

**THOUGHTS ON OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION:
SELECTIONS FROM ABRAHAM CALOV'S *BIBLIA ILLUSTRATA*:**

2 CORINTHIANS 5:18-19; ROMANS 3:23-24, 4:25, AND 5:18-19



**SOUTHWESTERN CONFERENCE OF THE WESTERN WISCONSIN DISTRICT OF THE WISCONSIN
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SYNOD
WINTER CONFERENCE
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2014
ST. JOHN LUTHERAN, BARABOO, WI**

UPDATED: 10/07/2014

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 CORINTHIANS 5:18-19	4
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND DIVISION	4
VERSE 18.....	4
VERSE 19.....	7
ROMANS 3:23-24.....	15
CHAPTER 3: SUMMARY AND DIVISION	15
VERSE 23	16
VERSE 24.....	17
ROMANS 4:25	20
CHAPTER 4: SUMMARY AND DIVISION	20
VERSE 25.....	21
ROMANS 5:18-19.....	25
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND DIVISION	25
VERSE 18.....	25
VERSE 19.....	28
CONCLUSION.....	32
EXCURSUS.....	34
QUOTATIONS FROM THE CHURCH FATHERS PERTAINING TO OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION FROM CALOV'S <i>BIBLIA ILLUSTRATA</i>	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	43

Thoughts on Objective Justification Part I

By Abraham Calov

Selections from *Biblia Illustrata*
2 Corinthians 5:18-19

Translated by Souksamay K. Phetsanghane

Disclaimer

“Just call me, Elihu.” “I am young in years, and you are aged ... Age should speak; advanced years should teach wisdom.” (Job 32:6-7) This is not just simple humility or modesty. Is there any insight I could give to men, who have been in the ministry for much longer than I, who have been cut and healed with the Word of God more often than I, who have lived and breathed in these precious glimpses into our LORD's heart longer than I have lived and breathed? Therefore, I decided to present this translation, a voice from our Lutheran past, for this paper.

Introduction

“Standing on the shoulders of giants.”¹ “We are very certain that, in theology, we are pygmies compared to these giants.”² These are the two sayings that jump to my mind when I think about the men the LORD used during those formative years, decades, and centuries after the Reformation. Abraham Calov is one of those giants.³

A little biography about Abraham Calov(ius)⁴ should be beneficial. He entered into this life on August 16, 1612. Calov served his LORD as: a professor and superintendent at

¹ A phrase made famous in a letter by Isaac Newton, (1642-1727) but first attributed to Bernard of Chartres. (d. c. 1124) The full Latin phrase is *nanos gigantum humeris insidentes* “dwarfs sitting on the shoulders of giants.” We can only see better and farther because we are up higher. We build upon the work of the people who came before us.

² August Pieper, “*Quo propior Luthero, eo melior theologus,*” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 14:1 (January 1917), 64. August Pieper wrote this against the charge that the Wauwatosa theologians did not quote the church fathers enough.

³ Schmeling called him the fourth in rank behind Martin Luther, Martin Chemnitz, and Johann Gerhard. For a more detailed biography of Calov, see T.R. Schmeling, “*Strenuus Christi Athleta Abraham Calov (1612-1686)*” *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 44:4 (December, 2004), 1. blts.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/TRS-Calov.pdf.

⁴ Calovius is a latinized version of his last name, Kalau.

Königsburg⁵ (1637-1643), a pastor and rector of the gymnasium at Danzig⁶ (1643-1650), and a professor and superintendent at Wittenberg (1650-1686).

Calov is famously (or infamously) remembered for his polemics. He wrote against Roman Catholics, Reformed, and Socinians.⁷ However most of Calov's ministry was his struggles against George Calixtus and the Syncretistic Controversy. Calixtus attempted to unite all of Christianity under a doctrinal consensus founded on the early Church fathers of Christendom's first five centuries. Calov's struggle against syncretism can be divided into three phases: 1645-1656, 1661-1669, and 1675-1686.

The purpose of all of his polemics was not to pick fights, but to protect the faithful and show the recipients of his critique the error of their ways so that they would be restored to the flock of God. His writings against the Syncretists and Socinians confirmed the fact that Abraham Calov was also the great champion of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in the Age of Orthodoxy. This is why he was dubbed the Lutheran Athanasius.⁸

In his personal life, Calov outlived five wives and all thirteen of his children. In 1684, at the age of 72, he married his sixth wife, Dorothea Quenstedt, daughter of Johann Quenstedt. He entered into eternal life on February 25, 1686.

Calov wrote some 500 different works. His three major works are his *Systema Locorum theologicorum* (I-IV 1655-1661; V-XII 1677), *Biblia Illustrata* (1672-1676), and *die deutsche Bibel* or Calov Bible (1682). The *Biblia Illustrata* is Calov's *magnum opus*. In some respects, it is a commentary on a commentary of the Bible. Calov wrote this professional, exegetical work to refute Hugo Grotius'⁹ *Biblia Annotata* (the Old Testament commentary published in 1644 and the New Testament between 1641-1650).

A few notes on the translation itself. The translation is taken from the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library's copy in the rare books room.¹⁰ I have added more paragraph breaks than in the original. I have also broken the longer Latin sentences into shorter English sentences. The sections from Grotius' commentary are in a smaller font and indented. *Emphases* are in the text unless otherwise noted. Incorrect scriptural references have been corrected as often as possible. An attempt has also been made to find the works that Calov cites. However that has not always been successful.

⁵ Modern Kaliningrad on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea, now part of Russia.

⁶ Modern Gdąnsk on the southern shore of the Baltic Sea, now part of Poland.

⁷ Socinianism, named after Socinus or Sozzini, Laelius (died 1562), who taught among other things, a Non-Trinitarian Christology and denied the deity of Jesus Christ. Laelius' nephew, Faustus Socinus aka Fausto Paolo Sozzini (1539-1604) popularized his uncle's teachings.

⁸ Schmeling, "*Strenuus Christi Athleta*," 8.

⁹ Grotius, Hugo, Huig de Groot, Hugo Grocio, or Hugo de Groot, (1583-1645) was a Dutch jurist, statesman, and Reformed theologian. Throughout his life, he attempted to unite Arminians and Calvinists.

¹⁰ Abraham Calov, *Biblia Testamenti Novi Illustrata: Volume II* (Frankfurt am Main: Balthasar Christopher Wust, 1676) I: 51, 62-63, 70, 87-88, 97-100, 456, 466-469.

I selected 2 Corinthians 5:18-19; Romans 3:23-24 4:25, and 5:18-19 for several reasons. First, after scouring through the works of various authors,¹¹ I found that these passages kept coming up in the discussion about objective justification.¹² Secondly, Pieper also cites Calov's comments on Romans 4:25 to point out "the relation of Christ's resurrection to our justification."¹³ Thirdly, we as a conference have been doing exegetical papers on Romans for a few years now. Lastly, one of the suggested topics for a paper was "Objective / Universal Justification: Responding to the accusation that Luther did not teach objective justification as we Lutherans do today." While this translation is not from Luther, it is from another staunch Lutheran father. For all of these reasons, it seemed that this work would be appropriate for us at our time.

Before we continue, a definition of terms should be laid out. We use universal justification and objective justification as synonyms. However Becker made this distinction, "'Universal justification' is a term denoting the doctrine that God has forgiven the sins of all men. Strictly speaking, the term 'objective justification' expresses the thought that the sins of a man are forgiven by God whether he believes it or not."¹⁴ Schaller also has:

The doctrine of universal, so-called objective, justification sets forth that the Lord God by grace because of Christ's redemption actually forgave sins to all men, to the whole world, altogether apart from man's receiving or not receiving this justification in faith; that thus the forgiveness of our sins is not in the least dependent on anything in us, not on our attitude, not on our believing, or not believing, not on our conversion; rather that faith, which God effects in men, apprehends an already complete gift, which is there for him personally and does not wait until he believes to become a reality.¹⁵

So it is with these few opening remarks that I present this work, this translation of one of God's servants in the midst of God's people. May this voice from our Lutheran past be a help and aid for us now and for our future, *Deo volente*.

¹¹ Siegbert Becker, "Objective Justification" (paper delivered at the Chicago Pastoral Conference, Elgin, IL, November 9, 1982) wlsessays.net/node/130. Siegbert Becker, "Universal Justification" (paper delivered at the Southeast Wisconsin District Convention, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, Milwaukee, WI, June 12, 1984) wlsessays.net/node/142. Daniel Deutschlander, "On the Distinction between Objective and Subjective Justification" (paper delivered at the Chicago Pastoral Conference, November 8, 1977) wlsessays.net/node/430. Roy Hefti, "One Sure Thing: The Gospel of Universal, Objective Justification" (paper delivered at the Southwestern Pastoral Conference of the Western Wisconsin District, Prairie du Sac, WI, March, 1, 2011). Adolf Hoenecke, *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics Volume III* (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2003) 337-338. Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics Volume II* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1951) 320-322, 346, 347-351. WLS Dogmatics Notes: Volume I, C. Christology, 3. The Office of Christ, B. The Priestly Office, VI. Christ established Christian liberty, 1. God declares every sinner to be righteous. WLS Dogmatics Notes: Volume II, 3. Order of Salvation, C. Justification, II. Definitions of objective and subjective justification, 1. Objective or universal justification.

¹² Some other passages are: John 1:29; 2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 John 2:2.

¹³ Pieper, *CD*, II, 321.

¹⁴ Becker, "OJ," 1. Cf. also Becker, "UJ," 1.

¹⁵ John Schaller, "Redemption and Universal Justification according to Second Corinthians 5:18-21" *The Wauwatosa Theology: Volume I* (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1997), 459.

2 Corinthians 5:18-19

Chapter 5: Summary and Division

The apostle Paul comforts himself with the confidence that he will have a building from God after the destruction of this earthly tent. Paul especially longs for that building so that he would not be naked but clothed. Moreover the Spirit is given as a pledge. For when the apostle is at home in his body, he is away from the Lord, away from home. He wishes rather to be away from the body and at home with the Lord. Paul also strives to be pleasing to the Lord because he will one day stand before the Lord's judgment seat. The apostle appeals to the Corinthians' consciences without worthless boasting but compelled by the love of Christ – who died for the sake of everyone so that we would live for him and be a new creation in him. Since we have been made pleasing to God by Christ's satisfaction,¹⁶ as Christ's ambassadors, we encourage everyone: be reconciled to God. For Christ was indeed made sin for us so that we would become God's righteousness in Christ.

There are two parts to this chapter:

1. Verses 1-10: the apostle Paul states *the certainty of the confidence in and the desire for the dwelling from God.*
2. Verses 11-21: the apostle Paul explains *Christ's satisfaction and reconciliation*, which are the foundation of that confidence and the capstone of the Christian religion. ...

Verse 18

τὰ δὲ πάντα

Namely, the things that we must value.

ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ¹⁷

καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς

He made us ministers of his very own plan.

God's grace is the source and origin of all of these things:

Christ died for all of us;
 since we have been made alive in Christ himself, we do not live for ourselves;
 we are not judged according to the flesh but to the spirit;
 we have the true and spiritual knowledge of Christ himself;
 we are in Christ through faith;
 we are a new creation;

¹⁶ Satisfaction in the sense of “reparation, a compensation for a wrong.” (Not in the sense of the Rolling Stone's song or Britney Spears' cover “(I Can't Get No) Satisfaction.”) The WLS Dogmatics Notes define satisfaction as “a non-biblical, ecclesiastical term that expresses the truth that all demands of God's righteousness have been fully satisfied.” (Volume I, C. Christology, 3. The Office of Christ, B. The Priestly Office, IV. The grand result of Christ's priestly work may be expressed as 1. Satisfaction.)

¹⁷ This section is not in the Grotius' text, but Calov will be discussing it.

and the Church is the assembly of the faithful and saints, “the old has gone, everything new has come.”¹⁸

By his grace, God has both reconciled us to himself through Christ and has given to us the ministry of reconciliation. Therefore since we have returned to his grace, we rejoice *in that very act*, i.e. in the reconciliation, which Christ won for us.¹⁹

Flacius²⁰ explains συνέχειν²¹ “to urge, impel; direct, control”²² in this way:

Many times the apostle Paul has joined law together with gospel and has placed the glory and efficacy of the gospel before the law. So at the end, he concludes by briefly explaining the true reason for salvation and the focus of the gospel. Although in this section, one does see that Paul willingly discusses his own very capable person and ministry. However that is only as a precursor to praising what he has been teaching, (and since in other aspects of life, people usually want to move from less to more important things) especially as a precursor to praising Christ and the transferring of his blessings. Therefore in the entire section, Paul hints at the article of justification. So just as we have said, he now wraps up that article with his short summary. He calls God the Father, the author and architect of salvation. Therefore his Son (who has suffered for us) is either the meritorious cause or ultimately he is the applicatory/instrumental cause²³ of so great a blessing—namely, the ministry or heavenly doctrine, of which the Son himself is the manager. First Paul very succinctly uses this three-part phrase,²⁴ and then he explains it in more detail.

¹⁸ 2 Corinthians 5:17. Calov usually quotes from the Vulgate. Unless otherwise noted, Bible passages are my own translation.

¹⁹ *Reconciliatione, quam Christus promeruit nobis, actu ipso fruamur.*

²⁰ Flacius, Matthias (1520–1575) was a Croatian Lutheran. He studied at Wittenberg. He was very polemical and in a heated dispute said that original sin is an essential part of human nature. Calov is most likely quoting from Flacius' *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae seu de Sermonibus Sacrarum litterarum Key to the Holy Scriptures or on the Language of the Holy Writings*. This is one of the fundamental works on biblical hermeneutics. The first four chapters of the first discussion (*De ratione cognoscendi Sacras litteras*) of this work, is translated by the Madgeburg Press as *How to Understand the Sacred Scriptures from Clavis Scripturae sacrae*.

²¹ Corrected from the text's reading συνέχειαν to συνέχειν “to compel, control.” Paul uses this verb in 2 Corinthians 5:14.

²² Calov does not always give a Latin definition of the Greek which he uses in the text. I have added an English translation to all the Greek words, translating Calov's Latin definition if he has given one.

²³ The meritorious cause is the cause that contributes to a change by making it worthy to happen and the applicatory/instrumental cause is the means used to make a change happen. The Council of Trent (Session 6, chapter 7) states that there are five causes to justification: 1) the formal cause is the sanctifying grace; 2) the final cause is God's and Christ's glory; 3) the efficient cause is God's mercy; 4) the meritorious cause is Christ's suffering; and 5) the instrumental cause is the reception of the Sacraments. Some of these causes are borrowed from Aristotle and added upon by the Scholastic theologians. Other theologians also added more causes as needed. Cf. Jon Buchholz, “Jesus Cancelled Your Debt” (paper presented for the Arizona-California District Pastors' Conference, October 17, 2012 and the Northern Wisconsin District Pastors' Conference, October 29, 2013), Appendix 3, 42.

²⁴ Perhaps a reference to 2 Corinthians 5:14 and the phrase: ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς.

