5-29-1930

The Christology of St. Paul's Captivity Letters

Luther V. Stephan
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_stephanl@csl.edu

The Christology of St. Paul's Captivity Letters.

A thesis

presented to the faculty of

Concordia Seminary

St. Louis, Mo.

by

Luther V. Stephan

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Bachelor of Divinity.

March 29, 1930.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL'S CAPTIVITY LETTERS.

"Christ and Him crucified" is the great theme of St. Paul. That is evident throughout all his epistles. His is emphatically a preaching of Our Lord, whether before Jew or Gentile, whether before king or slave. Everywhere in his writings the doctrine of Jesus shines forth like a beacon light; it is the sum and substance of all his sermons, the one thought which like a golden thread traces through them all.

It lies in the greetings at the beginning of his letters and in the salutations at the close of the same, where with remarkable clarity the Apostle to the Gentiles associates Jesus Christ with God the Father, proclaiming Him as the source of the richest spiritual blessings as well as the Father. Coequality of both Father and Son is there set forth. Cf. Eph. 1,2; Col. 1,2; Rom.1,7, and I Cor. 1,3.

It is implied in the benedictions which the Apostle pronounces in the name of Christ without mentioning the name of God. Here cf. Eph.6,24; Rom.16,20,25; I Cor, 16,23, and I Cor. 13,13.

It underlies those early apostolic hymns sung in the Redeemer's honor. Such may be found in I Tim. 1,15.

Christ , then , is the foundation-stone of Paul's teachings. Dr. Paul Feine makes this fitting remark: "Sein ganzes Evangelium laesst sich in das eine Wort zusammenfassen: Christus. Er ist christozentrisch." * And it is well that St. Paul so dwells on that subject; for as far as the remaining

* Dr. Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, p. 174.*

parts of dogmatics are concerned, Christology is the sun that illuminates them all and about which they revolve in harmony and order.

Christ is Paul's theme in his careful selection of passages quoted from the Old Testament and incorporated into the New Testament. ~~How impossible would not his applications to these passages have been had he renounced his faith in the "Hebrew Scriptures", nor~~ He recognized the truth that Jesus Christ of Nazareth is Lord of all, the very sum of <u>all</u> Scripture, He of whom Moses taught and the prophets testified. And to preach Him, Paul well knew, is to preach all; for Christ is our Life, our Hope, and our End. An unending theme did Paul choose.

It is Paul's theme on his first missionary journey, where, in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia, he appealed to the true Messiahship of Jesus as enforced by the testimony of John the Baptist and to the historical fact of Christ's resurrection, so as to proclaim the glories of the Gospel message, which alone has saving power.

It is his theme on the steps of the Areopagus at Athens, Acts 17, where he sets forth the lofty spirituality of the God of Christendom as the loving Father of all, and ends his sermon with Jesus.

It is his theme when admonishing the Corinthians for their loose living, licentiousness, and immorality of the basest sort, I Cor. 6. An appeal to the high and costly sacrifice of Christ is his means of establishing godliness again in their ranks; the price wherewith they are bought should turn them from their evil ways.

It was the theme that occupied the Apostle's mind everywhere, whether in perils on land or on the sea, whether in prison or in freedom, whether in shipwreck or sorrow, whether before fanatical Jew or sneering Greek, yes, whether arraigned in court before Festus or threatened with a grave of stones.

Because Christ meant so much to him as a called servant of the Lord, because the denial of Him meant the loss of one's eternal soul, and because there obtained at his time an almost universal denial of Christ among the learned, he counts not his life dear to himself if only he can complete the mission which is so precious to him, namely, the preaching of "Christ and Him crucified," I Cor. 2,2.

Thus at all times and at all places Christ is Paul's paramount issue. And that thought was uppermost in his mind during the years of his imprisonment. It was during this period of his life that he produced four of his finest letters, setting forth therein that message which was given him of God. As in all his epistles, so also in his captivity letters, he teaches with remarkable felicity the one thing needful: the humanity and divinity of Jesus together with His Saviorship. As he had in"Romans" shown that Gentile as well as Jew was bought by the price that Jesus paid on the cross; as he had in"Galatians" taught this great truth in opposition to the theory of the Judaizers; so now in"Ephesians","Colossians", and "Philippians", he, here povitively and there polemically, now devotionally, now dogmatically, upholds the dignity of the Lord's Person, His relation to the Father and to man, His two states, and His threefold office as our eternal prophet, priest, and king.

I purpose, therefore, to write on the Christology of Paul's captivity letters. My general plan of procedure shall be to tabulate in categorical fashion the sum of the christological doctrines taught by Paul in these same letters, with appended remarks for the purpose of clarification. Uppermost in my mind shall be the expounding of the truth as it is so powerfully adduced in these inspired epistles. I shall determine to defeat and expose the heretical doctrines after careful collation of the source material. The scope of my treatment shall begin with the pre-existent Christ in heaven, take special notice of Him as God manifest in the flesh, and end with the glorified Christ, who lives and reigns through all eternity.

A minor object of my thesis shall take into account whether or no Paul deviated from his doctrine on Christ in these his captivity letters from his former epistles.

I. The Doctrine of Christ's Person.

The doctrine concerning Christ's Person is not a development of the Christian religion; it is not a teaching arrived at in the course of time by a comparison and a coining of church terminology. In fact, the Christian or, for that matter, the church has ever stood for the two natures in Christ's body without an elaborate study on dogmatics, ~~or even a book on that subject~~. All technical discussions in regard to that topic are the outgrowth of polemics in the Christian church.

In his letters to his churches St. Paul does not only give the milk of the Word to his congregations; he also feeds them with some meat. Especially are his captivity letters

rich with the deeper knowledge of Christianity, with the doctrine concerning Christ's Person. Besides comforting his people with the sweet message of the Gospel, the Apostle is wont to instruct them. That a duality of natures in Christ's person is taught in Paul's letters written in imprisonment will be proved presently when His Deity and humanity are discussed. Omitting, therefore, at this point the proof for Christ's two natures, we shall content ourselves with a tabulation of those errorists who already in early times taught otherwise about the Person of Christ. They follow:

The Ebionites: "The Ebionites denied the reality of Christ's divine nature, and held Him to be merely man, whether naturally or supernaturally conceived.--- Ebionism was simply Judaism within the pale of the Christian church". *

*----------
A.H. Strong, Outlines of Systematic Theology, p.180.

The Docetae: "The Docetae, like most of the Gnostics in the second century and the Manichees in the third, denied the reality of Christ's human body.--- Docetism was simply pagan philosophy introduced into the church." *

*---------
A.H. Strong, l.c. p. 180.

The Arians:"The Arians denied the integrity of the divine nature in Christ. They regarded the Logos who united himself to humanity in Jesus Christ, not as possessed of absolute godhood, but as the first and highest of created beings."*

*----------
A.H. Strong, l.c. p. 180.

The Apollinarians:"The Apollinarians denied the integrity of Christ's human nature. According to this view, Christ had no

human "nous" or "pneuma", other than that which was furnished by the divine nature." *

*----------
A.H. Strong, l.c.p. 180,181.

The Nestorians: "The Nestorians denied the real union between the divine and human natures in Christ, making it rather a moral than an organic one. ---- Thus they virtually held to two natures and two persons, instead of two natures in one person."*

*---------
A.H. Strong, l.c. p. 181.

That these are errors of the purest type will be evidenced later under the chapters of the Deity and humanity of Jesus. We list them here to retain the unity of our discussion. Proceeding, then, we shall take up the first topic of Christology which is to be discussed properly, that is, the Deity of Christ.

1. The Deity of Christ.

That Jesus Christ was true God is most clearly and forcefully taught in the captivity letters of St. Paul. These his letters are virtually replete with direct statements and references to the effect that Jesus is God. We need but turn to Phil. 2,6:"ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ~~ἐαυτὸν~~ οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ ". What could be more definite in speaking of Christ's Deity than to say or speak of Him as being on an equality with God, as the Greek clearly shows, "τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ "? That Jesus is God, and not the mere semblance or appearance of God is here strongly taught. Let us hear the opinion of commentaries on this passage. We read:"Being on an equality with God" is not identical with subsisting in the form of God; the latter expresses the external characteristics,

majesty, and beauty of the Deity."* And again we note:"He

* ----------
Jameison, Fausset, and Brown, Critical and Explanatory Commentary of the Bible, p. 363.
----

therefore could have been none other than God; for God saith " to whom will ye liken me and make me equal?"(Is. 46,5.). * Another

*----------
Jameison, Fausset, and Brown, l.c. p. 363.
----

passage of great import here is Col. 1,16:" ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται ". There Christ is portrayed for the Colossians not as the creature, but as the Creator Himself. Is He,then, not God? More powerful language to express this truth upon his hearers the Apostle could hardly have used. Able commentators say: "For:Greek "because". This gives the proof that He is not included in the things created, but is the "first-begotten" before"every creature",v.15, begotten as the Son of God's love." * And

* ----------
Jam. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 372.
----

again:"In Him " τὰ πάντα " were created. From this it follows that the Son cannot be a creature, for creation is exhausted by the "all things". (cf 1.9(6). * Reverting to our passage from Philippians

* --------
The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol.3, p. 503,504.
----

again, we note the apt remark of the Expositor's Commentary:"He (Paul) means, of course, in the stricktest sense that the pre-existing Christ was Divine. For " μορφῇ " always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it." *

These two verses, Col. 1, 15-17, contain perhaps the most exhaustive assertion of the Lord's Godhead which is to be found in the writings of Paul. Here, against theosophic heresies, bent on degrading Christ to the rank of a mere creature, devested of divinity, St. Paul asserts that Christ is the "εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου ", the image of the invisible God. This expression supplements the title of"the Son." As the Son, Christ is derived eternally from the Father, and He is that One Substance, the exact likeness of the Father in all things, except being the Father. The Son is the Image of God. And, as the "εἰκὼν " Christ is the "πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ", that is to say, not the first in rank, but begotten before any created beings. That this is a true sense of the expression is etymologically certain. So stands Meyer when he writes:"Hier ist der gen. comparationis der Erstgeborne im Vergleich mit jedem Geschoepf, d.h. EHER geboren als jedes Geschoepf. Das Vergleichungs-moment ist das Verhaeltnis der Zeit, und zwar inbetreff des Ursprungs. Da aber letzter bei jeder "ktisis " anders ist als bei Christo ist nicht"prootoktistos"oder "prootoplastos"gesagt, welches von Christo eine gleiche Art der Entstehung, wie von der Kreatur anzeigen wuerde, sonder"prototokos"ist gewaehlt, welches in der Zeitvergleichung des Ursprungs die absonderliche Art der Entstehung in betreff Christi anzeigt, wie die andern Wesen, bei denen dies in der Benennung "ktisis" liegt, sonder geboren, aus dem Wesen Gottes gleichartig hervorgegangen." *

* -------
Meyer, Colosserbrief, p. 184.
----

* -------
The Expositor's Greek Testament, l.c. p. 436.

