

# **To What Does the Reconciling in 2 Corinthians 5:19 Refer?**

## **A “Change In the Heart of God from Wrath to Grace”**

### **Or**

## **A “Change in the Status of the Sinful World Before God”**

*By Rick N. Curia*

[Presented to the Northern California Pastoral Conference at Lodi, California, September 30, 1983]

### **Introduction**

I think one of the most difficult parts of this paper has been the attempt at the end of my research and study to organize and arrange it logically. Where should I begin? It would certainly help to be able to display what has been said concerning both views, together with the various considerations that arise, ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου, as the devil showed Jesus πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης (Lk 4:5). As this is impossible, I will do my best to set before you the two “sides” of the issue when it comes to orthodox Lutheranism and the perception of the reconciliation referred to in 2 Cor 5:19, as well as some of the considerations that follow.

I volunteered to write this paper because of questions left unanswered in my own mind after I had written my long(er) essay on Objective Justification, questions regarding the compatibility of these two views and the entire scripturalness of every aspect of the traditional view. I doubt if you will discover anything new or unusual in my conclusions, but my own mind has been set at ease. And so—onward! But first I wish to share a “maxim” written by Dr. A. L. Graebner (1849-1904; father of Theodore) in 1897 which I have done my best to remember and follow in my investigation and studies:

Our theology concedes the dignity of a theological doctrine to no statement which may be derived from a revealed doctrine by a process of reasoning only, but is not itself in all its terms actually taught in holy Scripture. And, again, our theology admits of no elimination or modification of any truth laid down in Scripture because of a seeming incompatibility with some other doctrine also clearly set forth in Scripture.<sup>1</sup>

(Comment: It is only a shame that those who followed Graebner in the Missouri Synod did not remember this truth, which had served them so well in the election controversy, when it came to a renewed look at the doctrines of Church and Ministry!)

### **The Two “Views”**

**ὥς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.**

This paper will deal only with the first portion of this verse, “that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not accounting to them their sins,” As a pastor trained at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary and a spiritual child of Adolf Hoenecke and John P. Meyer, I would expect you to visualize this reconciliation as a change in the world’s status before God, from the status of so sinful! to “sinless” in his sight, the world’s sins having been imputed to Christ and Christ’s righteousness to the world, a cross-imputation spelled out more clearly in v.21: τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. But here, in v.19, we simply find a world to which God accounts no sin; hence, a forgiven and justified world.

If you had been trained In the Missouri Synod by Walther or Pieper or men who followed their lead, or, had been trained at our own seminary by John Schaller or someone who followed his *Biblical Christology* to the letter, I would expect you to perceive this reconciliation as a change in the heart or mind of God, a change from wrath to grace. Thanks to Christ's life and death for the sinful world, God's wrath for or sinners could now change into grace and so, looking down on the sinful world with grace now, God no longer counts sin to it. He forgives its sin.

Perhaps even now this makes you uncomfortable, as it did me. But before we deal with this view in particular, why should there be two such seemingly different views in the first place? In a moment we will consider these two views in detail letting some of their chief proponents speak for themselves. But let it be said right now that where the verb *καταλλάσσω* is concerned, both sides agree that its basic meaning is "to change". Both sides would also agree that it can also have the meaning "to reconcile" In the sense of changing a person from enmity to friendship, as is clearly the case in occurrences outside Scripture. The problem, of course, is what happens when *God* is the subject of the verb and the *sinful world* is the object, as is the case in 2 Cor 5:19. If *καταλλάσσω* *has* to change a person from enmity to friendship, the problem is twofold.

First of all, Paul does not say that *the world* reconciled *God* to itself (changed him from enmity to friendship). He says that *God* reconciled *the world* to himself, and so, taken literally, changed *it* from enmity toward him to friendship! It is obvious from Scripture that this *did not* happen as a result of Christ's death. The sinful world is still hostile to the Lord. It still *hates* the God who brings the message of his law, yet without the message of the law it can have no insight or use for the Gospel. Both before and after Christ's work as its substitute under God's justice, the sinful world's attitude toward God remained as it always will be: "There is no one righteous, no one who seeks God. All have turned away . . . There is no fear of God before their eyes" (Ro 3:10-18). "Those who live according to the sinful nature have their minds set on what that nature desires . . . The sinful mind is hostile to God. It does not submit to God's law, nor can it do so!" (Ro 5a,7). "This is the verdict Light has come into the world but men loved darkness instead of light because their deeds were evil. Everyone who does evil hates the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed" (Jn 3:19,20). As Jesus said, "The world cannot hate you (Jesus' unbelieving brothers), but it hates me because I testify that what it does is evil" (Jn 7:7). "If the world hates you, keep in mind that it hated me first., If you belonged to the world, it would love you as its own. As it is, you do not belong to the world, but I have chosen you out of the world. That is why the world hates you. . . He who hates me hates my Father as well. If I had not done among them what no one else did, they would not be guilty of sin. But now they have seen these miracles, and yet they have hated both me and my Father. But this is to fulfill what is written in their Law: 'They hated me without reason.' (Jn 15:18-25). Here, Jesus specifically says that a *result* of his presence in the world as the God-Man is the world's hatred of him and those who follow him—those who "do not belong to the world," who are "in the world" (Jn 17:11), but not "of the world." Yet this is the *same world* that God reconciled to himself in Christ!

If, then, Scripture itself clearly says that the mind or heart or attitude of the sinful world toward God did not change—that God *did not, in fact, reconcile the world* as we normally use the word—then what does one do?

Both sides being dealt with in this paper are in perfect agreement that a change of heart or mind did not take place in the sinful world. That conclusion is simply scripturally unacceptable. For the one side, however, *someone's heart or mind* had to change toward the other, therefore it *had* to be God's! But the other side, in the person of Adolf Hoenecke in particular, saw problems arising from this conclusion from the facts that 1) God does not change; and 2) God's love and grace are clearly shown to be the reasons why God sent his Son to reconcile the world to himself. With this the case, how can you say that God's wrath was changed into grace? This side saw another solution: Go to Scripture and let Scripture shed its own light on the meaning of the verb *καταλλάσσω* here. (Note! This is *not* saying that the other side did not look to Scripture for guidance and support! But they do not seem to have relied on the immediate context as much as they should have—and I'm getting ahead of myself here!) We know the root meaning of the word. *καταλλάσσω* means to change; here, with the prefix *κατά*, to "change completely, make completely other." This fact, together with the force of the

immediate context, gives us every reason to view this reconciliation as a change of *status* or outward relationship between God and the now “reconciled” world, rather than an inward change of God’s heart or disposition toward the world. God’s hostile attitude toward sin and sinners revealed by the law did not change. The sinful world’s own hostile attitude toward God did not change. But by Christ’s life and death the sinful world was made “completely other” in God’s sight. The sinful world was given a new status before God for Christ’s sake, one which does not leave it under God’s law and righteous wrath. The gospel tells us that now God has bestowed the status of *sinless* on the world, *μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν* and thus a fitting object for God’s love and an object God can’t possibly hate. Viewed from the gospel message of 2 Cor 5:19 and Ro 5:9,10, God sees no sinful world and so the world has been rescued from God’s righteous wrath which still has objects it can fall on, the devil and his wicked angels who have no part in the gospel. (Note, we are looking at the world only through the eyes of the gospel here! While this interpretation does alleviate the problems raised by the other view, it does not, nor does it try to, remove the problems for human logic that still result from the apparent contradiction of law and gospel in the truth taught here. God has forgiven the sinful world, namely, all individuals who make up the sinful world. This is clear regardless of which view of the reconciliation one holds dealt with in this paper. Yet the Bible also clearly states that God’s hatred still stands over those who sin, the “children of wrath,” the *same sinful world*! Those who look for an answer to *this* problem will find none, either in this paper or in Scripture. They would do well to meditate on Graebner’s maxim and simply proclaim the full counsel of God.)

Thus far a brief summary of these two views concerning the reconciliation spoken of in 2 Cor 5:19. (And also referred to in Ro 5:10—*εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες καταλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*. I would also include those passages which use the verb ἀποκαταλλάσσω, Eph. 2:16—*καὶ [Jesus Christ] ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, Col.1:20—*καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ (Christ) ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ*, Col.1:22—*νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν (Jesus Christ) [ὕμᾱς ποτε...ἐχθροὺς] ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*...We will return to consider these passages in their larger contexts as they relate to one another and the proper meaning of reconciliation later in this paper.) It can also be seen that while reconciliation and justification really speak of the same act of God from two different perspectives according to the latter view (the non-imputation of sin=the declaration of righteous and just); according to the former view, justification actually follows reconciliation, at least logically. First there is a change of heart in God and *then* the non-imputation of sin. As we shall see, those who hold this view do not always make this distinction very clear, which only helps to complicate the whole matter!