Therefore in this verse, Paul reminds us of the two most important works of God that are especially evident in the church. After the Fall, the world has been reconciled to God,²⁵ and this reconciliation is announced through the ministry of the Word. Both are supremely necessary. *First*, for the restoration of mankind, God's legal righteousness (against which mankind had sinned) had to be satisfied.²⁶ (For if reconciliation had not happened, mankind would perish in sin and destruction.) *Second*, the ministry would have to be revealed or established for us so that God would announce so great a blessing to us and we would take hold of it by faith. Both, received solely by divine grace, are to be made known. For that reason, Paul immediately calls God the author of reconciliation.

Theophylact²⁷ comments here, "God has certainly gathered together all the universal blessings for us. By the intervention of his Son, he has brought about our return into grace. For our former selves did not go to him on our own, but he stirred us up through the death of his Son." Paul describes this blessing with the word καταλλαγῆς "reconciliation," a word taken from everyday life. Reconciliation takes place when the hatred that exists because someone was offended (*offensam*) is set aside by a mediator's intervention. Likewise the apostle Paul shows this reconciliation in Romans 5:10, "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God."²⁸ The verb καταλλάσσειν "to reconcile," by etymology, also implies "some change" or "alteration," by which the offended party (*offensa*) becomes something different and is changed (from ἄλλος "other"). The change was certainly not necessary because of anything wrong that the offended party did but because of something wrong that the offending party did. (*Non quidem sui sed offendentis respectu.*) Also just as there was previously anger, a wrong, and separation, so through the reconciliation, there is a change morally, appeasement, and propitiation. (Just as 1 Corinthians 7:11 commands a woman τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγῆτω "to be reconciled to her husband," whom she angered. She works hard to rebuild and restore the shattered love.)

The one who is reconciled is designated by the word ἡμᾶς "us," which does not mean *so much the apostles*, but (according to mankind's shared condition) means both the apostles and all of us who were under God's wrath and outside of this καταλλαγῆ. Moreover God is not described as reconciling us to himself in a way that implies that God had no role in the act of reconciliation. For God's anger was entirely appeased.²⁹ We were guilty before God on account of sin, since we all were kept under sin, Romans 11:32; Galatians 3:22. Moreover there was a change in that condition on the side of the one who did the wrong and is in need of reconciliation.

That is the normal way of speaking about reconciliation. *For example*, the prince is not described as reconciled to his servant. (For the prince did not do the wrong.) Customarily

²⁵ *Mundus post lapsum Deo fuit reconciliatus.* The verb forms are a perfect indicative of *sum*, along with the past participle of *reconcilio*, therefore a form of the perfect passive indicative. This form usually has *sum* in the present indicative.

²⁶ *Placaretur*, which may mean "placated" or "appeased," but we speak of persons being appeased, so "satisfied" seems better here.

²⁷ Theophylactus or Theophylact of Ohrid (1055-1107) was a Greek archbishop of Ohrid (a city in modern day Macedonia). He wrote commentaries on the gospels, Acts, Pauline epistles, and the minor prophets.

²⁸ *Cum inimici essemus, reconciliati sumus Deo.*

²⁹ When God is "appeased" this is not to be understood in the sense that a literal change has taken place in the essence, attributes, or will of God.

the party that did the wrong is completely responsible for making the reconciliation so that the guilt is removed. So the servant is said to be the one reconciled to the prince, because the servant is the one who did the wrong. For this reason Christ commands that the brother who did the wrong be reconciled to the wronged brother, Matthew 5:24.

God does not wrong humans, but humans wrong God. So for that reason, God is not described as being reconciled to us, but we to God. Therefore, the apostle Paul refers to God with the word ἑαυτῷ “unto himself.” God himself is the one to whom the human race is reconciled so that God is now appeased and propitiated on behalf of the human race. Since God had mercy on our obvious misery, “he reconciled the world to himself” because of his immense grace. All of that is included in the word καταλλαγή. *By his saving righteousness*, wrath is set aside, and propitiation is provided.

Accordingly, the apostle Paul also calls Jesus Christ “the Mediator,” through whom all this happens. (For “there is one mediator between God and mankind, the man Jesus Christ, who gave himself as the price of redemption for everyone,” 1 Timothy 2:5.) So here is the third party, who reconciled the opposing sides. He has satisfied the divine justice. He has appeased God's wrath. He also has made atonement to God for us. In this way, Paul has briefly reviewed the greatest of all blessings.

As to the second part, ἡ διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς “the ministry of reconciliation” denotes *the ministry of the Word*, by which the redemption, accomplished through Christ, is announced to the world. So therefore, the redemption brings about a change. By that phrase ἡ διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς, *the chief part* is expressed and *the doctrine of the gospel* is emphatically distinguished *from the doctrine of the law*. *The law* announces only God's hatred and wrath towards mankind so that the mouth of the entire world is silenced, Romans 4:2, 3:19. However *the gospel* announces God's appeasement through Christ's precious blood and death. So for that reason, God offers the divine grace that Christ acquired for the entire human race, to all people.³⁰ At the same time, the apostle Paul ascribes that blessing to God as the author. Without that revelation, no segment of humanity would know any part of this divine plan for our salvation. Without God's authority, no one could receive so great an ambassadorship or be able to merit or find faith. He gave to us the ministry of reconciliation. Paul not only means himself along with the other apostles ἀμεσιθεοκλήσις “called immediately” but also *Timothy* along with similar people, *called mediately*. For those who are called for this ministry by people, (as long as they are legitimately called) are called by God. As we hear that the Holy Spirit appointed the Ephesian elders as “overseers to shepherd the church of God, bought by his blood,” Acts 20:28. Although Christ did not call him immediately, that is, directly, Timothy is also said to have received *from God* τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς.³¹

Verse 19

ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ

Here ὡς is ἐξηγητικὸν “explanatory,” that is, the things we announce in God's name.

³⁰ *Adeoque gratiam divinam a Christo toto humano generi conciliatam, omnibus hominibus offerat.*

³¹ Perhaps a reference to 2 Timothy 4:5.

Now the apostle Paul explains both of the blessings in order: *first, the reconciliation accomplished by God through Christ*. That is attributed to God as the efficient cause.³² However *Christ* is not excluded. For it is plainly clear that *God*, who reconciled the world to himself, *was in Christ*, not by a gracious indwelling (as God lives in the saints through faith) but by *the personal indwelling of the Logos in the flesh* “with all his fullness,” Colossians 2:9. Namely the divinity united with the flesh by a personal union to establish the one ὑφιστάμενον “hypostatic” union. Therefore not only *God the Father* but also *the Son of God*, who “was made flesh,”³³ reconciled the world to himself.

For “God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.” Because *the Son of God*—who is God himself, forever blessed above all, who is of the same essence with God the Father, in whom the Father is present through the essential περιχώρησις “permeation”³⁴ – *was in the assumed flesh* through the *personal* union and *personal* περιχώρησις “permeation.” Since the Son (who is of the same essence with the Father and the Holy Spirit, for these three are one, 1 John 5:1³⁵) was sinned against and was angered by the apostasy of mankind (whom the Son, along with the Father and the Holy Spirit, formed in his own image, Genesis 1:26); for this reason, after *the Son appeared in the flesh*, he *reconciled* the world *to himself along with the Father and the Holy Spirit*. Just as if the Son of the King, by making satisfaction to the Father for the servant – who was guilty of the crime of offending the majesty, the crime that was committed against the Father and himself, σύνθρονον “enthroned with” the Father – is said to reconcile the servant to the Father and himself. Nevertheless this illustration is to be taken with a grain of salt.

The object of reconciliation, (which the apostle Paul indicates with the word ἡμᾶς) he already clearly explained. The apostle Paul means to include not only “friends,” not only “the faithful” or “the elect” but the κόσμος “the world,” that is “the entire human race.” For the word “world” in Scripture never means *only the elect* or *the faithful*, but is used for human beings in general. It refers either to *the reprobate world* or to *the entire human race*, all who have sinned against God and because of sin, are subject to God's wrath and eternal damnation. Romans 3:23 οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολή, πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ “For there is no distinction, because all have sinned and fall short of God's glory.” Romans 3:19 ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ, “The entire world has come under the

³² Aristotle (384-322 BC) was a Greek philosopher. He was a pupil of Plato, tutor to Alexander the Great, and started the Lyceum. In *Metaphysics*, Book 5, section 1013a, he said that there were four causes or reasons for anything: 1) material (the cause based on the materials that something is made of e.g. the bronze of a statue;) 2) formal (the cause based on the shape, arrangement, or configuration of something e.g. the idea for the statue in the sculptor's mind;) 3) efficient (the cause that brings something about or makes something happen e.g. the father to his son or a sculptor to a statue;) and 4) final (the cause as viewed from the end goal e.g. the “goal” of walking is to be healthy or a sculptor makes a statue to fulfill an order.) Cf. also Adolf Hoenecke. *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics Volume I*. (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009) 400.

³³ John 1:14.

³⁴ *Perichoresis* (lit. something like “going around in; rotation”) has been understood as “permeation” and “in-existence.” In dogmatics, it is used to describe the relation between the Godhead in Theology and the two natures of Christ in Christology.

³⁵ Thus the text, perhaps 1 John 5:7-8 and the *Johanneum Comma*.

judgment of God.” So therefore the entire world must be reconciled.³⁶ For this reason God sent his Son as the ἱλασμόν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν “atonement for our sins,” 1 John 4:10. St. John adds verse 14 so that this is not understood as only talking about the elect. It is very clearly understood that the Father sent the Son as the σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου “Savior of the world.” 1 John 2:2 has καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου “And he has become the atonement for our sins, not only for ours, but also for the sins of the whole world.”

Here we note:

1. *The absolute*³⁷ *scope* of the word “world.” It means “all people,” not “the elect” or “the reprobate.” “To be reprobate” and/or “elect” does not make one a human being. So for this reason “to be reprobate” and/or “to be elect” does not constitute the human race. Even Wolfgang Musculus³⁸ does not speak about “the world” in this way in his *Commentary on Colossians*, chapter 1:10.
2. *The designation of all humanity* as the beneficiary. For Christ died for the sake of those, who are reconciled to God through Christ, compare 2 Corinthians 5:14 and 15 to verse 17. In addition, Paul says, not once but three times without any restriction that Jesus died for all people.
3. *The nature of the act of reconciliation.* Reconciliation is between two opposing parties. These two parties are God and human beings. Not only some, but *everyone* sinned against God. The people who need reconciliation are not the elect, but the ones who are “locked up under sin”³⁹ and “liable to God's wrath.”⁴⁰ In this respect, there is no difference between people. For it is necessary that all are reconciled through Christ, “the mediator between God and mankind.”⁴¹ For he is the Mediator not of the elect, but of mankind. He gave himself as the ἀντίλυτρον “ransom” not for the elect, but for all mankind, 1 Timothy 2:6.
4. *The community that constitutes the ministry.* God offers the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς to those who are reconciled to God through Christ. For reconciliation cannot be announced to someone, unless they do not have it. Moreover, according to the divine plan and Paul's words so far, this applies to all mankind. They are all offered the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς. Even one of the Reformed, Gerard de Neufville,⁴² draws this conclusion, “The reconciliation is announced by Christ to everyone. That, which was obtained for everyone, is presented to be received through faith. Likewise, reconciliation with God accomplished through Christ is announced by Christ himself

³⁶ *Reconciliandus erat totus mundus.* A gerundive with a form of *sum* to denote necessity.

³⁷ Absolute in the sense of without any restriction, condition, or qualification. It was not arbitrary.

³⁸ Wolfgang Musculus, or Müsli or Mauslein (1497-1563) was a Reformed theologian and professor at the University of Bern.

³⁹ Romans 3:9.

⁴⁰ Romans 3:19.

⁴¹ 1 Timothy 2:5.

⁴² Gerard de Neufville (1590-1648) was a professor of mathematics at Bremen and Heidelberg.

to everyone and presented to be received through faith. Therefore it was obtained for everyone.”⁴³

5. *The universality of the encouragements.* Whomever God encourages to be reconciled to him through true repentance and conversion, those same people have been reconciled to God through Christ, i.e. he has acquired and earned reconciliation for them in God's presence. However God encourages through his Word not only the elect but all people to be reconciled to him through true repentance and conversion. Therefore, the major premise⁴⁴ is clear from the context of verse 20, “Therefore we are ambassadors for Christ, appealing in the place of Christ: be reconciled to God.” The inferential word οὖν “therefore” is used then to show that the reconciliation accomplished in Christ (namely, the reconciliation which produces *the propitiation and appeasement of the divine anger*) is the cause and foundation of *the encouragement for the reconciliation* which is brought about by our repentance and conversion to God.
6. *The payment for the sins of the human race.* Christ reconciled to God those who, after they have been reconciled, are described by the word “world.” He carried and paid for their sins. Also he was made sin for them.⁴⁵ Moreover he carried and paid for the sins not only of the elect, he became sin not only for the elect but for all people. Therefore the major premise is clear both from verses 19 and 20 and is sufficiently clear all by itself. In addition the minor premise is confirmed from the parallel scriptural passages and particularly 2 Corinthians 5:21 taken together with Isaiah 53:6.⁴⁶
7. *The agreement of some of the Reformed.* Wolfgang Musculus comments on this passage, “world i.e. the entire race of human beings, which was, is, and will be from the beginning to the end of the world, God has reconciled to himself, when he gave his Son into death for all people.” Bartolomaeus Copenius⁴⁷ writes in *The Disputation about the Satisfaction of Christ* in the year 1616, thesis 26, “The object of mercy is universally and indiscriminately all people in the universe without exception. For Christ died for all people and was made the reconciliation for the sins of the entire world, 2 Corinthians 5:19; 1 Timothy 2:6; 1 John 2:2.” The theologians of Nassau, Johann Heinrich Alsted⁴⁸ and Georg Fabricius⁴⁹ use 2 Corinthians 5:19 and prove, “that Christ is the expiation for the sins of the entire world is so very important for

⁴³ In his *First Disputation on Predestination*, thesis 26.

⁴⁴ In a syllogism, (a logical argument or inference) there are three parts: major premise, minor premise, and conclusion. The conclusion is true if the major and minor premise are true e.g. major premise: all rabbits have fur; minor premise: some pets are rabbits; conclusion: some pets have fur.

⁴⁵ 2 Corinthians 5:21.

⁴⁶ The major premise appears to be: God reconciled the world. The minor appears to be: Christ was made sin for us.

⁴⁷ Bartolomaeus Copenius (1565-1617) was an English professor of theology.

⁴⁸ Alstedius or Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588-1638) was a Calvinist pastor and professor. He was also a delegate at the Synod of Dort (1618).

⁴⁹ Fabricius or Georg Goldschmidt was also a delegate at the Synod of Dort (1618).

the merit and sufficiency of the λύτρου 'ransom.'" ⁵⁰ Gerard de Neufville was previously quoted.

