

# ANSELM: OVERVIEW OF CUR DEUS HOMO

---

Jeremiah J. E. Wierwille

Last Updated: 11/28/2012

Copyright © Year 2012

**Abstract — In his work *Cur Deus Homo*, Anselm challenges the dominating ransom theory of atonement developed by Origen in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD (which was later defended by Augustine) for a more nuanced understanding involving the satisfaction of God’s wrath. Building from logic and argumentation of courtroom language and feudal lord systems of thought, Anselm constructs a theory of atonement that is based on humanity being required to pay back the debt that they incur by robbing God of the honor and dignity that is due him. Since humanity is unable to pay the honor back and achieve good standing with God, a savior who is both God and human is necessary to offer the obligated sacrifice to satisfy God and bring fallen humanity back into a state of happiness (salvation).**

**General Research Topic(s) — Anselm of Canterbury, Christian History, Atonement Theology, Redemption, Salvation, Apologetics.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the time of Origen (185–254 C.E.), the pervading theology regarding atonement was known as the “ransom theory.” According to the ransom theory, Christ’s sacrifice on the cross was a form of payment (i.e., ransom) that was offered in order for humankind to be able to be redeemed. A primary text that supports this theory is Mark 10:45 (NRSV), “For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.”<sup>1</sup> The Greek word for “ransom” is *lutron* (λύτρον), which refers to the idea of “the payment

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Mt 20:28

of a price in order to purchase the freedom of a slave.”<sup>2</sup> The idea of Jesus as the ‘ransom’ is that he paid the price for freedom from sin with his own life in order to “buy-back” humanity from the authority of the Devil.

This theory, however, places the power and dominion of humanity under Satan’s hand, who could be said to have been paid this ransom by Jesus’ sacrifice. The issue that is brought to light is that this understanding then makes Satan a benefactor in the atonement and redemption process. In other words, it must be Satan who was appeased by Christ’s death so that God could then redeem humans from Satan’s dominion. But this view of atonement was challenged in the 11<sup>th</sup> century by a theologian named Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>3</sup>

## II. ANSELM’S THEORY OF ATONEMENT

Anselm firmly rejected the ransom theory for atonement seeing major obstacles by attributing any privileged position to Satan in Christ’s redeeming work. Rather, Anselm viewed Christ’s atoning sacrifice more in terms of a judicial pardoning of sin than the idea of a transaction made with the Devil to “buy-back”

---

<sup>2</sup> NET Study Bible, “ransom” under Mk 10:45 for the Greek word λύτρον.

<sup>3</sup> Anselm was a Benedictine monk (c. 1033–1109 C.E.) who rose within the ranks of the Church to become the archbishop of Canterbury in England.

humankind. In his work, *Cur Deus Homo (CDH)*,<sup>4</sup> Anselm draws heavily on “feudal views of crime and its penalties”<sup>5</sup> and uses logic and reason to formulate an argument for why Jesus had to be a God-man in order to pay the penalty for sin and satisfy the offense of humanity before God. He saw this as necessary in order to convince unbelievers of the rational nature of the Christian faith since they approached understanding it without faith, while believers sought to understand it with faith.<sup>6</sup> Thus, Anselm’s purpose was two-fold: 1) to correct the misleading premise behind the ransom theory of atonement, and 2) to present a logical and rational explanation for the Christian faith.

Like the ransom theory, Anselm’s atonement theology is based on the need for humans to be freed from the penalty of sin. But he views sin as the crime of withholding that which is due to God.<sup>7</sup> Sin therefore can be said to be the accrual of a debt that is owed to God and which is God’s right to collect. Any person (human or angel) who fails to pay this debt sins, but paying this debt consists of rendering the obligated honor to God that is rightfully God’s. Robbing God of the honor he deserves constitutes sin and as long as one fails to deliver the appropriate honor, they are guilty of sin. This honor due to God is the absolute subordination and submission to God’s will. Anselm presses his argument further by saying that “it is not enough for him [the one who sins] merely to repay what has been stolen; rather,

because of the wrong which has been inflicted, he ought to repay more than he has stolen.”<sup>8</sup>