Perhaps Paul expressed this truth of Christ's Deity most concisely in Col.2,9: "ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς ". The word "πλήρωμα " brushes aside all misleading ideas and notions: The "fulness" dwells within Him; he has not merely the attributes of God, but the very essence - He is God. Says a commentator:"The Greek (Theotes). means the Essence and nature of the God-head, not merely the divine perfections and attributes of the Divinity (Greek Theiotes). He, as man, was not merely God-like, but in the fullest sense, God. * That Christ's Deity is here brought out is also cor-

* -------
Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 376.
----

roborated by the"Expositor's"when it says:"πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος is not to be taken to mean the perfection of Divinity, i.e., divine holiness.----- The addition of "θεότητος " defines "πλήρωμα " as the fulness of the Deity. The word is to be distinguished from " θειότης " as Deity, the being God, from Divinity, the being Divine or God-like. The passage thus accepts the real Deity of Christ." *

* -------
The Expo. Greek Testa. l.c. p. 523.

To any one who accepts these words of Paul as the inspired Words of God, they are convincing proofs of the Deity of Christ, that He was true God, coequal with the Father. In speaking of God the Father, Paul shows the unity of God, which with him is a primal truth. We need but read the first chapter of his letter to the Ephesians. Paul would make known that nothing exists which was not created by His creative hand; that

God is separated from all creatures by a vast interval; that there is nothing existing which God does not uphold. In accord with this line of thought what then is the position which St. Paul assigns to Jesus Christ? This question was answered by the passages quoted above.

That he believed Jesus to be merely a man is an error which could be maintained by no careful reader of his epistles.

The question, "What is Christ?" could not have been an open one in the mind of Paul. His earnest, sharpely-defined faith in the One Most High God must force him to say that Christ is either a created being, or that He is the Essence of the God-head, Col.2,9. Compromise on this point is not admitted anywhere by Paul.

And Paul does not ascribe Divinity to Him as a fellow-creature by way of hyperbole. Nor does he, as did the pagan orators and writers of old, and some modern churchmen, falsely so-called, compliment his Lord in a panegyrical style, thereby cleverly seeking to evade the fact that Christ is Divine by estimating very highly His humanity!

As was evidenced by the passages quoted above, St. Paul's belief in Jesus Christ is too powerful, too exacting, too keen, too real as to speak of His most holy faith in Him in such a flippant manner!

There is no room in St. Paul's thought for an imaginary being like the Arian Christ, hovering indistinctly between created and uncreated life. Christ must either be conceived of as purely and simply a creature, with no other than a creature's nature and rights, or He must be adored as One who is equal to the eternal God of the heavens, Phil. 2, 6-11.

Some difference of opinion has arisen with regard to "form of God"and "form of a servant" in Phil.2,6,and 7. Luther says to this:"Aus diesem ist es klar, dass an diesem Orte nicht wird geredet vom goettlichem Wesen oder knechtlichem Wesen, aeusserlich, sondern von dem Gebaerden und Erzeigen des Wesens". * And

* -------
Luthers Saemtliche Schriften,Vol.12. (St. Louis), p. 469.
----
he very fittingly adds:"Er war, er war, er war, sage ich, drinnen. In dem Woertlein "war" liegt die Macht, dass er das goettliche Wesen hatte mit und sammt der goettlichen Gestalt." *

* ------
Luthers Saemt. Schr. l.c. p. 470.

The fact that Jesus was, and was God,also before His incarnation, is likewise taught in Phil.2,6. It was the true and eternal God who , in v.7, became man and was manifest in the flesh. To this Dr. Feine remarks: "Christus existierte in der Praeexistenz "in der Gestalt Gottes" oder "in Gottesgestalt" (en morphe Theou). Paulus denkt danach den praeexistenden Christus nicht in der Kategorie Mensch, sondern in der Kategorie Gott, nicht anthropomorph, sondern theomorph." *

* -------
D. Dr. Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, p. 179.

The dogmaticians have produced the following proofs for the divinity of Jesus: 1) The argument that divine names are ascribed to Him. Proof for this ~~truth~~ is not found directly in the captivity letters, but the fact is taught in the four Gospels and the general epistles.(Cf. I John 5,20). Here might be noted that Paul does not call Jesus God anywhere in the captivity epistles. In fact, Dr. Feine remarks:" Den Begriff der Gottheit Christi hat Paulus freilich nicht selbst gebildet. Er hat Christus nie

direckt Gott genannt.-- Aber, der, in dem die Fuelle der Gottheit leiblich wohnt, Kol.2,9, der das Ebenbild Gottes ist, II Kor.4,4, kann nur als Gott vorgestellt sein. Als Sohn ist ergleichen Wesens wie der Vater."* But Feine errs in so great

*---------
D. Dr. Feine, l.c. p. 176.
----

a sweeping statement. True, Paul does not call Jesus directly God in his captivity letters, but he does so otherwise. We quote Tit.2,10 (the doctrine of God our Savior), by which words Christ who is our Savior is directly called God also.

The second argument is drawn from the fact that divine attributes are ascribed to Him. That is proved by the passage Eph.3,18 (τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος).

A third argument is taken from the fact that divine deeds are ascribed to Him. Col. 1,16,17 may here be advanced; for compare "τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα" and v.17 "τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν ". That divine works are ascribed to Christ is a final argument. Compare for proof of Christ's divine works Phil. 2,10,11 (ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα), and v.11 (καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός).

The fifth argument is the testimony of Jesus concerning Himself and His Deity. Paul offers no proof for that in these his letters. Compare Luke 22,70.

For varification of these arguments refer to Lindberg, l.c. p. 195.

Other passages which corroborate those treated exegetically above and which likewise bear evidence of the Deity of Christ - a doctrine that Paul ever sought to teach his congregations - are the following: Eph. 1,3 (ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), for if God is His Father, then Christ must be the Son of God; Eph.1,23 (τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου), for if He fills"the

⑧ In Eph. 1,23 (ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου). Christ is shown as an omnipresent Being, as also in Col. 3,11 (ἀλλὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός).

all" he must also be omnipresent; Eph.3,8 (τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ), for of what man who is man only may we speak of"unsearchable riches"? Again compare Eph. 3,14 where Christ is once more pictured as the Son of God. In Eph 3,17 (κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν) we see Jesus as an invisible and omnipresent Being; in Eph. 3,18 (τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος) as truly omnipresent; in Eph. 4,13 (τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ) again as the Son of God; in Phil. 1,2 (χάρις ὑμῖν ... κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) as a Dispenser of spiritual gifts coequal with the Father; in Col.1,17 (καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων) as One who is eternal; and in Col. 3,11 (ἀλλὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός) where He is portrayed as the ever-present God of us all.

Surely these passages give us ample proof for the fact that Christ is truly God, coequal with the Father, blessed forever in heavenly places.

What is the stand of modernism on this point? How do they think of Christ, what position do they give Him over against the Father? Hear the words of the archbishop of the present-day modernists, Harry Emerson Fosdick. He says: "If we ask who Jesus is, we may be unsure, we may share our generation's doubts and uncertainties". * That breathes the tone

* -------
Harry Emerson Fosdick, The Modern Use of the Bible, p. 221.
----

of all modernistic conceptions of Christ. When speaking of Christ they either launch off into vagaries or resort to twofacedness, especially in the use of dogmatical terms. Modernism may be accused of using old words and phrases with

new meanings. While retaining in semblance the Christian doctrine, Christian theology is either changed or rejected outright. Let us hear the opinion of authorities on this score. Dr. Machen says: "In their attitude toward Jesus liberalism and Christianity are sharpely opposed." * And the same author

* -------
J. Gresham Machen, Christianity and Liberalism, p. 80.
----

charges: "To say, therefore, that Jesus is God means merely that the life of God, which appears in all men, appears with special clearness or richness in Christ. Such an assertion is diametrically opposed to the Christian belief in the Deity of Christ." *

* -------
J. G. Machen, l.c. p. 110.