Permit me now to digress and let the proponents of these two views speak in their own words. As that view of Pieper and Schaller, to name two, is the traditional one held by orthodox Lutherans, I give it first places. Let us listen carefully to catch exactly what Pieper and those who share his view are saying so that when we come to the view of Hoenecke and Meyer we can see where, and where they are not, speaking to Pieper’s view, and we can evaluate their “complaints” carefully to see if their arguments are valid or not,

Franz Pieper says, in an essay delivered in 1883,

As God, prompted by His grace, made Christ, who knew no sin, to be sin for us men (2 Cor 5:21) that is, imputed the sins of mankind to Christ as His own, so He also regarded the satisfaction rendered by Christ as though it had been rendered by men (2 Cor 5:14). By Christ’s suffering and death the sins of all men have been atoned for so completely as though all the thousand millions of men had themselves endured the torments of hell.<sup>ii</sup>

So far the other side would not disagree with Pieper. He goes on to say:

The result is: God is perfectly reconciled to all men and with every individual among them. No man need henceforth do or suffer anything to reconcile God to obtain righteousness and

salvation. 2 Cor 5:19: Nineteen hundred years ago God reconciled the world unto Himself. We know what it means to be reconciled to someone. *A person is reconciled to someone when he has dismissed from his heart all wrath against him. Now, just so God has for Christ's sake dismissed from His heart all wrath against men with whom He was angry because of their sins.* God now feels toward men as though they had never offended Him by sinning, as though never a disagreement between God and men had occurred. Here, then, the so-called objective justification is clearly taught: If God is reconciled with men, if He no longer has anything against them, then He has evidently in His heart absolved them of their sins, then He regards them as righteous for Christ's sake. Hence, according to Scripture, *the reconciliation between God and men, their justification*, took place before they came to faith.<sup>iii</sup>

Notice how Pieper equates “the reconciliation between God and men” with their justification! But—does he really consider them identical, or does one simply follow the other so closely that *for all practical purposes* they can be equated? “If God is reconciled . . . then he has evidently in his heart absolved them of their sins.” Why this absolution? *Is it only* because of Christ's death, or does it follow from the fact that “God has for Christ's sake dismissed from His heart all wrath against men” as well? The answer is not clear here.

In 1916 Pieper said on the subject of reconciliations:

But wherein does reconciliation consist? In other words, what does reconciliation involve? God's reconciliation of the world does not mean that men have changed their attitude toward God, as these words (2 Cor 5:19) have erroneously been explained; for men, ignorant of God's reconciliation, could never change their attitude toward Him.

No, the reconciliation of the world consists in this, that God “in Christ,” or for Christ's sake, *changed His own sentiment toward man*. St. Paul writes: “Not imputing their trespasses unto them.” Sin rendered man guilty and thus subject to God's displeasure, and despite all his own efforts he could never have placated the divine wrath. However, for Christ's sake God does not impute man's trespasses unto him; that is to say, He forgives him his sin and regards him as sinless. Indeed, God has erased the record of man's sins from His book; *in His divine heart grace has taken the place of wrath*.

...Reconciliation is complete so far as God's *disposition* (emphasis in original) is concerned; in God's heart the forgiveness of sins has been substituted for the imputation of sins.<sup>iv</sup> (emphasis mine in this and the previous quotes except where indicated)

Thus Pieper says that in God's heart forgiveness of sins has been substituted for the imputation of sins, grace has taken the place of wrath. But is he, for all of this, really saying anything different from that of the second view mentioned earlier? Does Pieper's “change of heart” really refer to anything different from an objective change of status, a change only God knows about and one, therefore, which God must proclaim to the world? Consider what he writes in his *Dogmatics*:

The καταλλάσσειν of Rom 5:10 and 2 Cor 5:19 does not refer—let this fact be noted—to any change that occurs in men, but describes an occurrence in the heart of God. It was God who laid His anger by on account of the ransom brought by Christ. It was God who at that time already had in His heart forgiven the sins of the whole world, for *the statement*: “*God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself*” means—and that is not our, but the Apostle's own interpretation—that God did “not impute their trespasses unto them,” And “not imputing trespasses” is, according to Scripture (Rom. 4:6-8). synonymous with “forgive sins,” “justifying” the sinner.<sup>v</sup>(emphasis mine)

Here Pieper doesn't mention any change from hatred into grace. In fact, he says the same thing we will hear Hoenecke say later: "...the statement: 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself' means—and that is not our, but the Apostle's own interpretation—that God did 'not impute their trespasses unto them.'"

Elsewhere Pieper states:

As we saw, this reconciliation does not consist of a change of attitude (*Sinnesänderung*) of men, but in a change of attitude on the side of God (Pieper states in a footnote that he's resorting to "anthropomorphism" here) in this way, that God, in himself, "before his divine Forum," allows the forgiveness of their sins to take the place of his wrath over the sins of men, *μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν* [2 Cor. 5:19]; *δι' ἐνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς* [Rom. 5:18]. The issue in these scriptural assertions (regarding reconciliation) is not merely that of a new relationship between God and men, but entirely and expressly that of an act of God with reference to men; namely, concerning the act of God whereby he does not impute to men their sin, forgives their sin, justifies them in his heart. This is the signification of the objective reconciliation as it is taught in 2 Cor 5:19, Ro 5:18,19; 5:10; 4:25.<sup>vi</sup>

I will offer just one more quote from Pieper at this point: "*At that time*, when God reconciled the world to himself through Christ, God did not impute to the world of men its sin, *that is*, he allowed grace to take the place of wrath against the world of men in himself (*bei sich*), 'before his Forum.'"<sup>vii</sup>

Let's now proceed to the words of some of Pieper's colleagues and students. As we do, look for the emphasis on the change from anger into grace or forgiveness and reconciliation viewed as an appeasement of God's wrath, A. L. Graebner, quoted earlier, writes:

...by the same judicial act by which he pronounced him guilty who was the world's substitute, God acquitted and absolved the world whose sin and guilt he laid to the charge of the Mediator, *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.* That their trespasses were not imputed unto them left them that were sinners in themselves sinless and guiltless in the judgement of God. The imputation of the sins of the world to Christ was *eo ipso* a justification of the world. And as the imputation of our sins to Christ was general and complete, all the sins, the iniquity of us all, being laid on the lamb of God, so the absolution and justification of sinners in that judgment of God *indicated* (emphasis mine!) a complete reconciliation of the world unto himself, inasmuch as our iniquities, which had separated between us and our God, our sins, which had hid his face from us (Is 59:2), were imputed and atoned by our substitute.<sup>viii</sup>

Notice that here God's absolution and justification of sinners *indicates* a complete reconciliation of the world to himself. The logical conclusion, then, is that reconciliation itself is not only connected with the fact that our sins were *imputed to Christ*, but also, and apparently more importantly, were *atoned for by Christ*. Graebner continues, "By the exaltation of Christ, the Father gloriously proclaimed to all the world that Jesus Christ, to whom he had imputed the sins of the world, had accepted that imputation and suffered its consequences, had borne the curse of the law, *had quenched the fires of God's righteous wrath* . . ."<sup>ix</sup> Here, then, is where God's anger disappears, allowing grace to take its place. Graebner concludes his discussion of this section:

When God imputed the sins of the world to Christ, he truly absolved the world, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and the promulgation of the world's reconciliation in Christ's resurrection was the proclamation of a full pardon and amnesty to a rebellious world . . . But even as God did not by force restrain man from disestablishing his primeval relation to God, so he will not by force constrain man to accept *the reestablishment of that relation. his*

*reconciliation to God.* When man rejects the amnesty which is in the heart of God and is proclaimed in the Gospel, God does not force his peace upon a recalcitrant subject. There is righteousness for sinners in Christ, but in Christ only, He who rejects Christ rejects the righteousness of God.<sup>x</sup>

Let's turn now to our "own" John Schaller, a professor at our seminary but one who did not share the view of Adolf Hoenecke. He writes in his *Biblical Christology*:

Reconciliation: This is the proper rendering of καταλλαγή, καταλλάσσειν, ἀποκαταλλάσσω (2 Cor 5:18f; Ro 5:10f; Col 1:20), since the "change" note the αλλ in these words!) is *a change into another state of mind, the change from a God deeply offended by our sin to a God at peace with the world.* The propitiatory work of Christ effects the permanent reconciliation of God. Announcing this fact, the gospel is the word of reconciliation. To preach this gospel is the ministry of reconciliation enjoined upon the church. The message proclaims "the peace of God which passeth all understanding" (Php 4:7; Ro 5:1), not the feeling of restful peace in the hearts of men, *but the peace prevailing in the heart of God.* If we find that *the idea of reconciliation bears a close resemblance to those of propitiation and satisfaction*, so that we slip from the one into the other almost without noticing it, we need not be disturbed; for we are not called upon to establish a regular logical sequence of these terms, but to accept each one at its full value without cavil.<sup>xi</sup> (emphasis mine)