In this regard, humans or angels who sin need to restore to the injured party (i.e., God) more than which they stole (or are indebted). This axiom that Anselm suggests appears to capture a striking similarity to the principle of gaining interest that is associated with financial debt. One must not only repay the money that is owed but additional money must be given on top of the balance in order to bring the debtor back into favor with the lender, compensating them for their trouble and duration of proprietary loss. In order for humanity to pay back the debt owed to God, a sufficient and acceptable payment must be offered that brings restitution between the one who has done wrong (i.e., humans) and the one who has been wronged (i.e., God). According to Anselm, “this [repayment of stolen honor] constitutes the satisfaction which every sinner is obliged to make to God.”<sup>9</sup> Thus, humanity’s responsibility is to bestow upon God that honor which God has been robbed of and more than that which has been taken. Another way to put it, humanity owes God the honor that was taken but even more honor than we are capable of giving. The “honor on-top-of honor” that humanity must repay God is the satisfaction necessary to repair the breach in the relationship between God and humankind.

With such reasoning as this, it also follows that this necessary satisfaction that is required by God is a prerequisite for God’s forgiveness. Anselm posits that if God showed mercy and forgave sin without the payment of the debt owed to him, that is tantamount to letting sin go unpunished.<sup>10</sup> He says that if God operated without this stipulation, God would be dealing with the sinner and non-sinner in the same way and that would be unjust and irrational. Anselm claimed that sin must be either

---

<sup>4</sup> Latin: lit. “Why God Became Human”. All references and quotations to *CDH* will be made from Anselm, “Cur Deus Homo,” in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury* (eds. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson; trans. Jasper Hopkins; Minneapolis: Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 295-389.

<sup>5</sup> Justo L. González, *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation* (vol. 1; New York: Harper One, 2010), 371.

<sup>6</sup> Ans., *CDH* I. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Ans., *CDH* I. 11.

---

<sup>8</sup> Ans., *CDH* I. 11.

<sup>9</sup> Ans., *CDH* I. 11.

<sup>10</sup> Ans., *CDH* I. 12.

punished or satisfied. What this means is that either the party in the wrong must incur the appropriate penalty or some restitution must be enacted which dissuades the effecting of punishment upon the wrongdoer.

The weight of sin is already incumbent upon humankind and therefore we are under God's wrath. Either God exacts punishment for such sin or satisfaction is made to alleviate God's wrath. To not deal with the sin of humankind in this way would make God's actions unbecoming to who God is,<sup>11</sup> and it would mar the very beauty of the universe's order and demonstrate that God has failed in properly governing it.<sup>12</sup>

Regarding the necessity for humankind to deliver this "honor on-top-of honor" recompense (which they are not able to render), satisfaction for sin (i.e., the voluntary payment of the debt owed) is imperative otherwise "God cannot forgive unpunished sin and the sinner cannot arrive at happiness [wholeness]."<sup>13</sup> Anselm puts forth an elaborate explanation to logically demonstrate the reason why humankind cannot payback the sin for dishonoring God. His argument proceeds that sinning against God carries with it huge proportions that are too vast for humans to replace. As Anselm's logic goes, "Satisfaction ought to be proportional to the measure of the sin."<sup>14</sup> But, the satisfaction that is required to remit sin is beyond that which is always owed to God. And if what is always owed to God is everything a person has, then a person has no means by which to make satisfaction.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the gravity of sin and the immense payment necessary for satisfaction is that "unless you pay something greater than is that for

whose sake you ought not to have sinned"<sup>16</sup> satisfaction cannot be rendered.

Therefore, Anselm asserts,

*"Attend to strict justice, and judge in accordance with it whether man makes to God satisfaction equal to his sin unless by conquering the Devil he restores to God exactly what he removed from God by letting himself be conquered by the Devil. The result would be that as by man's having been defeated the Devil seized what was God's and God lost it, so by man's triumphing the Devil loses [what was first God's] and God regains it."*<sup>17</sup>

In this case, humanity deserves to receive nothing from God until they have returned that which they took from God in the first place. Humanity's obligated and immeasurable task is then to return that honor which they have robbed from God. As it was humanity that caused alienation from God by falling short of doing God's will, only humanity can restore themselves to a rightful place of happiness through satisfaction for their sin. However, one critical problem with this paradigm persists, "sinful man cannot at all accomplish this justification, because a sinner cannot justify a sinner."<sup>18</sup> Or put another way, fallen humanity cannot lift themselves out of the pit into which they have fallen.

