The Doctrine of Impeccability

Definition and Description

The term “impeccability” refers to the fact that Christ could not sin or in other words, there was never any possibility or potential of our Lord ever sinning. The term “peccability” denotes that our Lord could have sinned meaning that there was a potential for Him sinning.

In regards to our Lord’s deity, both views contend that Jesus Christ is infinite and eternal God (John 1:1-2; John 8:58; 10:30a; Col. 2:9a; Rev. 1:8). They agree that He has the same divine essence as God the Father and God the Holy Spirit.

They agree that our Lord possesses all the attributes of deity: (1) Sovereignty (Matt. 28:18a; Col. 2:10b). (2) Perfect righteousness (John 8:46a; 2 Cor. 5:21; Heb. 7:26; 1 Pet. 2:22; 1 John 2:21b). (3) Justice (John 8:16a; 2 Tim. 4:8; Psa. 9:8; Deut. 32:4; Rev. 15:3b). (4) Love (John 13:34; Rom. 5:8; Eph. 3:19; 1 John 4:9-10). (5) Eternal life (1 Tim. 1:17; 1 John 5:11). (6) Omniscience (Luke 11:17; John 2:24-25; John 6:64). (7) Omnipresence (Matt. 18:20; Prov. 15:3) (8) Omnipotence (1 Cor. 1:23-24; Rev. 1:8). (9) Immutability (Heb. 13:8). (10) Veracity (John 1:14; 14:6a).

Both views are in agreement that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Creator and Sustainer of the universe (Col. 1:16-17), that He has authority to forgive sins (Matt. 9:6). They agree that the Lord Jesus Christ has the power to raise the dead (John 5:21; 6:40) and that all judgment belongs to Him (John 5:22), and that He receives worship from both men and angels (Psa. 99:5; Phil. 2:10; Rev. 5:13-14). The peccability view and the impeccable view both agree that in His Deity, Jesus Christ always occupied a place of equality and fellowship with God the Father and God the Holy Spirit. They both agree that as God, He is equal with the Father (John 10:30, 37-38; 14:9; 17:5, 24-25).

In regards to our Lord’s humanity, both the peccable and impeccable view are in agreement that our Lord was totally free from sin, which means He was perfect or flawless. They both agree that Christ remained free from all three categories of sin in the human race: (1) Old sin nature (2) Adam’s original sin (3) Personal sins.

The peccability view and impeccable view both agree that the Lord Jesus Christ has a human body like ours but without a sin nature (John 1:14; Heb. 10:5; 1 John 1:1; 1 John 4:2-3), that He has a human soul (Matt. 26:38a; Isa. 53:11a) and a human spirit (Luke 23:46; John 13:21; 19:30).

These two views are in agreement that because of the virgin birth our Lord did not have an old sin nature like every human being born in Adam. They agree that
He did not have an old sin nature because He did not have a human father (Luke 1:35).

The peccable view and the impeccable view both agree that the Lord Jesus Christ was found to be without sin in His humanity (John 8:46a; 2 Cor. 5:21; Heb. 7:26; 1 Pet. 2:22; 1 John 3:5). They agree that in His humanity that our Lord was tempted in all things as sinful humanity (Heb. 4:15). They agree that in His humanity, He was tempted to act and live independently from God the Father’s plan for His life (Luke 4:1-4; Matt. 16:21-23) and that He was tempted not to go to the cross (Luke 22:39-44).

Therefore, both views are in agreement that our Lord did not sin, but the peccability view contends that He could have sinned. They say that there was a potential of Him sinning. While on the other hand, the impeccability view contends that our Lord could never have sinned meaning there was absolutely no potential of Him ever sinning once because He had a divine nature.

Documentation

John 8:46a, “Which one of you convicts Me of sin?”

2 Corinthians 5:21, “He (Christ) who never knew sin experientially (Christ was impeccable), on behalf of us (as our Substitute), was made (the representative of) sin in order that we might become the very righteousness of God in Him.”

Hebrews 4:15, “For we do not have a high priest who cannot sympathize with our weaknesses, but One who has been tempted in all things as we are, yet without sin.”

Hebrew 7:26, “For it was fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners and exalted above the heavens.”