The previous section discusses *the object of reconciliation*. As to *the act itself of reconciliation*, some *Reformed* understand the word καταλλάξαντος "one who reconciled," not merely as *the acquisition of the forgiveness of sins*, but also as *the pardoning of sins*, for example the *Five Articles of Remonstrance*⁵¹ explain the blessing of reconciliation in v. 18-19 as *the actual justification of the elect*.⁵² In this way they restrict the accomplishment of reconciliation to only the elect. However that sort of reconciliation which they speak of (namely *only the accomplishment of reconciliation* on Christ's part) is understood as something distinct from actual restoration into grace.⁵³ Paul's conclusion from the *universal blessing* to the *universal ministry* (to encourage the whole world to die to themselves and to live for Christ) would not make much sense if Paul would be encouraging a *particular blessing*, limited by the divine plan to a very small number. The apostolic distinction between the achievement (*impetrationem*) of reconciliation (in verses 18-19, "he reconciled us to himself") and its application (in verse 20, "Christ appeals through us: Be reconciled to God") would also not make much sense. Therefore the kind of reconciliation, into which Christians are encouraged to enter is different from the reconciliation of the world, which Christ already accomplished. The former kind of reconciliation is necessary based on that kind of reconciliation, which already happened and which God has presented to us.

In addition, Wolfgang Musculus knows that the object of that kind of reconciliation (the reconciliation of the world) is not the assembly of the elect, but the world or the human race. Musculus says again:

For the reconciliation in Colossians 1:20 properly concerns sinners and in this way pertains to the entire human race. The Catholic church's understanding of reconciliation is for the sins of Catholics. (From God's point of view, that divides the human race.) Moreover, where Paul says that God has reconciled the world, there is no discussion of whether that is the reprobate or the elect. In conclusion, this reconciliation is to remove that universal enmity of the human race, which we all have from Adam because of our nature's corruption. So therefore the entire world is described as reconciled through Christ.

The Socinians wrongly deny that the word "reconciliation" is to be taken as *the reconciliation of the one (who does wrong) through a third party's intercession and satisfaction*. Instead they argue that reconciliation is *the same as the free and gracious forgiveness of the wrong (as far as the wronged party is concerned)* without any satisfaction.

⁵⁰ In *The Judgment on the Second Article of the Five Articles of Remonstrance*. The Five Articles of Remonstrance (1610) were the Arminian counterpoints to the Five Points of Calvinism. The second article states unlimited atonement in contrast to Calvinism's limited atonement.

⁵¹ *Hagiensi* p. 136, 203. Literally "of the Hague p. 136, 203." The Five Articles of Remonstrance were drawn up at a meeting at The Hague in 1609. It is unclear from what book Calov is actually quoting.

⁵² *Actuali electorum justificatione*. *Actualis* can mean "active, practical, actual." Cf. Korthals' extended quote of Marquart's translation work, *Justification – Objective and Subjective: A Translation* in the *excursus* for how *actualis* was understood in the theological schools.

⁵³ *Contradistincta actuali restitutioni in gratiam*.

However, the promise of freedom from punishment or the spontaneous forgetting of guilt is not properly reconciliation.⁵⁴ For we are described as reconciled to God *by the blood of Christ*, Romans 5:10-11, and here we are called reconciled to God through Christ. Also *the death of Christ* is connected to the reconciliation granted for everyone, by which the forgiveness of sins follows. The former is the reconciliation through Christ both because of the power of Christ's merit and God's plan, by which God no longer wants to impute sin to anyone. The latter is the actual non-imputation or forgiveness of sins.⁵⁵ The former is the reconciliation accomplished on God's part, but the latter brings in the confidence in reconciliation on our part.

Therefore it is foolishness when the Calvinists Alting⁵⁶ and Marcus Friedrich Wendelin⁵⁷ argue:

The reprobates are not reconciled to God and have not obtained the forgiveness of sins. Therefore God still imputes sins to them. So from God's viewpoint, they are not to be called the reconciled and those who have obtained the forgiveness of sins through the Mediator's death. And deservedly so, because they reject Christ, reconciliation, and the forgiveness of sins through unbelief.

The Calvinists mix together things that are clearly different. They deny what the apostle Paul obviously says here, namely the world i.e. the entire human race has been reconciled to God.⁵⁸

The heretics argue against themselves in their ἀντιλογία “counter-argument.” For if the reprobates through their unbelief can reject the reconciliation of Christ and the forgiveness of sins, then certainly the forgiveness of sins, reconciliation, and the grace of God were acquired for them through Christ. Since people are not able to reject something through unbelief unless these things were offered to them to be believed or accepted with a true faith, for how can they be expected to believe unless it pertains to them? Who can be held responsible for not believing that Christ has reconciled them to God and acquired the forgiveness of sins for them, if Christ did not reconcile them, and if Christ did not acquire the forgiveness of sins for them? Johannes Crocius⁵⁹ says, “No one is condemned unless they

⁵⁴ *Impunitatis enim promissio, aut spontanea reatus oblivio proprie non est reconciliatio.*

⁵⁵ *Hoc actualem non-imputationem seu remissionem peccatorum.* Cf. Korthals' extended quote of Marquart's translation work, *Justification – Objective and Subjective: A Translation* in the *excursus* for how *actualis* was understood in the theological schools.

⁵⁶ Jacob Alting (1618-1679) was a Dutch professor at the University of Groningen. *LL. CC. Heidelberg, part 2, locus 14.* I was unable to verify this work.

⁵⁷ Marcus Friedrich Wendelin, (1584-1652) was a Reformed theologian, also opposed by Johann Gerhard. *Theological and Scholastic Treatment of Predestination*, chapter 11, page 43). The work was verified, but I am unsure which edition Calov is quoting.

⁵⁸ *Negant, quod aperte ab Apostolo hic assertum est, nempe mundum, id est, totum genus humanum DEO reconciliatum esse.*

⁵⁹ Johannes Crocius (1590-1659) was a Reformed theologian. He attended the Leipzig Colloquy (1631) between Lutherans and Reformed.

reject something that for any reason applies to them.”⁶⁰ Also Paul Stein⁶¹ admits, “One can say about the condemned that Christ acquired for them the forgiveness of sins, justification, and eternal life.”⁶²

The Photinians⁶³ also thoroughly change the apostle Paul's very precious meaning. For the fact that God reconciled us to himself, Schlichting⁶⁴ corrupts in this way, “From his enemies, God made for himself friends, by not imputing our transgressions because of his vast grace i.e. not only by declaring that he wanted to do this, but also by showing it to those who were converted by that very same act through Christ.”

However it does not say here that *God made friends for himself from his enemies* but that *God is reconciled to us through Christ*, namely through Christ's death and blood. When that one person died in the place of all of us, we are reconciled to God. Certainly the apostle Paul says that God *declares* that he does not impute sins to us, but not in the sense that he *wants to do that on the basis of his absolute freedom and grace* without any real reconciliation of the human race. However that change that does take place in us is not the reason God does not impute sins to us, but that change is the result of the fact that we were reconciled to him through his Son's death. There is not a word about the declaration of the forgiveness of sins in these passages, but it is about the non-imputation acquired through Christ's reconciliation. The announcement, declaration, and publication of that reconciliation are then made through the λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς “message of reconciliation.”

For this reason these passages in and of themselves do not yet talk about that declaration or that presentation of the grace which is placed before the converted but about the presentation of *that grace of redemption and reconciliation to the world*, by which God has been appeased in regard to all people in such a way that the non-imputation or the forgiveness of sins has been given to everyone.⁶⁵ Therefore these verses are not yet about *how God made us his friends from enemies, saints and justified from sinners, spiritual from fleshly, very obedient from disobedient* but how God was reconciled to us through Christ; how he became *the appeased God from the wrathful God, a friend from an enemy*. Therefore, to us sinners, condemned to die, God does not impute sins on account of Christ's reconciliation and the satisfaction of his death, by the saving righteousness. Moreover God is able to forgive and receive us into grace.

μη̄ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν⁶⁶

⁶⁰ In *convers. Pruten. P. 2*, chapter 16, page 472. I was unable to verify this work.

⁶¹ Paulus Steinius or Paul Stein (1585-1634) was a Reformed theologian and professor at Kessel. He also was part of the Synod of Dort (1618). I was unable to verify this work.

⁶² In *Evangel. Eccl. Fraternal*, chapter 2, page 348.

⁶³ Photinians are named after Photinus (d. 376), a heretic, who denied the incarnation of Christ. This title became a phrase to describe all who denied that Christ is true God e.g. Socinians.

⁶⁴ Jonas Schlichting, (1592-1661) was a Crypto-Socinian. He famously had a controversy with Balthasar Meisner, Lutheran professor at Wittenberg.

⁶⁵ *Quapropter nec de ea declaratione, nec de exhibitione gratiae conversis, ipso facto, praestandae hic agitur; sed de mundo exhibita redemptionis et reconciliationis gratia, qua ita placates omnibus hominibus est DEUS, ut data sit omnibus non-imputatio vel remissio peccatorum.*

⁶⁶ This is not in Grotius' text, but is in the Greek.

καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς

To put words in another or the mouth of another is to give commands to them, cf. Exodus 4:15. In this way, God has given commands to the apostles to call back the human race to his friendship.

In verse 18 we already explained “the ministry of reconciliation” committed to them. The blessed Balduin⁶⁷ notes:

When the apostle rather emphatically explains the word “giving” with the word θέμενος “one who puts, places; establishes, sets,” he refers back partly to:

- The order established in God's eternal plan. God was pleased through the ministry of the Word to put things back in order with sinners and to restore the lost grace.
- The certainty of this doctrine. For God has decreed, established, and set it in place. Therefore it cannot fail.
- Also the constancy and stability of this doctrine. For whatever God sets in place, the gates of hell with all the heretics and tyrants cannot overcome it.

For this reason, when Paul talks about his own ministry, he freely uses the phrase “God placed me into the ministry,” cf. 1 Timothy 1:12, 2:7 etc.

*The power of διακονίας “ministry” is rather clear. None of the power depends on the worthiness of the ministers, but on the efficacy of the Word, which they preach. For this reason the apostle uses τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς “the message of reconciliation” for διακονία. In addition, by that word Paul means *the word of the gospel*, making a distinction from the word *of the law*. The law announces wrath, but the gospel announces the appeasement of wrath and grace. So then this reconciliation is received not by obeying a *command by which people are ordered* to return to grace with God, but they are to receive this message from the word, which announces the gospel. Through that gospel, the reconciliation acquired through Christ is offered to all. Although that announcement is made with the qualification that Christ's reconciliation is received by faith and we put the divine grace into action. ...*

⁶⁷ Friedrich Balduin (1575-1627) was a Lutheran theologian and professor at the University of Wittenberg. He wrote a commentary on Paul's epistles (first published in 1655).

Thoughts on Objective Justification Part II

By Abraham Calov

Selections from *Biblia Illustrata*
Romans 3:23-24; 4:25; 5:18-19

Translated by Souksamay Phetsanghane

Romans 3:23-24

Chapter 3: Summary and Division

Since circumcision was seen as a legal obligation, (for instance the Jews were boasting in it) the apostle Paul teaches that circumcision gave the Jews no special prerogative or usefulness in God's judgment. Unlike the Gentiles, they had as an advantage that the very words of God were entrusted to them, (from which they were able to have true righteousness). However, that does not mean that the Jews have any special favor in God's judgment. No part of God's righteousness disappears through their ἀπιστίαν “unbelief.” If God wants to put us to the test, we all are rightly condemned. However God turns our unrighteousness into praise for his righteousness. In God's presence there is no favoritism for anyone. For God convicts everyone without διαστολήν “distinction” through the law. Moreover, in this way, he crosses everyone over to the righteousness that is presented in the gospel and the justification that is evident through faith.⁶⁸ Likewise, for that reason, all boasting is excluded. The grace of God is commended not only to the Jews but also to the Gentiles. Moreover the law is not removed but elevated and upheld.

There are four parts to this chapter:

1. Verses 1-2: διάλυσις “*the refutation*” of the objection against the advantage of being a Jewish person.
2. Verses 3-9: ἐκδίκησις “*the vindication*” of God's constancy and righteousness.
3. Verses 10-21: the universal ἔλεγχις “*conviction*” of all people of sin and condemnation without any distinction.
4. Verses 22-31: ἔνδειξις “*the proof*” of the righteousness to faith.

The first three parts explain the subject of justification. However the fourth part begins the distinction of the causes of justification and the demonstration of true justification. ...

⁶⁸ *Atque ita ad justitiam in Evangelio propositam et justificationem per fidem explicandam transit.*

Verse 23

πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον

It is no wonder that in this matter God makes no distinction between Gentiles and Jews. For everyone, i.e. the entire human race, is held captive to the severest sins. This is what ἁμαρτάνειν “to sin” usually means.

The apostle Paul is not talking only about *specific* sins or the sins of *the Jews and the Gentiles of a certain time in history that are more severe*, but about the sins of all humanity in general without any distinction of *age or time*. He teaches that every human being without exception is guilty of sin. In no way is ἁμαρτάνειν to be taken as talking only about severe sins (Romans 2:12). In the books of John, ἁμαρτάνειν is general, just as ἁμαρτία also generally means “sin.” It means “to stray or turn aside from the mark or line of the divine law,” 1 John 3:4. In Socrates, ἁμαρτάνειν τοῦ ὁδοῦ is “to wander from the way.” Among the Greek writers, ἁμαρτάνειν is understood as “to err, to fall, to wander, to trespass, to sin” in general. In Scripture, “sin” is not to be taken in any other way unless *specific* evidence shows it in the text. Also since the apostle Paul concludes that all people universally are under sin so that he can show that all people are unworthy of God's grace, Christ's redemption, and the blessed forgiveness of sins, how can this word be taken as talking only about severe sins current at that time?

καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ

For how ever much they are lacking, by that same amount are they less approved by God. ὑστεροῦνθαι is “to be short of something,” 1 Corinthians 12:24; 2 Corinthians 11:5, 12:11; Hebrews 4:1. δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ is “the approval of a person, which is done by God,” as in John 12:44. See Romans 4:2 below.

One could certainly allow Grotius' explanation, if it is understood that *all people* in general *are short of something* and lacking something that they ought to have. For all people are not able to be approved by and pleasing to God. For they are lacking that perfection that God gave to them when he created them in his own image.

However ὑστεροῦνθαι means “to be lacking.” δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ also means “God's glory” rather than “the approval of a person by God.” Also δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ does not appear in Romans 4:2, but καύχημα πρὸς θεόν “a boast before God.”

Therefore one should not reject the usual explanation of the exegetes. Especially since that “*removal of*” and “*being without God's glory*” are the description of mankind's condition before justification. Therefore the discussion here is not about *the divine approval* but the lack of God's glory, which mankind had received from God. So *the removal of the divine image* is meant here. We all are without that divine image after the Fall. That was the glory that God gave to mankind in creation. That is what we all are missing after we lost it in Adam. The result of that lost is that we cannot stand in God's presence.

ὑστερέω is “to lack” Matthew 19:20; Mark 10:21; Luke 22:35; “to be without” “to be short of” John 2:3; Hebrews 4:1, 11:37; “to be weak” “to be in need” Luke 15:14; 1 Corinthians 8:8, 12:24; Philippians 4:12. Just as ὑστέρημα is “poverty” Luke 21:4.

That glory, which we are lacking after the Fall, is restored to us through Christ, cf. 1 Corinthians 3:18,⁶⁹ 15:43; Hebrews 2:9; 1 Peter 1:7, 5:1. However if because of the parallel with Romans 4:2, someone prefers to understand δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ as “the boasting in the presence of God,” along with Chrysostom,⁷⁰ the blessed Luther, and the blessed Gerhard,⁷¹ that person could then say that no one is able “to boast in the presence of God's judgment,” because namely everyone sins.