John Horsch is equally as strong in denouncing the modernists who subtly deny the Deity of Jesus when he writes: "Ritschl rejected the Deity of Christ, but thought that Jesus was a religious genius, a religious hero who had progressed in moral and spiritual attainments, that he was, to the Christian, the "value of God". But the idea that some one or something that is not God should have the value of God is unacceptable from the Christian viewpoint; it is, on the contrary, distinctly pagan." * And, quoting another modernist, Dr. McGriffeth, who

* -------
John Horsch, Modern Religious Liberalism, p. 59.
----

said: "Christ is essentially no more divine than we are or than nature is," * he charges them with denial of Christ's Godhood

* -------
J. Horsch, L.c. p. 80f.
----

in unmistakable terms. That the modernists, falsely so-called, deny the essential Christian truths in the cloak of a pious vocabulary is evidenced by the fact that they explicitly

call Jesus God. To this Horsch remarks:"That statement alone (Jesus is God) is not orthodox; it is heresy; it leaves out of account the unmistakable fact that Jesus was also man. * It

* -------
J. Horsch, l.c. p. 257.
----

is undoubtedly the fault of their attempting to explain Scripture on the basis of man's reasoning powers that they, the modernists, fall a prey to such thoughts and expressions. How hopeless must they not be, how blind to the truth expressed so powerfully in Phil. 2,6, when, as Horsch rightly says of them:"Divine substance and nature, ontological equality with God, were not involved in Messiahship at all." * In concluding this chapter

* -------
J. Horsch, l.c. p. 234.
----

we append the apt remark of Dr. Pieper:"Vornehmlich aber liegt der Leugnung der wahren Gottheit Christi ein pelagianisches Interesse zugrunde." * But how do not passages like Eph. 3,8

* -------
Dr. Franz Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik, Vol.2, p. 65.
----

which speaks of the"unsearchable riches" of Christ and Phil. 4,23 where we read of the"Grace" (forgiveness) of Jesus Christ speak like thunderbolts from heaven against that satanic falsehood, work righteousness!

2. The Humanity of Christ.

That Christ, besides being true God, is also true man is believed and accepted by all true Christians. It is a fundamental doctrine of our church and bears with it a practical importance of inestimable value for all believers. Were not Christ man, He could not have suffered and died for the sake

of our sins and justification before a righteous Father. The following passages are of importance here in proving our belief in the humanity of Jesus Christ: Phil. 2,7 and 8 (a)(b): "ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ ". When it is here stated that He was made in the form of a servant, we learn that Christ was not only a man, but an humble man, a servant. "Made in the likeness of men" expresses forcefully the truth that Jesus was true man. And in reading Phil. 2, 5-9 that one truth is certainly driven home, namely, that the same Being who was God became man. No one with an unbiased mind would find two persons in Christ here. Paul speaks of the same person; nevertheless, very emphatically of a duality of His natures, i.e., a divine and a human. And in speaking or acknowledging Christ's humanity we do not regard it as a phantom. Says a commentary:"This (man Christ) was no mere phantom, no mere incomplete copy of humanity". * And

* -------
The Expositor's Gr. Testa. l.c. p. 438.
----

in speaking of the word" fashion" here, another says:"Fashion" expresses that He had the outward guise, speech, and look". *

* -------
Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 363.

In fact, it is quite evident to the Christian that in the words "found in the fashion of men" all qualities such as eating, drinking, sleep, thirst, wake, go, stand, hungry, cold, tired, pray, live, and work etc. are therein contained. The "Expositor's" makes this interesting remark on "εὑρεθεὶς " in v.8:" The

verdict of His fellow-creatures upon Him. They classed Him as an "ἄνθρωπος ". * For substantiation of this passage we

* -------
The Expositor's Gr. Testa. l.c. p. 438.
----

also submit Col. 1,22: "ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου ". Here the same Christ who is called God is spoken of as possessing a "σῶμα " and "σάρξ " as well as suffering "θανάτου ". Man, true man, He must have been. Says Dr. Weiss in speaking of the flesh:"It is rather the whole natural human of Christ that is meant (#68,b) as distinguished from a higher divine element, which was in Him (1,4) or from the divine dignity which He now possesses." * On the death of Christ, as is here

* -------
Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, p.406.
----

clearly taught, another commentator says: " διὰ τοῦ θανάτου " sufficiently fixes the reference to the physical body." * And

* -------
The Expositor's Gr. Testa. l.c. p. 512.
----

on the same point another says: This implies that He took on Him our true and entire manhood. Flesh is the sphere in which His human sufferings could have place." *

* -------
Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 363.

The following passages stand in corroboration of the above deductions: Eph.1,7 (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ), for if He was a rational being with blood, He must have been a man; Eph. 2,15 ('ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ); Phil. 3,10 (παθημάτων αὐτοῦ.) and (τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ);

• That Christ died likewise shows Him human in deed. - cf. Phil. 2, 8.

Col. 2,9 (σωματικῶς); and Col.2,3, which speaks of heavenly treasures being hid in Him. To this passages the Formula of Concord remarks:" Christ (as man) had always a perfect knowledge of God." * Other passages speaking of the same things so far

* -------
The Formula of Concord, 825 p.
----

adduced and added for the sake of completeness are: Eph. 2,13; Eph. 2,15; Phil. 3,18; Col. 1,14; Col. 1,20; and Col. 2,11.

As in the case of the Deity of Christ, so also with the humanity of Jesus dogmaticians have tabulated various Scriptural arguments for proof of the same. They follow: a) Argument that Scripture calls Jesus human names. The Captivity Letters offer no proof for this statement, ~~but~~ Refer to John 8,40. In this connection the statement of Feine is worthy of note. He writes:" Der Praedikat "Menschensohn" gibt Paulus Jesus an keiner Stelle seiner Briefe"; * b) Passages which mention that

* -------
D. Dr. Feine, l.c. p. 187.

Christ possessed a soul, spirit, knowledge etc. Compare here Eph.2,15 (ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ) or Col. 1,22 (ἐν τῷ σώματι); c) Proof that He performed human deeds. As proof we cite Eph. 4,21 (ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε); d) Argument that Jesus had true human attributes and customs. For proof we must resort to John 11,35; e) The genealogical proof, which is likewise not offered in the imprisonment letters, but contained in Matt.1, and Luke 3.

Whoever denies the true humanity of Christ does so out of other reasons than Scriptural grounds. Here again, as in the case of the Deity of Jesus, there lies the fault of reason, as well as the pelagianistic motive in sinful man.

The Son of Man: No elaboration of this term is here possible for it is not used in the captivity Epistles. Feine states: "Das Praedikat "Menschensohn" gibt Paulus Jesus an keiner Stelle seiner Briefe". * The expression is used in Matt. 16,13-17.

* -------
Dr. Feine, l.c. p. 187.

Particularities of Christ's human nature: a) His birth by the working of the Holy Ghost. For proof of the above refer to Matt. 1,18; and likewise, for the fact that He was born of a virgin, to Isa. 7,14.

Proof for the fact that Christ was man was given above. However, His incarnation is not spoken of in direct terms. Of interest is here the modernistic stand on the incarnation of Christ. Writes Horsch, quoting Clark, a modernist: "The incarnation in Christ is nothing else than the incarnation of God in all men carried to a superlative degree." *

* -------
J. Horsch, l.c. p. 81.

The sinlessness of the human nature: Although the Bible gives us direct proof for the sinlessness of Christ, we have no such statements in the captivity letters. I Pet. 2,22 will here suffice. But, Paul, bearing that truth ever in mind, adduces many an indirect statement to the same effect, cf. Phil. 2,7 (μορφὴν δούλου). Such and other terms are used to describe Christ's humanity as a mode of being, and to hint at its veiling a higher nature undiscerned by the senses of man, or to mark the point at which, by its glorious inaccessibility to sin, it is in contrast with the nature of that frail and erring race to which it truly belongs. True Paul speaks of Jesus as possessing flesh, Col.1,22, but, says Dr. Weiss: "In all men

the "sarx" is the seat of sin, and under the dominion of "hamartia". Arguing then, that Adam was the cause for all sinful flesh, he continues: "Accordingly, the sarx of Christ is not a 'sarx hamartias', which it cannot be, if He did not know sin (II Cor. 5,21). He is, nevertheless, man in the full sense ----- only such as man was before sin began to dwell and reign in him." * And Feine

* --------
Dr. B. Weiss, l.c. p. 406.
---

argues similarly from the standpoint of reason: "Liess Gott daher seinen Sohn in die Menschheit eintreten, so gestaltete er sein Fleisch, ohne dass gesagt waere, dass Christus damit auch in den Zusammenhang der menschlichen Suende eingetreten waere." * We must cling to the doctrine of Christ's sinless-

* -------
D. Dr. P. Feine, l.c. p. 181.
---

ness; with it our belief in the God-man stands or falls. Says Dr. Pieper: "Diejenigen, welche die Moeglichkeit des Suendigens bei dem Menschen Christus annehmen, geben eo ipso, bewusst oder unbewusst, die Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes, die unio personalis von Gott und Mensch, preis. *

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 80.

That Jesus Christ after His human nature was necessarily sinless is not dwellt on in our letters of Paul. Ample proof for the same, however, is found in Heb. 7, 26,27.

That Jesus was free from original sin, refer to Rom, 5, 18,19, and likewise, that He was over the Law of God, compare Matt.12,8.

As far as the outward appearance of Jesus is concerned, He was perfectly normal, "being found in the fashion of men", Phil. 2, 8. He enjoyed supernatural works ~~and speech~~, but not

appearance. Arguing from phil. 2,7 Dr. Pieper states:"Christus war fuer seine Person, ohne Suende, aber fuer sein aeuseres Aussehen war nicht das des Menschen vor dem Fall, sondern das des Menschen nach dem Fall."*

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 83.

The impersonality of the human nature: The human nature in Christ was not a separate person from the divine; we therefore speak of the human nature, but the same time ~~He was one~~ person, "ἀνυπόστατος" without "ἐνυπόστατος", ? as the dogmaticians were wont to express it. As proof we cite Col.2,9 (τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς). The divinity was incorporated into His body, thus producing one person. Just as our body and soul are one, so God and man here are one Christ. Lindberg well states in this connection:"The human nature, therefore, lacked personality, but became personal by being made partaker in the personality of the Son of God which is called enupstasia." * This is a Scriptural truth

* -------
C.E. Lindberg, Christian Dogmatics, p. 198.
----

quite beyond the powers of human reason to grasp or comprehend. And accordingly we find the doctrine rejected by non-christians or by unchristian Christians. Pieper writes:"Die Unitarier haben je und je behauptet, dass die Bildung einer eigenen Persoenlichkeit zum Wesen der menschlichen Natur gehoere." *

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 86.