1 Peter 1:19, “But with precious blood, as of a lamb unblemished and spotless, the blood of Christ.”

1 Peter 2:22, “Who committed no sin, nor was any deceit found in His mouth.”

1 John 3:5, “And you know that He appeared in order to take sins; and in Him there is no sin.”

Definition of Impeccability

Most orthodox theologians agree that Jesus Christ never committed an act of sin. Walvoord writes, “This seems to be a natural corollary to His deity and an
absolute prerequisite to His work of substitution on the cross. Any affirmation of moral failure on the part of Christ requires a doctrine of His person which would deny in some sense His absolute deity” (The Person and Work of Christ Part VII, The Impeccability of Christ).

There has been debate regarding whether the sinlessness of Christ was the same as that of Adam before the fall or whether it possessed a unique character because of His divine nature. Could the Son of God be tempted as Adam was tempted and could He have sinned as Adam sinned? Was there any potential of Him sinning once? Most theologians who are orthodox agree that Christ could be tempted because of the presence of a human nature, but there is great division as to whether being tempted He could have sinned or was there the potential of Him ever sinning.

The term used to describe the teaching that there was a potential that Christ could sin is called “peccability.” The term used to designate that there was no potential of Christ sinning is called the “impeccability” of Christ.

Those who adhere to “peccability” and “impeccability” are in agreement that Christ did not sin. However, those who are proponents of “peccability” contend that He could have sinned meaning that there was a potential that He could sin. On the other hand, those who declare the “impeccability” contend that He could not sin meaning that there was no potential whatsoever that He could sin because of His divine nature.

The impeccability position has been challenged. Can an impeccable person be tempted in any proper sense? Since Christ had a human nature that was subject to temptation, does this mean that He could have sinned? The point of view of those who believe that Christ could have sinned is expressed by Charles Hodge, he writes, “This sinlessness of our Lord, however, does not amount to absolute impeccability. It was not a non potest peccare. If He was a true man, He must have been capable of sinning. That He did not sin under the greatest provocations; that when He was reviled He blessed; when He suffered He threatened not; that He was dumb as a sheep before its shearers, is held up to us as an example. Temptation implies the possibility of sin. If from the constitution of his person it was impossible for Christ to sin, then his temptation was unreal and without effect and He cannot sympathize with his people.” (Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, II, 457)

John Walvoord makes the following comment in response to Hodge, he writes, “The problem that Hodge raises is very real, and, judging by our own experience, temptation is always associated with peccability. Hodge, however, assumes certain points in his argument which are subject to question. In order to solve the problem as to whether Christ is peccable, it is necessary, first of all, to examine the
character of temptation itself to ascertain whether peccability is inevitably involved in any real temptation and, second, to determine the unique factor in Christ, i.e., that He had two natures, one a divine nature and the other a sinless human nature. It is generally agreed by those who hold that Christ did not commit sin that He had no sin nature. Whatever temptation could come to Him, then, would be from without and not from within. Whatever may have been the natural impulses of a sinless nature which might have led to sin if not held in control, there was no sin nature to suggest sin from within and form a favorable basis for temptation. It must be admitted by Hodge, who denies impeccability, that in any case the temptation of Christ is different than that of sinful men. Not only is there agreement on the fact that Christ had no sin nature, but it is also agreed on the other hand, that as to His person He was tempted. This is plainly stated in Hebrews: “For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (4:15). It is also clear that this temptation came to Christ in virtue of the fact that He possessed a human nature, as James states: “Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself tempteth no man” (1:13). On the one hand, Christ was tempted in all points except through that of a sin nature, and on the other hand His divine nature could not be tempted because God cannot be tempted. While His human nature is temptable, His divine nature is not temptable. On these points all can agree. The question is, then, can such a person as Christ is, possessing both human and divine natures, be tempted if He is impeccable? The answer must be in the affirmative. It is possible for a rowboat to attack a battleship, even though it is conceivably impossible for the rowboat to conquer the battleship. The idea that temptability implies susceptibility is unsound. While the temptation may be real, there may be infinite power to resist that temptation and if this power is infinite, the person is impeccable. It will be observed that the same temptation which would be easily resisted by one of sound character may be embraced by one of weak character. The temptation of a drunken debauch would have little chance of causing one to fall who had developed an abhorrence of drink, while a habitual drunkard would be easily led astray. The temptation might be the same in both cases, but the ones tempted would have contrasting powers of resistance. It is thus demonstrated that there is no essential relation between temptability and peccability. Hodge’s viewpoint that temptation must be unreal if the person tempted is impeccable is, therefore, not accurate. Temptability depends upon a constitutional susceptibility to sin, whereas impeccability depends upon
omnipotent will not to sin.” (The Person and Work of Jesus Christ Part VII: The Impeccability of Christ)

