

## 1: True Christian Religion, sections ff

*If imputation were possible, an impenitent and wicked man could impute the Lord's merit to himself, and so think himself justified, and yet this would be to defile what is holy with things profane, and to profane the Lord's name; for it would be to keep the thought fixed on the Lord, and the will in hell, and yet the will is the whole man.*

The term imputation has undergone some debate. Scholars have reached the conclusion that it is not very important in the Bible. The evidence suggests it is very important. If readers would like to see the verses in various translations, they may go to Lumina. Sometimes in this study, however, we look at the concept behind the verbs even though they do not appear in a passage of Scripture. Another basic definition of the verbs is seen in a business context: However, the main uses are when people think or consider. We will discover the two basic meanings thinking and commercial crediting as we go along. Reformed Theologian Charles Hodge writes about imputation: In the juridical and theological sense of the word, to impute is to attribute anything to a person or persons, upon adequate grounds, as the judicial or meritorious reason of reward or punishment, i. So far as the meaning of the word is concerned, it makes no difference whether the thing imputed be sin or righteousness; whether it is our own personally, or the sin or righteousness of another. Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, vol. He is the ultimate arbiter of the universe, and he controls spiritual reality as well. A more succinct definition and I believe a better one, with two examples, is offered by Wayne Grudem. To think of as belonging to someone, and therefore to cause it to belong to that person. Therefore, what God thinks matters, as the Biblical texts affirm see below. Our personal feelings of righteousness one day and unrighteousness the next do not matter. And that is a blessing to us because everything flows from God through Christ; everything is based on them, not us. Now we are secure in our salvation. When God thinks or imputes something, then that matters in his sight Rom. However, the New Covenant often redefines or recasts the concepts, so we must be judicious in how we use the OT. He required him to leave his family behind and go to a land the Lord would show him, which turned out to be Canaan Gen. Then God makes a covenant of promise to childless Abram. God will grant him a son Gen. Abram simply believed God and then a blessing ensued. Abram did not have to work to get this righteousness. God thought of Abraham as righteous, and it was so. This credit to his account took place before his circumcision Gen. In fact he had misled the Pharaoh earlier, which broke the moral law Gen. Nonetheless, Abraham passed the most difficult test of his life, nearly sacrificing his son Isaac Gen. Therefore this gift of righteousness was not based on his own character or inner righteousness or the good or bad that he did. God credits us with righteousness, even though we may not feel righteous. Nonetheless, he imputes it to us by faith alone, regarding it as ours, and therefore it is Rom. God thinks of us as righteous in Christ, and therefore this righteousness belongs to us. We are righteous in his sight. But God blessed Jacob with prosperity to make up for the conniving of Laban. Finally, the Lord called Jacob to return to his homeland, and his two wives were glad to go, for their father had manipulated them as well. Not only has he sold us, but he has used up what was paid for us. So in his sight it is as if they were foreigners, even though they never went through an inner transformation or a legal proceeding to be disowned. Laban thought of them as foreign, and so they were in his sight. It will not be credited to the one who offered it, for it is impure; the person who eats any of it will be held responsible. And so it was, in his sight or opinion. The goat did not commit the sins of the people. It was not a moral sinner by inner transformation. How could it be? Yet God thinks of the goat as carrying their sins, and therefore it does. He had none at all. He was not a moral sinner by inner transformation or by being infused with a sin nature. While on the cross, he did not get the flu or cancer. Yet he carries and takes up our sin and infirmity. Thus Jesus carries or bears them only by imputation or reckoning. Instead, the people of God were required to sacrifice at the tent of meeting, where they could be supervised by the priest. The Israelite was therefore to be cut off from the people. But it does yield some interesting insights. The priests and Levites were not to have the share of the land; that is, they were not farmers. They were not to thresh the grains or press the grapes into wine. Instead, their sustenance was to come from the offerings that the Israelites gave them. That tenth was then to be credited or counted or reckoned to them as grains from the threshing floor and juice from the winepress. The priests and Levites get

credit for the grain and juice. This reckoning or imputation does not come from any practical act that the priests and Levites did. They did not actually thresh the grains or press the grapes into juice. They present it as an offering to God. But this physical example should not be taken too far. God thinks of us as forgiven as well. He imputes forgiveness to us through Christ, and therefore it belongs to us. But David kept on sinning in his life, and so do we. But he was forgiven, and so are we. Believers are considered as sheep. They have not been transformed into sheep or infused with the entire nature of sheep. Rather, they are counted or reckoned or considered as sheep. So we need to spend more time here, since it appears to be at odds with Gen. But is it really? Is there a contradiction? Background In the original context, the children of Israel yoked themselves to the god Baal Num. The focus of action in the verse is on them, not Moses. What they did was before Moses, in his presence “under his nose! And what they did was to engage in a sexual embrace in the manner of Baal worship” right at the entrance of the holy Tent of God! They are not weeping; they are laughing “that is, engaged in delirious love-making cf. He describes the monstrosity of the act: The audacious action of this Israelite man is unparalleled and totally unexpected. The contempt for the holy things and the word of the Lord shown by Zimri and his Midianite lover, Cozbi v. This is a climax to the first section of the Book of Numbers; here is Israel at her very worst. This provides an unhappy justification for the ways of the Lord; it also provides a theodicy of his judgment of the entire first generation. The scholar again explains why the ancients used a euphemism or hid the meaning in code for some enormities. The man is a blasphemer in the strongest sense. His sin is a deliberate provocateur of the wrath of the Lord, flaunting and taunting holiness in an almost unbelievable crudity. The issue was so blatant, so outrageous, so unspeakable “I suggest” that the ancients had to hide the meaning somewhat in code words. Those who read the text today find between the words that stand which are awful enough something that is truly an outrage against Majesty that is nearly unbelievable. As noted, this is the same language used of Abram, whose faith, not zeal, was credited to him as righteousness. So now we turn to classical commentaries. Classical Commentaries The older commentators say Phinehas was already justified by faith first, so God, out of pure benevolence, imputes or counts or credits an act as righteousness. John Calvin in his commentary on the Psalms writes about First of all, let us examine, whether or not Phinehas was justified on account of this deed alone, Verily, the law, though it could justify, by no means promises salvation to any one work, but makes justification to consist in the perfect observance of all the commandments. It remains, therefore, that we affirm that the work of Phinehas was imputed to him for righteousness, in the same way as God imputes the works of the faithful to them for righteousness, not in consequence of any intrinsic merit which they possess, but of his own free and unmerited grace. Besides, were our works strictly examined, they would be found to be mingled with much imperfection. We have, therefore, no other source than to flee for refuge to the free unmerited mercy of God. And not only do we receive righteousness by grace through faith, but as the moon borrows her light from the sun, so does the same faith render our works righteous, because our corruptions being mortified, they are reckoned to us for righteousness. In short, faith alone, and not human merit, procures both for persons and for works the character of righteousness. Phinehas had to have been already justified by faith alone, and that is his deepest source of righteousness.