And we cannot assume that Christ as man gradually became God on the basis of personal righteousness. Of all the millions of persons who have lived since the dawn of time, none ever became God. Says Dr, Pieper:" Das ist nur in der einen Men-

schennatur Christi geschehen." * Dogmaticians have coined

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 87.
----

a fitting expression to defend their stand on the impersonality of Christ. Read F. Pieper when he quotes Gerhard! Wir bleiben daher bei dem alten Satz: in Christo ist zwar "ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο", aber nicht "ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος". *

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 87,88.

In fine, the rejection of this our clear Scripture doctrine is rooted in rationalistic interpretations of the Bible. Because it is not comprehensible it is rejected entirely or altered at will. Development theories are introduced, as Pieper shows, l.c. pp.89 and 90. But an openminded study of Phil. 2, 5-11 brushes all false assumptions aside. In Christ there dwellt the fulness of the Godhead corporally, Col.2,9. The God and man made <u>one</u> Christ, who is Savior of all.

3. <u>The Personal Union.</u>

Christians have at all times held to the doctrine that there is a personal union in Christ, that into Him as God there was taken up a human nature which did not exist before, at a time definitely appointed by the Father. And by this union of God and man there resulted one Person, Christ, the Anointed. Writes Dr. Pieper:" In Christo sind Gott und Mensch nicht irgendwie verbunden, sondern bilden eine persoenliche Einheit." * Of

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 92.
----

special value is also the statement of the Formula of Concord:" As the two natures are united personally, i.e., in one person, we believe, teach, and confess, that this union is not such a

copulation and connection that neither nature has anything in common with the other personally,i.e., because of the personal union, as when two boards are glued together, where neither gives anything to the other".*

* -------
The Formula of Concord, p. 819.

Such has been the stand of our church; Christ is one person; there is no change in Him. Whether He be the image of God, the Son of God, or even in man's form, He is always and ever the same person. A unity always obtains. The captivity letters are not rich with expressions to this effect. One proof only will have to suffice here, Col.2,9: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς ". In Christ,then, who is one Being, dwellt both the "Fulness of the Godhead" and at the same time the essence of man, "σωματικῶς ". Not two Christs are spoken of, but one, who possesses the full essence and nature of God and at the same time has ~~or is filled with~~ the essence and nature of man in bodily form, "σωματικῶς ". Remarking on "σωματικῶς " a commentary states:"Bodily, not merely as before His incarnation, but now"bodily in Him" as the incarnate word.--- He is full of the "fulness" itself; we, filled from Him." * That this is to be

* -------
Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 376.
----

an eternal union, one that is not dissolved in heaven is nicely brought out by the word "κατοικεῖ ": "permanently dwells".

We are not to conceive of this union in the same way as that of the union of God with every creature, nor of that mysterious union of God with His believers, known as the "unio mystica",

nor can it be properly defined by means of illustrations; for it is unique - of its own nature. Writes Dr. Pieper:" Diese Vereinigung zu einer Person lehrt aber die Schrift klar und unmisverstaendlich in allen Aussagen in denen sie "Gott" "Mensch" und "Mensch" "Gott" nennt." * This is not a partial union,

* -------
Dr. F.Pieper, l.c.p. 93.
----

but a complete one; not only the gifts of God dwell in Him, but together the full Godhead and the complete manhood live in such a manner that they are one Person only. For substantiation of the above statements refer to Dr. Pieper's "Christliche Dogmatik", p. 92, and 93, Vol 2.

In discussing Col.2,9, Dr. Pieper states:"Die Menschheit in Christo verhaelt sich zu der Fuelle der Gottheit wie der Leib zur Seele". * But this remark must again be modified ,

* -------
Dr. Pieper, l.c. p. 94, footnote, 157.
----

for, he says, one cannot say:" Die Seele ist Leib und der Leib ist Seele und ------, waehrend wir doch bei der"unio personalis" von Christo sagen koennen und muessen:. Gott ist Mensch und Mensch ist Gott." * From Col. 2,9 it cannot be otherwise argued but

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, L.c. p. 94,95.
----

that in Christ, God is truly man, and man is truly God. Note that "ἐν αὐτῷ " is used by Paul; he does not use the plural; for he was speaking of <u>one</u> person.

Is Christ partly God and partly man? Writes Lindberg:"Gerhard says in this connection that neither has a part been united to a part, but the entire Logos to the entire flesh and the entire flesh to the entire Logos." *

* -------
C.E.Lindberg, l.c. p. 210.

As regards those critics who disbelieved the personal union Strong says:"Gess and Beecher hold that the immaterial part in Christ's humanity is only contracted and metamorphosed deity. The advocates of this view maintain that the divine Logos reduced himself to the condition and limits of the human nature, and thus literally became a human soul." * And the same author

* -------
A.H. Strong, l.c. p. 184.
----

writes on the same page:"Dorner and Rothe hold that the union between the divine and the human natures is not completed by the incarnation. The advocates of this view maintain that the union between the two natures is accomplished by a gradual communication of the fulness of the divine Logos to the man Christ Jesus." * (above).

Did Christ have a consciousness of Himself - of the fact that He was both God and man? Turn here to John 8,58:"Before Abraham was, I am"; or to Luke 2,49 where the twelve year old Jesus stated:"I must be about my Father's business."

True Lutheranism has always stood for an unmixed and unconfused personal union in Jesus. Asserts Dr. Pieper:"Abzuweisen ist jede Vermischung und jede Verwandlung goettlicher und menschlicher Natur in Christo." * And similarly writes Lindberg:

* -------
F. Pieper, l.c. p. 100.

"At the Council of Chalcedon in 451 it was decided that the two natures were united inconfusedly (ἀσυγχύτως), unchangeably (ἀτρέπτως), indivisibly (ἀδιαιρέτως) and inseparately (ἀχωρίστως)." *

* -------
C.E. Lindberg, l.c. p. 200.

Were we to hold to such a doctrine, we would introduce a tertium, thereby destroying completely the Scriptural teaching of a real union. Writes Strong in his dogmatical outlines: "The Eutychians denied the distinction and the coexistence of the two natures, and held to a mingling of both into one, which constituted a "tertium quid" or a third nature." * In fact,

* -------
A.H. Strong, l.c. p. 181.
----

the denial of the union overthrows our belief in a Savior who is and necessarily is a God-man. What a clever invention of Satan, this "tertium quid!" For, is Christ no true God, we are yet in our sins; He has, then, not redeemed us!

In like fashion every division of the divine and human natures is to be rejected. Says Dr. Pieper: "Geschieht dies, so ist "eo ipso" die persoenliche Vereinigung und das gottmenschliche Erloesungswerk aufgegeben." * That is to be charged against the Nestorians and the Zwinglians

*--------
Dr. ------- Pieper, l.c. p. 102.
----

ainst the Nestorians and the Zwinglians, as Pieper says, l.c., p.102. Conscious of the fact that they are depriving Christ of honor in dividing His natures, they resort to many and high-sounding compliments to fill in a measure the deficiency they cause. Pieper says: " Man (Zwingli etc) redet von "absoluter Immanenz Gottes" in Christo, "absoluter Verwirklichung des Willens Gottes" durch Christum usw." * And how true is this very act also of the

* --------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c.p. 104.

Modernists; how does it not remind one of their phraseology. Fosdick goes so far as to say: " He is the best we know", * but

* -------
H.E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 240.
----

to call Jesus true God in its full sense is far from him.

That is borne out by the statement:" Have done with your theological Christ and give us back Jesus, the ethical teacher." *

* -------
H.E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 245.

The personal union of God and man in Christ is not:

a) An"unio nominalis". For proof read John 10,30. The Pauline captivity letters offer no proof;

b) an "unio relativa". The union which obtains between parents and children is here meant. But Col. 2,9 shows that not only was there a relation of God to man in Him, but God and man dwellt together in one body, "σωματικῶς";

c) An "unio accidentalis". Refer to I John 1,1;

d) An"unio sustentativa", i.e., by mere support and aid. But Col.1,18 shows clearly that Christ upholds all creatures, being above them all, "καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν";

e) An "unio naturalis". Compare Luke 1,78,79;

f) An "unio essentialis"in the sense that there is only one nature in Christ since the union. But Col.2,9 teaches the existence of <u>two</u> natures, "fulness" and "bodily". Reformed theology is partially guilty of this accusation. Dr. Pieper, quoting Charles Hodge, says:"They are mixed (commiscentur)." * Evi-

* -------
Dr. Pieper, l.c. p. 110.
----

dently Hodge is guilty of mixing the natures, and I say guilty, because Pieper states:"Die lutherischen Dogmatiker erkennen den Ausdruck "They are mixed, commiscentur" nicht als einen adaequaten"tenminus" fuer die von ihnen gelehrten Gemeinschaft der Naturen"; *

* --------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 110.
----

g) An "unio ad adoptionem", as though the man Jesus was adopted as the Son of God. But compare here Phil. 2,6 (Being

in the form of God); Christ was God before He became man.

The Kenoticists are here to be exposed who divide the union when they would teach Christ as God. They, as Pieper writes:"Suchen den Sohn Gottes ohne (minus) Allmacht, Allwissenheit, und Allgegenwart in die Welt einzufuehren." * But,

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 117.
----

more on them later!

