Theology of Menno Simons." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 35.3 (July 1961): 187-97, 237.
- Osiander, Andreas. *Ein Disputation von der Rechtfertigung des Glaubens*. Oct. 1550.
- _____. *Von dem Einigen Mitler Jhesu Christo und Rechtfertigung des Glaubens*. Königsberg. September, 1551.

- Ozment, Steven. *The Age Of Reform 1250-1550: An Intellectual And Religious History Of Late Medieval And Reformation Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- _____. *The Reformation In Medieval Perspective*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
- Parker, T. M. *Christianity And The State In The Light Of History*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Luther The Expositor*. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959.
- Peterson, Robert A. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Atonement*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1983.
- Preus, Robert D. and Wilbert Rosin, eds. *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord*. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978.
- Reid, W. Stanford. "Justification By Faith According To John Calvin." *Westminster Theological Journal* 42.2 (Spring 1980): 290-307.
- Richard, James William, D. D. *Philip Melancthon: The Protestant Preceptor Of Germany, 1597-1960*. New York: Burt Franklin Reprints, 1974.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *The Christian Doctrine Of Reconciliation And Justification*. Trans. H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay. Clifton, N. J.: Reference Book Publishers, Inc., 1966.
- Rogness, Michael. *Philip Melancthon: Reformer Without Honor*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1969.
- Rolston, Holmes, III. *John Calvin Versus The Westminster Confession*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1972.
- Rupp, Gordon. *The Righteousness of God*. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1973.
- Santmire, H. Paul. "Justification in Calvin's 1540 Romans Commentary." *Church History* 33 (Sept. 1964): 294-313.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds Of Christendom*. Rev. by David S. Schaff. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Schmid, Heinrich. *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Trans. Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. *Vom Himmlischen Fleisch Christi*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1951.
- Schwiebert, E. G. "Andreas Osiander." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. X. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

- . *Luther And His Times: The Reformation From A New Perspective*. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950.
- Seeberg, Reinhold. *Text-Book of the History Of Doctrines*. Trans. by Charles E. Hay. Two Vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966.
- Shepherd, Victor A. *The Nature And Function Of Faith in the Theology Of John Calvin*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer Univ. Press, 1983.
- Siggins, Ian D. Kingston. *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Simons, Menno. *Opera Omnia Theologica, of alle de Godtgeleerde Wercken van Menno Symons*. Amsterdam: Joannes van Veen, 1681.
- . *The Complete Writings Of Menno Simons*. Trans. by Leonard Verduin, Ed. by J. C. Wenger. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1956.
- Spitz, Lewis W. *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1971.
- Stob, Henry. *Ethical Reflections: Essays on Moral Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Stoesz, Willis M. "The New Creature: Menno Simon's Understanding of the Christian Faith." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 39.1 (Jan. 1965): 5-24.
- Strehle, Stephen. *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1988.
- Stupperich, Martin. *Osiander in Preussen: 1549-1522*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973.
- Stupperich, Robert. *Melanchthon*. Trans. Robert H. Fischer. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.
- Tonkin, John. *The Church and the Secular Order in Reformation Thought*. New York and London: Columbia Univ. Press, 1971.
- Tylenda, Joseph N. "Calvin and Christ's Presence in the Supper: True or Real." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27 (Feb. 1974): 65-75.
- Voolstra, Sjouke. "Free and Perfect: Justification and Sanctification in Anabaptist Perspective." *Conrad Grebel Review* 5.3 (Fall 1987): 221-31.
- . *Het Woord is Vlees Geworden*. Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok-Kampen, 1982.
- Wallace, Ronald S. *Calvin's Doctrine Of The Word And Sacrament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Company, 1957.
- . *Calvin's Doctrine Of The Christian Life*. Tyler, Texas: Geneva Divinity School Press, 1982.

- Weaver, J. Denny. "A Believers' Church Christology." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 57.2 (April 1983): 112-31.
- _____. "Atonement for the Nonconstantinian Church." *Modern Theology* 6.4 (July 1990): 307-23.
- _____. "Christology in Historical Perspective." *Jesus Christ and the Mission of the Church: Contemporary Anabaptist Perspectives*. Comp. Erland Waltner. Ed. Maynard Shelly. Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life, 1990.
- _____. "Discipleship Redefined: Four Sixteenth Century Anabaptists." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 54.4 (Oct. 1980): 255-79.
- _____. "The Christology of Atonement." *Radical Catholicity*. Eds. Stanley Hauerwas and Mark Nation. (Book forthcoming).
- Webber, Robert E. *The Secular Saint*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.
- Weis, James. "Calvin vs. Osiander on Justification." *The Springfielder*. 29 (1965): 31-47.
- Wenger, John C. "Grace and Discipleship in Anabaptism." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 35.1 (Jan. 1961): 50-59.
- Wicks, Jared. "Justification And Faith In Luther's Theology." *Theological Studies* 44 (March 1983): 3-29.
- Williams, George Huston. "'Congregationalist' Luther And The Free Churches." *Lutheran Quarterly* 19 (1967): 283-95.
- Wilson-Kastner, Patricia. "Andreas Osiander's Theology of Grace in Perspective of the Influence of Augustine of Hippo." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 10.2 (1979): 73-91.
- Wyneken, Karl H. "Calvin and Anabaptism." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 36.1 (May 1965): 18-29.
- Zimmermann, Gunter. "Die Thesen Osianders zur Disputation 'de iustificatione.'" *Kerygma und Dogma* 33 (July-Sept., 1987): 224-244.

REFERENCE
DO NOT CIRCULATE