Anselm also makes a point in his argument to show how fallen humanity is culpable for the guilt of their sin and how this plays a primary role in the inability of humanity to do anything about their condition. He writes,

*"For he [humans] voluntarily became obligated to that debt which he is unable to pay, and through his own doing he lapsed into his inability, so that he is unable to pay [to God] either what he owed before*

---

<sup>11</sup> Ans., CDH I. 13.

<sup>12</sup> Ans., CDH I. 15.

<sup>13</sup> Ans., CDH I. 19.

<sup>14</sup> Ans., CDH I. 20.

<sup>15</sup> Ans., CDH I. 20.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ans., CDH I. 21.

<sup>17</sup> Ans., CDH I. 23.

<sup>18</sup> Ans., CDH I. 23.

*sinning—viz., that he keep from sinning—or what he owes because he has sinned. Indeed, this inability is blamable, because he is not obliged to have it; rather, he is obliged not to have it.*<sup>19</sup>

Furthermore, whether humans are able to pay the debt of their sin or are not able to pay the debt is a matter of indifference because either way they are unable to acquire happiness.<sup>20</sup>

### III. GOD HAS TO ACT

With all the incapacity to effect any change in their condition, the plight of humanity seems hopeless. But, this is where God's grace enters the picture in Anselm's theory of atonement. God's grace stems from the fact that God's needs to accomplish that which he began in humanity. If God did not fulfill in the human race that which he started and intended, then this incompleteness would not be fitting and God would have failed to finish what he had originally undertaken.<sup>21</sup> Basically, Anselm is saying that God must do something about the fallenness of humanity otherwise God would be a failure, which is something altogether not possible for God to be.

Thus, within Anselm's logical framework, God must act to restore humanity to happiness (i.e., wholeness) in order to uphold the very fabric of God's own honor. But, God acting to preserve his own honor is not driven based on necessity as though God is compelled to act against his own will. Rather, as Anselm sees it, when God

*"...submits himself to the necessity of doing a good work, and does not merely endure this necessity*

*against his will, surely he deserves greater gratitude for his good work.*"<sup>22</sup>

This "necessity" is one that does not diminish the gratitude due to a benefactor but actually imposes a greater gratitude since it is in accord with God's immutable character. And so, since God voluntarily is held to this necessity without constraint, Anselm says this is what ought to be called "grace."<sup>23</sup> In a more simple expression, God's grace is God fulfilling (according to his own volition) the good work that was started in creation since it is not right for God to leave it unfinished and since the work is not for God's sake but for humanity's.<sup>24</sup>

But now there arises a dilemma in Anselm's atonement theory: if humanity is helpless to make satisfaction to God but they are absolutely indebted to do so, what option is left besides abandoning all hope for attaining salvation? If humans cannot reverse their guilt for robbing God of his honor, but they must otherwise they will perish, what avenue of atoning for their crime is there?

On account of this seemingly irreparable breach between God and humanity, Anselm finds Christ's sacrifice inevitable in accomplishing this satisfaction to God on behalf of humanity. For Anselm, it is humankind who must make this satisfaction because only they can pay for their own debt, but he sees the infinitude of the satisfaction that is necessary can only be paid by the divine.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, Anselm concludes that Christ must be a God-man to fulfill both requirements:

*"Hence, in order that a God-man will do this, it is necessary that one and the same [individual] be*

<sup>19</sup> Ans., CDH I. 24.

<sup>20</sup> Ans., CDH I. 24.

<sup>21</sup> Ans., CDH II. 4.

<sup>22</sup> Ans., CDH II. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Ans., CDH II. 5.

<sup>24</sup> Ans., CDH II. 5.

<sup>25</sup> Ans., CDH II. 6-7 (cp. I. 5).

*fully divine and fully human, so as to make this satisfaction. For only one who is truly divine can make satisfaction, and only one who is truly human ought to make it.*"<sup>26</sup>

But what exactly does Anselm mean when he talks about Christ paying the debt for human sin? And why does this lead him to conclude that Christ must have been a God-man? What Anselm has been laying bread crumbs toward all along is that the debt for sin can only be paid by humans who are responsible for the sin but the magnitude of the debt can only be paid by the divine who can offer more than was taken by humans. And so, Anselm's whole argument hinges upon the demand that Jesus had to be both God and human at the same time in order to be able to fulfill both of these criteria, thus accomplishing the necessary satisfaction to God for the redemption of humanity.