4. The Communication of Natures.

This is not a new doctrine. It is in essence the same as the doctrine of the personal union. Dogmatists have developed it, however, in an effort to defend their stand over against false teachers. The Apostle Paul writes in prison Col.2,9: "ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς ". And if in one Being, Christ, the Godhead dwellt in bodily form, thus bringing two natures, a human and a divine, into one Person, these two natures must necessarily have been communicable. That is to say, the human nature must have been permeated with and partook of the divine nature, and the divine nature likewise of the human nature. Accordingly also, it is reasonable that the divine nature perfects the human while the human nature is perfected by the divine. In using the word "κατοικεῖ " Paul gives us the picture of communication; a separation of the natures is foreign to the mind of Paul. Writes Dr. Pieper: "Wohnt" die goettliche Natur Christi in seiner menschlichen Natur wie in ihrem "σῶμα ", so ist damit so klar wie moeglich ausgesagt, dass die goettliche Natur mit der menschlichen nicht nur nominelle, sondern reale Gemeinschaft hat." * From

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 139.
----

the words " ἐν αὐτῷ " we may deduce that the human nature had gone down into the divine to "dwell" there. How could the idea of communication of natures been more emphatically expressed? Besides this single passage of Paul we have for our contention the spirit of the Apostle's writings; they are replete with the thought or idea that the natures in Christ were not kept definitely apart, but partook of each other. In fact, that thought runs through all of his references to Christ.

As asserted above, this doctrine is advanced in the interest of defending the personal union in its fullest sense over against errorists. Such are the Reformed and Roman theologians, charges Pieper, when he says:"Auch Hodge sagt tadelnd von der lutherischen Lehre: "The capacity of human nature for divinity became the formative idea in the Lutheran church doctrine of the person of Christ . Roemische Theologen machen in diesem Punkt gemeinschaftliche Sache mit den reformierten." *

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 135.

We cling to our interpretation; for the whole doctrine of the personal union cannot be properly defined without the communication of the natures. Were we to deny this communication, we automatically deny the personal union. That lies in the very nature of the subject. For what is the communication of natures but a part explanation or finer definition of the personal union? By rejecting one, the Reformed deny both.

Detailed descriptions of this communication: This communication of natures in Christ is to be regarded,according to Pieper;"Nicht als ein Nebeneinander (συναφεια), sondern als ein Ineinander zu denken, und zwar so, dass die goettliche Natur die menschliche durchdringt (περιχωρησις). *

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 139.

Just as unrelentingly as the church ~~stands for~~ insists on the συναφεια) of the natures, so also it declares this ~~(union or)~~ communication intact, without a resultant commixture. When the Apostle uses the word "κατοικεῖ " ,"permanently dwells", he most emphatically does not teach a changing of the natures, or, much less, an absorption of the human by the divine nature! Consult here Dr. Pieper, l.c., p. 140.

Dogmaticians have invented the axiom :"Neque caro extra λόγον neque λόγος extra carnem," to substantiate our point of contention. To this Pieper remarks:"Die reformierten Theologen beantworten diese Frage ebenso entschieden mit Nein."*

* --------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 141.

For corroboration of this contention we submit again Col.2,9, where the thought of the human nature existing outside (extra) the divine is impossible, compare "ἐν αὐτῷ " and "κατοικεῖ ".

How does not one rejection of the Reformed lead them into untold difficulties; one denial leads to another! Teach they their belief in " extra carnem" they immediately leave hold on the personal union. And if they teach a personal union it is nothing more than a union like that of God with His Christians, a"unio mystica".

As is in accord with their usual aberrations from Scripture, the Modernists have no place in their so-called theology for this doctrine. Says Fosdick:" Divine substance and nature, ontological equality with God, were not involved in Messiahship at all." *

* -------
H.E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 234.

Machen avers likewise, saying: "This doctrine ("the N.T. doctrine of two natures in one person") is, of course, rejected by modern liberalism. And it is rejected in a very simple way -- by the elimination of the whole higher nature of our Lord." *

* -------
G. Machen, l.c. p. 115.

The teaching of a communion of natures leads us on to a similar topic, the doctrine of the communication of attributes.

5. The Communication of Attributes.

If there is, as was just shown, a communication of natures, there is also a communication of attributes or qualities. Our same passage, Col.2,9 proves our contention. When Paul asserts, by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that "πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα " of the Godhead dwellt in Christ, then also are the attributes included. And if these attributes were in Him bodily "σωματικῶς", then He, Christ was also filled with human attributes; for where is a rational body that has not human attributes?

Dr. Pieper has catalogued the attributes in the following fashion: "Was goettliche und menschliche Natur ihrem Wesen nach sind, also: ewig -- zeitlich, unendlich -- endlich usw., ----- schaffen -- geschaffen werden, Leben geben -- das Leben lassen usw." * If the Son of God took on Himself the human nature and

*-------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 146.
----

became true man, as we proved above, Phil.2,5-8, then also He becomes partaker of all human attributes, e.g., to be born, to suffer, to die, and to arise, solely by virtue of the fact of His incarnation or the act of becoming man. (Pieper, l.c. p. 147).

Dogmaticians define three kinds of communication:

Genus Idiomaticum: This fact is carried out all through Paul's letters. It is a truth of which he is ever aware, compare Col.1,13,14:"ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ", The variant reading "through His blood" is appended.And if we receive forgiveness through the blood of Christ, an act possible with God, then Paul is here ascribing to human the nature divine qualities. The act of forgiving sins is in reality the work of the entire person of Christ, but Paul here designates this attributes, belonging to the entire person, unto the human nature only. Similarly the divine nature can be predicated with human attributes, e.g., dying; compare Col.1,22 (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου).

Rationalists have at all times despised this doctrine. Speaking of Nestorius, Dr. Pieper cites him as asserting:"Ich kann einen geborenen, gestorbenen und begrabenen Gott nicht anbeten.* In the same reference Pieper shows that Nestorius

* -------
Dr. Pieper, l.c. p. 152.
----

is the prototype of Zwingli, who likewise taught the impossibility of the Son of God to die, and introduced into the church his abominable Alloeosis. By this clever turn, he sought to alter the Bible readings and meanings by inserting the human nature for the divine, whenever Scriptures predicated human attributes to the divine nature. Says Pieper:" Wenn Menschen sich erlauben, fuer den "Sohn Gottes" die "menschliche Natur" einzusetzen, um einer vermeintlichen Irrlehre zu entgehen, so ist das ein tatsaechlicher Abfall von der Wahrheit --." *

* -------
Dr. Pieper, l.c. p. 155.

Of interest here is Luther's opinion of Zwingli's Alloeosis. Pieper quotes him, saying:" Huete dich, huete dich, sage ich,

vor der Alloeosis! Sie ist des Teufels Larve." * This doctrine,
* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. note 185, p. 104.
----
or should I say poison, seems to have affected his colleagues for years. Compare Pieper's assertion:"Auch die spaeteren reformierten Theologen sind der Sache nicht von Zwingli's Alloeosis losgekommen." *
* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 166.

How was it possible for the Son of God to suffer? We cite Dr. Pieper again:"Wir brauchen nur an Kyrills Paradoxen "ἀπαθῶς ἔπαθεν ", "ohne zu leiden, hat der Sohn Gottes gelitten", zu erinnern." * All eager searching for an answer to the
* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 157.
----
question of its possibility borders on skepticism. We Christians know that Christ suffered, Phil.2,8, and at that, according to His human nature only; for His divine nature could not suffer. How this was all possible we leave for eternity to answer.Dr. Pieper quoting Luther, writes:"Duenkt's Nestorium wunderlich sein, dass Gott stirbt, sollt' er denken, dass es ja so wunderlich ist, dass Gott "ensch wird." * True, we dare speak of
* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 164.

God as dying, but only in a special sense; not with reference to His divine nature. Says Pieper:"Wenn hier das Abstraktum "Gottheit" gebraucht wird, so ist nicht an die Gottheit an sich, sondern an die "Gottheit im Fleisch" -- gedacht". * The divine
* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 169.
----
nature is not able to suffer death.

Genus Maiestaticum: This teaching follows naturally from our position on the personal union, and it has in its favor special Scriptural backing and proof. Turning to Phil. 2, 8-10 we read:

"καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα ". Paul here speaks distinctly of an exaltation of Christ; but can the divine nature of Christ be exalted? Surely not. This exaltation can then refer only to the human nature which dwells bodily in Christ, Says Pieper:"Da er nun als Gott in nichts erhoeht werden kann, so ist hierdurch die Mitteilung goettlicher Attribute an die menschliche Natur klar ausgesprochen."*

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 175. (Quoted from Hase).

And he goes on to show that were this not the case even the Deity of Christ would be denied, and an Arian creature would remain.(Cf. Pieper,l.c. p. 175). The above passage is substantiated by Eph.1,20 ("set Him at His own right hand"). Reasoning along the lines of the above principles, Paul here speaks of the elevation of the human nature. To admit an exaltation of the divine, admits of an inferior Christ, of a created God. It denies the eternity of the divine nature! Paul thus guards against such falsehoods with sufficient explicitness. That Christ is an eternal God, elevated in time according to the human nature is inextricably interwoven with the central, most vital teachings of Paul, Christ's greatest ambassador. Were Paul here speaking of an elevation of the divine nature, he would be speaking in contradistinction to his preceding statements about Christ; he would be preaching an humanitarian Christ! That certainly would warp and mutilate his glorious passages on the Deity of Christ. No! The Apostle's doctrine centers wholly in the One who is at once and truly God Eternal as well as man. Thus it is possible to speak of exaltation here; the divine transmitted it to the human nature.

We shall treat especially three of the divine attributes communicated to the human nature of Christ.

Omnipotence: Turning to PHil. 3,21, we read:("-- whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself"); and Eph. 1, 21 ("Far above all principality and power"). These passages give ample predication to the omnipotence of Christ.

Omniscience: For varification of this attribute we cite Col. 2,3:"In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"; and our oft quoted Col.2,9. If in Christ the "fulness" exists, yea, dwells, then He knows all things in heaven and in earth. Under the caption of Christ's works we shall note that Jesus taught or rather spoke otherwise than did His predecessors. That is but natural; in Him was omniscience, all godly wisdom.