Here we see a little more clearly the real difference between the two views we are dealing with in this paper. The one actually connects reconciliation to propitiation and satisfaction; the other to justification. So Schaller also writes: "According to the Scriptures, the reconciliation resulting from the vicarious obedience of Christ was indeed an at-one-ment, an establishment of peace between God and mankind after the enmity which had existed by reason of man's sin."<sup>xii</sup> What about the fact that 2 Cor 5:19 literally states that the world was reconciled to God, not God to the world? "It is a common way of speaking that an offender becomes reconciled to him whom he offended (Mt. 5:24; 1 Cor 7:11), *though surely reconciliation is effected by the forgiving attitude of the offended person.*"<sup>xiii</sup> (emphasis mine)

Elsewhere Schaller writes to say that:

καταλλάσσειν does not as ἰλάσκεσθαι point to the way in which the reconciliation was brought about, also not really wherein the reconciliation actually consists. It says rather that the relationship between two parties has been *fundamentally changed*, God changes His relationship to the world. It is essentially this with respect to reconciliation that here comes into consideration.<sup>xiv</sup>

So far Schaller sounds very much like Hoenecke! But he goes on to say:

From other passages we know very well what the relationship between both was previously: as children of wrath (Eph 2:3) men were under the curse of the law (Ga 3:13); God, offended by sin, was incensed against them with a wrath that burned to the deepest hell. If a change in this relationship has set in, men have peace with God (Ro 5:1) and *grace has taken the place of wrath.*<sup>xv</sup> (emphasis mine)

Schaller also says:

We turn now to the other two participial clauses in (2 Cor 5) verse 19: Not imputing their trespasses unto them and giving to us the word of reconciliation. Without a doubt, the sequence

of the participial clauses in this verse is to present *the actual, at least logical sequence of the actions of God: first reconciliation. Then non-imputation*, then transmission of the word of reconciliation... If we... were to assume that *μὴ λογιζόμενος* is to present the way and manner in which God made Himself the reconciled one, the resultant thought would be: He changed His mind in that He overlooked the sins of the world. (Notes: The counter argument is simply that God makes it clear *why* he can do this elsewhere—v. 21, for instance—so that sins are not simply “overlooked”.) This, however, contradicts not only all clear conceptions of a reconciliation, *in which the non-imputation of the guilt is conceivable only after the appeasement of the offended*, but it at the same time poses the possibility that God has suppressed His holiness with its principled opposition against sin and His righteousness with its irrevocable demands for punishment, set them aside, rendered them inoperative, in short that in this matter and in this transaction He has denied or relinquished a part of His unchangeable essence.<sup>xvi</sup> (emphasis mine)

From the emphasized sections above, it certainly seems fair to say that reconciliation for Schaller in 2 Cor 5:19 is identical, for all practical purposes, with satisfaction, “appeasement of the offended”, rather than justification of the sinful world. That this is entirely fair we see from Schaller’s further comments:

If, however, *μὴ λογιζόμενος* denotes an action *which is not identical with reconciliation nor is presupposed by it*, then Luther is correctly interpreting when he inserts an “and,” which Paul did not have. *And did not impute their trespasses unto them.* (emphasis Schaller’s). This sequence of thought Paul now indicates by means of *καὶ* before *θέμενος*; for *also* with respect to this second participle it is obvious that therewith *not a presupposition but a consequence of reconciliation is to be expressed*... Thus the giving or establishing of this Word (of reconciliation) is a consequence of the reconciliation and therefore at the same time includes the knowledge of *the justification of the sinner, which indeed is involved in the reconciliation, but is not identical with it.*

Accordingly *having reconciled* the world for Himself, *having made* the reconciliation with the world a reality, God did not impute their sins to them...<sup>xvii</sup> (emphasis mine)

...And so the results of our discussion thus far can be expressed as follows: God on His part made the reconciliation of the whole world a reality, is reconciled to the whole world, has made peace with it; *as the reconciled One, because He was reconciled, He then of necessity forgave the sins to the same world, justified it*...<sup>xviii</sup> (emphasis mine)

We find our last witness for this view of reconciliation, E.W.A. Koehler, in complete agreement with Schaller:

God reconciled the world unto Himself by setting the world right with Himself, in exacting full satisfaction for or the shortcomings of man... While the wrath God against sin itself continues as before, Ps. 5:4, there was by this reconciliation effected a change in the mind and attitude of God towards sinners. His righteous wrath was appeased by the blood of His Son, I John 2:2... Because of the redemption by Christ there is now in God “good will toward men.” ...Accepting the sacrifice of His Son for the reconciliation of the world, God did not impute their trespasses unto them, 2 Cor. 5:19....the nonimputation of sins is in our text not presented as merely purposed and intended, but as a fact which took place then and there; *it was the immediate effect of the reconciliation*.<sup>xix</sup> (emphasis mine)

In our way of thinking we indeed differentiate between redemption, reconciliation and justification as Paul does in 2 Cor, 5:19. But we may not separate them nor change the order in which they are named, *for they are as closely related to each other as cause and effect*. By the work of redemption Christ achieved our reconciliation unto God, and the *immediate effect of this reconciliation was the nonimputation of our sins... justification presupposes the reconciliation* and the atonement by Christ. We may not think of one and forget the other two. Because Christ lived and died for us, that is why we are reconciled to God, and *because we are reconciled to God, that is why He does not impute our trespasses to us.*<sup>xx</sup> (emphasis mine)

We could perhaps take Koehler to task for labeling reconciliation as separate from redemption when he says, as he does, that “there was *by this reconciliation* affected a change in the mind and attitude of God towards sinners.” Isn’t this change the very reconciliation itself according to his distinction between redemption, reconciliation and justification? Setting this “slip” aside, what might we now conclude from the above testimonies? It seems to me that if one sees the non-imputation of sins as separate from and a *result* of the reconciling in 2 Cor 5:19, rather than a description of the same act, *and at the same time* separates this reconciliation from redemption or the atonement (satisfaction) rendered by Christ by which God’s justice is satisfied, all one is really left with here is an *appeasement of God’s wrath* which has to be distinguished from the *appeasement of his justice*. This, then, is the so-called “*Unstimmung Gottes*,” from an angry, incensed God into a loving, gracious God, so that the God who was going to punish is now ready and willing to forgive—which, it must be said, he does immediately. God’s justice is satisfied, therefore he can cease his anger and can now be friendly and gracious toward the sinful world, and in this new (?) attitude of grace he now forgives the sinful world its sin. Reconciliation in this view is definitely not a change of relationship in the sense of a change of status on the part of the world (which, nevertheless, must still be acknowledged under justification, “not imputing to them their sins.”). Reconciliation is a change, pure and simple, in the relationship of God’s “heart” or mind or attitude toward sinful mankind: “God’s anger was turned into grace.”<sup>xxi</sup>

Before we consider the validity of this conclusion ourselves, let’s now go to the orthodox Lutheran who challenged this idea of an “*Umstimmung Gottes*” in καταλλάσσω, where he thought it out of place, Adolf Hoenecke. Forgive me for the lengthy section I now place before you, but I felt it would be good to see this entire section in context as we note the important points Hoenecke raises that pertain to the subject before us.

## Section 50. The High Priestly Office of Jesus Christ (*De officio sacerdotali Jesu Christi*)

*Doctrinal Proposition I.* That Christ holds the office of High Priest, the Bible states in part, in that it calls him a priest, and, in part, in that it attributes to him priestly functions.

*Comment:* The Bible attributes the high priestly office to Christ both *directly* and *indirectly*:

- 1) *Directly*, in that it calls him “priest” and “high priest” (Ps 110:4; Zch 6:13; He 2:17; 3:1; 4:14,15; 5:5,10; 6:20; chapter 7; 8:1-4; 9:11; 10:21).
- 2) *Indirectly*, in that it:
  - A. speaks of him with *expressions* that relate to the *priesthood*:
    - a. *to take upon himself the sins of the people* (Jn 1:29; 2 Cor 5:21; Ga 3:13,14).
    - b. *to sacrifice himself to God* (I Tm 2:6; He 7:27; 9:12; 10:10,12,14).
    - c. *to wear priestly clothing* (Eze 9:2; Dn 10:5,6; Zch 3:5f; Is 61:10; Ps 45:8; Ro 1:13)
  - B. attributes *priestly functions* to him:
    - a. *to make satisfaction to God (versoehnen Gott) through sacrifice* (He 8:3; 5:1; Lv 17:11; 1:4; 6:30; Ex 28:22,30 (? - I believe this reference is incorrect!); 29:36; Lv



- 4:20; 5:10,13,18, where forgiveness is referred to as the *fruit* of sacrifice). This is attributed to Christ in He 9:26,28; Eph 5:2; I Pe 2:24.
- b. *to make intercession with God* (Ex 28:29; Lv 16:12; Lk 1:9,10; 1 Kgs 8:30). This is attributed to Christ in He 5:7; 7:25; 9:24; Is 53:12; Ro 8:34; 1 Jn 2:1.
  - c. *the benediction* (Nu 6:22f). This is attributed to Christ in Lk 24:50,51; Jn 20:19,21.