Anselm's argument is that as a God-man, Christ would have,

*"...freely offered to the Father what He was never going to lose as a result of any necessity; and He paid on behalf of sinners that which He did not already owe for Himself."*<sup>27</sup>

And so, in offering himself, Jesus appeased the wrath of God (satisfaction). But, the question Anselm raises is, "How should Jesus be recompensed for so great a deed seeing he is one 'who needs nothing and to whom there is nothing that can be given or remitted?'"<sup>28</sup> The answer he offers is that it is both just and necessary that Jesus be permitted to bestow what is his upon whomsoever he chooses (which must be someone other than himself), and who would he "more fittingly give

the fruit and the recompense of His death than to those for whose salvation He became a man."<sup>29</sup>

#### IV. THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE

Turning to the text of the New Testament, Anselm draws upon the writing of the Apostle Paul who said: "All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith" (Rom 3:23-25 NRSV). The description offered by the Apostle Paul is that Christ was offered as a "sacrifice of atonement" for humanity's redemption. The Greek word translated "sacrifice of atonement" is ἱλαστήριος (*hilastērios*). In Greco-Roman literature, the *hilastērios* served as an instrument for regaining the goodwill of a deity.<sup>30</sup> A difference in the NT usage of *hilastērios* in light of the Greco-Roman idea is the initiative taken by God (the deity) to effect the removal of impediments to a relationship with himself instead of the worshiper.

In Romans 3:25, 'sacrifice of atonement' (*hilastērios*) refers to that which is 'a means of expiation' and that which 'results in propitiation'.<sup>31</sup> Expiation is the act of reparation or mending by the removal of the guilt and fault of the offender. Propitiation is the result of expiation where there is conciliation and the return to favor and good standing by a change in attitude and disposition of the injured party. In the Septuagint (LXX), *hilastērios* refers to the lid of the ark of the covenant (often called the "mercy-seat") that was sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering on

<sup>29</sup> Ans., *CDH* II. 19.

<sup>30</sup> Nico S. L. Fryer, "The Meaning and Translation of Hilastērion in Romans 3:25," *EvQ* 59 (1987): 99-116. A position championed by C. H. Dodd in Charles H. Dodd, "Hilaskesthai. Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint," *JThS* 32 (1931): 352-60.

<sup>31</sup> Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 234-36.

<sup>26</sup> Ans., *CDH* II. 7.

<sup>27</sup> Ans., *CDH* II. 18.

<sup>28</sup> Ans., *CDH* II. 19.

the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) every year.<sup>32</sup> The *hilastērios* was the place and the means for Israel to obtain removal of their sin (expiation), thus bringing atonement (propitiation), restoring their relationship with God.<sup>33</sup>

What Paul is describing in Romans 3:25 is that on the day Jesus was crucified, Jesus offered his blood as the means for the expiation of sin which resulted in a propitiation for atonement. Through faith in his sacrifice and by God's grace, redemption would be freely given.<sup>34</sup> *Hilastērios*, whether referring to the actual place of atonement or figuratively as in the capacity to remove sin and offense against God, contains the idea of expelling guilt and regaining favor. The sacrifice of Christ causes a change in God's view of and relation toward the believing sinner (atonement).

According to 2 Corinthians 5:21 it reads: "For our sake he [God] made him [Jesus] to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" (NRSV). It seems that Paul is referring to a form of substitutionary sacrifice where Christ bore the punishment for sin in place of humanity. I think that Anselm was faithful to Paul in a large degree in his view of atonement. Part of the process of atonement evoked from reference to the "mercy-seat" on the ark of the covenant in the Old Testament that Paul is likely drawing upon is the removal of guilt (expiation) and the assuaging of God's wrath through the blood of sacrifice (propitiation). This ritual (or means of atonement) carries with it a sense of "satisfaction" to God on the part of the people. But the idea of appeasing God to divert his wrath is only part of the picture that Paul portrays.

---

<sup>32</sup> W. Bauer et al., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (3rd ed.; BDAG; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 474. (BDAG)

<sup>33</sup> See Leviticus 16:1-34.