Verse 24

δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν

However those, who are used to “little virtues,” i.e. philosophical virtues, to be required, they are brought to righteousness but without working for it. Faith gains from its work, as it was evident in Paul and in many others who converted from paganism and then suffered martyrdom. דָּבָר “for nothing” is properly the opposite of “cost” and also “the price for an expense” and “something that is bought by work.” Epicharmus⁷² writes τῶν πόνων πωλοῦσιν ἡμῖν πάντα τ’ ἀγαθ’ οἱ θεοί, “The gods sell to us all the goods of our labors.” However a great cost exists for the Jews and the Gentiles, καθαρτικὰ “purifying” sacrifices. The apostle Paul refers back to Isaiah 55:1. One correctly interprets this passage by understanding the words of Lactantius⁷³ *The Divine Institutes*, Book 3, chapter 26:

Give me a man who is offensive, scandalous, and unrestrained. With a very few words of God, “I will make him as gentle as a sheep.”⁷⁴ Give me one who is greedy, covetous, and materialistic. I will soon give him back to you free of that so that he freely gives his money with open hands. Give me a man who is afraid of pain and death. He shall soon despise crosses, fires, and the bull of Phalaris.⁷⁵ Give me one who is a drunkard, an adulterer, a glutton. You shall soon see him sober, faithful, and moderate. Give me one who is cruel and bloodthirsty. That fury shall soon be changed into true mercy. Give me a man who is unjust, foolish, a sinner. Afterwards he shall be just, wise, and pure. For by one bath,⁷⁶ all his wickedness shall be taken away. So great is the power of divine wisdom, that, when infused into a person's chest, with one thrust it at once drives out foolishness, which is the mother of faults. For this to happen there is no need of payment, or books, or nightly studies. These results are accomplished graciously, easily, and securely, if only the ears are open, and the chest thirsts for wisdom.

⁶⁹ Thus the text, perhaps 1 Corinthians 2:7.

⁷⁰ Chrysostom, John (349-407) was an orthodox Christian bishop.

⁷¹ Gerhard, Johann (Oct. 17, 1582–Aug. 17, 1637) was a German Lutheran theologian. He wrote his *Loci Theologici* in nine volumes and finished the *Harmonia*, first started by Martin Chemnitz and Polycarp Leyser.

⁷² Epicharmus of Kos (c.540-c.450 BC) is the first recorded comic writer in Greek history. He wrote between 35-52 comedies. Plato says that Socrates called Epicharmus “the prince of comedy.” (*Thaetetus*, 152E) Xenophon used this quote in his *Anabasis*, Book 2, chapter 1.

⁷³ Lactantius or Lucius Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius (ca. 250-ca.325) was an early Christian author. He tried to present Christianity as appealing to philosophical non-Christians. He was mocked in Copernicus's *De revolutionibus*.

⁷⁴ Terence, *Adelphi*, 4.1.

⁷⁵ Perillus invented the brazen bull, which the tyrant of Acragras, Sicily, Phalaris (c. 550 BC) used as an instrument of torture. It was so constructed that the groans of the victims appeared to resemble the bellowing of the bull. This story is related by Ovid, *Tristia*, 3:11:39-54.

⁷⁶ *Lavacro*, perhaps a reference to baptism.

There is no comparison of *the righteousness of faith* with *philosophical virtues*. (There is no trace of those virtues in this verse.) *A person's virtue* cannot be meant here by the word “righteousness,” to which a person is brought either through much labor or cost. For Paul is discussing the justification of a sinner in the presence of God's tribunal and court, not *how people are brought to piety and virtue* to become Christians. Therefore the Lactantius' quote does not apply here, “So great is the power of divine wisdom, that, when infused into a person's chest, with one thrust it at once drives out foolishness, which is the mother of faults.”

However Grotius correctly observes that $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ are *properly* the opposite of “cost” and “the price for an expense,” (cf. Isaiah 55:1). That is the opposite of the *sacrifices* of the Jews. (The sacrifices of the Gentiles do not apply here, since they arise out of $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\zeta\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$ “jealousy” and the mockery of the devil.) For the Jews' $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ “purifying” sacrifices came at a great cost. On the contrary, we had no expense at all. By our own works, we could not acquire righteousness, but we acquired it freely and out of pure grace on account of Christ's merit. We were unable to contribute any merits to justification or to make justification happen by any work of our own. Therefore with that one word, $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$, the *Catholics'* $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ “heterodoxy” is excluded, where they contend a person *must be prepared and made ready for justification*. For $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ means “freely” and “without cost.” Just as $\delta\omicron\omega\rho\omicron\nu$ is “a free gift” freely given. Agreeing with its use in Scripture, this word is the opposite of “cost” (Genesis 29:15; Exodus 21:2; Numbers 11:5; 2 Samuel 24:24; Matthew 10:8; 2 Corinthians 11:7; Revelation 2:5⁷⁷) and “merit” or “something deserved” (1 Samuel 19:5, 25:31; 1 Kings 2:31; Ezekiel 16:10; Ecclesiasticus 29:8,10; 2 Thessalonians 3:8). Ambrose⁷⁸ says about this verse, “we are justified freely, i.e. by a gift of God. We do nothing and do not give anything back in return” i.e. neither do we earn this for any works done beforehand nor do we pay for it with any works done afterwards.

τῆ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

Through Christ's obedience, especially to death, the Father answered the prayers that Christ brought before him. Therefore the Father does not leave the human race plunged into the deepest sins and stuck in them, but gives to the human race life from the righteousness that comes through Christ (Isaiah 53:4). This is called “to forgive sins” (Luke 23:34). It is also $\acute{\alpha}\rho\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ “to release, redeem” or $\rho\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ “to make redemption” (Luke 1:68). It is also $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ or $\rho\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ i.e. “to free,” namely to free from the need to die in sins by opening the way to escape such things. In addition, the apostle Paul correctly attributes this freedom to divine goodness, for it was because of God's goodness that he gave Christ to us (John 3:16; Romans 8:32. Add Ephesians 1:7).⁷⁹

One correctly explains “grace” as “divine goodness,” which is to be noted against the Catholics, who understand “grace” as “the infused inner righteousness.” That Catholic idea is contrary to:

⁷⁷ Thus the text, perhaps Revelation 21:6 or 22:17.

⁷⁸ Ambrose (c. 340- 397) was bishop of Milan. He is best known for his powerful sermons and his role in converting Augustine. However this is an unknown author, Ambrosiaster. His commentary on Paul's letters dates to the late fourth century. It was erroneously attributed to Ambrose until Erasmus started doubting its authorship in 1527.

⁷⁹ In the original this paragraph is formatted as if it belongs to Calov's section, however the comments are Grotius' and later on in this section, Calov disapproves of some statements in this section.

1. The *proper meaning of the word*, because χάρις means “grace,” just as χαρίζομαι is “to give out of grace” Luke 7:42; 2 Corinthians 2:10, 12:13.
2. The *use of Scripture*, which nowhere has anything “infused or inner” as a meaning for χάρις.
3. The *focus of the apostle Paul*, who is teaching that we are justified *freely and out of grace through Christ's redemption alone*, without our abilities, our righteousness, and our works or merits, but by taking hold of Christ's righteousness and merit solely by faith.
4. The *synonym*, by which χάρις is explained as “God's mercy” Ephesians 2:4; Titus 3:5; 1 Peter 1:3.
5. The *antonym*, because in parallel passages “grace” is contrasted with “works” Romans 11:6; Ephesians 2:8 and “something that is owed” Romans 4:4-5.

In his book *On the Free Will of Mankind and the Divine Grace*, Cardinal Piggius⁸⁰ comments about the meaning of “grace.” He identifies it “as some quality of our spirit not created by God.” Biel⁸¹ says in his *Commentary on Peter Lombard's Sentences*, Book 2, dissertation 26, “Logically, grace is received (because of God's gracious will to everyone) freely and without cost, not because of an obligation.” However, even after *the Jesuit anathemas* of the Council of Trent, Pererius⁸² says in dissertation 13 on this verse, “Paul shows that God's gracious goodness and kindness towards mankind is to be seen here in the word 'grace,' since Paul contrasts the grace of God with the works of people.” Check also the *Theol. Apost. Rom. Orac.* 31.⁸³

Needless to say, here it is not our *freedom* that is attributed to God's goodness (although that by all means is ascribed to divine *grace*) but here our *justification* is attributed to God's goodness. For the origins of ἀπολυτρόσεως “redemption” are not explained, but the cause of *justification* is explained, namely that it is attributed to God's grace. However it is not an *absolute*⁸⁴ grace, but the grace founded on Christ's merit or the grace that comes to us on account of Christ's ἀπολύτρωσις. By that justification Christ redeems us by the intervention of the λύτρου “ransom” of his obedience, both *active* and *passive* and by the shedding of his most precious blood. He redeemed us from God's wrath, sin, Satan's power, death, and hell, (1 Timothy 2:6; 1 Peter 1:18-19). (This is directed against the *Socinians*.)⁸⁵ Therefore Jesus earned for us grace and the forgiveness of sins by expiating God's wrath and by making satisfaction to the divine justice for the sins of the entire human race. Therefore, by his

⁸⁰ Albert Pigghe, or Piggius, or Pighius (c.1490-1542) was a Dutch Catholic theologian, mathematician, and astronomer. He wrote his book *De libero hominis arbitrio et divina gratia* (1542) against Martin Luther and John Calvin.

⁸¹ Gabriel Biel (c. 1420-1495) was a German Catholic theologian.

⁸² Benedict Pererius or Pereira (1535-1610) was a Spanish, Jesuit philosopher, theologian, and exegete. Pereira wrote 188 dissertations on Romans.

⁸³ Unable to verify this work.

⁸⁴ “Absolute” in the sense of without any restriction, condition, or qualification. It was not arbitrary.

⁸⁵ The Socinians did not teach that Christ's suffering and death was to redeem us from God's wrath, sin, Satan's power, death, and hell. They said Christ's suffering and death was an example and pledge of our forgiveness, cf. the *Racovian Catechism*, chapter 8: “Of the Death of Christ” and chapter 11: “Of Justification.”

ἀπολύτρωσις Christ did not merely show that God opens the way for us to come to justification, but Christ also made satisfaction for us with the shedding of his precious blood. In this way he freed us from God's wrath and linked us to God's grace. By all means, this obedience is his "obedience all the way to death on the cross,"⁸⁶ "through which we are established as righteous" (Romans 5:19). For "he was made sin for us so that we would become righteousness in him" (2 Corinthians 5:21). "He was made by God righteousness for us" (1 Corinthians 1:30). He himself is "our righteousness" (Jeremiah 23:6). Also "in him, righteousness is ours" (Isaiah 45:23).

In addition "grace" is not merely *to make a way to justification* and *to forgive sins*, nor merely *to open a way*, by which *one is allowed to leave the necessity of death*. Christ redeems us. Therefore the words גאֵל and פָּדָה "to free" not only include that thought, but also that *Christ has made satisfaction for us by his death and has redeemed us from sin and death*, just as it is shown against the Socinian foolishness. Grotius himself brought that up in *A Defense of the Catholic Faith concerning Christ's Satisfaction* against the Socinians.⁸⁷

Romans 4:25

Chapter 4: Summary and Division

The apostle Paul shows that a person is justified by faith not by works. He first uses the example of Abraham, to whom in the matter of good works, faith (not works) was imputed as righteousness without works. Then Paul uses the testimony of David, who talks about the blessedness found through the non-imputation of sins. Paul also shows that faith was imputed to Abraham while he was still uncircumcised and that he indeed received circumcision only as the sign of the righteousness of faith. So to everyone who is uncircumcised, who has the faith of Abraham, he is the prime example of justification or the father of all those who believe. For Abraham believed in hope against hope. Following his example so that faith would be imputed as righteousness, it is necessary that everyone believe in God, who made Jesus, who was put to death for our sins, made alive again for our righteousness.

There are *three* parts to this chapter:

1. Verses 1-8: The proof for *the justification through faith* from the *example* of Abraham and *the testimony of David*.
2. Verses 9-13: The extension of the way in which Abraham was justified *to the Gentiles*.
3. Verses 14-25: The declaration of Abraham's *justifying faith*. ...

⁸⁶ Philippians 2:8.

⁸⁷ This work *De satisfaction Christi adversus Faustum Socinum* (1617) was translated by Frank Hugh Foster in 1889. yoel.info/grotius.pdf

Verse 25

ὃς παρεδόθη

Handed over by God the Father, namely “into death” is to be understood here and in Romans 8:32. See especially what we said at Matthew 28:22. Look back to the Septuagint of Isaiah 53:6 κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν “the Lord handed him over for our sins.”

διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν

We are accustomed to saying that Christ both died and rose so that he would justify, i.e. free us from sins. However because the apostle Paul loves ἀντίθετα “antitheses,” he has connected sins, which are the death of the soul, to death, but he has connected the obtaining of justification, which is the making alive of the soul, to resurrection. God wondrously draws us back from sin and leads us to justification. Therefore we see that Christ did not fear death to testify to his teaching against sins and to call us to justification. We also see that God raised Christ to life so that the highest authority would be added to this same teaching (cf. 1 Peter 1:3).

The death of Christ is not so much in order to be a martyr or to testify to his teaching, which is sealed by death, but rather to provide the satisfaction for sins, which Grotius himself maintained against Faustus Socinus in *A Defense of the Catholic Faith concerning Christ's Satisfaction*. We also adamantly maintain that against the Socinian error. Not only does Christ's courage draw back from sins and lead to justification—because to show that he did not fear death to testify to his teaching against sins and to call us to justification, those were not the reasons that the only begotten Son of God had to face death (since many martyrs faced such things, martyrs who certainly did not fear to die for the testimony of Christ's teaching)—but the death of Christ itself also was the λύτρον⁸⁸ “price of release, ransom” and ἀντίλυτρον⁸⁹ “ransom” for our sins. That was the reason that Christ died. Since sins are the meritorious cause⁹⁰ for death, *Christ was handed over into death for us so that one died for everyone* (cf. 2 Corinthians 5:15). This section is not talking about that drawing back from sins, but about the expiation of sins accomplished through Christ's death or the satisfaction presented for sins, which is the meritorious cause of our justification. Even less does this section talk about the reason that moves us morally to cease from sins.

In addition the apostle Paul does not speak about Christ *having been made alive* by God in order to add authority to his teaching. Christ could just as easily add this authority through miracles and the testimony about heaven in a way so that the Jews would not have become hardened. However Christ has been made alive διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν “on account of our justification.” Although the only begotten Son of God was handed over to death and resurrected from death not only to confirm this teaching through the martyrdom of death and the miracle of the resurrection, but also to free others from sin and destruction through this same teaching. Likewise he himself was able to show this through the death and resurrection of some of the martyrs. For instance some of the believers of the past were made alive and many appeared, as Matthew 27:53 says.

Therefore was it necessary that *God's very Son, forever blessed above all things*, be handed over to death and be made alive again? At length the apostle Paul teaches that *the death of*

⁸⁸ Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45.