### 2: Doc. of Lord (Dick)

*Imputation Of The Lord's Merit [Emanuel Swedenborg] on [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com) \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. This scarce antiquarian book is a facsimile reprint of the original.*

Both models imputed and infused righteousness agree that God is the source of our righteousness, and that it is a gift which, strictly speaking, humans cannot deserve. At times this agreement has been obscured, with Protestants accusing Catholics of believing that humans can earn salvation, and Catholics accusing Protestants of believing that Christians need not have their lives transformed. The distinction includes at least two areas: How justification is maintained, and the effect of sin. According to imputed righteousness, the righteousness by which humans are made acceptable to God, remains "alien. Sin can result in God treating them as disobedient, but not in God disowning them. Protestants differ on the question of whether it is possible for humans to forfeit justification. But if they do, it is by ceasing to have faith in God, not by any individual sin. Catholics hold that righteousness comes to be present in humans, and that the continuing status of acceptance is based on this. Humans have a responsibility to cooperate with God in maintaining and strengthening the presence of this "grace" in their lives. Certain serious sins called "mortal sins" can result in its loss. Protestants have avoided speaking of humans as having any "merit" before God. Because all justifying righteousness is alien, humans do not deserve anything from God. Because Catholics hold that righteousness comes to be present in humans, humans can in a certain sense merit reward. Note however that Protestants agree that even non-Christians can do things that are worthwhile. They do not merit salvation, but some Protestant writers have spoken of them as reflecting "civil righteousness. The position that they are potentially complementary is taken by a joint declaration of the Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church. To avoid confusion, the discussion above has used "acceptance by God" rather than justification. Starting with Augustine, the Catholic tradition has understood justification as the entire process by which God forgives and then transforms Christians. The term "sanctification" was used to refer to the life-long process of transformation. Thus the Catholic term "justification" effectively includes both what Protestants refer to as "justification" and "sanctification. However the difference in definitions reflects a difference in substance. Thus using different words for justification and sanctification reflects a distinction between aspects of salvation that are entirely the result of Gods activity, and those which involve human cooperation. The Catholic tradition uses a single term, in part, because it does not recognize a distinction of this type. For the Catholic tradition, while everything originates with God, the entire process of justification requires human cooperation, and serious sin compromises it. The concepts here are nominally derived from the letters of Paul the Apostle which form a large part of the Christian New Testament , particularly the Epistle to the Romans. From at least the time of Augustine of Hippo in the 5th Century, "righteousness" has been seen as a moral and religious quality. In the 16th Century, the Protestant Reformers came to understand human acceptance by God according to a "forensic" model, in which God declares humanity not guilty, even though they were in a moral sense still guilty of sin. However the Reformers contined to accept the traditional concept of righteousness. Starting in the middle of the 20th Century, increased knowledge of first Century Judaism has produced a reassessment of many of the concepts with which Paul was working. Wright , who is one of the best-known advocates of this New Perspective on Paul , sees this reading of righteousness as knocking the props out from under both imputed and infused righteousness. A person is a member of the covenant through faith in Christ. Paul sees this as moving the person from the realm of sin to the realm of Christ although in this life people will still sin from time to time. This difference has too many implications to deal with in this article. So many of the consequences of imputed righteousness continue to apply. Indeed if Wright is correct, imputed righteousness can probably be seen as the closest one can come to this view while using the definition of righteousness that came to be traditional in Christian theology. On the one hand, God is infinitely merciful, "not wishing for any to perish, but for all to come to repentance. On the other, God is infinitely holy and just, which means that he cannot approve of or even look upon evil Habakkuk 1: Because the Bible describes all men as sinners and says that there are none who are righteous Epistle to the Romans 3: To use the words of the apostle Paul, how can