Shedd writes: “It is objected to the doctrine of Christ’s impeccability that it is inconsistent with his temptability. A person who cannot sin, it is said, cannot be tempted to sin. This is not correct; any more than it would be correct to say that because an army cannot be conquered, it cannot be attacked. Temptability depends upon the constitutional susceptibility, while impeccability depends upon the will. So far as his natural susceptibility, both physical and mental, was concerned, Jesus Christ was open to all forms of human temptation excepting those that spring out of lust, or corruption of nature. But his peccability, or the possibility of being overcome by those temptations, would depend upon the amount of voluntary resistance which he was able to bring to bear against them. Those temptations were very strong, but if the self-determination of his holy will was stronger than they, then they could not induce him to sin, and he would be impeccable. And yet plainly he would be temptable.” (William G. T. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 396)

Therefore, the doctrine of the impeccability of Christ acknowledges the reality of the temptations of Christ due to the fact that our Lord had a human nature which was temptable. Our Lord might have sinned if His human nature had not been sustained by His divine nature. Adam sinned because he was not sustained by divine power, nor did he have a divine nature to sustain him of course. However, there is absolutely no possibility or potential that Christ could have sinned since He was infinite and eternal God, having a divine nature.

Walvoord makes another insightful comment that helps understand the relationship between our Lord’s divine and human nature, he writes, “The ultimate solution of the problem of the impeccability of Christ rests in the relationship of the divine and human natures. It is generally agreed that each of the natures, the divine and the human, had its own will in the sense of desire. The ultimate decision of the person, however, in the sense of sovereign will was always in harmony with the decision of the divine nature. The relation of this to the problem of impeccability is obvious. The human nature, because it is temptable, might desire to do that which is contrary to the will of God. In the person of Christ, however, the human will was always subservient to the divine will and could never act independently. Inasmuch as all agree that the divine will of God could not sin, this quality then becomes the quality of the person and Christ becomes impeccable.” (The Person and Work of Christ Part VII: The Impeccability of Christ)

The concept of peccability in the person of Christ is refuted by the attributes of immutability and omnipotence. For example, the immutability of Christ (Hebrews
13:8) supports the impeccability of Christ in the sense that since Christ was infinite and eternal God in eternity past, it is absolutely essential that this divine attribute as well His others be preserved unchanged eternally. Therefore, our Lord must be impeccable since He is immutable. It is ridiculous to think that God could sin in eternity past, thus, it was impossible for God to sin in the person of Christ incarnate. The nature of His person forbids susceptibility to sin. To say that He could have sinned, you would have to separate the deity of Christ from His humanity.

Also, the omnipotence of Christ makes it impossible for Him to sin. We must remember that peccability always implies weakness on the part of the one tempted in the sense that He is weak to the extent that He can sin. However, with our Lord, this was impossible. It is true that if the human nature of Christ was left to itself, He would have been both peccable and temptable, but since His human nature was permanently united to an omnipotent divine nature, this made our Lord impeccable. The infinite quality of our Lord’s omnipotence makes it clear that Christ is impeccable.

One final comment from Walvoord, “It is rationally inconceivable that Christ could sin. It is clear that Christ is not peccable in heaven now even though He possesses a true humanity. If Christ is impeccable in heaven because of who He is, then it is also true that Christ was impeccable on earth because of who He was. While it was possible for Christ in the flesh to suffer limitations of an unmoral sort—such as weakness, suffering, fatigue, sorrow, hunger, anger, and even death—none of these created any complication which affected His immutable holiness. God could have experienced through the human nature of Christ these things common to the race, but God could not sin even when joined to a human nature. If sin were possible in the life of Christ, the whole plan of the universe hinged on the outcome of His temptations. The doctrine of the sovereignty of God would forbid any such haphazard condition. It is therefore not sufficient to hold that Christ did not sin, but rather to attribute to His person all due adoration in that He could not sin. While the person of Christ could therefore be tempted, there was no possibility of sin entering the life of Him appointed from eternity to be the spotless Lamb of God.” (The Person and Work of Christ Part VII: The Impeccability of Christ)