<sup>34</sup> Fryer, "Hilastērion," 99-116.

When Paul talks about how God placed Jesus as a sacrifice of atonement, he speaks primarily of God's motive so that God might show God's righteousness when God justifies the believing sinner (Rom 3:25-26). He talks about salvation predominantly in terms of a gift of God's grace according to his righteousness whereby he justifies unbelieving sinners. However, the ideas of the payment of a ransom and avoiding the coming wrath of God as parts of atonement and salvation are certainly biblical as well.<sup>35</sup> But the idea of "satisfaction" is only a corollary along with the idea of an atonement sacrifice and not an explicit way that the Bible describes atonement. Therefore, Anselm's explanation of atonement addresses the ideas in the biblical text in a sort of tangential way.

Atonement also entails a transfer of power/dominion from death to life. Hebrews 2:14-15 discusses this very idea of the Devil's power over the sinner and the part that Jesus played in nullifying it: "Since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he [Jesus] himself likewise shared the same things, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and free those who all their lives were held in slavery by the fear of death" (Heb 2:14 NRSV). Anselm views the Devil as being also subject to God as humanity is and therefore humanity cannot fall under the Devil's power seeing as the Devil has none because he too is under God's power.

Pressing this deduction further, the Devil is also part of God's house and Anselm likens the Devil to a naughty servant who has persuaded other servants of God to steal from God what is rightfully God's.<sup>36</sup> This seems to logically imply that the Devil has no power at all if all power is God's. Then how would the Devil be able to steal something that he does not have the power

---

<sup>35</sup> "And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead—Jesus, who rescues us from the wrath that is coming." (1 Thess 1:10)

<sup>36</sup> Ans., *CDH* I. 7.

to steal? This is a troubling paradox because it attributes all calamity and misfortune to God and places people's pain and suffering as ultimately caused by God's power and not the Devil's. Anselm does a worthy job refuting the Devil ransom theory and putting the unduly exalted power and rights of the Devil back into the hands of God, but it does not completely agree with the biblical testimony that speaks of the power of the Devil. Hebrews 2:14 says that Jesus died so that through his death he might "the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil." The Devil has a form of power whereby he rules the world bringing death upon all creation, and it is that power that was stripped from him through the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross.

## V. SYNTHESIS AND EVALUATION

One important weakness in Anselm's argument is the intense focus on the courtroom law language he uses to describe the effect of sin and the state of fallen humanity. His description of sin as a debt that is owed for dishonoring God puts the consequence of sin in solely civil judiciary terms as though redemption is a business transaction with our Creator that simply needs to be paid in full so that he will not indict us. What I am getting at is Anselm's approach and language removes the relational aspect that is disrupted by sin between God and humanity. By describing atonement simply as the act to appease an infraction of God's legal code, the idea of this incurred debt places relatively little importance on the relational trauma (between God and humanity) that is caused by sin.

Pastorally speaking, this has huge ramifications for God's relationship with his people and their understanding of atonement and redemption. Anselm's perspective is solidly dialectical and his description of God's motivation for saving humanity equates to a logical and moral necessity that is based on God's self-centeredness. I do not agree that this is the complete

biblical picture of atonement and redemption, especially the New Testament.

John 3:16 offers an insight that does not fully accord with Anselm's perspective: God sent Jesus to sacrifice himself because "God so loved the world," not because God was dishonored or offended or felt 'put-out' by humanity. Anselm lacks the personal nature surrounding redemption by likening the reason for God's salvific activity to the indemnity of a feudal lord, who seeks to maintain a position of status and dignity. Anselm does offer some explanation in his model of God's justice for how God can be viewed as being compassionate in redemption. But all Anselm's argument consists of is a round-about way of saying God is merciful and compassionate because God is just, which seems to betray his own logical ground.<sup>37</sup> In certain ways Anselm's reasoning resembles cyclical argumentation that proceeds on rational identities but in the end is faulty in its overall conclusion.