God be "just and the justifier of those who believe Rom. Adherents say that God the Father resolves this problem by sending His Son, who is sinless and indestructibly perfect in character, to lead a perfect life and sacrifice himself for the sins of mankind. The sins of the repentant sinner are cast onto Christ, who is a perfect sacrifice. They then note that this imputed righteousness is particularly that of the second member of the Trinity, Jesus Christ 2 Corinthians 5: By this terminology, they mean that God legally credits the believer with the righteous acts that Christ performed while on this earth. Christ trades his "garments," holiness, righteousness, being blessed by God the Father, in exchange for human sin. This is really Good News for sinners - Christ takes their sin and believers receive His blessed condition and righteousness. This righteousness of Christ and its relationship to the recipient can also be likened to adoption. Similarly, in marriage the married partners are considered one entity legally. Those who disagree with the Protestant doctrine of imputed righteousness disagree on the following grounds. Hence the Protestants say that Christians are "declared righteous by faith". Those opposed to the Lutheran understanding of imputed righteousness contend that this is an error supported only by the misunderstanding of three Greek roots. The argument goes as follows: The Supplement of Liddell Scott and Jones also includes the definition, "brought to justice"; the noun means "justice". A denial of this important tenet of the doctrine of justification leads ultimately to a contradiction in various other "essential Christian doctrines. The classic text used to defend this position is Romans 5: Those who hold to the doctrine of imputed righteousness do not agree with the hermeneutical moves made above. The doctrine of imputed righteousness is at the center of the rift in the visible church between many different denominations. The Protestant doctrine of imputed righteousness is opposed by the doctrine of The New Church , as explained by Emanuel Swedenborg , and is thus closely aligned with the Roman Catholic tradition. Through this faith alone a man is believed to be made righteous; and it is believed further that such are they who are called in the Word "the righteous. Therefore a man is righteous, and has been made righteous, insofar as he receives good from the Lord, that is, insofar, and according to the way, in which he has in him what belongs to the Lord. In doing so he emphasized that Law binds, convicts, and drives people, while the Gospel proclaims repentance, the promise of grace, eternal life, and proclaims their liberty in Christ. Recently, some prominent theologians have disputed the centrality of the law-gospel distinction in the Reformed tradition. Although the sinner is justified by the justice of Christ, inasmuch as the Redeemer has merited for him or her the grace of justification *causa meritoria* , nevertheless he or she is formally justified and made holy by his or her own personal justice and holiness *causa formalis*. Put starkly, the Roman Catholic Church rejects the teaching of imputed righteousness as being a present reality. This is at the very center of the disagreements between the Roman Catholic Church and Lutherans, and remains the primary sticking point to a unification of these traditions to this day. Many who hold to the doctrine of imputed righteousness reject the Roman Catholic teaching of *gratia infusa* infused grace because Lutheran and Calvinist anthropology see total inability allow no room for the Roman Catholic concept of *synteresis* a "spark of goodness". In other words, the image of God is completely lost as a result of the Fall into sin. In regard to salvation, there is nothing in a sinner that is worth being redeemed by God, if based on the intrinsic merit or worth of the sinner. Something altogether more radical must be done to make a sinner righteous; the sinful nature must be killed and replaced by a new nature made by God; "positional sanctification" is achieved through the divine declaration of imputation. Banner of Truth Trust, , pp. Dau, in Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, Part 23, Article 18, Of Free Will. I have used the text at [http: Standard](http://Standard) publication information is not given, but it appears to date from A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification. Cambridge University Press, 3rd Edition Intervarsity Press Academic, Crossway, , provides a good example of this answer. Erickson, Christian Theology Grand Rapids: Baker, , p.

### 3: Imputation of the Lord's Merit: [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com): Emanuel Swedenborg: Books

*At the five-hundredth anniversary of Martin Luther's Ninety-Five Theses and the dawn of the Protestant movement, Indulgences: Luther, Catholicism, and the Imputation of Merit sets forth a revised theological interpretation of the Church's practice of indulgences.*

In His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus uttered these words: Then, in Matthew 5: Obeying the law is more than simply abstaining from killing, committing adultery, and breaking oaths. At the end of all this, we learn that we must exceed the righteousness of the Pharisees, and that comes from being perfect. Love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, mind, and strength and love your neighbor as yourself Matthew This is certainly an admirable goal, but has anyone ever loved the Lord with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength and his neighbor as himself? Everything we do, say, and think has to be done, said, and thought from love for God and love for neighbor. If we are completely honest with ourselves, we have to admit that we have never achieved this level of spirituality. We are born with it, and we cannot overcome the effects of it on our own. Sin radically affects us to our core. Sin affects what we do, say, and think. In other words, it taints everything about us. Our own righteousness is simply not good enough and never will be, no matter how hard we try. Everything He did was perfect. He went willingly to the cross and allowed Himself to be crucified without resisting Isaiah His passive obedience pays our sin debt before God, but it is the active obedience that gives us the perfection God requires. Through our faith in Christ, the righteousness of God is given to us. To impute something is to ascribe or attribute something to someone. When we place our faith in Christ, God ascribes the perfect righteousness of Christ to our account so that we become perfect in His sight. That is how Christ paid our sin debt to God. He had no sin in Himself, but our sin is imputed to Him so, as He suffers on the cross, He is suffering the just penalty that our sin deserves. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. By having the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, we can be seen as sinless, as Jesus is sinless. It is not, therefore, our perfection, but His. When God looks at the Christian, He sees the holiness, perfection, and righteousness of Christ.

## 4: Imputed righteousness

*Imputation of the Lord's Merit Average rating: 0 out of 5 stars, based on 0 reviews Write a review This button opens a dialog that displays additional images for this product with the option to zoom in or out.*