The *terms* which occur in the Bible for *reconciliation* (*Versöhnung*) are:

1. καταλλάσσω (Ro 5:10; 2 Cor 5:18,19). The *meaning* of this word is: to change, exchange (*verwechseln austauschen*); then, to make one's peace with someone, reconcile (*aussoehnen*). In the *active* it is found only in 2 Cor 5:18,19; in the *passive* (to be reconciled) in 2 Cor 5:20; 1 Cor 7:11; Ro 5:10. It occurs with reference to God in all the cited passages with the exception of 1 Cor 7:11 where it is used with reference to a woman and reconciliation to her husband. *Quenstedt* (Theol. did. pol., pars III, cap. III, memb. II, sect. I, thes. XXII, p. 223), following *Budaeus* (Guillaume Bude, French scholar, b. 1467 at Paris, royal librarian, d. 1540. Among his many philosophical, philological and judicial works, his *Commentarius linguae graecae*, Venice, 1548, is especially esteemed. It is precisely to this work that Quenstedt refers here. A descendant of his was the later Joh. Franz Buddeus.), assigns as the sense of the word: "It signifies such a reconciliation as that certain change by which the *offended* party becomes, as it were, another person, not with respect to himself, but with respect to the *offender*." (Note Pieper and those who follow him would also accept this definition. Hoenecke's difference with them is still coming up.) Quenstedt intimates the correct thing, Here it is not a matter which concerns both parties who are at odds with each other, God and the world, but only the *offended* party, God. It is certainly not the case that God reconciles the world to himself in that he, for instance changes its attitude toward himself through conversion. If it were, how could the invitation be subsequently issued, "Be reconciled"?

Now it is a question of whether the reconciliation, in which God reconciles the world to himself, consists of a *change* of God's *disposition* overagainst the world. The answer reads: *No!* For nothing indicates this in the subordinate clauses embodied in the Scripture references cited above, which say nothing of a change of God's disposition, but speak only of certain arrangements, judicial facts and attestations, such as "not to impute sin," and, "to make Christ to be sin." And again, Romans 5:8-10 speaks decisively against such a change. Here, love is the *starting point* (v.8). It cannot, therefore, be first the result of the καταλλαγή. And then it says that we receive the καταλλαγή through Christ, an expression which does not harmonize with an emotion in God. Further, v.9 says that as we are rescued δικαιωθέντες...σωθησόμεθα...ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. And in a proposition entirely parallel to this, v.10 says: If we, yet as enemies, κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ through the death of Christ, thus, as καταλλαγέντες, how much more will we be rescued, namely, manifestly, ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς, as in v.9. If the καταλλάσσω as an act of God were now the changing of God's attitude from wrath into love, v.10 would thus be a *meaningless, repetitious proposition* with this sense: Thus, after we have been freed from God's wrath, καταλλαγέντες, we will, much more, be rescued from his wrath. From all of this it is certain that θεὸς...κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ (2 Cor 5:19) does not declare as the reconciling activity of God his bringing his bringing the world into a friendly, loving disposition toward himself. Nor, moreover, is it giving a changed disposition of his heart to the world. Rather, it is his changing the *relationship* between God and the world in such a way that the world no longer has to appear as the one separated from him and damned by sin, in conformity with his justice. The καταλλάσσω on God's part is the

*cancellation of sin and the imputation of guilt which occurred in Christ with respect to the world*, as the explanatory *μη λογιζόμενος* in v.19 says, as well as v. 21 which asserts that the imputation which absolutely could not have been left undone, has occurred with respect to Christ. Cf. Romans 3:25, *ὃν προέθετο θεὸς ἱλαστήριον*. God changes the relationship between himself and the world in that he becomes, as Budaeus says, another person with respect to the sinner. The *καταλλάσσειν* as an act of God's reconciliation is, in truth, essentially the *objective, universal pardon or justification of the whole world from sin and guilt in Christ*, which must and will become a subjective, special pardon or justification by faith. And so it happens that in Ro 5:9,10 *δικαιωθέντες* and *καταλλαγέντες* are placed *parallel* to the similarly concluded *σωθησόμεθα...ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς*.

It goes without saying, moreover, that because we don't conceive the active *καταλλάσσειν* as an activity of God in the sense of a change of God's attitude toward the world from anger into love, we therefore do not at any time deny the doctrine of the *wrath of God* and, for this sake, we thus conceive the *καταλλάσσειν* as we do. This is, to be sure, the case with *von Hofmann* (as well), but his own concern, which is inimical to Scripture cannot prevent that *καταλλάσσειν* be conceived of similarly if it is correct according to Scripture itself.

It may also be noted that the passive, as it stands in 2 Cor 5:20, now says "Be reconciled!" that is, "Be transferred into this blessed relationship of peace, in as much as God does not impute guilt to the sinner!"

The doubly-prefixed *ἀποκαταλλάσσειν* (Col 1:20; Eph 2:16) has altogether the same sense as *καταλλάσσω*. In the *ἀπό* there is contained the reference to the restoration of the onetime relationship between God and man in the state of innocence.

2. *ἱλάσκεσθαι* and *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* (to expiate, atone for (*suehnen*)), then to *reconcile*, appease, placate (*versoehnen*). *Quenstedt* says that the word refers to two different things (L. c., observ. 2, p. 223):
  1. To expiate, or to compensate (make good, equalize) the guilt of sin by means of a sin offering (*Expiare, seu reatum peccati piaculo compensare*).
  2. To placate, appease, and render gracious, to propitiate; and it is customary for these verbs to be connected grammatically with the accusative designating the person whose wrath is to be averted.

The first is correct. As He 2:17 demonstrates, the basic meaning of *ἱλάσκεσθαι* is this: to cover sin before God through a sacrifice. It does not, however, mean "to render or make God gracious" (*Deum propitium reddere*), as *Quenstedt* incorrectly assumes. It does not stand with the accusative of the person to be reconciled, nor does *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* as well. Only in Gn 32:30 and Zch 7:2 in the LXX does it occur with the accusative of the person to be reconciled. It is not the proper biblical usage (*Sprachgebrauch*) that God is the object to be reconciled of *ἱλάσκεσθαι*. However, Greek profane literature has it thus. This is understandable. Heathendom knows only a god who must first be put into a favorable mood for him to bestow kindness on unworthy men. The Christian revelation teaches a God who, in mercy, is already favorably disposed from eternity, and did not ordain an atonement (*Suehnung*) for guilt whereby he first becomes gracious (*gnadig werde*), but rather one whereby sin is covered and his justice is not compelled to let its merited wrath rule and, on the contrary, he is able to let his eternal mercy take its course.

The Old Testament *kipper* corresponds to *ἱλάσκομαι*, which has a double meaning:

1. To cover sin *by means of a sacrifice*, so that it can be forgiven. It is often used in this way. Ps 49:7: “Nor anyone reconcile God (*Noch Gotte jemand versöhnen*)”. This doesn’t mean: “nor is anyone able to reconcile God.” Literally it says: “Nor will he give God *kaphro*, i.e., that which covers him (the sinner), by which God could cover the sinner.
2. From this meaning is derived: to cover sins *by means of forgiveness (durch Vergebung)* by pardoning. In this case, God is then the subject, cf. Jr 18:23; Ps 79:9 (*wekhapper al hate thenu*, according to Luther, “Forgive us our sins; literally, “cover over” our sins). *Kipper* occurs with the accusative of the thing to be covered, or, rather, with *al* as does the verb *casah* also.—Ne 39:7; Ps 32:1, 85:3; Ps 65:4; Dt 21:8. This is the underlying meaning when ἰλάσκομαι has the meaning “to be gracious, have mercy on” (Lk 18:13).