In his great work, “Systematic Theology, volume 5, chapter 5, Lewis Sperry Chafer makes the following comment, which though long is well worth reading, he writes, “At least twenty-seven incidents or references are recorded in which it is said that God has been or might be tested; but these are always to be considered in the light of the assurance that God cannot be tempted in the way of evil, nor does He so tempt any man (James 1: 13-15). The divine testings extend to each Person...
of the blessed Trinity. Of the Father it is said with respect to the imposition of the Mosaic Law upon perfected believers, ‘Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?’ (Acts 15:10). To those who, perhaps in ignorance, teach that the Mosaic system is a rule of life for the believer already perfected in Christ, the warning which this Scripture advances should be effective. There are no elements of piety in the act of imposing the Mosaic system upon the Church; rather it is a dangerous and awful provoking of God. It is significant that, of all the wickedness in which Christians may indulge, only this one high crime against God is mentioned as the cause of His testing from believers. Thus, also, the Spirit may be tested. In this there is a similarity with the preceding, since but one incident of the Spirit’s testing is recorded. This experience was brought to pass by a falsehood uttered by two early Christians, which falsehood was declared to be against the Holy Spirit. It is written: ‘And Peter answered unto her, Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much? And she said, Yea, for so much. Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out. Then fell she down straightway at his feet, and yielded up the ghost: and the young men came in, and found her dead, and, carrying her forth, buried her by her husband’ (Acts 5:8-10). Of the temptation of Christ the Son more Scripture is written—cf. Luke 4:1-13; Hebrews 2:18 and 4:15. The discussion of these important declarations will be considered in the following section.”

Chafer goes on to say, “When declaring, as above, that the testings which came to Christ were in the sphere of His humanity and not addressed directly to His Deity, not only is the truth asserted that He, being God, could not be solicited respecting things evil, but the whole problem, which may be extended into infinity, concerned with the relations of His two natures to one another is introduced again. There is general agreement that, had Christ sinned, the lapse would have arisen wholly from His human nature; but in all the discussion respecting His impeccability the truth is too often ignored that Christ was wholly free from a sin nature and all that the sin nature generates. Some theologians, much as heathen philosophers might do, have based their speculations on the acknowledged limitations of fallen men. It is argued that no man is free from sin and, since He was a man, Christ was solicited to evil even as other men. In his discourse on the problem of Christ’s personal relation to sin, Bishop Martensen writes (Christian Dogmatics, pp. 284-85): The fact that the Second Adam experienced all temptations--enticements to sin, threats and tortures of body and mind--is to be explained upon the ground, not of His moral freedom only, nor of the progressiveness of His nature, but of both these combined. The propositions,
potuit non Peccare, ‘it was possible for Him not to sin,’ and non potuit peccare, ‘it was impossible for Him to sin,’ so far from being distinct or contrasted, may be said to include and to presuppose each other. The first, which means that sinlessness was only a possibility for Christ, implies that He experienced temptation as an actual power; for while it came upon Him from without, it must, if it were not a mere pretence, have excited some corresponding feeling within Him; through which alone He could have been really tempted. And as the contrast between the cosmical and the sacred--the natural and the spiritual--was necessary in the Second Adam in order to a twofold influence upon the will;--as the Second Adam cannot be viewed as Monotheletic, which would be in fact to consider Him Monophysite, but Duotheletici---the same principle must have been active in Him which made the fall of the first Adam possible. The possibility of evil existed in the Second Adam; but this possibility never became active, was never realized; it served only as the dark and obscure background to show forth His perfect holiness. This was guaranteed, not by the force of virtue or innocence, which the very idea of temptation makes uncertain and doubtful, pending the trial, nor again by the force of the Divine nature as distinct from the human, or the human as distinct from the Divine, but in virtue of the indissoluble union of the divine and human natures in Him; that bond which might indeed be strained and shaken to the greatest apparent tension and contrast of the two natures, but which never could be broken. This is expressed in the second proposition non potuit peccare, ‘it was impossible for Him to sin.’ Though the temptation itself and the conflict against it were not apparent merely but real and sternly earnest, the result could never have been doubtful; for the bond between the Divine and the human natures, which may be severed in the creature, was indissoluble in Him who is the Mediator between the Father and all His creatures. This bond may be broken only when the connection of the divine with the human is merely relative and representative; never when it is essential and archetypal, as in Him, in whom the counsels of the Father were comprehended before the foundation of the world. Dr. Martensen here, along with many theological leaders, sustains a very high regard for the theanthropic: Person, but his implications are that Christ suffered those temptations which belong to a fallen nature; still, Christ could not have possessed a sin nature without having par- taken of the fall, since that nature does not belong to unfallen humanity. Naturally, the only examples of this form of human existence are restricted to Adam before he fell and to Christ. If Christ had been Himself a fallen Being, He could not have been the uninvolved Kinsman-Redeemer that was demanded. Perhaps some fail at this point to realize that the saving work of Christ extends as much to the sin nature of those He saves as to their individual transgressions. Had Christ been Himself a fallen man, He would
have needed to be saved and could not have saved Himself or another. If, on the other hand, He was unfallen and theanthropic in His Being, He had no solicitations to evil such as arise out of a sin nature. It is intrinsic divine holiness which is predicated of Him (Luke 1:35). It has been declared on previous pages and is reasserted here that Christ was impeccable in the *non potuit peccare* sense; that is, it was impossible for Him to sin. That which creates doubt in many devout minds is the obvious fact that, as illustrated by Adam, an unfallen human being is capable of sinning. Tragic indeed, in this instance, is the failure to recognize that the first Adam was unsupported in the hour of his testing, but that the Last Adam though equally possessed of an unfallen human nature was—as Dr. Martensen so well affirms—because of “the indissoluble union of the divine and human natures” unable to do what He might otherwise have done if His human nature had been left to itself, which disunion of the two natures could never occur. Even then the case, as with Adam, differs from that of any fallen man. While the fallen man is utterly prone to sin, both the unfallen Adam and the humanity of Christ had no such impetus to sin, and the unfallen Adam might have easily avoided the thing that he did. Since this bond of union which unites Christ’s two natures—for He is one Person—is so complete, the humanity of Christ could not sin. Should His humanity sin, God would sin. When the absolute Deity of Christ is recognized, there is no logic which is more inexorable than this. Though unsupported unfallen humanity might sin, a theanthropic Person even if He incorporates an unfallen human nature is incapable of sinning. The contention that Christ could, but would not, sin is far removed from the contention that Christ could not sin. The former either denies His Deity or else dishonors God with the calumnious averment that God is Himself capable of sinning. Again, it must be declared that Christ’s human traits which did not involve moral issues could be exhibited freely. The idea might be admitted with certain reservations that He was both omnipotent and impotent, omniscient and ignorant, infinite and finite, unlimited and limited; but it could never be allowed that He was both impeccable and peccable. There are no God-dishonoring elements in human weakness, human pain, human hunger, human thirst, or human limitations with respect to various capacities—even human death may be admitted as a death undergone for others, but not for Himself.”