Imputed, infused and imparted righteousness[ edit ] Discussion of these concepts are complicated by different definitions of key terms, such as "justification" and "grace". Imputed righteousness is the righteousness of Jesus credited to the Christians, enabling the Christians to be justified. It is closely related to the Reformed doctrine of justification by grace through faith alone. Passages like 2 Corinthians 5: John Wesley believed that imparted righteousness worked in tandem with imputed righteousness. The term " sanctification " was used to refer to the lifelong process of transformation. Thus the Roman Catholic term "justification" effectively includes both what Protestants refer to as "justification" and "sanctification. However the difference in definitions reflects a difference in substance. The Roman Catholic tradition uses a single term, in part, because it does not recognize a distinction of this type. For the Roman Catholic tradition, while everything originates with God, the entire process of justification requires human cooperation, and serious sin compromises it. The distinction includes at least two areas: Sin can result in God treating them as disobedient, but not in God disowning them. Protestants differ on the question of whether it is possible for humans to forfeit justification. But if they do, it is by ceasing to have faith in God, not by any individual sin. Roman Catholics hold that righteousness comes to be present in humans, and that the continuing status of acceptance is based on this. Humans have a responsibility to cooperate with God in maintaining and strengthening the presence of this "grace" in their lives. Certain serious sins called "mortal sins" can result in its loss. Because all justifying righteousness is alien, humans do not deserve anything good from God. Because Roman Catholics hold that righteousness comes to be present in humans, humans can in a certain sense merit reward. Protestants and Roman Catholics agree that non-Christians can do things that are worthwhile. They do not merit salvation, but some Protestant writers have spoken of them as reflecting "civil righteousness. The position that they are potentially complementary is taken by a joint declaration of the Lutheran World Federation and the Roman Catholic Church. From at least the time of Augustine of Hippo in the 5th Century, "righteousness" has been seen as a moral and religious quality. In the 16th Century, the Protestant Reformers came to understand human acceptance by God according to a "forensic" model, in which God declares humanity not guilty, even though they were in a moral sense still guilty of sin. However, the Reformers continued to accept the traditional concept of righteousness. Starting in the middle of the 20th Century, increased knowledge of first Century Judaism has produced a reassessment of many of the concepts with which Paul was working. The case against both imputed and imparted righteousness[ edit ] This section is a precis of N. He relates the court-room metaphor, pointing out that there are three parties in the Hebrew court - two parties in disagreement and one judge there is no "Prosecuting Attorney". The judge decides the dispute between the parties declaring one to be correct and the other incorrect. The one who is declared "correct" in court is called "righteous" in the matter that was judged. This means that we do not "receive" the righteousness of God or as often expressed, "of Jesus" , as in the classical Evangelical vernacular, nor is it "infused" as in the classical Roman Catholic vernacular. The "righteousness of God" remains His alone, and our "righteousness from God" means that we are found to be "of" the people of God. An important verse to note is 2 Cor 5: We implore you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God" - v This meaning is natural when taken in context from verse 11 through On the one hand, God is infinitely merciful, "not wishing for any to perish, but for all to come to repentance. On the other, God is infinitely holy and just, which means that he cannot approve of or even look upon evil Habakkuk 1: Because the Bible describes all men as sinners and says that there are none who are righteous Epistle to the Romans 3: To use the words of St Paul , how can God be "just and the justifier of those who believe Rom. Adherents say that God the Father resolves this problem by sending Christ, who is sinless and indestructibly perfect in character, to lead a perfect life and sacrifice himself for the sins of mankind. The sins of the repentant sinner are cast onto Christ, who is a perfect sacrifice. They then note that this imputed righteousness is particularly that of Jesus Christ 2 Corinthians 5: By this terminology, they mean that God legally credits the

believer with the righteous acts that Christ performed while on this earth. Christ trades his "garments," holiness, righteousness, being blessed by God the Father, in exchange for human sin. This is really good news for sinners - Christ takes their sin and believers receive His blessed condition and righteousness. This righteousness of Christ and its relationship to the recipient can also be likened to adoption. Similarly, in marriage the married partners are considered one entity legally. This, therefore, means that someone is now infused with the righteousness of Christ. Catholics contend that the final interpretation of scripture falls to the historical Catholic Church collectively known as the Magisterium ; in particular the opinions of the early Church Fathers - many of whom held opinions on justification before the closure of the Christian Canon. A major objection to imputed righteousness is that it appears to be a means of acquitting the guilty rather than pardoning the guilty. Scripture denies the possibility of acquitting the guilty in Exodus Understood this way, the objectionable idea of acquitting the guilty in the term "justify" is avoided. The Protestant doctrine of imputed righteousness is also opposed by the doctrine of The New Church , as explained by Emanuel Swedenborg , and is thus closely aligned with the Roman Catholic tradition. Through this faith alone a man is believed to be made righteous; and it is believed further that such are they who are called in the Word "the righteous. Therefore, a man is righteous, and has been made righteous, insofar as he receives good from the Lord, that is, insofar, and according to the way, in which he has in him what belongs to the Lord. Although the sinner is justified by the justice of Christ, inasmuch as the Redeemer has merited for him or her the grace of justification *causa meritoria* , nevertheless he or she is formally justified and made holy by his or her own personal justice and holiness *causa formalis*. Put starkly, the Roman Catholic Church rejects the teaching of imputed righteousness as being a present reality. This is at the very center of the disagreements between Roman Catholics and Lutherans, and remains the primary sticking point to a unification of these traditions to this day. Lutheran view[ edit ] Philipp Melanchthon , a contemporary of Martin Luther , stressed the classic Lutheran desire to distinguish carefully and properly between Law and Gospel. In doing so he emphasized that Law binds, convicts, and drives people, while the Gospel proclaims repentance, the promise of grace, eternal life, and proclaims their liberty in Christ. Historically, they have been more open to the broader biblical language the Lutheran Formula of Concord calls "correct" but not "proper. For Protestants, the nature of man is profoundly damaged as a result of the Fall , leaving him in bondage to sin and rendering him incapable of choosing God as Lord and treasure over sin. In regard to salvation, there is nothing in a sinner that is worth being redeemed by God the sinner does not possess any intrinsic merit or worth. Something altogether more radical must be done to make a sinner righteous: Banner of Truth Trust, , pp.