⁸⁹ 1 Timothy 2:6.

⁹⁰ The meritorious cause is the cause that contributes to a change by making it worthy to happen.

Christ occurred not only because of our sins, not only to confirm Christ's teaching that he takes away sins from us, but also because of our sins. For the words διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν “on account of our trespasses” state the “meritorious cause” of Christ's death. After he was handed over, according to the divine plan and decree, Christ endured the punishment for our sins to free us from our sins. Isaiah 53:6 clearly teaches that we are reconciled to God by Christ's death and therefore are justified. Therefore Christ's death was the motivating cause and reason that the forgiveness of sins and salvation are decreed for us. In no other way are we justified in the presence of God, with the result that salvation follows, except that satisfaction was made by Christ's death. Christ is the focus of Paul's discussion and discourse in this chapter. Therefore Paul describes *faith* in this way, *as imputed to us in justification, because faith depends on God, who made Jesus alive again from the dead, just as he was handed over for our sins.* For his resurrection from the dead is the infallible proof of *the very complete satisfaction* and expiation for our sins and reconciliation with God, accomplished through Christ's death.⁹¹ If that had not happened, God certainly would have never made alive this Mediator and our Bondsman, (who gave himself as the ἀντίλυτρον “ransom,” 1 Timothy 2:6) from the dead to share and distribute to us his justification or our justification.

However it is surely not that same line of thought when Christ is said *to have been made alive on account of our justification.* For instance God handed him over to death *on account of* our sins. Christ's *death* is established as the meritorious cause for the expiation of our sins, just as our sins were the meritorious cause of Christ's death. *Because of the “merit” of our sins,* he himself was handed over into death *in our place,* so that by the merit of his death, we would be freed from sin and its punishment, death. However this same thing cannot be said *about Christ's being made alive:* by his resurrection Christ merited justification for us. By his resurrection he confirmed that his merit had been completed by his death on the cross with his exclamation τετέλεσται “it is finished,” John 19:30.

Therefore Scripture here speaks about Christ's death and about his resurrection in different ways. For it says that Christ suffered and died both *in our place and on account of us.* However it does not say that he rose again *in our place* but only *on account of us.* Therefore although theologians call Christ's resurrection *the meritorious cause* of our justification, nevertheless they understand that word “merit” only in the general sense, as the blessed Gerhard reminded in his commentary on this verse. To the question whether Christ's resurrection pertains to the merit offered in our place, Gerhard responds:

The word “merit” is understood either γενικῶς “generically” for everything that pertains to our justification or ειδικῶς “specifically” for that, which Christ offered in our place and we ought to have offered. In the first sense, Christ's resurrection pertains to merit, because Christ's resurrection is needed for our justification in some respects. However in the second sense, it does not pertain to merit, because Christ rose again on account of us, not however, in our place. Christ suffered and died not only on account of us but also in our place.

⁹¹ *Quia illa resuscitatio e mortuis documentum est infallibile plenissimae satisfactionis et expiationis peccatorum nostrorum ac reconciliationis cum Deo per mortem Christi factae.*

Moreover Christ's resurrection was necessary for our justification for other reasons, just as the blessed Gerhard explains. Certainly:

1. *As the sign and proof.* Because Christ's resurrection is the clear testimony that the satisfaction for our sins is finished, and completed righteousness happened. For this reason, Chrysostom said in his *Homilies on Romans*, homily nine, on Romans 4:25, "In the resurrection, one sees that Christ was put to death not on account of his own sins, but on account of ours. For how could he have risen, if he was a sinner? Moreover since he was not a sinner, he was crucified on account of other people's sins."
2. *Because of the application.* If Christ remained in death, he would not be the victor over death, and he would not be able to apply to us the justification acquired at such a costly price, Romans 5:10, 8:34.
3. *Because of the actual absolution from sins.*⁹² Just as God punished our sins in Christ, which were placed on him and imputed to him as our Bondsman; so also by the very act of raising him from the dead, God absolved Christ of our sins, which were imputed to him. So for that reason, God also absolved us in Christ⁹³ (Cf. 1 Corinthians 15:17; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Ephesians 2:5; Galatians 2:12-13;⁹⁴ Philippians 3:8-10; 1 Peter 1:3).

The sign and proof for the expiation of our sins and the evidence of the victory over death are for the strengthening of our *faith*, but not for *Christ's merit*. Moreover *the application of Christ's righteousness* is certainly different from *Christ's merit*. The resurrected Christ is the *efficient cause*⁹⁵ of the application of Christ's righteousness. However Christ's resurrection is not the *meritorious cause* of either Christ's *righteousness* or *his application*. So in the resurrected Christ, we are absolved from our sins. *Because* Christ was absolved of our sins that were imputed to him, the expiation of our sins is certain for us, just as the vivification and the resurrection from the dead to eternal life is certain for us as well. Because of this certainty that depends on the merit of Christ's death and was confirmed through Christ's resurrection, we are said to be made alive in Christ and to have risen again with Christ (Isaiah 6:2;⁹⁶ Ephesians 2:5). However these things are not properly *the meritorious cause* of justification. Christ's resurrection was needed only *for faith to be strengthened on our part* or *for the application of righteousness* accomplished by Christ for us through the gospel. That does not however happen in a meritorious sense. Do not forget that Paul says Christ *was put to death on account of our sins*. He does not say about the resurrection, on account of δικαιοσύνην "righteousness," (which in other passages is the opposite of sin), but διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν "on account of our justification." For if Christ was not raised from the dead,

⁹² *Respectu actualis a peccato absolutionis.* *Actualis* can mean "active, practical, actual." Cf. Korthals' extended quote of Marquart's translation work, *Justification – Objective and Subjective: A Translation* in the *excursus* for how *actualis* was understood in the theological schools.

⁹³ This is the section that Pieper (*CD*, II, 321) quoted in his discussion on objective justification. [intrepidlutherans.com](http://www.intrepidlutherans.com) says this entire Gerhard quotation is talking about the justification of believers. (<http://www.intrepidlutherans.com/2013/05/an-essay-on-article-of-justification.html>) Appendix 4. The discerning readers can decide for themselves.

⁹⁴ Thus the text, but perhaps Colossians 2:12-13.

⁹⁵ The efficient cause is the cause that brings something about or makes something happen.

⁹⁶ Thus the text. However it does not prove the point.

there would not be faith, (which is necessary to make righteousness ἀμεταπτόως “immutably certain”) and Christ would not be able to apply righteousness to us.

The Catholics however twist Paul's meaning when they argue that Paul wants “Christ's death to be the example for the death of sinners, also the resurrection is the example of the internal restoration and regeneration, by which we walk in the newness of life,” cf. Bellarmine,⁹⁷ *Disputations*, Volume four, Book two, chapter six *On Justification*. This section does not deal with *the death of sinners* or *the restoration and newness of life*, which the apostle Paul begins to discuss only in Romans 6, but this is dealing with *the non-imputation* or *the forgiveness of sins* and *the imputation of righteousness* or *justification*. The particle διὰ “on account of” *our sins* does not have the idea of an *exemplary* cause, but a *meritorious* cause and “on account of” *our justification* has the idea of a *final* cause.⁹⁸ Moreover, the application of Christ's suffering is necessary for the justification that Paul discusses. Suárez⁹⁹ himself recognizes that in *Tome 2, in part 3, Thomae disputation 44*, p. 478, “Through his suffering, Christ sufficiently destroyed sin so that we are justified, and sin is efficaciously forgiven to us. Christ's suffering ought to be applied to us through living faith. This application is through imputation as the apostle Paul teaches.”

Therefore notice what the apostle Paul specifically says about how a person is to be justified:¹⁰⁰ *faith ought to be imputed to a person for righteousness to believe in God, who raised Jesus from the dead – Jesus, who was handed over to death on account of our sins and raised to life on account of our justification*. Therefore Paul certainly teaches that our *faith* looks back to what *God made us so very certain of: the satisfaction presented to him, by making Jesus alive again*. Paul also equally teaches that our *faith* looks back to the *death, to which God handed Jesus over on account of our sins*. For those reasons, our *faith* looks back to the one and the same *meritorious satisfaction* of the Lord Jesus. Paul testifies that faith is imputed to us for righteousness, especially since for our justification, God the Father made his Son alive again. Therefore by that undeniable proof, God the Father would establish for us the expiation of sins. Also *by God the Father's decree and will*, we would believe that Christ himself, our Mediator, has without a doubt applied to us this expiation, (which he acquired for us) i.e. righteousness. ...

⁹⁷ Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) was a Jesuit cardinal of the Catholic church. He was an important figure in the Counter-Reformation against the Lutherans. He wrote *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus hujus temporis Haereticos*, which Calov cites here.

⁹⁸ The final cause is the cause as viewed from the end goal.

⁹⁹ Francisco Suárez (1548-1617) was a Spanish, Jesuit priest, philosopher, and theologian. Unable to verify this work.

¹⁰⁰ *Justificandum*.

Romans 5:18-19

Chapter 5: Summary and Division

After justification through faith, there is peace of conscience, confidence to approach God, and a hope of future glory. All of this is confirmed by God's love and Christ's satisfaction for us. Through the sin of one, guilt came over all people. However the gift of grace through Christ does not free us only from one sin but from all sins. Though sin's power is through the law for condemnation, how much more powerful is the received grace not only to free us from the rule of sin and death but also to rule through righteousness for life in Christ.

There are three parts to this chapter:

1. Verses 1-2: ἐξηγητική “the narrative” section, where the apostle Paul declares, and by that declaration, he also supports *the teaching of justification through faith, by pointing to the subsequent peace with God.*
2. Verses 3-19: ἀποδεικτική “the proving” section, where the apostle Paul, *by comparing and contrasting the first and second Adam*, confirms the gracious justification through the imputation of Christ's righteousness.
3. Verses 20-21: παρασκευαστική “the preparatory” section, where the apostle Paul prepares to answer objections, by instructing us about the law. The law is doubtlessly useful *not for justification*, but for *the increase of sin and the magnification of God's grace in Christ*. Additionally let us consider the universal οικονομίαν “arrangement” of Paul's discussion. The third and fourth evidences¹⁰¹ are βεβαιώσεως “to confirm” the main point, namely the proof for the justification of faith is from the following or subsequent peace of conscience, the comparisons and contrasts of unrighteousness and righteousness, and the comparison of Adam and Christ. Therefore after the apostle Paul has finished *proving* his main point, and before he proceeds ἐκδίκησιν “to defend” the teaching of *the justification through faith*, he lays the groundwork by restating the reason why the law came in. ...

Verse 18

Ἄρα οὖν

After a long παρενθήκη (“aside”) in which the apostle Paul in passing shows certain differences of the things compared, he returns to that which he began to say in verse 12. ἄρα is “to return again to an interrupted discussion.” In Philippians 2:1 and 5, there is a similar hyperbaton¹⁰² and repetition of an unfinished discussion through the use of καί.

ὡς δι’ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντα ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα

Supply ἐγένετο “the matter proceeds.” When Hebrew wants to use הַ with the same meaning as εἰς, it uses הַ with a noun, as in Genesis 2:24: ἔσονται εἰς σάρκα μίαν “they will become one flesh,” also 1 Corinthians 15:45: ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν “he became a living being.” Therefore the

¹⁰¹ *Argumentum tertium et quartum βεβαιώσεως thematis principalis.* Unsure which of Paul's evidences used in chapter 5 are the third and fourth in Calov's numbering.

¹⁰² A figure of speech where the word order is changed to produce an effect.

Peshitta¹⁰³ translated with nouns εἰς κατάκριμα “into condemnation” here and εἰς δικαίωσιν “into justification” that follows.

οὕτως καὶ δι’ ἑνὸς δικαίωματος

That is ὑπακοῆς “of obedience,” as the apostle Paul already explained. Paul indicates this obedience of Christ from every stage of his life all the way to his death with the singular noun δικαίωμα “righteous act,” on account of his singular course of life as we said above in verse 16.¹⁰⁴

εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους

Understand this as everyone who themselves ought to believe. That believing is the beginning of the new nature, as we said.

εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς

This is the freedom from sin for them. This freedom is the cause of eternal life. Among our Hebrew writers, the genitive case has various meanings. Here it designates what is put into effect.

There is no παρενθήκη here. Everything is accurately arranged and besides, this comparison is relevant to Paul's discussion. Paul makes this comparison especially because it is significant for proving and explaining his main point. Therefore this comparison is not made in passing but is purposely and carefully made.

ἄρα here is *inferential* rather than *repetitive* and/or “a return to previously stated things.” For the apostle Paul draws a conclusion from those things that he finished thoroughly discussing. He completes that presentation of his main point based on that very well designed ἀντιθέσις “antithesis” between Adam and Christ. “Therefore just as through the sin (evil or guilt or guilty of τὸ κρίμα “the judgment,” which is deduced from the previous passages) of one comes over every person for condemnation, so also through the righteousness (blessing or gift or τὸ χάρισμα “the gracious gift”) of one comes over every person for the justification of life.” Adam and Christ are contrasted with each other in this way: Adam's παράπτωμα “sin,” Christ's δικαίωμα “satisfaction.”¹⁰⁵ From Adam, comes κρίμα or “judgment,” to those guilty of and sharing in Adam's sin. However from Christ flows the χάρισμα or “gracious blessing,” the gift of satisfaction and imputation. Therefore κατάκριμα or “the condemnation and eternal death” that comes from judgment is contrasted with “the justification of life” that flows to us out of “the gift of righteousness.” By that righteousness, we are freed from sin and restored as heirs of eternal life.

In addition one can easily approve the *Peshitta's* translation and Grotius' observation. Nevertheless the *Peshitta's* translation is deeper and simpler and more fitting than what Grotius cited. For the *Peshitta* has, “Just as through the sin of one, condemnation was for all

¹⁰³ *Syrus*. The *Peshitta* (Syriac for “common” or “simple”) is the standard translation of the Bible in the Syriac language, a dialect of Aramaic.

¹⁰⁴ Grotius on εἰς δικαίωμα in verse 16: “δικαίωμα here and in verse 18 means 'pure life' or 'continual obedience.' Cf. Job 34:27 and יְהוָה, which means 'his ways.' The LXX translates that as δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ 'his righteous acts.' Therefore the apostle Paul uses a singular noun here to mean the one constant course of life.” [In some cases in Revelation a better translation would be “verdicts of righteousness.”]

¹⁰⁵ Both “sin” and “satisfaction” are the English translations of the Latin words that Calov uses to translate the Greek.

of humanity, so also through the righteousness of one, the justification of life is for all of humanity.” With that understanding, which is *in the following verse*, a reason starts to become clear – why both the condemnation is through the sin of one, and the justification of life arises through the δικαίωμα of one – because indeed “many are made sinners through the disobedience of one, and in comparison, many are made righteous through the obedience of one.” Moreover δικαίωμα did not overflow to all people for *justification* because of *an actual justification*, but because of *the merit and acquisition of salvation*. For *faith* is necessary for actual justification and for the benefit of salvation.¹⁰⁶

Besides, δικαίωμα is defined by the philosopher Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book five, chapter seven, section seven, as a ἐπανόρθωμα τῆς ἀδικίας “correction of the wrong,” which is either *active* (that is done through a valid action and carrying out of a legal punishment) or *passive* (that is done through satisfaction, when a guilty person, who has done a wrong, is freed from his obligation to punishment). Michael of Ephesus¹⁰⁷ has this to say in chapter 19 of his *Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics*, “δικαίωμα means 'to receive justice.' That is talking about the person who receives what has been taken away from them by an unjust act and that person who is punished by the law.” Satisfaction in general means that payment which frees someone from punishment, who ought to be punished. Either the satisfaction is large enough to compensate for an offense, no matter how large, (just as a *penal satisfaction* is the payment of punishment that pays for a crime) or it is *to remove the obligation* to punishment because of the crime.