**Argument for Impeccability**

Therefore, the debate surrounding peccability and impeccability is easily resolved by an accurate understanding from the Scriptures of the Person of Christ and the nature of His testings.
First of all, the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is infinite and eternal God (John 1:1-2; John 8:58; 10:30a; Col. 2:9a; Rev. 1:8). The titles assigned to His deity are as follows: (1) “The Son of God” (Luke 1:35) (2) “The Son of the Most High” (Luke 1:32) (3) “Mighty God” (Isaiah 9:6) (4) “Eternal Father” (Isaiah 9:6) (5) “His goings forth are from long ago, from the days of eternity” (Micah 5:2). (6) “Lord” (Rom. 15:30; Eph. 1:22; Phil. 2:11). (7) “God” (Titus 2:13).

He has the same divine essence as God the Father and God the Holy Spirit. He possesses all the attributes of deity: (1) Sovereignty (Matt. 28:18a; Col. 2:10b). (2) Perfect righteousness (John 8:46a; 2 Cor. 5:21; Heb. 7:26; 1 Pet. 2:22; 1 John 2:21b). (3) Justice (John 8:16a; 2 Tim. 4:8; Psa. 9:8; Deut. 32:4; Rev. 15:3b). (4) Love (John 13:34; Rom. 5:8; Eph. 3:19; 1 John 4:9-10). (5) Eternal life (1 Tim. 1:17; 1 John 5:11). (6) Omnipotence (Luke 11:17; John 2:24-25; 6:64; 21:17). (7) Omnipresence (Matt. 18:20; Prov. 15:3) (8) Omnipotence (John 1:1, 10; 5:21; 1 Cor. 1:23-24; Phil. 3:21; Heb. 1:3; Rev. 1:8). (9) Immutability (Mal. 3:6; Heb. 1:10-12; 13:8). (10) Veracity (John 1:14; 14:6a; 1 John 3:16).