The relationship of both words denoting the reconciliation, καταλλάσσειν and ἰλάσκεσθαι, is, according to the preceding, this: καταλλάσσειν and ἀποκαταλλάσσειν in the active voice, with God as the subject, mean to reconcile, and, without a doubt, in the sense that *God withdraws the claim of his justice against sinners*; While ἰλάσκεσθαι means “to reconcile” in the sense that *a satisfaction occurs (es auf die Genugtuung geht), by virtue of which God can abrogate his claim without injury to his holiness and justice*. In the case of καταλλάσσειν, God is the subject. In the case of ἰλάσκεσθαι, however, either *Christ* is the subject, representing mankind, or mankind which was represented by Christ naturally on the basis of Christ’s position as substitute (*Stellvertreterschaft*). Hence Christ himself is also called, in the abstract, ἰλασμός, for our sins (I Jn 2:2; 4:10) and ἰλαστήριον (Ro 3:25). The latter is properly the place of sacrifice, *kaphoreth* (LXX: ἰλαστήριον). He 9:5 clearly occurs with this meaning, and Ro 3:25 as well, in that, by way of synecdoche, that on which something rests (*continens*) the altar, stands for that which rests upon it (*contentum*) the sacrifice. Christ, now, can be designated in this way because he is indeed, not only the *sacrificing priest*, but also the *priestly sacrifice*.<sup>xxii</sup>

What can we conclude from Hoenecke here? A change has taken place between God and the world. The sinful world’s attitude toward God hasn’t changed. But, as Hoenecke concludes, neither does Scripture in the context of καταλλάσσειν anywhere indicate an *Umstimmung des Gemüts Gottes*, “change in the heart or disposition of God.” Rather, as Hoenecke says above, “The καταλλάσσω on God’s part is the cancellation of sin and the imputation of guilt which occurred in Christ with respect to the world, as the explanatory μὴ λογιζόμενος in v. 19 says, as well as v. 21, which asserts that the imputation, which absolutely could not have been left undone, has occurred with respect to Christ.”

Building on Hoenecke on this point, his student J.P. Meyer writes:

Paul...gives us a definition of καταλλάσσειν in the following verse. He announces his explanatory remarks as such by ὥς ὅτι: the whole matter took place *in this way that*. For the present we disregard other remarks and concentrate on the one which describes the nature of καταλλάσσειν. Paul uses a participle to do so. God performed His καταλλάσσειν of the world μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, not imputing their trespasses unto them. The καταλλάσσειν is basically an act of accounting, imputing, of charging. The world had trespassed. Every individual found in that group of beings which are summarily called the world transgressed the commandments of God, and thereby burdened himself with a heavy load of guilt, if his trespasses were to be charged against his account. But God in His mercy decided not to do that. He did not impute their trespasses to the sinners. To whom God imputed them, Paul does not state at once in express words. He does not leave us in doubt, however, saying that God performed this καταλλάσσειν through Christ and in Christ. In vs. 21 he will tell us directly that God made Christ to be sin for us.

We thus see that καταλλαγή does not denote a change in the nature of the sinner, in the attitude of his heart. That change will take place when he is led by the Spirit to accept in faith the offered καταλλαγή. The change occurred in the standing of the sinner before his Judge. Before Christ's intervention took place God regarded him as a guilt laden condemned culprit. After Christ's intervention and through Christ's intervention He regards him as a guilt-free saint. The *nature* of the sinner has not changed. *God* did not undergo a change, did not experience a change of heart. The *status* of the sinner was changed.<sup>xxiii</sup>

On this same point we add here the observations of a student of Meyer, David P. Kuske. Commenting on the verb καταλλάσσω, first used in I Cor 5:18, he writes:

The root meaning of the word suggests a complete change (κατα = perfective, ἀλλάσσω which has the same root as ἄλλος = change or alter). The New Testament usage indicates that this root meaning of the word still prevails. Besides the use of this verb here in 2 Corinthians 5, it is also used in a very similar context in Romans 5:10, "if when we were God's *enemies*, we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son how much more, having been *reconciled* shall we be saved through his life." Note the emphasis of the *change of status* from God's enemies to those who can stand before him without fear. In a somewhat different context in I Corinthians 7:11 καταλλάσσω is used to describe the change of status of a woman, "She must *remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband*." In this case the change is a return to a *former* status as wife. It is this idea of bringing back or restoring to a former position which is also the meaning of καταλλάσσω in Colossians 1:21-22, "You were alienated from God and were enemies in your minds because of your evil behavior. But now he has reconciled you by Christ's physical body through death to present you holy in his sight."

To summarize: καταλλάσσω means to make or bring about a complete change; when used with a personal object it most often refers to a change in the status of an individual by restoring him or her to a former status. Thus the meaning also to restore friendship between two people who have become enemies or to "reconcile".

What exactly is the change of status which is meant in this context? In the next verse (19) Paul gives the details (ὡς ὅτι). There we will see that the change is not something which took place either in the heart or mind of God or man. Rather it simply a change in the legal status of a sinner before God.<sup>xxiv</sup>

What about a change from *wrath* to *love* or *grace* in particular, then? As Hoenecke points out, Scripture makes it clear that love is the *starting point* of God's reconciling activity (Ro 5:8-10). And in his subsequent remarks, dealing with the other Greek verbs Luther translated with the same German verb, *versoehnen*, "to reconcile," Hoenecke definitely rejects reconciliation as an act of appeasing God's anger *in the sense that* it now, for the first time, renders or makes God gracious as if his righteous anger and his gracious love could not both exist at the same time, As he says above, "The Christian revelation teaches a God who, in mercy, is already favorably disposed from eternity, and did not ordain an atonement for guilt whereby he first becomes gracious, but rather one whereby sin is covered and his justice is not compelled to let its merited wrath rule and, on the contrary, he is able to let his eternal mercy take its course."

To this same point Meyer writes:

It is important to note that Paul traces the entire matter of justification peace, etc., to God's love as its source. God's love is present and productive at the very beginning. It is the motivating cause of our καταλλαγή. There are some who assume that καταλλάσσειν points to a change in God, that during the process He changed from an irate into a placated God, that some sort of

appeasement took place.—But no, not the least change took place in the heart of God. It was His love which was active during the entire process of καταλλάσσειν. The change was effected in our status before our Judge.<sup>xxv</sup>

Treating the μὴ λογιζόμενος in 2 Cor 5:19, Kuske writes:

It is important to note that this appositional μὴ λογιζόμενος makes God's act of reconciliation basically one of negative accounting (i.e., not imputing, or not charging) rather than some kind of inner change in God or in man. God never changed in either his love or his justice; he loved man ἐν Χριστῷ, and ἐν Χριστῷ the justice which God's holiness required as the punishment for sin was satisfied completely...The only change which took place as a result of God's Christ-worked-world-reconciliation was in every sinner's account before God.<sup>xxvi</sup>

We see that those who hold the above position seem to find fault with those who speak of reconciliation as a change in the heart of God from wrath into grace for the reasons that 1) God does not change; and 2) it is improper to view Christ's work of atonement or satisfaction as if God's anger had to be appeased before he could become gracious to sinful mankind. His righteous justice had to be satisfied so that mankind would not remain under its well-deserved wrath, but it was God's loving grace which moved him to provide the atonement through Jesus.

I think that there is no doubt that we would agree with the statements of Hoenecke, Meyer and Kuske as expressions of Scripture truth. We only need two Bible passages for proofs "He who is the Glory of Israel *does not lie or change his mind*; for he is not a man, that he should change his mind" (1 Sm. 15:29); "This is love; not that we loved God, but that *he loved us and sent his Son* as an atoning sacrifice for our sins" (1 Jn 4:10). Other passages could, of course, be quoted, but these two suffice to establish the scriptural truth of 1) and 2) above.

But does this automatically mean that the view of Pieper and those who follow him is unscriptural? If they, too, can find scriptural support for their position, then both *views* must be allowed, even if a person opts for one over the other. With this in mind, let's take the first argument against Pieper's view of the reconciliation that occurred in Christ: "God does not change."