Therefore the δικαίωμα of Christ in our passage doubtlessly means Christ's *satisfaction*. Just as verse 18 shows the *meritorious cause*¹⁰⁸ of *our absolution from sins* (that happens in our justification) namely δικαίωμα or satisfaction, so also verse 19 adds *the meritorious cause of the imputation of Christ's righteousness* (that likewise happens in justification) by calling the cause, Christ's *obedience*. Certainly just as *by the merit of Adam's transgression*, according to the nature of the law, *judgment comes to all people for condemnation*; so also by the merit of Christ's *satisfaction*, the imputation of Christ's satisfaction is gained for all people for justification (not for only one sin, but for all sins according to the gospel) or the absolution from sins is gained for all people so that they would have eternal life. Just as by the merit of *Adam's disobedience*, all were made sinners and *unjust* according to the nature of divine justice (because Adam's disobedience was imputed to everyone); so also by the merit of *Christ's obedience*, according to the nature of the divine, gracious will, everyone is able and ought to become *righteous*, (because Christ's *obedience* was imputed to everyone.)

Therefore δικαίωμα and ὑπακοή “obedience” are not simply the same thing. For through δικαίωμα, penal satisfaction is meant, but through ὑπακοή, the fulfillment of the law is meant.

¹⁰⁶ *Non autem in omnes redundavit δικαίωμα ad justificationem ratione actualis justificationis, sed ratione meriti et acquisitionis salutis; quia ad actualem justificationem, and salutis fruitionem opus est fide. Actualis can mean “active, practical, actual.” Cf. Korthals' extended quote of Marquart's translation work, *Justification – Objective and Subjective: A Translation* in the *excursus* for how *actualis* was understood in the theological schools. Calov appears to make a distinction between two ways of talking about justification. He first seems to be equating justification with merit and acquisition of salvation. He then defines actual justification as something, for which “faith is necessary.”*

¹⁰⁷ Michael of Ephesus (early to mid 12th century) wrote important commentaries on many of Aristotle's works.

¹⁰⁸ The meritorious cause is the cause that contributes to a change by making it worthy to happen.

(For Christ presents both as the cause of our justification.) Cf. *Our Königsberg Disputations about the Truthfulness of Christ's Satisfaction*. Augustine¹⁰⁹ beautifully says in *A Treatise on the Grace of Christ and on Original Sin*, Book 2, chapter 28, "In the cases of these two men, the Christian faith is properly established: since through Adam, we were sold under sin; through Christ, we are restored from sin (that is the satisfaction fulfilled in the passion and death) ... since Adam in himself destroyed us by doing his own will, not the will of God, who made him; Christ in himself saved us by not doing his own will, but the will of God, who sent him" that is Christ's *active* obedience.

Verse 19

ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί

Again here is a μετωνυμία "metonymy."¹¹⁰ They are treated in his way, as if they actually committed the sin, because indeed they were delivered to death. "Sinner" is understood in this way in 1 Kings 1:21 and elsewhere. Paul again said πολλοί "many" here, after he had only said πάντας "all people," since the force is taken from the one or the other.

οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς

Through Christ's continual obedience, which agrees with his teaching, and which God repaid with the highest reward. See Philippians 2:8-9.

δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί

The future is used for the durative present. Also "many" means i.e. "believers," since faith is necessary. Notice here that δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται "will be made righteous" is the same as δικαιωθήσονται "will become righteous" or δικαιούται "become righteous." The abstract term is used instead of the concrete term as in Hebrew usage, δικαιοσύνη γίνονται¹¹¹ "to become righteousness," 2 Corinthians 5:21. Moreover Isaiah 53:11 is clearly in the picture here, "Through his knowledge, my righteous servant will make many righteous."¹¹² Certainly they become righteous in the presence of God and consequently the divine rewards follow in their own time.

Thoughtlessly Grotius assumes a μετωνυμία and the apostle Paul's line of thought is twisted in Socinian fashion. Paul does not show *how we are considered* because of Adam's disobedience, but *what we have become*, namely *sinner and unrighteous through the imputation of Adam's disobedience*. Paul is not discussing *death* here but *sin*. In this orderly discussion, the apostle distinguishes sin, the cause, from death, the effect.

¹⁰⁹ Augustine of Hippo in North Africa (354- 430) was one the greatest theologians of the early Christian church.

¹¹⁰ A figure of speech where something is called not by its proper name, but by something that is closely associated to it e.g. drink the cup i.e. drink the contents of the cup.

¹¹¹ Thus the text, however the Greek has γενόμεθα δικαιοσύνη. There is no variant given in the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament or the 4th edition of the *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft* Greek New Testament.

¹¹² *Per sui notitiam justos faciet Justus servus meus multos.*

The 1 Kings 1:21 reference is not relevant here. For in 1 Kings 1:21, the particle כִּי is to be correctly understood in the usual Hebrew usage, “we will be *just like* sinners.”¹¹³ However none of that applies to this passage.

Moreover πολλοί “many” is certainly used for those who were previously called πάντες “all.” Therefore *everyone* is to be understood and no one is excluded. For there is no διαστολή “distinction,” Romans 3:22. All people were in Adam's body, “all people sinned in him,” Romans 5:12.¹¹⁴ For this reason, *all people have become sinners and condemnation comes over all people*.

Christ's obedience is presented before us not *as something to be repaid in Christ with the highest reward* but *as something given to us* and is imputable to all of us. We all are able to become righteous through Christ's obedience. We ought also to become righteous by the plan of the most gracious, divine will. In addition it is correct to take the future as the durative present.¹¹⁵ The Isaiah passage, (which Grotius horribly distorted in his *Annotata* on Isaiah 53:11) is clearly not applicable here.

Therefore just as Adam's disobedience was imputed to his descendants, *Christ's righteousness and obedience* are imputed to us in our justification. According to the divine plan, *Christ's righteousness and obedience* are taken hold of through faith or by faith. For as

¹¹³ The BHS has כִּי with no כִּי . There is a כִּי in this verse at כִּי . However that does not apply to this discussion. A few English translations translate as if a כִּי is there e.g. HCSB, NIV84, NIV2011.

¹¹⁴ *Omnes in ipso peccarunt*. Greek: ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Following the Latin, Calov takes *in ipso*/ἐφ' ᾧ as a preposition and pronoun referring back to Adam. However grammatically ἐφ' ᾧ could also mean “because,” e.g. ESV, HCSB, NIV1984, NIV2011. Cf. also the discussion on this passage in Hoenecke's *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics Volume II* (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009), 397-401.

¹¹⁵ “(The *durative (linear or progressive)* in the present stem: the action is represented as durative (in progress) and either as timeless (ἔστιν ὁ θεός) or as taking place in present time (including, of course, duration on one side or the other of the present moment: γράφω ‘I am writing [now]’).” Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert Walter Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 166. Under the category of durative present is the gnomic (logical) present, cf. Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 519, 523. A gnomic present serves the same purpose as a gnomic (logical) future. Robertson simply states that there is a durative future as well, cf. A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the New Testament in Light of New Testament Research*, (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), 871.

Citing A.T. Robertson for the term, Kuske calls this a durative future. “The durative future speaks of something that is true both now and on into the future.” David Kuske, *A Commentary on Romans 1-8*, (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2007), 286.

Or it could be a “logical future, (i.e. If x happens than y will be the case.)” Roy Hefti, “One Sure Thing,” 6. Cf. also J.P. Meyer, “Objective Justification: Part I and II.” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 37:1,2, January and April 1940. wlsessays.net/node/1448 “From all of this it appears that the time question is a foreign element in the entire argument of Paul. What Paul stresses throughout is the certainty and superabundance of grace. It may well be assumed that the future serves the same purpose; in fact, any other assumption would seriously disturb the balance. What Paul wants to say, is this: As by the disobedience of the one man the many were entered on God's lists as sinners, so in the nature of the case by the obedience of the One the many will *without doubt* be listed as righteous – without any reference to time.” “Logical future or as some have called it, the future of logical certainty.” Georg Stöckhardt, *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer*, (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1907), 261.

All agree that this is not a future in the predictive or temporal sense.

they became sinners *by the imputation of Adam's disobedience, so we become righteous by the imputation of Christ's obedience or righteousness.*

The Catholics Bellarmine, Becanus,¹¹⁶ and others understand from this comparison that *Christ's obedience* is not *the formal cause*¹¹⁷ of our justification, but the efficient cause,¹¹⁸ since *Christ's obedience* is in contrast to *Adam's disobedience*. Just as through *Adam's disobedience*, we are said to become *unrighteous*, so through *Christ's obedience*, we are said to become *righteous*.

However we do not *formally* become unrighteous through *Adam's disobedience*, but *efficiently* and *meritoriously*. In addition, the fact that *Adam's disobedience* is able to produce unrighteous people and *Christ's obedience* is able to produce righteous people cannot be contrasted to each other unless, *it is in the imputed sense* that we become unrighteous through *Adam's disobedience* and righteous through *Christ's obedience*. For if both were not imputed to us, then by no means would either be ours. For acts are singular things, both individual (and therefore *properly* belong to those who do them) and *personal*. Moreover, that one's own personal acts are formally made someone else's is contradictory. For this reason *to be imputed* is necessary. So just as *Adam's disobedience* necessarily was imputed to his descendants, how much more necessarily is *Christ's obedience* to be imputed to us.

Likewise *Adam's disobedience* is not imputed to us unless *Adam* earned by his disobedience this *punishment* so that his disobedience was imputed *for condemnation* to him and *all of Adam's descendants*. *Adam* was the one, who represented the entire human race. In *Adam* the entire human race received that original righteousness through nature. Therefore *Adam's apostasy and disobedience* is considered the apostasy and disobedience of the entire human race, because humanity was *in Adam's body*. "We all sinned in *Adam*."¹¹⁹ So for that reason, since *Adam* sinned, the entire human race was condemned and made guilty of apostasy and disobedience to God, cf. Augustine's previous comments on original sin. For through human procreation, we pass on from *Adam* the punishment (so to speak) of *the first sin* or the punishment of *Adam's disobedience*. How could that punishment of the first sin be passed on to *Adam's descendants* unless that first sin was imputed to the descendants! Bellarmine also says in *Disputations*, Volume four, Book four, chapter ten *on Lost Grace*, "The sin of *Adam* is imputed to all of his descendants in this way, since they all committed the same sin." Bellarmine also quotes St. Bernard,¹²⁰ "*Adam's guilt* is ours, because although it was in another, we nevertheless sinned, and it was rightly imputed inside us by God's just judgment."

In the same way, *Christ's obedience* cannot be imputed to us unless *Christ* earned the obedience by fulfilling the law so that his obedience, which was fulfilled in our place, is

¹¹⁶ Martin Becanus (1563-1624) was a Flemish, Jesuit priest and theologian. He authored 37 books and most were works of polemics.

¹¹⁷ Formal cause is the cause based on the shape, arrangement, or configuration of something e.g. the idea for the statue in the sculptor's mind.

¹¹⁸ Efficient cause is the cause that brings something out or makes something happen.

¹¹⁹ Romans 5:12.

¹²⁰ Bernardus or Bernhard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) was a Catholic monk and priest. In Roman Catholicism, he is considered one of the "Doctors of the Church," and is given the name Doctor Mellifluus, "the honey-flowing teacher."

imputed to us. For Christ was the substitute *in our place* under the divine judgment, not only *to pay the penalty of sin in our place* and to make satisfaction for the divine justice, 2 Corinthians 5:14, 21; but also *to fulfill the law in our place* and to achieve the obedience that we were not able to achieve (Romans 8:3, 10:4; Galatians 4:6). Therefore Christ's obedience is considered the obedience of the entire human race. We take hold of Christ's obedience with faith. The obedience to God's justice becomes ours through a λογισμόν “counting” and imputation, as real as if we had done it ourselves.

Therefore in this way, Christ is the *efficient* and *meritorious* cause of our justification, because he fulfilled the obedience to God in the place of the human race. Christ is also the *formal* cause, because Christ's obedience is imputed to our faith and our receiving it through faith is taken into account before God. If someone would say, “No one becomes righteous unless through the inherent righteousness.” I would say in return, “To truly be righteous in God's sight is to give to someone another's righteousness, namely Christ's.” So since God does this, it must truly happen. Therefore we are righteous and truly righteous in God's sight through this imputed righteousness. Certainly we are much better off and more honorable than someone, who is judged *by their own inherent righteousness*.

If someone would say with Stapleton¹²¹ that κατασταθήσονται “will be made” assumes *an inherent righteousness*, as in Luke 12:44, “the servant was placed over¹²² all the possessions,” and in James 4:4, “who is made¹²³ an enemy of God;” I would respond that καθίστημι does not always mean *something inherent*, but *the truth and certainty of the matter under discussion*. (Also nothing can mean two things at the same time.) In this way *a white wall is set up* because of the *inherent* whiteness. *Someone becomes a master over possessions* not because of an *inherent quality*, but because of ἐχῆσιν¹²⁴ “ownership.” Someone becomes a *friend of God* because of *the loving God's affection*,¹²⁵ which is inherent in God, but not in the one, who is loved. Therefore, because of Christ's imputed *righteousness*, we are *truly* able to become *righteous in God's presence*, just as real as if someone becomes a master over possessions or an enemy or friend of God, cf. Chamier¹²⁶ in *The Catholic Panstratia* or *The Wars of the Lord* (1606), Book 21, chapter 2, *On Justification*.

¹²¹ Stapletonus or Stapleton, Thomas (1535-1598) was an English Catholic theologian. Calov cites from Stapleton's *Antidota Apostolica in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (1595), *Apostolic Antidotes to Paul's Letter to the Romans*.

¹²² The Greek is καταστήσει, a future indicative from the same root as κατασταθήσονται.

¹²³ The Greek is καθίσταται, a present indicative from the same root as κατασταθήσονται.

¹²⁴ The text has ἐχέσιν.

¹²⁵ *Amicus Dei per affectum Dei amantis*.

¹²⁶ Daniel Chamier (1564-1621) was a French Huguenot. He wrote this work, *Catholica Panstratia*, as a refutation of mainly Bellarmine.

Conclusion

Are these selections from Calov's *Biblia Illustrata* consistent with what the Bible teaches and what Lutherans today teach about justification? I will conclude with just two extended quotations from Calov and compare them with quotations from dogmaticians from the last century.