Omnipresence: This thought underlies all of Paul's references to the Godman, Jesus Christ. Reading Eph. 4,10 ("That He might fill all things"), and Eph. 1,23("The fulness of Him that filleth all in all") we are immediately convinced of the everpresence of Christ; He is in all things. Note here that the Apostle does not say that all things are Christ, which is the essence of the erring pantheists, but that Christ is in all things - thus an omnipresent God. What comfort does not such a doctrine lend, i,e., to know that Quiet God is ever with us. But, according to Pieper, l.c. p. 183, the Reformed resort to the teaching of a monster, "eine ungeheuerliche Erdichtung" - only to escape the fact of Christ's assumed divine attributes! Writes Hodge of Princeton:" Omnipresence and omniscience are not attributes of which the creature can be made the organ". *

* -------
DR. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 185.

Acting in this fashion, the Reformed rob Christ of honor and glory; they teach a monstrosity in place of God!

Old Lutheran theologians taught, the efficacy of Christ was omnipresent, not Jesus in His Person. To this Pieper says, refering to Eph. 4,10:"So ist auch nicht blos eine Wirksamkeit , sondern eine Person hinabgestiegen ueber alle Himmel. Und sie, diese Person , " ὁ ἀναβάς ", erfuellt das All." *

* -------
DR. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 186.

Lutherans distinguish between a local and an illocal presence of the human nature in Christ. For proof of the local presence refer to EPh. 1, 23 (ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα) and to Col.2,9 (κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα). Thus according to His human nature - in His body - Jesus, not extra carnem, but intra carnem, fills the church and all things," τὰ πάντα ." This view is held in opposition to the reformed idea of a local widening of the human nature, which calls up the picture of a monster. Luther charges them with teaching "ein grosser Strohsack, da Gott Himmel mit und Erde inne waere", Pieper,l.c. p. 193, and in the same reference Pieper calls this reformed notion "eine Wahnvorstellung! We Lutherans need not resort to such imaginary explanations, since we teach an illocal presence. Compare Col.2,9. If "all the fulness" dwells in Him "bodily", then He partakes of the illocal presence of the Father in His human nature. Likewise does Eph. 1,21 express this thought ("above every name that is named"). In fact, Paul's phraseology is replete with this idea that Christ possessed and pessesses an illocal presence. Of this presence Dr. Pieper says:"Nach dieser Seinsweise -- und nur nach dieser Seinsweise -- hat die menschliche Natur Christi an der goettlichen Allgegenwart teil!"*

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 200.

Lutherans have ever stood for this truth, and rightly so. Writes Lindberg:"Luther correctly emphasized the fact that wherever Christ is, there He is entire." * Already the For-

* -------
C.E. Lindberg, l.c. p. 222.
----

mula of Concord rejects the reformed monstrosity "that the human nature of Christ is <u>locally</u> extended to all places."*

* -------
The Formula of Concord, l.c. p. 825.

Also in the state of humiliation did Christ have the divine omnipresence, says Pieper:"Mit Recht beweisen die alten lutherischen Lehrer aus Kol.2,9 die mitgeteilte goettliche Allgegenward auch fuer den Stand der Niedrigkeit". *

* -------
DR. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 228.

<u>Divine glory:</u> This attribute of Christ is taught already under the headings of the communication of attributes. It is taught specifically in Phil. 2, 10 (πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ) and in Eph.1,21 ("above -- every name that is named"). On Phil.2,10 Pieper states:" Hier wird sowohl die Qualitaet der Anbetung Christi als "cultus vere divinus" bestimmt, als auch die Hinsicht angegeben, in welcher der "cultus vere divinus" zukommt, naemlich nach seiner menschlichen Natur." * He likewise shows

* -------
DR. F. pieper, l.c. p. 240.
----

that the Reformed are on this point rather inconsistent; they refuse the human nature divine power etc, but ascribe to it divine honor and glory,l.c.p. 238.

Dogmaticians also indicate that, although Christ possessed all divine attributes even in His human nature, He was not, according to it, eternal; ~~for~~ for compare Phil. 2,7 ("took on Him the form of a servant"). The human nature, then, is the

product of time; it is not from everlasting, though it will endure through all eternity now. Says Lindberg:"It is self-evident that the human nature could not become eternal, as it had a beginning from the time of conception." *

* -------
C.E. Lindberg, l.c. p. 220.

In closing this chapter it is well to note the modernistic stand. Says Fosdick:"Here was a personality who drew to Himself as necessary to his interpretation all the noblest ways of conceiving spiritual greatness which men possessed." * This

* -------
H.E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 217.
----

is just another example of their hopeless conception of Christ as true God, possessing all divine attributes, blessed in heaven!

Genus Apotelesmaticum: This third "genus" is of utmost practical importance; with its denial goes also the faith in a saving Christ. Pieper says:" Die Kirch e kaempft fuer die beiden ersten"genera" im Interesse des dritten." * While in prison

* -------
Dr. Pieper, l.c. p. 277.

Paul wrote to the Ephesians, chapter 5, 2:"--- καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ "--. The work of saving us is there ascribed to both natures, to the divine and the human; for Paul mentions Christ, not just the divine nature. Reading Col.1,22:" In the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in His sight," we get the same picture or thought. Both natures here participated in the divine act of redeeming sin-lost mankind. According to this communication it is then evident that Christ is our Redeemer, High-priest, Shepherd etc. To deny it is to deny the true faith.

This "genus" is rejected by the reformed Theologians. And in doing so they are in opposition to themselves, as Pieper shows,l.c. p. 273, for in accepting the communication of the divine Person with the human nature, they refuse acceptance of the communication of acts that are divine to the human nature. Pieper calls this action of theirs "eine Verwerfung der ganzen goettlichen Erloesungsmethode". * And Luther says:"Wo es nicht

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 274.
----

sollte heissen: Gott ist fuer uns gestorben, sondern allein der Mensch, so sind wir verloren." *

*-------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 280.

As is to be expected the Modernists put no faith in this our glorious doctrine; for they already reject Christ's Deity. Writes Fosdick:"What has Jesus done? what changes has he wrought? ---- Jesus must have been the kind of person who could do what he has done." * And in spite of that statement, which

* -------
H.E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 221.
----

is so deceivingly put, they refuse to believe in Him as God! Horsch affirms this when he states:" They(the Modernists) deny the history of Jesus in so far as it partakes of the supernatural." *

* -------
John Horsch, l.c. p. 83.

These three "genera" are admittedly the work of man's hands; they are classed as technical terminology of all Christian dogmatics. But it is not necessary, therefore, that all Christians be able to define them. Whoever has believed in the saving work of Jesus Christ, who as Man and God gave His life for us on the cross, has also believed in the "Genus idiomaticum, maiestaticum, and apotelesmaticum".

II. THE STATES OF CHRIST.

The New Testament is replete with passages telling of two states in Christ. Paul's thoughts also move about this truth also while in imprisonment. He writes to the Philippians, chapter 2,5-11 (ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν and (διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν). There, in the space of a few verses the Apostle teaches the humiliation and the exaltation of Christ. Says a commentator:" In v. 8 the emphasis is on(~~humiliation~~)"humbles" (which stands before the Greek "Himself"); He not only emptied Himself of His previous "form of God", but submitted to positive humiliation." * And on Phil. 2,9 the same

* -------
Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 363.
----

commentary writes, p. 364:"God exalted Christ as man to equality with God." Writes the'Expositor's" on these passages:"Ever as man He endured great humiliation, for He suffered the shameful death of the cross." * The same commentator says of Eph. 1,21, one

* -------
The Expositor's Gr. Testa. l.c. p. 438.
----

of Paul's great statements on the exaltation of Christ:"This paragraph gives simply a positive statement of the exaltation of Christ, His sovereign and unshared supremacy over all."*

* -------
The Expositor's Gr. Testa. l.c. p. 279.

This same truth is taught by Paul in passages such as Eph.4, 9-10 (ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν); Eph.1,20 (καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ); Col, 2,15 (θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς); and Col. 3,1 (ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος). Paul speaks of the death of Christ, Phil.2,10. That shows unmistakingly His humiliation; a thing otherwise foreign to God. Paul speaks of His sitting at the right hand of God. That shows the exaltation of Christ.

In speaking of the exaltation and humiliation of Christ, we always refer them to the human nature. Says Pieper:"Die Beziehung auf Christum nach der goettlichen Natur ist eine "laesterliche Verkehrung".* To refer them to both natures

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 313.
----

is the error of the Reformed. And as Pieper again shows, page 316,l.c., the Unitarians think of Christ in the state of humiliation as an intellectual and moral ruler of the world and church only.

In regard to the possibility of Christ's humiliation, Pieper writes:"So also kam es bei Christo zum Sterben, dass er die in ihm wohnende Macht nicht gebrauchte."* In His humil-

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c.p 318.
----

iation Christ did not abdicate the possession of the divine majesty, but the <u>full use</u> of it, thus concealing His glory. Phil. 2,6-8 :"He made Himself of no reputation "ἐκένωσεν ", thus making no display of His equality with God. This act of Christ's, this non-use of divine power, occurred in the interest of our salvation. Without it He could not have suffered pain or sorrow nor approached death. The word "ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν " is to be understood in that wise only, that He, who was God, did not use the full majesty that was His while here on earth in the sole interest of our redemption. As Pieper shows, l.c. p. 333, all interpretations to the contrary, especially those that would introduce here a "κρύψις ", a hiding, are false and to be rejected. Likewise affirms Lindberg: "Neither can the self-renunciation imply the hidden use of the divine attributes or a "κρύψις χρήσεως ".*

* -------
C.E. Lindberg, l.c. p. 229.

Similarily writes the Formula of Concord:"This majesty He (Christ) always had according to the personal union, and yet he abstained from it in His humiliation." * Luther with his usual felicity

* -------
The Formula of Concord, p. 821.
----

expresses this thought very aptly when he says:"Christus habe sich selbst geaeussert oder entledgt,i.e., er hat sich gestellt, als legte er die Gottheit von sich, und wollte derselbigen nicht gebrauchen." *

* -------
Luthers Saemt. Schriften, Vol. 12,(St. Louis,)p. 474.