Anselm does, however, present a strong argument for the immense power of sin and the inability of humanity to undo the wrong that has been done. This is extremely important pastorally in communicating the seriousness of sin to God's people. Anselm uses an apt illustration to define how colossal the weight of sin is when it is viewed in its proper context. To convey this reality, Anselm uses the depiction of a person standing before God where another person suggests you look one way while God forbids you to look that way, but then you choose to go ahead and look anyway.<sup>38</sup> That is sin. This logic makes good sense and it directly demonstrates the tragedy that happens each time a person chooses to disobey and not follow God's will. Also, the pastoral aspect of instructing the believer to consider the monumental proportions sin carries cannot be understated. Sometimes it is not easy to see what it

---

<sup>37</sup> Ans., *CDH* II. 20.

<sup>38</sup> Ans., *CDH* II. 21.

truly means to sin, but Anselm paints the picture quite vividly and drives the point home about the not-so-apparent destruction that lies within sin.

Anselm also seems to mix his logic when discussing humans achieving “happiness” (salvation) in the way he describes the ability and inability of humanity to avoid sin. He does not appear to subscribe to the notion of total depravity, but he does portray humanity in a state of helplessness, and therefore requiring the need of an altogether “other” savior to come and make recompense on their behalf. After the Fall, humanity was left with will and reason and could recognize the obligation of their duty and the claims necessary to fulfill it. Therefore, Anselm’s thought is not altogether misleading because he consistently affirms the possibility of salvation which brings hope into the equation. However, Anselm reasons that humanity has the possibility to not sin and therefore to not have to incur the debt against God. And since it was possible for humanity to avoid sin, but did not, and now is unable to pay for it, humanity is now to blame for their own inability to satisfy God. Anselm states that, “For he [humankind] freely did that thing because of which he lost this ability and came into this state of inability.”<sup>39</sup>

If Anselm sees humans as culpable from original sin, then sin (humanity’s debt) is ultimately not a voluntary offense but an involuntary one. This does not excuse whether the punishment of sin is just or unjust but merely that sin guilt cannot then be based on humankind’s inability to retain justice (i.e., refrain from sinning) if sin is a natural part of their constitution at birth. As the Apostle Paul writes: “Sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned...[and] because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one” (Rom 5:12, 17 NRSV). If humans are born with sin inherited from

Adam, then inability starts at birth and the debt that is owed is not one that originates with each person being responsible for themselves but humanity as a whole has fallen under an obligation from the trespass of Adam. In a pastoral sense, the idea that each person has incurred a debt of sin as a member of humanity really depicts the disease-ridden state of humanity since the beginning of the race. Thus, Anselm validates the biblical idea that Jesus came to pay the price for the world because everyone in the world needed redeeming: past, present, and future.

## VI. CONCLUSION

With some final remarks, Anselm is very precise in the way he presents sin, humanity, and the idea of a God-man redeemer. He has masterfully arranged a series of logical arguments to substantiate how humankind has become enveloped in a debt that they must pay, but cannot, and how only a God-man could pay a debt that was not owed by him in order to pass off the reward for such a meritorious deed onto the very ones he paid it for (i.e., humanity).

Anselm’s logic holds on many accounts but he is not totally consistent in his overall argumentation and certainly fails to account for the multifaceted composition of atonement as described in the biblical text. Atonement is not a single-color entity but contains several aspects and ideas (i.e., nuances) that all work in conjunction with each other to form the whole picture of atonement. I can agree with parts of *Cur Deus Homo*, but Anselm’s satisfaction atonement theory is far from perfect, even though he might see it as flawless. And, the concept of “satisfaction” is a secondary premise not explicitly mentioned in Scripture. But on any account, the work has particular strengths as have been mentioned (as well as weaknesses too) and holds its own unique place in the history of apologetics and atonement theology.

---

<sup>39</sup> Ans., *CDH* II. 24.



## VII. ABBREVIATIONS

Ans., *CDH*      Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*

## VIII. REFERENCES

- Anselm. "Cur Deus Homo," in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*. Edited by Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson. Minneapolis: Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.
- Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Dodd, Charles H. "Hilaskesthai. Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonymns, in the Septuagint." *Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1931).
- Fryer, Nico S. L. "The Meaning and Translation of Hilastērion in Romans 3:25." *Evangelical Quarterly* 59 (1987).
- González, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation*. Vol. 1. New York: Harper One, 2010.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

## CORRESPONDENCE

Author:            Jeremiah Wierwille  
 Affiliation:        N/A  
 Street:             06573 Southland Rd  
 City/State:        New Knoxville, OH 45871  
 Country:           U.S.A.  
 Email:              contact@jerrywierwille.com