- On 2 Corinthians 5:19: *The term "reconciliation" is used in two different aspects*: The apostolic distinction between the accomplishment of reconciliation (in verses 18-19, he reconciled us to himself) and its application (in verse 20: "Christ appeals through us: Be reconciled to God") would also not make much sense. Therefore the kind of reconciliation, into which Christians are encouraged to enter is different from the reconciliation of the world, which Christ already accomplished. The former kind of reconciliation is necessary based on that kind of reconciliation, which already happened and which God has presented to us.¹²⁷
 - The Scripture teaches the *objective reconciliation*. Nineteen hundred years ago Christ effected the reconciliation of all men with God. God does not wait for men to reconcile him with themselves by means of any efforts of their own. He is already reconciled. The reconciliation is an accomplished fact, just like the creation of the world. Rom. 5:10: "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son." When Christ died, God became reconciled. As Christ's death lies in the past, so also our reconciliation is an accomplished fact. 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ, reconciling" (namely, when Christ lived and died on earth) "the world unto Himself." ... The message of this finished reconciliation is brought to us by the Gospel ("the Word of Reconciliation," 2 Cor. 5:19), and thus the subjective reconciliation takes place only by faith (*sola fide*). In other words: only for this reason does faith reconcile us with God (subjectively) that reconciliation has already been effected through Christ's satisfaction and is proclaimed and proffered to us in the Gospel. "Be reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5:20)—believe and accept the objective reconciliation procured by Christ and now offered to you.¹²⁸
- On Romans 4:25: *Christ's resurrection is the actual absolution from sins*: Because of the *actual absolution from sins*. Just as God punished our sins in Christ, which were placed and imputed on him as our Bondsman, so also by the very act of raising him from the dead, God absolved Christ of our sins, which were imputed to him. So for that reason, God also absolved us in Christ.¹²⁹
 - Now, then, if the Father raised Christ from the dead, He, by this glorious resurrection act, declared that the sins of the whole world are fully expiated, or atoned for, and that all mankind is now regarded as righteous before His divine tribunal. This gracious reconciliation and justification is clearly taught

¹²⁷ Cf. also on 2 Corinthians 5:19 "*The object of reconciliation ...*" and "However the promise of freedom ..."

¹²⁸ Pieper, *CD*, II, 347-348,349; cf. also Becker, "OJ," 7 and Becker, "UJ," 4.

¹²⁹ Cf. also on Romans 5:18 "Therefore the δικαίωμα of Christ ..."

in Rom. 4:25: “Who was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification.” The term δικαίωσις here means the act of divine justification executed through God’s act of raising Christ from the dead, and it is for this reason called the *objective justification* of all mankind.¹³⁰

Soli Deo Gloria

On the anniversary of the death of Abraham Calov (1686) and the birth of Adolf Hoenecke (1835)

S.K.P.

Khàwp jai (“Thank you”) to Pr. Joe Fricke, John Meyer, and Brian Schmidt for previewing, proofreading, and improving this paper. Any remaining mistakes, typos, and errors are my own fault.

¹³⁰ Pieper, *CD*, II, 321; cf. also Becker, “UJ,” 5.

Excursus

Someone might ask, “Why do the Confessions not talk about objective justification? If they did not talk about it, it must be because it is not a teaching of Scripture.” Besides that being an argument from silence (although not really as the following quotations will show), it is also a straw man argument, putting up a false assumption and then knocking it down. It is also *petitio principii* “begging the question” assuming something to be true for the sake of argument, which *cannot* be assumed to be true because there is no proof for it. Hoenecke makes a good point on this question, “Our dogmatists do not treat objective justification especially but only incidentally.”¹³¹ Korthals has this to say about this above line of argumentation:

[The reality of Christ’s work accomplished for the whole world] was a given fact as far as Catholics and Lutherans were concerned. The primary point of contention between these two groups was in *how* the work of Christ for the world was brought to bear on the individual sinner. ...

It doesn’t surprise us, then, that when the Lutheran Confessions treat justification the points of dispute center largely on questions about *how* justification or the remission of sins are delivered to and obtained by the sinner. Therefore most of the statements in the Lutheran Confessions and in the writings of Lutheran theologians during the Age of Orthodoxy deal with the personal justification of an individual.

Those who deny objective justification try to make the case that the doctrine is not found in the Lutheran Confessions. This is not the case. While the term “objective justification” does not appear in the Confessions and while objective justification doesn’t receive nearly the same amount of attention as the doctrine of justification through faith, the doctrine is taught implicitly throughout, and in some cases explicitly.¹³²

As to why one does not find the term “universal justification” in the post-Formula of Concord century, Korthals adds this, “The first appearance of the term ‘universal justification’ is apparently found in the work of Samuel Huber in the late 1500’s. Ironically his use of the term was rejected by orthodox Lutherans because of difficulties connected to the definition he attached to it.”¹³³ Quoting from some of the discussion at the first meeting of the Synodical Conference (1872), Curia reports:

¹³¹ Hoenecke, *ELD*, III, 338. One can see that in these selections from Calov.

¹³² James Korthals, “Universal/Objective Justification: An Historical Perspective” (paper delivered at the Kettle Moraine Pastoral Conference of the Southeastern Wisconsin District, Trinity, West Mequon, WI, January 15, 2013), 5-6.

¹³³ Korthals, 3. There is a footnote that states “C.F.W. Walther’s edition of Baier’s *Compendium Theologiae Positivae* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1879) cites the rejection by orthodox faculties of Huber’s contention that justification was ‘universal’ and that Christ’s redemption had properly speaking and in actual fact been conferred on all men (III, V, 286-287.) The rejection of Huber’s language, however, was generally understood to be due to his other errors, principally about the election of grace.”

This doctrine [universal justification] is positively taught [in] Rom 5:18, and it is therefore not only a Biblical *doctrine*, but also a Biblical *expression that the justification of life came upon all men*. None but a Calvinistic exposition could explain this passage in such [a] manner as to restrict this universal justification to the elect. Therefore older orthodox theologians of our Church also speak of the universal justification acquired and extended to all. (Here follows the quotations previously cited in this paper. It is interesting to note why Schmidt believes more theologians of the past did not use the terminology of a “universal justification.” He says that, “Our older theologians would have employed the term more frequently, (since they believed and taught the thing), if Huber (Samuel Huber, 1547-1622) had not coupled universal justification with a universal election ... Nevertheless no small number of undoubtedly sound theologians speak of general justification or absolution.”)¹³⁴

Korthals also sheds more light on the Confessions and objective justification by quoting from Marquart’s translation work, *Justification – Objective and Subjective: A Translation*. In this book, there are also discussions from that same first meeting of the Synodical Conference (1872):

But now that God has through the raising of His Son signed the letter of pardon for the sinners, and sealed it with His divine seal, we can confidently preach: the world is justified, the world is reconciled with God, which latter expression too would be impermissible if the former were not true. Our old dogmatians too would themselves have used the expression more - since they believed and taught the substance - had not *Huber* shortly before Gerhard's time taught that God had not only justified all men already, but had also elected them to eternal life. In order to avoid the appearance of agreement with this erroneous doctrine, they used the expression only rarely. Already in the year 1593 the Wuerttemberg theologians (Heerbrand, Gerlach, Hafenreffer, Osiander, Bidembach, and others) conceded to Huber with reference to the doctrine of justification that he seemed to deviate from them in it “*in phrasi tamen magis ac loquendi modo, quam re ipso,*” that is, “more however in the expression and in the manner of speaking than in the substance itself” (Loescher's *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, 1730, p. 567). The Wittenberg theologians (Gesner, Leyser, Hunnius, and others) did not want to tolerate Huber's expression: “*Christus contulit proprie redemptionem toti generi humane*” that is, “Christ imparted the redemption to the entire human race *in the proper sense,*” because the *actual imparting*, “as it is taken in the theological schools,” refers to the *appropriation* (see Wittenberg *Consilia* I, 642ff).¹³⁵

So from these quotations, the issue with that term in the late 16th and 17th centuries was not the term itself, but the *definition* that Huber attached to the term. He wanted to teach a

¹³⁴ Rick Curia, “The Significant History of the Doctrine of Objective or Universal Justification Among the Churches of the Former Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America” (California Pastoral Conference, Alpine, CA, January 24-25, 1983), 42.

¹³⁵ Korthals, 11-12. The use of the word “actual” may shed some more light as to how Calov understands it in “actual justification” and “actual absolution of sins.”

universal election under the term universal justification. Korthals adds this then about how this issue still affects us today:

As a result of Huber's definition and its rejection, opponents of the universal/objective justification say it is a contrived doctrine whose terminology grew out of Pietism. In this day of internet blogs, there has been a lot of digital ink spilled in objection to this term. Much of that rejection comes from a failure to understand that it was the pollution of Huber's definition and not the term itself that led orthodox fathers in the Post-Reformation to initially reject it.¹³⁶

Therefore to show that the doctrine of objective/universal justification was taught in the 16th century, I selected a few *clear* statements. Luther writes on the authority of the Keys (1530):

Even he who does not believe that he is free and his sins forgiven shall also learn, in due time, how assuredly his sins were forgiven, even though he did not believe it. St. Paul says in Rom. 3[:3]: "Their faithlessness nullifies the faithfulness of God." We are not talking here either about people's belief or disbelief regarding the efficacy of the keys. We realize that few believe. We are speaking of what the keys accomplish and give. He who does not accept what the keys give receives, of course, nothing. But this is not the key's fault. Many do not believe the gospel, but this does not mean that the gospel is not true or effective. *A king gives you a castle. If you do not accept it, then, it is not the king's fault, nor is he guilty of a lie. But you have deceived yourself and the fault is yours. The king certainly gave it.*¹³⁷

The Apology has:

The law was shown to be harmful since all are made sinners, *but when the Lord Jesus came, he forgave the sin for everyone, which no one could avoid*, and he blotted out the bill of indictment that stood against us by the pouring out of his blood [Col. 2:14]. This is what Paul says [Rom. 5:20], 'the sin abounded through the law; but grace superabounded through Jesus.' For after the entire world was placed in subjection, he took away the sin of the entire world, just as John testified, saying [John 1:29], 'Behold the Lamb of God, behold, the one who takes away the sin of the world.'¹³⁸

Luther writes in the Smalcald Articles:

Here is the first and chief article: That Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, "was handed over to death for our trespasses and was raised for our justification" Rom 4[:25]; and he alone is "the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the

¹³⁶ Korthals, 3.

¹³⁷ Martin Luther, Helmut Lehman ed., *Luther's Works: Volume 40: Church and Ministry II*, (Philadelphia, PA: Muhlenberg Press, 1958), 366-367. Cf. also 376. Emphasis is mine.

¹³⁸ Apology, Article IV, 103. Robert Kolb and Timothy Wengert ed., *The Book of Concord*, (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000). Cf. also Article XII, 61, 62, 94. Emphasis is mine.

world” (John 1[:29]); and “the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all” (Isa. 53[:6]); furthermore, “All have sinned,” and “they are now justified without merit by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus ... by his blood” (Rom. 3:23-25).¹³⁹

The Formula of Concord states:

Third, Scripture says this not only in general regarding the person of the Son of Man but refers specifically to the assumed human nature. 1 John 1[:7], “the blood of Christ cleanses us from all sin,” refers not only to the merit achieved on the cross once for all. *Rather, John states in this very place that in the work or action of justification, not only the divine nature in Christ but also his blood per modum efficaciae [in an efficacious manner] (that is, really) cleanses us from all sin.* Thus, according to John 6[:48-58] the flesh of Christ is a food that gives life. On this basis the Council of Ephesus also concluded that the flesh of Christ has the power to give life. Concerning this article, many other glorious testimonies from the ancient, orthodox church are cited elsewhere.¹⁴⁰

The Formula of Concord also states, “*That the human race has been truly redeemed and reconciled with God through Christ, who has merited with his innocent obedience, suffering, and death both the righteousness that avails before God [Rom 1:17; 3:21-26; 2 Cor 5:21] and eternal life.*”¹⁴¹

To finish this *excursus*, Schaller adds this helpful bit of information about where to find objective justification in the writings of older dogmaticians:

Only one inference I would not like to leave unstated, that the doctrine of justification really belongs *to the Second Article*. Through our Catechism expositions we have been spoiled, to the point that we do not really find this doctrine expressed until the Third Article as a work of the Holy Ghost, and thus consider it as belonging not so much to soteriology, as rather to pneumatology. According to our passage, [2 Corinthians 5:18-21] to which for the sake of brevity we are here confining ourselves, this is a mistake in understanding and arranging the thoughts expressed in the gospel. *Justification and forgiveness of sins were not only made possible after the reconciliation of God through Christ's vicarious atonement had been accomplished, but actually became a reality in Christ whose resurrection as far as we are concerned was equally as substitutionary as His passion.* The forgiveness of sins as such does not depend on the subsequent activity of the Holy Spirit; the appropriation of the accomplished salvation on the part of the individual is rather ascribed to Him.

From this standpoint alone Luther's explanation of the two Articles becomes perspicuous and is safeguarded against the charge of repetition. He has the Christian confess in the Second Article: Christ is my Lord, ... from all sins ... When? When I came to faith? *None of this, but as [a] lost and condemned sinner*

¹³⁹ Smalcald Articles I (II, 1-3).

¹⁴⁰ Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Article VIII, 59. Cf. also Article III, 57. Emphasis is mine.

¹⁴¹ Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Article XI, 15. Cf. also Article XI, 28. Emphasis is mine.

He redeemed me from my sins. Luther obviously wants to say that faith in Christ embraces the existing finished forgiveness of sins intended for the individual and thus acknowledges Christ as his Lord. In the Third Article he again comes to speak of the forgiveness of sins. Here, however, he does not, as in the Second Article, emphasize the purchasing and winning but the imparting: In this Christian Church (note with emphasis: and nowhere else) the Holy Ghost forgives (through the gospel, thus through the ministry of reconciliation!) me and all believers daily and richly all sins. Here then the believer is to confess that through the power of the Holy Spirit in the gospel, justification is merely made his own certain, conscious possession. Whoever teaches otherwise immediately comes close to the synergistic doctrinal presentation that our faith is the condition of our personal justification.¹⁴²

Commenting on the Schaller quote, Curia adds:

What Schaller says here about the dogmatical [*sic*] presentation of justification is so true! In the older (and not so old) dogmaticians, don't necessarily expect to find the concept of objective justification under "justification." Generally the only facet of justification you'll find there is our subjective or personal justification. If they treat the concept of objective justification at all, look for it where the resurrection of Christ is treated, or his office of High Priest.¹⁴³

¹⁴² Schaller, 476. Emphasis is mine.

¹⁴³ Curia, 75.

Quotations from the Church Fathers pertaining to Objective Justification from Calov's *Biblia Illustrata*

Translated by

Souksamay Phetsanghane

(N.B. These quotations are originally at the end of Calov's comments on Romans 5:19.)