Pieper writes that as far as the argument against speaking of a change in God is concerned, this is really:

...a direct criticism of the manner in which the Holy Spirit speaks in Scripture. The Holy Spirit testifies very well to the "eternal immutability" of God (Ps 102:25-28), and this must be maintained by all means. But because we men, due to the *finiteness* of our own powers of comprehension, cannot encompass the "eternal immutability" of God and, what's more, all our thoughts necessarily move in time and space, *the Bible itself* thus instructs us to think of matters in the immutable God as *before* and *after* one another. On the basis of Scripture, we must not think of the *wrath* of God against men as *before*, but *after* man's sins. And we must let the forgiveness of sins follow upon the reconciliation (or atonement) through Christ in our thoughts (*in puncto rationis*). (Notice one of our problems here. In German the word *Versoehnung* is used for both "reconciliation" and "atonement, propitiation," and the verb *versoehnen* means both to reconcile and to appease, placate. I believe that at least part of the difficulty concerning the concept of "reconciliation" stems from Luther's German translation rather than the Holy Spirit's Greek.) The Bible speaks throughout of a *beginning* and *cessation* of God's wrath as well as God's grace (Pieper is no doubt referring here to all those cases where God "turned his face away" from his people, kindling his wrath against them, only to turn his wrath away again later and graciously look down on his people once again. But to what did his people appeal when they found themselves under his anger? His mercy and love and grace, showing that as far as they

were concerned his love and grace and mercy had only “ceased” as far as their own outward perception of the manifestations of these changeless “emotions” on God’s part in their own earthly lives was concerned. As we shall see, we can assume that Pieper means the same here—but I’m getting ahead of myself!). This occurs by divine condescension to our human powers of comprehension. And where we men won’t admit this conception offered to us by God himself under an appeal to God’s “eternal immutability,” we thus rob ourselves of the revelation of God in the Bible intended for our powers of comprehension, and go astray. The old theologians have worked through the “problem” of the eternity and immutability of God on the one hand, and “God’s entrance into history” on the other hand, very carefully on the basis of Scripture. They comprehend the result in this way: “In God, no *causae causantes*, (“causing causes”) are given *formaliter* (formally, i.e., actually) that is, God in his immutable, for us incomprehensible, majesty). Nevertheless, “causing causes” are given *virtualiter* (virtually) or *in puncto rationis* (conceptually, i.e., to our human way of thinking) (This is God, as he presents himself in the Bible for human apprehension)... Thus, on the one hand, on the basis of Scripture we must maintain that the decree of the reconciliation (or, atonement) of the world through Christ belongs to immutable *eternity*; (but) on the other hand, Scripture teaches us to think of a *change in God’s disposition* (*Umstimmung Gottes*) or a transformation of his wrath into grace, which was accomplished by Christ’s work and suffering in the fullness of time more than 1900 years ago.<sup>xxvii</sup>

I do not believe that any of us would have any quarrel with Pieper here—at least with the basic argument for the propriety of speaking about a *change* taking place in God. We all accept the fact that Scripture does speak of God both anthropomorphically and anthropopathically (attributing to God human form and characteristics as well as human feelings and emotions). We are all familiar the passages that speak of God “repenting” (KJV/NIV: “relent”; AM “change his mind”—the same Hebrew verb used in I Sm 15:29 quoted above), cf. Ex 32:14 for one of many cases. And regardless of how we may feel about καταλλάσσω in 2 Cor 5:19, we deal with the apparent “changes” in God elsewhere just as Pieper does. The fact that God *can* be said to “change” elsewhere, however, does not necessarily mean that καταλλάσσω refers to a change in God here or anywhere else it is used.

More important, of course, is the claim of a *change in God’s disposition* here, a “transformation of his wrath into grace”. But again, we must ask, is Hoenecke’s argument valid against Pieper’s view and those who hold it? If Pieper and those who hold his view absolutely denied God’s love or grace for sinful mankind before Christ satisfied God’s justice-appeased God’s wrath, if you will—then they would justly fall under Hoenecke’s rebuke and denial of their position, Hoenecke rightly wants to uphold the biblical truth that it was a loving and gracious Father who sent his Son to die for sinful mankind. And what does Pieper say?

A further objection: Since the death of Christ manifests God’s love (Rom 5:8: “God commendeth His love toward us in that... Christ died for us”), the death of Christ cannot possibly have taken place for the purpose of appeasing the wrath of God.—According to Scripture, Christ’s death reveals both God’s love and God’s wrath. This truth is brought out in this very passage, Rom. 5:8-11: “Hated by God (*Deo inveni*, lying under God’s wrath (Pieper’s view of ἐχθροί as passive here, “hated” rather than “hater, enemy” is possible, but by no means any more likely than the other)), we were reconciled to God.” Love prompts God to reconcile us to Himself by the death of His Son, that is, to render satisfaction to His punitive justice. (Notice how this is exactly the same definition Hoenecke would accept for ἱλάσκεσθαι, to atone!). Scripture teaches that God’s compassionate will or love does not preclude the settlement with the righteousness of God, but includes it.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Pieper said in 1916: "...it was His great love that moved Him to satisfy His righteousness through the death of His Son, which was impossible for us to accomplish."<sup>xxix</sup> And thus we see that Pieper does not deny in any way that God was also gracious to sinful mankind and loved sinful mankind before Christ completed his work of atonement, and that his love and grace moved him to supply this atonement. But a realization of the possibility of the wrong picture of God, as a wrathful God who must first be appeased before he will be gracious, arising from Pieper's view of the reconciliation is voiced by Theodore Graebner at the conclusion of his answer to the question, "God reconciled to us or we reconciled to God?":

As usually found in Scripture, the statement reads that we have been reconciled to God. As generally stated in our literature and preaching, it reads that God has been reconciled to us, that His wrath has been appeased. Our orthodox teachers point out that both must be exhibited, the love of God and the wrath of God. God loves us as His creatures; He is angry with us because we transgress His Law. His love is revealed in the sending of His Son into the flesh to be slain for us; His anger was wreaked in the sentence of condemnation passed upon His Son. Our theologians distinguish *caritas generalis Dei*, revealed in His sending a Redeemer for all men (Hoenecke mentions this in his *Dogmatik* as *amor specialis*), and *caritas specialis Dei*, the love of God for the redeemed soul, the effect of the reconciliation made through Christ (Hoenecke, as far as I can tell, does not make this distinction, but distinguishes as the next level or sphere of love *amor specialissimus*, his love for *believers*). Hence, says Calovius, "it is in complete agreement with Scripture to say: Christ has reconciled God to us, and God, out of love for us, has sent Christ to become the Author of our reconciliation."

Young preachers, in treating the "reconciliation," are apt to stress the love of the Son as opposed to the wrath of the Father. The impression is made that the Father was bent upon executing His wrath upon the sinful world and was prevented from doing so only by the fact that the Son interposed His merits and, as it were, stopped the uplifted arm of justice which was about to descend upon the sinner. Such statements are at variance with the truth that the Father loved us before His Son died for us, I John 4,10. A close study of the relevant texts will help you avoid a mode of presentation which ignores the fact that it was the love of the Father which caused Him to send forth His Son.<sup>xxx</sup>

I think it's safe to say that Graebner speaks directly to the point Hoenecke wanted to make with his stress against the idea of a "change" in the heart or disposition of God. And so we see that those who hold Pieper's view certainly do not deny God's love and grace before the completion of Christ's work of atonement. But why do they stress a "transformation of God's wrath into grace" then? Certainly a part of it is simply the fact that this is the view a sinner has as he is brought from the message of the law to the message of the Gospel. The law told him: "You are not a God who takes pleasure in evil; with you the wicked cannot dwell. The arrogant cannot stand in your presence: *you hate all who do wrong*" (Ps 5:4,5). God is the God "who does not leave the guilty unpunished" (Ex. 34:7) and the law informs the sinner, "It is a dreadful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (He 10:31). God hates him and will punish him! But now what does this terrified sinner heart hopeless before the righteous wrath and hatred of God's justice? He hears Jesus say, "Come to me, all you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls" (Mt 11:28,29). He hears John the Baptist proclaim, "Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!" (Jn 1:29); hears the apostle John proclaim, "But if anybody does sin, we have one who speaks to the Father in our defense—Jesus Christ, the Righteous One. He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not only for ours but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 Jn 2:1b,2).

And how did this all happen? Jesus, God's Son, "was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed. We all,

like sheep, have gone astray, each of us has turned to his own way; and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all...it was the Lord's will to crush him and cause him to suffer..." (Is 53:5,6,10a). Surely from the sinner's point of view it seems as if God has changed now. By Christ's life and death he has been transformed from a hating God into a loving God, his wrath has changed into grace—until the sinner also learns that it was this same God's love and grace that sent his Son into this world to live and die in his and every sinner's place! And so the sinner comes face to face with the "mystery" of law and Gospel, its apparent contradiction to our own human reason. And here we see the limitations and difficulties of the "anthropopathism" of Pieper and his followers when it comes to the reconciliation in 2 Cor 5:19. They certainly used this language here because they especially wanted to stress the fact that God was and is angry with sin, and that he doesn't forgive unless his righteous wrath has been satisfied, *i.e.*, sin has been punished and his justice carried out in full! None of which Hoenecke or those who hold his view would deny! But as Dr. Siegbert W. Beaker says concerning such language as "God's anger was changed into love":

This sort of language can only result from a failure to understand the distinction between Law and Gospel. God has always been and will always be the God who forgives and the God who punishes. He has always been and will always be the God who loves sinners in spite of their sin. He has always been and always will be the God who hates sinners because of their sin. He cannot become angry or stop loving any more than water can become or stop being wet.<sup>xxx</sup>

For all of this, we have seen that Pieper and his followers here can be allowed their "anthropopathic" view of reconciliation, providing they also supply the necessary balances to offset any false ideas that might arise—balances which finally leave their "reconciliation" identical to Hoenecke and his followers' view of *the atonement or satisfaction of Christ*, where "to appease God's wrath" is not really saying that God no longer hates sin or sinners, as the law teaches, but that from a human point of view it seems as if God's anger has changed into grace, when in reality Christ has provided the satisfaction sin is covered and his justice is not compelled to let its merited wrath rule and on the contrary, he is able to let his eternal mercy take its course.