### 5: But what does it help you now that you believe all this? - Lord's Day 23 - Heidelberg Catechism

*Doc. of Lord (Dick) n. V THE IMPUTATION OF THE LORD'S MERIT IS NOTHING ELSE THAN THE REMISSION OF SINS AFTER REPENTANCE It is believed in the Church that the Lord was sent by the Father to make atonement for the human race, and that this was effected by His fulfilling the Law, and by the passion of the cross; and that He thus took upon Himself damnation, and made satisfaction.*

Imputed, infused and imparted righteousness Discussion of these concepts are complicated by different definitions of key terms, such as "justification" and "grace". Imputed righteousness is the righteousness of Jesus credited to the Christian, enabling the Christian to be justified. It is closely related to the Reformed doctrine of justification by grace through faith alone. Infused righteousness, by contrast, can be described as: John Wesley believed that imparted righteousness worked in tandem with imputed righteousness. The term "sanctification" was used to refer to the lifelong process of transformation. Thus the Catholic term "justification" effectively includes both what Protestants refer to as "justification" and "sanctification. However the difference in definitions reflects a difference in substance. The Catholic tradition uses a single term, in part, because it does not recognize a distinction of this type. For the Catholic tradition, while everything originates with God, the entire process of justification requires human cooperation, and serious sin compromises it. At times this agreement has been obscured, with Protestants accusing Catholics of believing that humans can earn salvation,[ citation needed ] and Catholics accusing Protestants of believing that Christians need not have their lives transformed. Sin can result in God treating them as disobedient, but not in God disowning them. Protestants differ on the question of whether it is possible for humans to forfeit justification. But if they do, it is by ceasing to have faith in God, not by any individual sin. Catholics hold that righteousness comes to be present in humans, and that the continuing status of acceptance is based on this. Humans have a responsibility to cooperate with God in maintaining and strengthening the presence of this "grace" in their lives. Certain serious sins called "mortal sins" can result in its loss. Because all justifying righteousness is alien, humans do not deserve anything from God. Because Catholics hold that righteousness comes to be present in humans, humans can in a certain sense merit reward. Protestants and Catholics agree that non-Christians can do things that are worthwhile. They do not merit salvation, but some Protestant writers have spoken of them as reflecting "civil righteousness. The position that they are potentially complementary is taken by a joint declaration of the Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church. The concepts here are nominally derived from the letters of Paul the Apostle , which form a large part of the Christian New Testament , particularly the Epistle to the Romans. From at least the time of Augustine of Hippo in the 5th Century, "righteousness" has been seen as a moral and religious quality. In the 16th Century, the Protestant Reformers came to understand human acceptance by God according to a "forensic" model, in which God declares humanity not guilty, even though they were in a moral sense still guilty of sin. However the Reformers continued to accept the traditional concept of righteousness. Starting in the middle of the 20th Century, increased knowledge of first Century Judaism has produced a reassessment of many of the concepts with which Paul was working. The case against both imputed and imparted righteousness This section is a precis of N. Wright , who is one of the best-known advocates of the New Perspective on Paul , explains that although the "righteousness of God" and "righteousness from God" have been confused and conflated in the past, they are distinct concepts. He relates the court-room metaphor, pointing out that there are three parties in the Hebrew court - two parties in disagreement and one judge There is no "Prosecuting Attorney". The judge decides the dispute between the parties declaring one to be correct and the other incorrect. The one who is declared "correct" in court is called "righteous" in the matter that was judged. Paul was positing that the people of such faith are vindicated when Messiah returns, being declared "righteous" or in other words, vindicated for their stance , which is exactly the meaning of the Biblical term "justified", in N. This means that we do not "receive" the righteousness of God or as often expressed, "of Jesus" , as in the classical Evangelical vernacular, nor is it "infused" as in the classical Roman Catholic vernacular. The "righteousness of God" remains His alone, and our "righteousness from God" means that we are found to be "of" the people of God.

An important verse to note is 2 Cor 5: We implore you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God" - v This meaning is natural when taken in context from verse 11 through On the one hand, God is infinitely merciful, "not wishing for any to perish, but for all to come to repentance. On the other, God is infinitely holy and just, which means that he cannot approve of or even look upon evil Habakkuk 1: Because the Bible describes all men as sinners and says that there are none who are righteous Epistle to the Romans 3: To use the words of the apostle Paul, how can God be "just and the justifier of those who believe Rom. Adherents say that God the Father resolves this problem by sending His Son, who is sinless and indestructibly perfect in character, to lead a perfect life and sacrifice himself for the sins of mankind. The sins of the repentant sinner are cast onto Christ, who is a perfect sacrifice. They then note that this imputed righteousness is particularly that of the second member of the Trinity, Jesus Christ 2 Corinthians 5: By this terminology, they mean that God legally credits the believer with the righteous acts that Christ performed while on this earth. Christ trades his "garments," holiness, righteousness, being blessed by God the Father, in exchange for human sin. This is really Good News for sinners - Christ takes their sin and believers receive His blessed condition and righteousness. This righteousness of Christ and its relationship to the recipient can also be likened to adoption. Similarly, in marriage the married partners are considered one entity legally. Those who disagree with the Protestant doctrine of imputed righteousness disagree on the following grounds. They contend that the typical Protestant understanding of the Greek word DIKAIOS[ citation needed ] -- usually translated "justify" -- as meaning "declared righteous" to be in error. Hence the Protestants say that Christians are "declared righteous by faith. The argument goes as follows: A denial of this important tenet of the doctrine of justification leads ultimately to a contradiction in various other "essential Christian doctrines. The classic text used to defend this position is Romans 5: Those who hold to the doctrine of imputed righteousness do not agree with the hermeneutical moves made above. The doctrine of imputed righteousness is at the center of the rift in the visible church between many different denominations. The Protestant doctrine of imputed righteousness is opposed by the doctrine of The New Church , as explained by Emanuel Swedenborg , and is thus closely aligned with the Roman Catholic tradition. Through this faith alone a man is believed to be made righteous; and it is believed further that such are they who are called in the Word "the righteous. Therefore a man is righteous, and has been made righteous, insofar as he receives good from the Lord, that is, insofar, and according to the way, in which he has in him what belongs to the Lord. In doing so he emphasized that Law binds, convicts, and drives people, while the Gospel proclaims repentance, the promise of grace, eternal life, and proclaims their liberty in Christ. Historically, they have been more open to the broader biblical language the Lutheran Formula of Concord calls "correct" but not "proper. Although the sinner is justified by the justice of Christ, inasmuch as the Redeemer has merited for him or her the grace of justification *causa meritoria* , nevertheless he or she is formally justified and made holy by his or her own personal justice and holiness *causa formalis*. Put starkly, the Catholic Church rejects the teaching of imputed righteousness as being a present reality. This is at the very center of the disagreements between Catholics and Lutherans, and remains the primary sticking point to a unification of these traditions to this day. Many who hold to the doctrine of imputed righteousness reject the Catholic teaching of *gratia infusa* infused grace because Lutheran and Calvinist anthropology see total inability allow no room for the Catholic concept of *synteresis* a "spark of goodness". In other words, the image of God is completely lost as a result of the Fall into sin though cf. In regard to salvation, there is nothing in a sinner that is worth being redeemed by God, if based on the intrinsic merit or worth of the sinner. Something altogether more radical must be done to make a sinner righteous; the sinful nature must be killed and replaced by a new nature made by God; "positional sanctification" is achieved through the divine declaration of imputation. Banner of Truth Trust, , pp. Dau, in Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, Part 23, Article 18, Of Free Will. I have used the text at <http://Standard> publication information is not given, but it appears to date from A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification. Cambridge University Press, 3rd Edition Intervarsity Press Academic, and N. Wright , What Saint Paul really said Eerdmans, Crossway, , provides a good example of this answer. Erickson, Christian Theology Grand Rapids: Baker, , p.