The Stages of Christ's Humiliation:

a) His Conception and Birth: The captivity letters offer no statements to effect a proof here. Compare Luke 1, 42 and Luke 2,17 for the conception and birth respectively.

b) His Increasing in Knowledge and visible dwelling with men: Again Paul does not dwell on these subjects in his letters written while in prison. For proof refer to Luke 2,52 and Mark 4,1 respectively.

c) His Suffering, Death, and Burial: Having no direct statement for a proof of Christ's sufferings, we quote an indirect one, Eph.5,2 ("And hath given Himself as an offering and a sacrifice to God"). The idea of suffering is certainly contained therein. Again, Phil. 3,10 ("the fellowship of His sufferings") may be classified as a direct reference to Christ's suffering. But the thought that Christ suffered underlies many of the expressions of Paul, especially the reference to His death. That Christ died is proved by Phil. 2,8 (obedient unto death), and Phil. 3,10 (conformable unto His death). These passages leave no doubt in the reader's mind as to the actual death that Christ underwent. They are plain words!

Paul accepts the Scriptural and historical fact of Christ's burial when he states Col. 2,12:"Buried with Him in baptism ----". If he does not directly say Christ was interred, he, by these words acknowledges the fact, as it was taught before his time in the oral Gospel of the Evangelists and later recorded in writing for posterity (John 19,42).

d) His Descent into Hell: I Pet.3,18 ff. is considered the "locus classicus" for the doctrine of Jesus' descent into hell. Paul refers to it also in the captivity letters, Eph. 4,9:" Κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς;". With the expression "lower parts of the earth" Paul refers to hell, so conceived anthropomorphically. Says a commentator:"This phase means more than simply the earth, viz., the regions beneath it, even as He ascended not merely to the visible heavens, but "far above" them."* Unquestionably the same thought is prevailing in Paul's mind when he writes Phil. 2,10 (and things under the earth). And arguing from Eph.4,8 (He led captivity captive), we judge that in order to lead them captive, Christ went down to the abode of the captives.

*Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 350.

The expression "led captivity captive" says that Christ proved to them that He had conquered sin and the devil; for Paul adds "triumphing over them in it", Col. 2,15. It does not mean that Christ preached the Gospel in hell for their salvation, as some are wont to believe, and others in doubt about. Says Lindberg:"This theory -- (of Christ's descent) is still an open question."*

* C.E. Lindberg, l.c. p. 242.

e) His Resurrection: This truth is expressly taught by Paul almost everywhere; it is too glorious to be avoided. Compare Eph. 1,20 (when He raised Him from the dead) and Col.3,1 (If ye then be risen with Christ), both of which verses show that the

passive stage of the resurrection, i.e., the fact that God raised Christ. Scriptures also refer to Christ as raising Himself.

Christ's resurrection, although an historical fact, is denied by the Modernists. Writes Horsch:" They (the Modernists) deny His supernatural birth, His miracles, and His resurrection."*

* -------
John Horsch, l.c. p. 83.
----

f) His ascension into Heaven: As Paul teaches Christ's resurrection, so he with equal emphasis proclaims Jesus'ascension. Eph. 4,10:"He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things." And Dr. Pieper shows,l.c. p. 383, that the purpose of this ascension was not merely to receive the place of honor, but "to fill all things" refers to the place of power He, Christ, is there to occupy.

g) His Sitting at the Right Hand of God: This is an anthropomorphic expression. It has no reference to a definite place in heaven, but has refenerce to the place of honor and power in heaven. Says Dr. Pieper:" Wird nun von Christo hinsichtlich seiner Menschheit gesagt, dass er nach Leiden und Tod zur Rechten Gottes gesetzt sei und nun permanent zur Rechten Gottes sitze, so ist damit nicht ein Ehrensitz, sondern ein Herrschersitz ... beschrieben," *

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 387.
----

and goes on to show that it is also a place of power and rule unlimited with respect to divine might and authority, according to Eph. 1,20 (καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ). Of the same passage a commentary says:" The exaltation to the place of honor and authority following the resurrection is a further witness to what the "ἐνέργειά " of God can effect." *

* -------
The Expositor's Gr. Testa. l.c. p. 277.

Parallel to the passage just treated is Col. 3,1 ("Where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God"). It is of practical importance to realize fully this authority of Christ. It is of comfort to the Christian. Jesus, who is our brother and Redeemer -- our best Friend -- is ruling us and the world with divine power, yes, on the right hand of God.

The second coming of Jesus will not be treated here; that is a matter to be discussed under soteriology. Passages from Paul's letters which we are treating are: Eph. 1, 20-22, Eph. 4,30, and Phil. 3,20.

III. The Doctrine of Christ's Work.

This chapter is sometimes treated under soteriology. We shall briefly discuss it here also so as to present a complete christological survey of Paul's captivity letters.

By way of definition Dr. Pieper writes:"Alles, was Christus, der Gottmensch, zur Seligmachung der Menschen im Stande der Niedrigkeit getan hat und im Stande der Erhoehung noch tut, gehoert zum Amt oder Werk Christi."* And so mighty,

* DR. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 388.

so glorious, so beneficiary, so rich was this work of Christ that He can well be called the greatest philanthropist the world has ever seen.

1. The Prophetic Office of Christ.

There is a wealth of material in the New Testament as well as in the Old proclaiming Christ as our great Prophet. St. Paul also dwells on this phase of Jesus' work, He who was and is a unique Prophet, the like of whom there never was nor ever

shall be. Turning to Eph. 2,17 we read:" Καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν ". And, of course, that which Christ preached was His Gospel, the way unto salvation. Reading Eph. 1,13 (after that ye heard the word of truth) and Col.3,16 (Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom) we are introduced to the same thought, namely, that Jesus Christ,the Anointed Son of God, preached the Word of God - yes, His own Word to men. He was a Prophet in the fullest sense of the term. Remarks Strong:" He was rather an inspired interpreter or revealer of the divine will, a medium of communication between God and men, not a foreteller, but a forth-teller. As prophet, though, He being God, the Messiah, the Christ, the Logos, the Word did not come to Him as it did to the O.T. prophets. He was the Word!"* And He, as the Word,

* -------
A.H. Strong, l.c. p. 191.
----

preached Himself, says Pieper:"Christus zeigt das Heil --- als in seiner Person gegenwaertig." * According to Pieper,

* -------
DR. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 396.
----

l.c. p. 398,399, the Romanists, late Unitarians, and Arminians preach Christ as a new Lawgiver; not as One who gave us"the Gospel of peace." They greatly err; for if Christ preached a new Law, Paul would not have said Eph. 2,17 "preached peace" (εἰρήνη).

Christ still maintains this office in the state of exaltation; it is His for all eternity. We need but turn again to Col. 3,16"Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom". Christ then is the only teacher in the church and through the church until the Day of Judgment. All teachings contrary to His are false; they are pseudoprophecies.

Because of the fact that Christ is the one and only Prophet in the church, 2. is 1. there in the church at all times a safe-guard against error and falsehoods. This is of real comfort to us Christians; it guards against indifferrece in doctrine.

Modernism again rejects this Christian standpoint. The best Fosdick can say here is:"He(Jesus) has given the world its loftiest ethical ideals!" * And again he says:"The

* -------
H. E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 226.
----

fundamental attribute of Jesus' God was universal moral will".*

* -------
H.E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 222.

He may eulogize the man Jesus, but he fails to see Him as true God. They do not believe this Man's Word, as Horsch says: "What He said about His supernatural person and work --- they rejected - as mere fiction." *

* -------
John Horsch, l.c. p. 85.
----

2. THE Priestly Office of Christ.

Christ, our eternal High Priest - that is the glory of the Christian church. The grace which Christ preached to us as Prophet He has won for us as our High Priest.

Fundamental as this doctrine is Paul treats it very thoroughly. He writes to the Ephesians, chapter 1,7: "ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν ... τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων ". There it is certainly stated in concise words that Jesus redeems us with His blood, He having evidently shed it for us, as did the animals in O.T. times; they for a time, His for eternity. Says a commentary:"Hence antithetically, the Son of God became the Son of man, that as our kinsman He might redeem us." *

* -------
Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 342.

Of the same verse another says:"It is a sacrificial term, based on the use of the blood of victims, offered under the O.T. law, for the purpose of purification and expiation."*

* The Expositor's Gr. Testa. l.c. p. 254.

Other Pauline passages serving our stand are: Eph. 13 (made nigh by the blood of Christ), Eph. 2,16 (that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross), Eph. 5,2 (and hath given Himself for us), Col. 1,22 (to present you holy).

Christ has freed us from all the consequences of sinfulness. He has liberated us from the power of the devil, Col. 2,15 (having spoiled principalities and powers); from the power of death, Phil. 1,21 (For me to live is Christ, to die is gain); and from the rule of sin, Col. 2,14 (blotting out the handwriting of ordiances that was against us).

Modernism again places reason above the Bible and resists our doctrine. Horsch says:"Liberalism regards Him as an example and guide; Christianity, as a Savior." *

* John Horsch, l.c. p. 96.

Christ's Vicarious Satisfaction: That the sacrificial atonement of Jesus extends to all people - is for them-we infer from passages such as Phil. 2,15 (That ye may be blameless). Paul makes no restriction here. All are meant. And this gift of Christ to us is accomplished; it is done for all time, compare Eph. 1,3 (who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly palces). And it was death that Christ suffered for us, because death was represented as the curse which was pronounced upon sin by the Law against its transgressors, Deut. 27,26. Such are Weiss' thoughts, l.c. p. 423,424. He also shows this reconciliation to God was not something mutual,

as if man gives up his enmity and God consequently gives up His ὀργή". *

* -------
Dr. B. Weiss, l.c. p. 429.