Before we move on to one last area of discussion and then our conclusion, on behalf of Pieper and his followers we might also point out some specific scriptural support for their "anthropopathism" with reference to God's reaction to his Son's life and death. Are there any places in Scripture which picture God as angry with the world up till the time Jesus completed his mission, and then gracious and loving? While we might validly argue about when God's anger began in the following verses, its "end" is certainly seen in Christ, Isaiah 12:1-2: "In that day you will say: 'I will praise you, O Lord. *Although you were angry with me, your anger has turned away* and you have comforted me. Surely God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid. The Lord, the Lord, is my strength and my song; he has become my salvation.'" Isaiah 54:7-10: "For a brief moment I abandoned you, but with deep compassion I will bring you back. In a surge of anger I hid my face from you for a moment, but with everlasting kindness I will have compassion on you, says the Lord your Redeemer. 'To me this is like the days of Noah, when I swore that the waters of Noah would never again cover the earth. So now I have sworn not to be angry with you, never to rebuke you again. Though the mountains be shaken, and the hills be removed, yet my unfailing love for you will not be shaken nor my covenant of peace be removed,' says the Lord, who has compassion on you.'" Even with the "change" related here, we might still add that we don't have the picture of an angry God who had to be appeased before he could be made gracious, but a gracious, compassionate, loving God whose righteous anger did not allow his grace to take its course until sins were covered.

We are now ready for the last subject to be discussed in this paper, one related to the subject at hand and one which gave my human reason a great deal of trouble. Graebner alluded to it above when he quoted Calov: "it is in complete agreement with Scripture to say: Christ has reconciled God to us, and God, out of love for us, has sent Christ to become the Author of our reconciliation."<sup>xxxii</sup> Translated into the terms of our paper under discussion: "It is in complete agreement with Scripture to say that Christ has appeased God's wrath and made



God gracious to us, and God, out of love for us, sent Christ to appease his wrath.” This same idea finds current form under Thesis 14 of the Missouri Synod’s Commission on Theology and Church Relations report: *Theses on Justification*, where it is stated that “It is contrary to Scripture and the pure Gospel to teach: . . . That there is conflict between the fact that Christ by His saving work *made* God gracious toward the world and the fact that God *in His grace sent* Christ to be the Savior, or vice versa.”<sup>xxxiii</sup>

The problem is, of course, a logical one. Was it God’s love that ordained Jesus to live and die for us? Yes! Then grace has to come first and you logically can’t say that “Christ by His saving work *made* God gracious”! The problem here, however, is that what is logical is not always *scriptural*, because God’s grace is always grace *in Christ*! And all problems disappear when we finally realize (as I did) that we’re dealing with occurrences in *eternity* here, not time and space. In *eternity*, God in his grace determined to send us the Savior we needed. In *eternity*, God was gracious to us for his Son’s sake, in view of Christ’s life and death for us even though it had not occurred yet in time and space! This is seen very clearly with reference to Paul’s remarks concerning our eternal election in Ephesians 1:3-6: “Praise be to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in the heavenly realms with every spiritual blessing in Christ. For he chose us *in him before the creation of the world* to be holy and blameless in his sight (εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ; cf. Col 1:22: νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν [ὑμᾶς]...παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους...κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ). In love he predestined us to be adopted as his sons *through Jesus Christ*, in accordance with his pleasure and will—to the praise of *his glorious grace, which* he has freely given us *in the One he loves*.” We could certainly ask for no clearer words than those of Paul to Timothy: “So do not be ashamed to testify about our Lord, or ashamed of me his prisoner. But join with me in suffering for the gospel, by the power of God, who has saved us and called us to a holy life—not because of anything we have done but because of his own purpose and grace. *This grace was given us in Christ Jesus before the beginning of time*, but it has now been revealed through the appearing of our Savior, Christ Jesus, who has destroyed death and has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel” (2 Tm 1:8-10).

Thus it is that Hoenecke himself writes in one place that:

...two acts comprise (God’s) universal counsel of love (*der allgemeine Liebeswille*). Quenstedt: “The first is that compassion of God by which he sincerely and intimately suffered with the grief of the human race. . . The other act is that wherein God, moved by this mercy and φιλανθρωπία, made the decree of freeing the human race through the sending of his Son, and of the manifestation of the same through the gospel to this end, that all believe in him and in this way be saved.”<sup>xxxiv</sup>

And Hoenecke also writes:

One could call God’s counsel of universal love an *absolute will* in consequence of the fact that it is not based on the conduct, worthiness or rightful claim of sinners. But with all good reason it is not, in turn, designated as an *absolute will* (*voluntas absoluta*), but an ordered will (*voluntas ordinata*) in accordance with Scripture, for...this counsel of universal love *is based on the satisfaction of Jesus Christ. Grace is given to us in Christ before time itself* ( 2 Tm 1:9; Jn 1:17; Ro 8:39; 1 Cor 1:4; 1 Tm 1:14). Quenstedt: “The basis of this divine universal benevolence is the intervention of the Son of God.”<sup>xxxv</sup>

Regardless of which view of reconciliation in 2 Cor 5:19 one holds, neither side should have problems with the apparent logical contradiction between “the fact that Christ by His saving work *made* God gracious toward the world and the fact that God *in His grace sent* Christ to be the Savior, or vice versa.” Both are scriptural and *their* “reconciliation” lies in eternity, *before* time.

I would like to conclude this section with a beautiful portion from W.H.T. Dau's article on "Grace" which appeared in 1905. For the sake of the beauty of its "flow" I will not footnote all the Scripture references as Dau does in the original.

The grace that saves is not a single act of God, but a chain of acts, which starts in eternity, enters time and space, and leads back into eternity. As we view its different links, there appears a wonderful plan and method by which God saves the sinner. This plan begins "before the foundation of the world;" it is executed "in the disposition of the fullness of times," and it terminates in the glory of the exalted Christ. Every part of this plan stands to grace in the relation of effect to cause. God acts at every stage of it "according to the riches of His grace," "by grace," "to the praise of the glory of His grace." To prompt the adoption of this plan there is nothing in God save "the good pleasure of His will," "His will according to the good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself," "the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."

In the execution of the divine plan of salvation everything is made to revolve around the person and work of the Redeemer. It was grace that furnished the Savior: "*God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son.*" The different stages in the earthly life of the Lord, from His conception to His elevation, are determined by grace. It was grace that a maiden of Israel was chosen to become the mother of God. The angel greeted Mary: "Hail, thou that art highly favored...thou hast found favor with God." It was grace that a lowly position and a life of want and misery was allotted the Redeemer. "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor." It was grace that the Redeemer was sent into a shameful death. "By the grace of God He should taste death for every man." Thus the humiliation of Christ is seen to be due to the grace of God. When the work of redemption was accomplished, "God gave Him," *i.e.*, graciously bestowed upon Him, "a name that is above every name." The exaltation of Christ is God's gracious approval of His work.

In stating, as He frequently did, that He had been "sent," that He came to do "not His own will, but the will of the Father," Christ emphasized the gracious origin and cause of His mission on earth. *But the aim of His mission was also to acquire grace.* (emphasis mine) "It pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself...And you, that were some time alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unblamable in His sight." "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." "He hath made us accepted in the Beloved, in whom we have the redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace." "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." "Grace in Christ," "in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ,"—that, henceforth, is the standing direction to the sinner who would return to the divine favor. "For Christ's sake God hath forgiven you," the apostle informs his hearers, Christ has found for the sinner "access unto the Father," "access into grace." He, the High priest of the new covenant, who excels the priests of old by the preciousness of His offering, having finished His expiation, now is set before the sinner-world as the mercy-seat of the new dispensation of grace. Him "God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness: that He might be Just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." All who desire to "obtain mercy and to find grace to help in time of need" must "come boldly unto the throne of grace," *i.e.* to Jesus, who invites sinners, saying: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden,

and I will give you rest.” The rest which Christ gives is the peace of justification by His grace: we are “being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.”<sup>xxxvi</sup>

### Conclusion

What can we now conclude concerning καταλλάσσω in 2 Cor 5:19? As you would expect, we have to conclude that both views are allowed by Scripture, properly explained and understood. The anthropopathic view of Pieper and his followers really fits with Christ’s atonement and satisfaction, not the justification found in μη λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν. They are not denying the eternal immutability of God or God’s grace toward mankind previous to Christ’s atoning works. They wish to oppose those who deny God’s wrath, a righteous wrath which demanded man be punished for his sin—a wrath Hoenecke and his followers do not deny in the least according to their view. As Becker writes:

When modern theologians say that God does not need to be reconciled this is often joined with a denial of the wrath of God. Everyone who wishes to speak as the oracles of God speak must admit that the Scriptures have much to say about the fearful wrath of God against all sin. This wrath must so how be appeased, and it was appeased through the death of Christ.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

I believe that Pieper and his followers would agree wholeheartedly with Hoenecke that when we are speaking of the atonement as Scripture does, we are not speaking of a god who must first be put into a favorable mood for him to bestow kindness on unworthy men. The Christian revelation teaches a God who, in mercy, is already favorably disposed from eternity, and did not ordain an atonement for guilt whereby he first becomes gracious, but rather one whereby sin is covered and his justice is not compelled to let its merited wrath rule and, on the contrary, he is able to let his eternal mercy take its course.”