### 6: Imputed righteousness - The Full Wiki

*We have to work to merit the additional Fatherly pleasure that was not provided by the imputation of Christ's perfect sacrifice. This situation is a bit like paying the penalty for sins in purgatory.*

What a beautiful truth! God the Father viewed Abraham thereafter as having the righteousness of Christ. Abraham believed God concerning the coming Messiah which was to save His people from their sins. Why was Abraham able to simply believe God in place of merit or good works? No matter how much good we may do here on earth, our sins are still recorded in Heaven. Our sins must be dealt with. This is why Jesus came to earth to paid the price for our sins with His own precious blood. Even in our sincerest efforts, humanity is tarnished with the curse of sin and rebellion. We read in Romans 4: We read concerning Abraham. He who knew no sin, became as sin, that we who knew no righteousness could be made the righteousness of God in Christ 2nd Corinthians 5: What a wonderful truth! To think that Jesus would actually bear our sins upon Himself and sacrifice His precious blood for our sinsâ€”we are not worthy. Thankfully, God looked beyond our faults through His love and saw our need. Do you realize all that you will miss if you reject Christ as your Savior? Eternal life is a free gift Romans 5: It is by grace through faith in Jesus Christ that we are saved, so that God the Father may view us as having the righteousness of Christ which is imputed unto us at salvation. Would you like to be the friend of God? It all begins when you receive Jesus as your Savior. Jesus earnestly wants to impute your sin to His record and impute His righteousness to your record. All you must do to be saved is admit your guilty condition before God for violating His holy Law Romans 3: Trust upon the Son of God to wash away your sins with His shed blood that was shed at Calvary. Here is a very precious quote from Pastor Jack Hyles from a sermon he preached in We go to Heaven because we trust what Christ did for us; and not because of what we can do for Him. Our best righteousness is filth to God Isaiah Oh how foolish is the world today! Billions of unsaved religious people are headed for the Lake of Fire! Religion is the worst thing that ever happened to this world, because Satan uses it to blind men 2nd Corinthians 4: Religion says that everything is ok while a person is headed for Hell forever. You need He Who is the beginning, Jesus, born in you Revelation 1: No amount of personal effort can undo our sins. We are sinful by nature, by behavior, by motive and even by virtue. If you receive what Christ did as payment for your sins, then you are saved!!! This is Biblical salvation! Jesus paid a debt that He did not owe, because we owed a debt of sin that we could not pay. The Lamb of God was crucified for you and me, and His blood shed for our sins.

### 7: Why does Christ's righteousness need to be imputed to us?

*The notion of the papists concerning merit is the foundation of all their errors. They teach, that Christ merited the grace for them, which is in them, and then this grace in them merits their justification, and for this inherent grace God doth justify them.*