This is a fundamental doctrine of our church, namely, that we are justified by faith through Christ's blood or sacrificial atonement. With it our Lutheran church stands; without it she falls. Modernism seeks to find salvation through their own deeds. Says Horsch:"Considered from this viewpoint, salvation is not the work of Christ, but our own work". * When

* -------
John Horsch, l.c. p. 92.
----

they use the words "vicarious satisfaction" they refer to something other than do Christian dogmaticians! Dr. Machen says: "A cardinal doctrine of modern liberalism is that the world's evil may be overcome by the world's good." * Or read Fosdick

* -------
G. Machen, l.c. p. 136.
----

himself:"Yet another thing the historic Jesus has done; he has made men believe in the possibility of moral reclamation and renewal."*

* -------
H. E. Fosdick, l.c. p. 225.

<u>Christ's Active Obedience:</u> Jesus not only bore the punishment which we should have suffered because our our transgression of divine law, but also fulfilled that law while here on earth. He rendered that obedience to the holy will of God which we should have rendered, but did not. Paul ascribes this active obedience or fulfilling of the law to Christ Phil. 2,8 (and became obedient unto death --). In that entire group of doctrinal passages, Phil.2, 5-11, Paul holds this fact before his readers' eyes, i.e., Christ, who was the eternal God, took on Him the form of a man, and as such was obedient

unto death, for which reason God exalted Him. Not only is Christ's death spoken of, but also His obedience to the law.

There are especially two attacks directed against this doctrine. There are those who hold that Christ, being true man, had to fulfill the law for His own person, and thus that obedience was not vicarious, but used by Jesus Himself. They forget, however, that Christ was also God. By holding to such a view they automatically dispense with the doctrine of the personal union of God and man in Christ.

There are those who say that the work of redemption is ascribed to Christ's passive obedience only. But, compare Rom. 5,18,19 where our salvation is ascribed to Jesus' active obedience. None of these passages are to be regarded as exclusive of the other.

Paul never makes any restrictions in regard to the extent of Christ's redemptive work. In Eph. 1, 7 he says "In whom we have redemption through His blood; in Eph. 4, 34 "even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you; in Col. 2,10 "And ye are complete in Him"; always indicating thereby that the atonement of Jesus is a universal one; that it is meant for all. Such is sound Bible doctrine, which is treated extensively under the caption of "gratia universalia". Writes Dr. Pieper:"Die von Christo geleistete Genugtuung ist sowohl intensiv als auch extensiv vollkommen."*

* -------
Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 457.

Christ, our Mediator: This doctrine is not touched upon by Paul in his captivity. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews elaborates upon it, Heb. 7,24-27. Christ is there portrayed as our High Priest in the state of exaltation.

3. The Regal Office of Christ.

Scriptures also describe Christ as King of all men and of the universe. All power in heaven and in earth lies at His feet. Paul dwells on this very theme in extenso. He writes to the Colossians, chapter 1, 17:"Καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν". All things, then, are upheld by His almighty power; they consist in Him. Says a commentary:"The Son of God is the conserver, as well as the creator of all things." * Here, if ever is the universal reign of Christ's kingship brought to light; it is not restricted to a definite territory. For substantiation of the above passage refer to Eph. 1, 22 ("καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ "), a figurative expression for the full supremacy which Christ enjoys; Phil. 3,21 (whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself); and Col. 2,10 (which is the head of all principality and power). In any of these passages there is neither restriction of Christ's power as King intensively speaking or extensively considered; His is all power everywhere, both in heaven and on earth.

* ---
Jame. Fauss. and Brown, l.c. p. 372.

It will be recalled that the fact that Christ rules as King according to both His natures, the human and the divine, was treated under the chapters of Genus maiestaticum and apotelesmaticum.

Dogmaticians employ three terms to differentiate between the triplex office of Christ's kingship. They are: a) The "regnum potentiae" in which Christ is King of all creation - rules the entire universe (cf. Eph.1,21 "far above all principality and power"); b) The "regnum gratiae", in which kingdom belong

all Christians who have accepted Jesus' Gospel message, (cf. Eph.5,23 "even as Christ is the head of the church"); c) The "regnum gloriae", which is the continuation of the earthly kingdom of grace glorified eternally in heaven (cf. Col.3,4 "When Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory").

The unity as well as the distinction of these three kingdoms of Christ are to be maintained on positive Scriptural grounds. Paul speaks of the unity to the Ephesians, chapter 1, 21-23: "ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς κτλ. ... καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ". The distinction between the kingdoms is written Rom. 8,24,25.

In the following we again expose those who teach otherwise than does Scripture. They are: 1) All Nestorian false teachers, who divide the Person of Christ, - who divide Christ as King. Here Pieper states:"So die Roemischen, die Reformierten und die reformierten Sekten";* 2) All the

* Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 468.

modern Kenosists, who teach an humiliation of Christ also according to His divine nature. (Cf. Lindberg,l.c. p. 236); 3) All Subordinationists, who "lassen Christum nach der goettlichen Natur dem Vater untergeordnet -- sein;"* 4) All

* DR. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 468.

Chiliasts, who teach a caricature of both the kingdom of grace and kingdom of glory. This is an invention of their imagination; "es gehoert in das Reich der Phantasie".* We can rejoice with

* Dr. F. Pieper, l.c. p. 471.

Christian pride to be called one day co-heirs of Christ's glory.

Concluding Remarks.

Remarkable it is to observe that from the Apostle Paul's captivity letters alone can be drawn up virtually a complete study of Christology. We must, therefore, proclaim him as the laudest herald of Him who gave Himself a sacrifice to and for sinful mankind, thereby revealing the will and love of the Father. Every reader of these Pauline letters is impressed with the earnestness and frequency of Paul's references to the grace that is now ours through the atonement of Jesus, our Savior. Salvation, forgiveness he preaches; for is not the plan of redemption through Christ and its glorious fulfillment, done in the interest of mankind, for the forgiveness of our sins, - is that not "χάρις ", grace?

The question is justified, Was Paul a staunch preacher of Christ in his earlier years also, in the early 50's of the first century? Did he alter his doctrine in later years? A detailed study of this question would take us too far afield; we shall, therefore, content ourselves with a comparison of this paper to a few sweeping statements made by Paul in several of his earlier letters.

We find no essential difference in "Romans". He writes, 1,16: "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth". And again, 5,10: "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son --". This is the same Christ taught in the captivity epistles.

To the Corinthians Paul proclaimed the same truth. He asserts, 2,2: "For I am determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified". There we have the

very material principle of our church. Again he says,3,23:"Ye are Christ's". And in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians he instructs, 5,21:"For He hath made Him to be a sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

The Galatians hear the same meaaage. He teaches them,4,4,5: "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons".

So conscientious, so true to the Word of Christ is the Apostle that he exclaims, I Cor.9,16:"Yea, woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel;" and so eager is he that this selfsame doctrine remain intact and unvarnished by judaizing philosophies or gnosticism, he writes strongly to the Galatians, chapter 1,8:"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, let him be accursed."

To say, therefore, that there is in Paul, as far as doctrine is concerned, an historical development is wholly unwarranted. It is the product of a biased mind. There is no difference between Paul's early and late letters with respect to doctrine, real or implied. With him Christ and the entire plan of salvation are ever the same. The Christ of his early years is the Christ of his later years, "God blessed forever."

And, in fine, because Paul sets forth the doctrines of Christ so gloriously; because he preaches"Christ and Him crucified"; because he proclaims Him as the risen Savior, who laid down His life that sinners, that we, might live; and because he is ever consistent in heralding the Gospel of Christ, the God-

Man, who,"though He was rich, became poor", suffered and died a disgraceful death on the cross "that we might be rich", rich in the glory and blessedness of heaven; we praise him as one of the greatest, if not the greatest ambassador of Christ, revere his name, cherish his epistles, love the more the time-old Gospel, and give all honor to that Christ whom he proclaimed.

FINIS.

Bibliography:

The English Bible, King James' Version.

Novum Testamentum, Graece (Eberhard Nestle).

Dr. Franz Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik, Vol.2.

C.E. Lindberg, Christian Dogmatics.

A.H. Strong, Outlines of Systematic Theology.

Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament.

D. Dr. Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments.

Luthers Saemtliche Schriften, Vol. 12. (St. Louis).

The Formula of Concord.

Harry Emerson Fosdick, The Modern Use of the Bible.

J. Gresham Machen, Christianity and Liberalism.

John Horsch, Modern Religious Liberalism.

The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol.3.

Jameison, Fausset,and Brown, Critical and Explanatory Commentary of the Bible.

Meyer, Colosserbrief.

----- OUTLINE -----

I. The Doctrine of Christ's Person.

1. The Deity of Christ.
   A. Proof.
   B. Rejection.

2. The Humanity of Christ.
   A. Proof.
   B. Pecularities of the Human Nature.

3. The Personal Union.
   A. Proof.
   B. Difference from other unions.

4. Communication of Natures.
   A. Proof.
   B. Its Constitution.

5. Communication of Attributes.
   A. Proof.
   B. Genus idiomaticum.
   C. Genus maiestaticum.
   D. a. His omnipotence.
      b. His omniscience.
      c. His omnipresence.
      d. Divine Honor.
   D. Genus Apotelesmaticum.
      a. Proof.
      b. Rejection.

II. The States of Christ.

1. Proof.
2. Humiliation and Exaltation.
3. The Different Stages.
   A. Conception and Birth.
   B. His Rearing.
   C. Suffering, Death, and Burial.
   D. Descent into Hell.
   E. Resurrection.
   F. Ascension.
   G. Sitting at Right Hand of God.

III. The Doctrine of Christ's Work.

1. In General.
2. Prophetic Office.
   A. Proof.
   B. In both States.
3. Sacerdotal Office.

A. Proof.
B. Satisfactio Vicaria.
C. Active Obedience.
D. For Whom Christ Died.
E. His Mediatorship.

4. Regal Office.
A. Proof.
B. The Triplex Division.
C. Rejection.

Conclusion: Proof that there is no doctrinal difference about Christ in Paul's captivity letters from his former letters.