He is the Creator and Sustainer of the universe (John 1:3, 10; Col. 1:16-17; Heb. 1:3, 10). The Lord Jesus Christ has authority to forgive sins (Matt. 9:6; Luke 5:24; Col. 3:13). The Lord Jesus Christ has the power to raise the dead (John 5:21; 6:40; 11:25). All judgment belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ (John 5:22; 1 Cor. 3:11-15; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev. 20:11-14), and receives worship from both men and angels (Psa. 99:5; Phil. 2:10; Rev. 5:13-14). In His Deity always occupied a place of equality and fellowship with God the Father and God the Holy Spirit. The Lord Jesus Christ as God was equal with the Father (John 10:30, 37-38; 14:9; 17:5; 24-25).

Therefore, since Jesus Christ is God, then there as to His divine nature, there is no inherent propensity for Him to sin. In other words, there is nothing in the divine nature of Christ that could incite Him to sin.

James 1:13a, “When tempted, no one should say, ‘God is tempting me.’ For God cannot be tempted by evil.”

The Word of God teaches that Jesus Christ had a human body.

1 John 1:1-4, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked at and our hands have touched-this we proclaim concerning the Word of life. he life appeared; we have seen it and testify to it, and we proclaim to you the eternal life, which was with the Father and has appeared to us. We proclaim to you what we have seen and heard, so that you also may have fellowship with us. And our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ.”

The difference between Jesus Christ and the human race is that He did not have a sin nature (John 1:14; Heb. 10:5; 1 John 1:1; 1 John 4:2-3).

Hebrews 4:15, “For we do not have a high priest who cannot sympathize with our weaknesses, but One who has been tempted in all things as we are, yet without sin.”

Hebrew 7:26, “For it was fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners and exalted above the heavens.”

1 John 3:5, “And you know that He appeared in order to take sins; and in Him there is no sin.”

Unlike the human race, Christ did not have a sin nature and thus did not have an inherent propensity to sin like we do!

Therefore, since Jesus Christ is fully human, yet without a sin nature, then like His divine nature, as to His human nature, there was no inherent propensity to sin. In other words, there was nothing in His human nature that would incite Him to sin because He did not have a sin nature. Thus, if there was nothing in both His divine and human natures that could incite Him to sin or tempt Him to sin, then, there could have been no possibility whatsoever, that Christ could have sinned. The temptations that the Lord’s human nature had undergone were from without. However, those temptations unlike the first Adam did not incite in Him anything that could cause Him to sin since there was nothing in both His divine and human natures that would be enticed to sin.

There are some who argue that God would be unfair to Satan in his appeal trial if there was no possibility for Christ to sin. However, this view is based upon a misunderstanding of God’s holiness, His justice and righteousness. Matthew 25:41 teaches that God sentenced Satan to the Lake of Fire for his rebellion. God would have been fair if He executed that sentence. However, in His grace, He did not as evidenced by the fact that Satan is the god of the world according to 2 Corinthians 4:4 and that he deceives the entire world according to 1 John 5:19 and Revelation 12:10.
To say that God would have been unfair to Satan if there was no possibility for Christ to sin fails to recognize that God would have been fair to execute Satan’s sentence immediately, and the fact that God did not execute the sentence immediately indicates that God was operating in grace towards Satan. To say that in order to be fair to Satan that there had to be a possibility that Christ could sin is to call into question God’s justice and righteousness, His integrity since God did not have prove His fairness to His creatures since He would have been fair in the first place to execute Satan’s sentence immediately. What God was doing for Satan and the angels was demonstrating His grace and love towards them by not executing their sentence immediately.

Therefore, the argument that it would have been unfair to Satan if there was no possibility of Christ sinning is a faulty argument that in fact attacks God’s integrity and character.

Also, the fact that Christ did die on the Cross for sinners in obedience to the Father’s will demonstrated the righteousness of God itself and that God is integrity (Romans 3:21-26; 5:6-8) and not the fact that there was a possibility of Christ sinning! To say that God demonstrated His integrity through the potential of Christ sinning is without Scriptural basis. However, the fact that Christ dying on the Cross for sinners demonstrated God’s justice and righteousness does have wealth of Scripture to support it.