As for Hoenecke and his followers, they identify the καταλλάσσω in 2 Cor 5:19 with justification, the μη λογιζόμενος, and describe it as a change of the world’s judicial status before God rather than a change of heart in *either God or man*. Hoenecke and his followers are guilty of none of the errors Pieper is trying to protect the καταλλάσσω from, just as Pieper makes it clear that the same is true for him with regard to Hoenecke. Those who accept the *objective justification* taught in μη λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν must also accept what Hoenecke says about a change of “status”, even if they must find it only here and not in καταλλάσσω.

Yet does one’s view of reconciliation in 2 Cor 5:19 and elsewhere finally result in a “take your pick” situation? As un-“dogmatically” as possible I will say: I think not! I believe the basic meaning of the verbs καταλλάσσω and ἀποκαταλλάσσω, together with the immediate scriptural context in which they are found, lean heavily toward a reconciliation that belongs to justification rather than satisfaction or atonement. If one wants to look for an anthropopathic “change in the heart of God,” a “transformation of wrath into grace,” let him look elsewhere, but not in these verbs! Rather than repeat them, I refer you to Hoenecke’s telling arguments on pp. 10-11 of this paper, as well as point you to the context of ἀποκαταλλάσσω in Eph 2:16 and Col 1:20,22. In Eph 2:14-20 we read:

For he himself is our peace, who has made the two one (Jew and Gentile) and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace, and in this one body *to reconcile both of them to God* through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility. He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near. For through him we both have access to the Father by one Spirit.

Consequently, you are no longer foreigners and aliens, but fellow citizens with God’s people and

members of God's household, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone.

Here we do find references to "peace" and the "killing" of hostility connected to the reconciliation of both Jew and Gentile *to God*. But the emphasis seems to me to be on a new "status" for sinners, rather than any change of attitude in God's disposition or "heart". Those who were foreigners and aliens are now *fellow* citizens with God's people, members of God's household.

This idea of "status" is clearer, perhaps, in Col 1:19-23:

For God was pleased to have all his fullness dwell in him, and *through him to reconcile to himself all things*, whether things on earth or things in heaven, by making peace through his blood, shed on the cross. *Once you were alienated from God and were enemies* in your minds because of your evil behavior. But *now he has reconciled you by Christ's physical body through death to present you holy in his sight, without blemish and free from accusation* you continue in your faith, established and firm, not moved from the hope held out in the gospel. This is the gospel that you heard and that has been proclaimed to every creature under heaven, and of which I, Paul, have become a servant.

Regardless of the fact that subjective justification comes into play here, with the reference to faith in v. 23, it certainly says that *peace* has been made! But who were the enemies? "Once, *you* were alienated from God and were *enemies in your minds because of your evil behavior*." And what is the activity of this ἀποκαταλλάσσω? To change God's heart or disposition, God who *was pleased* to ἀποκαταλλάσσω through Christ? As Paul says, it is "to present you holy in his sight, without blemish and free from accusation." God hasn't changed here, but our status before him certainly has!—from ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθρούς to ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

And so I, for one, choose to stand with Hoenecke and those who view the reconciliation in 2 Cor 5:19 and elsewhere as change of "status" before God, a part of the doctrine of justification and not of the atonement, as such. Is Hoenecke's view the "official interpretation" of the WELS? That all depends on your definition as to what makes an interpretation "official".

If by "official," one means the interpretation taught as most correct at our Seminary, then I would have to say, "Yes," on the basis of my instruction there. If by "official," one means that it is the interpretation found most often in our Synod's publications, then I would also have to answer, "Yes." If by "official," one means that it is the *only* interpretation allowed by our Synod, then, of course, I would have to answer, "No," for we have just recently republished Schaller's *Biblical Christology*, unedited and without comment when he expounds his views quoted earlier in this paper. Likewise, an article of his espousing the traditional view, also quoted earlier in this paper, appeared unedited and without comment. translated from German Into English, in our own *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* in 1975—translated by no one less than a grandson of Adolf Hoenecke!

But for myself, I would rather not speak of an "official" interpretation—or an "interpretation" at all! To borrow a phrase used by Franz Pieper, I would prefer to say: "*Ich hab' keine Auslegung. Diese sind die Wörter:* θεὸς ἦν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν.

---

### Bibliographical Notes

<sup>i</sup> A. L. Graebner, "Doctrinal Theology: What Is Theology?" *Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1. January, 1897, p. 12.

<sup>ii</sup> F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. II, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951, p. 348.

<sup>iii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 348.

<sup>iv</sup> F. Pieper. "The Reconciliation of Man with God," *What Is Christianity? and Other Essays*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1933, p. 62.

<sup>v</sup> F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, *op. cit.*, p. 348.

- 
- <sup>vi</sup> F. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. II, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1917, pp. 474-475.
- <sup>vii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 439 (footnote).
- <sup>viii</sup> A. L. Graebner, "Doctrinal Theology: Soteriology," *Theological Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 4, October, 1901, p. 194.
- <sup>ix</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 195.
- <sup>x</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 197-198.
- <sup>xi</sup> John Schaller, *Biblical Christology*, Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1981, p. 163.
- <sup>xii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 164.
- <sup>xiii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 165.
- <sup>xiv</sup> John Schaller, "Redemption and Universal Justification According to Second Corinthians 5:18-21," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. 72, No. 4, October, 1975, p. 312.
- <sup>xv</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 312.
- <sup>xvi</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 314.
- <sup>xvii</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 315-316.
- <sup>xviii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 318.
- <sup>xix</sup> E.W.A. Koehler, "Objective Justification," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, Vol. XVI, No. 4, April, 1945, p. 218.
- <sup>xx</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 219.
- <sup>xxi</sup> J.T. Mueller, *Christian Dogmatics*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1935, p. 310.
- <sup>xxii</sup> A. Hoenecke, *Ev. Luth. Dogmatik*, Vol. III, Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1912, pp. 189-194.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> J.P. Meyer, *Ministers of Christ: A Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1963 p. 106.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> David P. Kuske, "Making Use of Our Lutheran Heritage: 'Objective Justification' in Our Mission Outreach Based on an Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:18-19," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. 77, No. 1, January, 1980, p. 9.
- <sup>xxv</sup> Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 112.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Kuske, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, *op. cit.*, p. 438.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 352-353.
- <sup>xxix</sup> Pieper, *What Is Christianity?*, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Th. Graebner, *Pastor and People*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1932, pp. 70-71.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Siegbert W. Becker, "Objective Justification," Essay delivered at the Chicago Pastoral Conference of the WELS, November 9, 1982, p. 8.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Perhaps this is Graebner's free translation of Calov quoted in *Baier-Walther*, Vol. III, p. 115:  
 Moreover, a distinction should be made as to the *general* love of God for the human race and the *special*. The former was the cause of the ordination of Christ's mediation and reconciliation. The latter is, as it were, the effect and consequence of the reconciliation accomplished through Christ, both of which the apostle here (Ro 5:8) clearly intimates. *Therefore the (truths) rest quite unshaken according to Scripture, that Christ has reconciled God to us and that God, out of love for us, set Christ as the reconciliator.*
- As noted earlier, Hoenecke would call this *general* love *special* (as opposed to God's *general* love for *all* creation), and he would reserve his *specialissimus* love for *believers* alone, not the entire reconciled world (Vol. III, pp. 136-137). He mentions that Quenstedt refers to these as *amor benevolentiae* and *amor amicitiae*.
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> *Theses on Justification: A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations. The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*, May, 1983, p. 10.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Hoenecke, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
- <sup>xxxv</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> W.H.T. Dau, "Grace," *Theological Quarterly*, Vol. IX, No. 4, October, 1905, pp. 194-198.
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 8.