

The principal difference between the Lutheran theology and that of Anselm was significant of this change. Anselm's doctrine was based in the necessity of the Divine nature, Luther's in a need of human nature. Anselm asked, How shall God be satisfied? Luther, How shall man be justified?

In answering this question, the Lutheran theologians maintained the doctrine of an infinite evil in sin, but changed the *satisfaction* of Anselm into an *equivalent*. They also made the distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ, which was not known to the theory of Anselm. Their view was, that man, by disobeying the law of God, was justly exposed to punishment, but Christ is punished in his place, and he thus becomes free. Yet he is still bound to obey God and lead a life of perfect goodness, in order to be saved. Christ fulfils this obligation for him by his holy life. The suffering he ought to bear, Christ bears; the duty he ought to perform, Christ performs. The satisfaction, therefore, before confined to the death of Christ, is now extended to his life; and now first is Christ considered as being punished in the place of the sinner.* God also is now regarded as a sovereign, bound to uphold his laws, instead of a creditor,

* A strong opposition was made to the Lutheran distinction of active and passive obedience by John Piscator, a reformed theologian, at the end of the 16th century. Piscator argued, from the definition of justification in Rom. iv. 6, 7, that the imputation of forgiveness and active obedience are not two parts of Justification, but one and the same. Christ, he maintains, as a man, was bound to obey God on his own account, and his active obedience cannot therefore be credited to us. His obedience in suffering, therefore, was the only cause of our being forgiven. If his active obedience is imputed to us, God is paid twice for our sins. Again, if his active obedience is imputed to us, we are not bound to obey for ourselves. The Lutherans, in reply, argued that we could only be justified by actual obedience to God's commandments. As no one obeyed these for himself, Christ must obey for us. But Piscator replied, "The law demands punishment or obedience, not both." This controversy forms an important epoch in the history of the doctrine.