Jun 8th, By Bryan Cross Category: Blog Posts According to the Reformed Protestant doctrine, on the cross Christ paid the penalty for all the sins of all and only the elect. But this raises a difficulty. When Christ taught us to pray, He prescribed a daily prayer in which we not only ask for our daily bread, but we also ask daily for the forgiveness of our trespasses. But if at the moment we first believe, all our past, present and future sins are forgiven, then why should we subsequently ask for the forgiveness of our sins? Westminster Assembly Portrait According to Reformed theology, on the cross Christ paid the penalty for all the sins of all and only the elect. Therefore at the moment he believes the gospel, all his past, present and future sins have not only already been paid for; they are all forgiven. In Reformed theology, all past, present and future sins are forgiven at the moment we believe. Nor, according to Reformed theology does God impute to Christ only those sins that the sinner has already committed, and then, when the believer later confesses subsequent sins, impute those subsequent sins to Christ. In Reformed theology the imputation is not piece-meal or successive. It takes place once and entirely, at the moment the sinner first believes. Once the double-imputation has occurred i. If all our sins are paid for and forgiven, then it makes no sense to ask daily for the forgiveness for our sins. If we are supposed to believe that all our past, present and future sins were already paid for on the cross and forgiven at the moment we first believed, then to ask daily for the forgiveness of our sins is to contradict the doctrine that at the moment we first believed all these sins were already forgiven. Believing that all our sins are already forgiven is incompatible with asking daily for the forgiveness of our sins. But on the other hand, in the Reformed view God continues to forgive our sins. The problem is that if our sins are all already forgiven, then there is no reason for God to keep forgiving them. If God is still forgiving them, this implies that they are not all already forgiven. So there is a contradiction here. The doctrine teaches that the sins are all already forgiven. The prayer teaches that the sins are not all already forgiven. One way of attempting to resolve the contradiction is to make a distinction between God forgiving our sins, and restoring us to fellowship. According to this view, all our past, present and future sins are entirely forgiven at the moment we believe, and at that moment we are brought into fellowship with God. If all our sins are already paid for, and when He sees us He sees the perfect righteousness of Christ imputed to us, then there is no reason for Him to be displeased with us, unless He is peeking behind the imputed righteousness. If, however, God is ever pleased with us when peeking behind the imputed righteousness of Christ, then simul iustus et peccator is false. But if after justification simul iustus et peccator is always true in this life, then if God peeks, we are always under His Fatherly displeasure until we are entirely sanctified in heaven. There is a third logical possibility, namely, that there are two qualitatively different levels of righteousness by which God is pleased. The second level of righteousness presupposes having already attained the first level; this second level is the level of pleasing or displeasing God above and beyond the perfect righteousness of Christ, by our repentance, confession of sins, and good works. He is at least pleased enough to let us into heaven, but He is not perfectly pleased with us. This situation is a bit like paying the penalty for sins in purgatory. As there is no sin so small but it deserves damnation; so there is no sin so great that it can bring damnation upon those who truly repent. As every man is bound to make private confession of his sins to God, praying for the pardon thereof, upon which, and the forsaking of them, he shall find mercy 4 Logically, either these statements are limited to the time of justification, or they also refer to the post-justification period. But, if these statements from WCF XV are about the time after justification, then since the believer already knows that all of his past, present and future sins have already been forgiven at justification, it makes no sense to say that he should not expect pardon for his post-justification sins, without repentance. Regarding this problem Reformed theologian Louis Berkhof writes: The latter remains and therefore always produces in believers a feeling of guilt, of separation from God, of sorrow, of repentance, and so on. Hence they feel the need of confessing their sins, even the sins of

their youth, Ps. The believer who is really conscious of his sin feels within him an urge to confess it and to seek the comforting assurance of forgiveness. Moreover, such confession and prayer is not only a subjectively felt need, but also an objective necessity. Justification is essentially an objective declaration respecting the sinner in the tribunal of God, but it is not merely that; it is also an *actus transiens*, passing into the consciousness of the believer. The divine sentence of acquittal is brought home to the sinner and awakens the joyous consciousness of the forgiveness of sins and of favor with God. Now this consciousness of pardon and of a renewed filial relationship is often disturbed and obscured by sin, and is again quickened and strengthened by confession and prayer, and by a renewed exercise of faith. Therefore, it would follow that we should welcome the overcoming or cessation of such feelings. We should outgrow them as our feelings conform to the truth. At least, if we can outgrow such feelings we should. Berkhof claims that the standard Reformed position on the purpose of confessing our sins and asking God for forgiveness after our justification is not to gain forgiveness of sins, but to relieve the subjective urge we feel to confess, and to acquire the comforting feelings of assurance that our sins are forgiven. It sentimentalizes these passages in order to preserve its doctrine of justification. According to Berkhof, even though before God we do not need to ask forgiveness, and we know that we do not need to ask for forgiveness, nevertheless the human psyche has a primitive urge to continue to ask for forgiveness for continued sins. So according to Berkhof it is good that we daily confess and ask forgiveness, and in doing so, comfort ourselves by making ourselves think that in confessing our sins daily and in asking God daily to forgive them, somehow that activity ensures that God has forgiven us, even though in actuality our past, present and future sins were all already forgiven at the moment of our justification. The problem here is that asking daily for forgiveness teaches the exact opposite; it teaches that our sins are not yet all forgiven. If we are governed by reason, then we should speak and live according to the truth. And if the truth is that all our past, present and future sins were already forgiven when we first believed, then we should speak and live according to that truth. But if we should speak and live as though our sins daily need to be forgiven, and we should speak and live according to the truth, then it follows that at least our future sins were not forgiven when we first believed. If Berkhof is correct that the standard Reformed position is this psychologized notion of the purpose of continued confession and asking for forgiveness, then Reformed teachers and pastors should be urging all believers to try to get over this urge to confess and ask for forgiveness. Pastors, being mature, would tell their congregations that they [the pastors] no longer confess their sins or ask God for forgiveness, because they do not feel those inaccurate feelings of guiltiness any more; they are fully convinced, in mind and feelings, that all their past, present, and future sins were forgiven at the moment of their justification, and their sheep should all seek to reach that same mature state. But if our sins are forgiven progressively, then either our sins are progressively imputed to Christ on the cross, or the satisfaction doctrine of the Atonement is correct. Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done On earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

### 8: IMPUTATION | Theology Forums

*Imputed righteousness is the Protestant Christian doctrine that a sinner is declared righteous by God purely by God's grace through faith in Christ, and thus all depends on Christ's merit and worthiness, rather than on one's own merit and worthiness.*