- Justin Martyr:¹⁴⁴ in his *Exposition of the True Faith*: Indeed by his sin, Adam subjected the human race to death and made all of nature responsible for a debt. Since the Son is *God* and man, he removed and absolved Adam's transgression and the Fall. So as he was man, he lived his life blamelessly without sin.¹⁴⁵ Then he subjected himself willingly to death ἀφανίζων "to cover" the Fall through the perfect life that was needed (so that the Fall is not seen) and also through his death to remove the debt that was owed.
- Justin Martyr:¹⁴⁶ in his letter to Diognetus: What can cover our sins except Christ's righteousness! Who is able *to turn* us sinners and impious people *into righteous people* except God's Son alone! Sweet exchange! Unsearchable undertaking! Blessings beyond every expectation! Certainly one righteous person covers the sins of many. Likewise the righteousness of one makes it so that many unrighteous people become *righteous people*.
- Irenaeus:¹⁴⁷ in *Against Heresies*, Book 5, chapter 16: For to destroy what first happened on a tree, (the disobedience of mankind) Christ had to become obedient to death, even death on a cross – the death that happened on a tree – to correct that disobedience ... Indeed in the first Adam, we sinned by not following God's command; in the second Adam, we are reconciled by being made obedient to death.
- Irenaeus: in chapter 15 of *On the Giving of Christ's Righteousness*:¹⁴⁸ Christ gave us his righteousness, which makes our life and obedience easier.
- Ambrose: in his *Commentary on 2 Corinthians*, on chapter 4:14:¹⁴⁹ Just as in Adam, all people have died; so also in Christ, all people have been made alive. For Adam is the

¹⁴⁴ Justin Martyr (100-165) was a Christian Apologist. This work survives in a collection of other Justin Martyr works, but he is not considered the author. Rather Theodoret of Cyrus (c.393-c.457) is considered the author of *Expositio rectae fidei*.

¹⁴⁵ *Cum sine crimine innocenter vitam egit. Καὶ ἡ μὲν ἄνθρωπος, ἀμέμπτως πολιτεύεται.*

¹⁴⁶ The usual title of this letter today is "The Epistle of Mathetes to Diogenetus." Mathetes is Greek for "disciple." Diogenetus was the tutor to Marcus Aurelius. This letter survives in one manuscript from the 13th century, a collection of writings including some works of Justin Martyr. The actual author is disputed.

¹⁴⁷ Irenaeus (c.130-202) was bishop in Gaul and a Christian apologist. Eusebius of Caesarea (*Ecclesiastical History*, Book five, chapter five) says he was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John the apostle.

¹⁴⁸ Unable to verify this work.

¹⁴⁹ The unknown author, Ambrosiaster, not Ambrose.

image of death because of his sin, but Christ is the image of life because of righteousness.

- Cyril of Alexandria:¹⁵⁰ *Third Treatise on the Right Faith, Addressed to the Empress*: It does not make sense that we would inherit the punishment of the first Adam, when corruption entered through disobedience. How much more senseless that we would share in the righteousness of the second Adam, who made us alive again through his surpassing obedience. Therefore when Scripture says, “Many are made righteous through the obedience of the one,” we do not say that simply anyone, who is similar to us, was made sin but that the Son became incarnate and was obedient to the Father for our sake.
- Cyril of Alexandria: Book 11 of his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, on chapter 10:18-19: Just as by the transgression of the first man, (the founder of our human race) we were delivered over to death, as if we heard with Adam, “Dust you are and to dust you will return;”¹⁵¹ in the very same way through Christ's obedience and righteousness, because he subjected himself to the law, (although he is the author of the law) I testify that blessing and vivification (which happens through the Holy Spirit for eternal life) extended to our human nature.
- Cyril of Alexandria: Book 12 of his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, on chapter 19:1-3: Just as condemnation came over all people through the first Adam, so also through one man, the blessing of Christ's justification comes over all people. Paul testifies to this when he says, “For just as through the sin of one, all people are in condemnation, so also through the righteousness of one, the free gift came over all people for the justification of life.” Therefore we became diseased through the first Adam's disobedience and curse, however we became rich through the second Adam, through his obedience and blessing. For the one who was the author of the law as God, kept the commands of the law as man.
- Athanasius:¹⁵² *On the Incarnation of the Word*: It is impossible for purity and innocence to be seen in nature unless God is believed to have come in the flesh. He brought his sinless righteousness into the world so that we would become *sharers* in that righteousness, we would live, and we would be saved. For the passage, there “is no one in the world who is righteous, who does good and does not sin”¹⁵³ applies to all people in general. When Christ descended from heaven, it was to give his *spotless* righteousness. This same Jesus (unlike those, who brought our human race into damnation when they disobeyed) as a servant took up the first fruits of our nature. It is necessary and extremely necessary to believe that Holy Scripture reveals the first

¹⁵⁰ Cyril of Alexandria (c.376-444) was pope of Alexandria (414-444) and was instrumental against Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus 431. Cyril wrote three treatises *On the Right Faith* against Nestorius. The first was addressed to Emperor Theodosius II; the second to Theodosius' younger sisters, Marina and Arcadia; the third to the Empress Eudocia and Theodosius' eldest sister, Pulcheria.

¹⁵¹ Genesis 3:19.

¹⁵² Athanasius (ca. 293-373) was a strong opponent of Arianism and was exiled five times for it. “Athanasius against the world” best sums up his work against Arianism.

¹⁵³ Ecclesiastes 7:20.

fruits of our human race; praises the unique love for the human race of the one who took up the human nature; marvels at the miracle of the great accomplishment and execution; does not fear the curse of the law; (for Christ freed us from the curse of the law) and *ascribes*, λογίζεσθαι “imputes” to all people the fulfillment of the law accomplished by the first fruits (by Christ).

- Gregory of Nyssa:¹⁵⁴ *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, homily two: Since the filthiness of my sins were transferred to him, Christ communicated his purity to me. He made me a sharer in the beauty that is in that purity.
- St. Augustine: *Tractates on John*, tractate 3, on John 1:15-18, paragraph 12: All people, who are of Adam are sinners with sin; all people, who are justified through Christ, are righteous not in themselves, but in Christ. For in themselves, if you would ask, they belong to Adam; in Christ, if you would ask, they belong to him.
- St. Augustine: *Sermons on 2 Corinthians*, sermon 6, on chapter 5:21: God the Father made him Jesus Christ (who did not know sin) sin for our sake so that we would be the righteousness of God in Christ. Notice two things: the righteousness of God, not ours; in him, not in us.
- St. Augustine: *Enchiridion on Faith, Hope, and Love* in his words to Laurentius, chapter 13: Therefore he himself was sin so that we would be righteousness – not our own, but God’s righteousness; not in ourselves, but in him. Just as he himself was sin – not his own, but ours; rooted not in himself, but in us.
- St. Augustine: in his *Exposition of Psalms*, on chapter 31:1: “In your righteousness, rescue me and deliver me.” Since you did not find in me my righteousness, rescue me in your righteousness i.e. your righteousness rescues me because it justifies me; it makes the righteous from the unrighteous; it makes the just from the unjust.
- St. Augustine: *Letter to Boniface*:¹⁵⁵ From Adam we have contracted guilt, because we were present in Adam when he sinned.
- Chrysostom: *Homilies on Romans*, homily 10, on chapter 5:13: For this reason, at every turn the apostle Paul keeps to the “one.” He is continually putting it before us, when he says, “As by one man sin entered into the world,”¹⁵⁶ and “If through the sin of one, many died,”¹⁵⁷ and “The gift is not like the trespass, for death entered through the one, who sinned,”¹⁵⁸ and “The judgment to condemnation was by the sin of the one,”¹⁵⁹ and again, “For as through the disobedience of the one man, the many were made sinners.”¹⁶⁰ So the apostle Paul does not let go of the “one” so that when the Jew says to you, “How can the world be saved by the obedience of this one person, Christ?” You

¹⁵⁴ Gregorius Nyssenus or Gregory of Nyssa (c.335-c.394) was one the three Great Cappadocians with Basil of Caesarea, his older brother, and Gregory of Nazianzus.

¹⁵⁵ This letter could be letter 98, 185, 189, or 220. All are addressed to Boniface.

¹⁵⁶ Romans 5:12.

¹⁵⁷ Romans 5:15

¹⁵⁸ Romans 5:15.

¹⁵⁹ Romans 5:16.

¹⁶⁰ Romans 5:19.

are able to say to him, “How could the world be condemned by the disobedience of this one person, Adam?”

- Leo the Great:¹⁶¹ *Letter 189*, to Juvenal: So that Christ would restore life to all, he took up the cause of all. To free all people, he also nullified the power of the old debt, because he alone of all people did not owe it. Therefore just as through the guilt of the one, all people were made sinners; so also through the righteousness of the one, all people become *innocent*. Therefore he, who took up the human nature, gives righteousness to humans.
- Anselm:¹⁶² *On Romans*, on chapter 5: Through the one's righteousness that comes over all the chosen people, it has happened for justification so that they would be justified by *sharing in Christ's righteousness*.¹⁶³
- Bernard: *Letter 190*, to Pope Innocent:¹⁶⁴ It is a man who is in debt. It is a man who frees. For the apostle Paul says, “If one has died for all people, therefore all people died.” Therefore the satisfaction of one is clearly *imputed* to all, just as that one carried the sins of all.
- Bernard: *Letter 190*, to Pope Innocent: What can they, who are servants to sin and prisoners to the devil, do by themselves to restore the *righteousness* once it is lost? For that reason the *righteousness* of another is given to those, who have lost their own.
- Bernard: *In Praise of the New Knighthood, the Knights Templar*, chapter 11: Death is put to flight in Christ's death, and Christ's righteousness *is imputed* to us. Likewise one sinned, and all people were bound *to it*. Will *the innocence* of the one only *be restored* to one? The sin of one brought death to all people, will *the righteousness* of one restore life to one? Does *God's* justice want to condemn more than restore? Or is Adam stronger in evil than Christ in good? Will Adam's sin be imputed to me and will Christ's *righteousness* not apply to me? ...

¹⁶¹ Leo the Great (c.400-c.461) was pope from 440-461.

¹⁶² Anselm or Anselm of Laon (d. 1117) was a French theologian. His greatest work is *Glossa ordinaria* “The Ordinary Gloss.” He and his students built upon and added to a collection of glosses from the Church Fathers and placed them on the sides of the Vulgate. Anselm added the *glossa interlinearis*, “interlinear gloss,” which was written above the text of the Vulgate. This became the standard edition of the Bible in Western Europe well into the 1600's. A digital copy is at: lollardsociety.org/?page_id=409. A translation of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Romans by Michael Scott Woodward (2011) is at: wmich.edu/medieval/mip/books/teams/commentary.html
This could also be Anselm of Canterbury (c. 1033-1109). His most famous work is *Cur Deus Homo*. These two Anselm's appear to have been confused over the centuries. Anselm of Laon's commentaries have been ascribed to Anselm of Canterbury.

¹⁶³ *Per unius iustitiam venientem in omnes homines electos, itum est in justificationem, ut PARTICIPATIONE JUSTITIAE Christi iustificentur*. This appears to be an expansion/commentary on the Vulgate text of Romans 5:18b: *Per unius iustitiam in omnes homines in iustificationem vitae*.

¹⁶⁴ Unable to verify this work.

Bibliography

- Becker, Siegbert. "Objective Justification." Paper delivered at the Chicago Pastoral Conference, Elgin, IL, November 9, 1982. wlsessays.net/node/130.
- _____. "Universal Justification." Paper delivered at the Southeast Wisconsin District Convention at Wisconsin Lutheran High School, Milwaukee, WI, June 12, 1984. wlsessays.net/node/142.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert Walter Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Buchholz, Jon. "Jesus Cancelled Your Debt." Paper presented for the Arizona-California District Pastors' Conference, October 17, 2012 and the Northern Wisconsin District Pastors' Conference, October 29, 2013.
- Calov, Abraham. *Biblia Testamenti Novi Illustrata: Volume II*. Frankfurt am Main: Balthasar Christopher Wust, 1676.
- Curia, Rick. "The Significant History of the Doctrine of Objective or Universal Justification among the Churches of the Former Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America." Paper delivered at the California Pastoral Conference at Alpine, CA, January 24-25, 1983.
- Deutschlander, Daniel. "On the Distinction between Objective and Subjective Justification." Paper delivered at the Chicago Pastoral Conference, November 8, 1977. wlsessays.net/node/430.
- Hefti, Roy. "One Sure Thing: The Gospel of Universal, Objective Justification." Paper delivered at the Southwestern Pastoral Conference of the Western Wisconsin District, Prairie de Sac, WI, March 1, 2011.
- Hoenecke, Adolf. *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics: Volume I*. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009.
- _____. *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics Volume II*. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009.
- _____. *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics: Volume III*. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2003.
- Huber, Samuel. "On Election and Justification: Translations from his Writings," trans. Andrew Hussman. WLS Essay File. wlsessays.net/node/4003.
- Hunnius, Aegidius. *Theses Opposed to Huberianism: A Defense of the Lutheran Doctrine of Justification*, trans. Paul Rydecki. Malone, TX: Repristination Press, 2012.
- Kolb, Robert and Timothy Wengert ed., *The Book of Concord*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Korthals, James. "Universal/Objective Justification: An Historical Perspective." Paper delivered at the Kettle Moraine Pastoral Conference of the Southeastern Wisconsin District, Trinity, West Mequon, WI, January 15, 2013.

-
- Kuske, David, *A Commentary on Romans 1-8*. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 2007.
- _____. "Making Use of Our Lutheran Heritage – 'Objective Justification' in Our Mission Outreach Based on an Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:18-19." Paper delivered at the Nebraska-Colorado Missionaries' Conference at Stockton, KS, 1978, later printed in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*. wlsessays.net/node/1281.
- Luther, Martin, *Luther's Works: Volume 40: Church and Ministry II*. (Helmut Lehman ed.) Philadelphia, PA: Muhlenberg Press, 1958.
- Meyer, J.P. *Ministers of Christ, a Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1963.
- _____. "Objective Justification: Part I and II." *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 37:1,2, January and April 1940. wlsessays.net/node/1448.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics: Volume II*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1951.
- Reim, Edmund. "A History of the Term 'Objective Justification.'" Paper delivered for the Milwaukee City Conference, printed in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 52:2, April 1955. wlsessays.net/node/1919.
- Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the New Testament in Light of New Testament Research*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.
- Rydecki, Paul. "Do we want to be Dresden Lutherans?" Paper delivered at the Intrepid Lutherans Conference at Bethlehem Lutheran in Oshkosh, WI, June 2, 2012. dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/4826137/Do%20We%20Want%20to%20Be%20Dresden%20Lutherans_Amended.pdf.
- _____. "The Forensic Appeal to the Throne of Grace in the Theology of the Lutheran Age of Orthodoxy: A Reflection on Atonement and Its Relationship to Justification." Paper delivered at the colloquium of the Evangelical Lutheran Diocese of North America in Malone, TX, April 30, 2013. intrepidlutherans.com/2013/05/an-essay-on-article-of-justification.html.
- Schaller, John. "Redemption and Universal Justification according to Second Corinthians 5:18-21" *The Wauwatosa Theology: Volume I*. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1997.
- Schmeling, T.R. "*Strenuus Christi Athleta* Abraham Calov (1612-1686)." *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 44:4 (December, 2004) blts.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/TRS-Calov.pdf.
- Stöckhardt, Georg. *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1907.
- Wallace, Daniel, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Walther, C.F.W. "There is Nothing New Under the Sun," trans. Souksamay Phetsanghane. *Lehre und Wehre* 29:10, October 1883. studiumexcitare.com/content/6.

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Dogmatics Notes: Volume I and Volume II.