He suffered the loss of a righteous nature, and then a two-fold loss of legal righteousness in the sight of God. Man sinned; he was therefore no longer innocent of transgression. Man did not keep the command; he therefore was guilty of the sin of omission. In that which he committed, and in that which he omitted, his original character for uprightness was completely wrecked. Jesus Christ came to undo the mischief of the fall for his people. So far as their sin concerned their breach of the command, that he has removed by his precious blood. His agony and bloody sweat have for ever taken away the consequences of sin from believers, seeing Christ did by his one sacrifice bear the penalty of that sin in his flesh. He, his own self, bare our sins in his own body on the tree. Still it is not enough for a man to be pardoned. He, of course, is then in the eye of God without sin. But it was required of man that he should actually keep the command. It was not enough that he did not break it, or that he is regarded through the blood as though he did not break it. He must keep it, he must continue in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them. How is this necessity supplied? Man must have a righteousness, or God cannot accept him. Man must have a perfect obedience, or else God cannot reward him. Should He give heaven to a soul that has not perfectly kept the law; that were to give the reward where the service is not done, and that before God would be an act which might impeach his justice. Where, then, is the righteousness with which the pardoned man shall be completely covered, so that God can regard him as having kept the law, and reward him for so doing? Surely, my brethren, none of you are so besotted as to think that this righteousness can be wrought out by yourselves. You must despair of ever being able to keep the law perfectly. Each day you sin. Since you have passed from death unto life, the old Adam still struggles for dominion within you. And by the force of the lusts of the flesh you are brought into captivity to the law of sin which is in your members. The good you would do, you do not, and the evil you would not, that you too often do. Some have thought the works of the Holy Spirit in us would give us a righteousness in which we might stand. I am sure, my brethren, we would not say a word derogatory to the work of the Holy Spirit. But we hold it to be a great cardinal point in divinity that the work of the Spirit never meant to supplant the merits of the Son. We know that each particular branch of the divine salvation which was espoused by the persons of the Trinity has been carried out by each one to perfection. Now as we are accepted in the Beloved, it must be by a something that the Beloved did; as we are justified in Christ it must be by a something not that the Spirit has done, but which Christ has done. We, therefore, assert, believing that Scripture fully warrants us, that the life of Christ constitutes the righteousness in which his people are to be clothed. His death washed away their sins, his life covered them from head to foot; his death the sneaky to God, his life was the gift to man, by which man satisfies the demands of the law. Herein the law is honored and the soul is accepted. He completed the work of obedience in his life, and said to his Father, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. In his life he was gathering together the precious gold, in his death he hammered it out to make for us a garment which is of wrought gold. You have as much to thank Christ for loving as for dying, and you should be as reverently and devoutly grateful for his spotless life as for his terrible and fearful death. Having introduced the doctrine of imputed righteousness, I proofed to map out my subject. First, then, He is so. Jesus Christ is the Lord our righteousness. Read that verse, and you will clearly perceive that the Messiah of the Jews, Jesus of Nazareth the Saviour of the Gentiles, is certainly Jehovah. He hath the incommunicable title of the Most High God. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: We know, and this day we testify in his name, that the very Christ who did lie in the manger as an infant was infinite even then; that he who cried, cried for very pain as a child, was nevertheless saluted at that very moment as God by the songs of the creatures that his hands had made. He who walked in pain over the flinty acres of Palestine, was at the same time possessor of heaven and earth. He who had not where to lay his head, and was despised and rejected of men, was at the same instant God over all, blessed for evermore. He that sweat great drops of blood

did bear the earth upon his shoulders. He who did hang upon the tree had the oration hanging upon him. He who died on the cross was the ever living, the everlasting One. As a man he died, as God he lives. In nature Christ proves himself to be universal God. Without him was not anything made that was made. By him all things consist. Who less than God could make the heavens and the earth? Bow before him, bow before him, for he made you, and should not the creatures acknowledge their Creator? Providence attests his Godhead. He upholdeth all things by the word of his power. Creatures that are animate have their breath from his nostrils; inanimate creatures that are strong and mighty stand only by his strength. He can say concerning the earth, "I bear the pillars thereof. And as for Grace, we claim for Christ that he is Jehovah in the great kingdom of his grace. Who less than God could have carried your sins and mine and cast them all away? On whom less than God could we rely to keep us from the innumerable temptations that beset us? How can he be less than God, when he says, "Lo, I am with you always, unto the end of the world? How could he hear our prayers, the prayers of millions, scattered through the leagues of earth, and attend to them all, and give acceptance to all, if he were not infinite in understanding and infinite in merit? How were this if he were less than God? At his footstool we bow and pay him the very homage that we pay to his Father and to the Spirit. Christ in his life was so righteous, that we may say of the life, taken as a vehicle, that it is righteousness itself. Christ is the law incarnate. Understand me. From his eye there never flashed the fire of unhallowed anger. On his lip there did never hang the unjust or licentious word. His heart was never stirred by the breath of sin or the taint of iniquity. In the secret of his reins no fault was hidden. In his understanding was no defect; in his judgment no error. In his miracles there was no ostentation. In him there was indeed no guile. The law consists in this first, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart. It was his meat and his drink to do the will of him that sent him. Never man spent himself as he did. Hunger and thirst and nakedness were nothing to him, nor death itself if he might so be baptised with the baptism wherewith he must be baptized, and drink the cup which his Father had set before him. The law consists also in this, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. He loved man better than his own life. He would sooner be spit upon than that man should be cast into the flames of hell and sooner yield up the ghost in agonies that cannot be described than that the souls his Father gave him should be cast away. He carried out the law, then, I say to the very letter he spelt out its mystic syllables, and verily he magnified it, and made it honorable. He loved the Lord his God, with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and he loved his neighbors as himself. Jesus Christ was righteousness impersonated. One thousand eight hundred years have passed since then, and blasphemy itself has not been able to charge him with a fault. Strange as it may appear, the most perverted judges have nevertheless acknowledged the awful dignity of his character. They have railed at his miracles; they have denied his Godhead; but his righteous character I know not that they have dared to impugn. They have hatched jokes about his generation; they have made his poverty a jest, and his death has been the theme of ribald song; but his life has staggered even the most unbelieving, and made the careless wonder how such a character could have been conceived even if it be a fiction, and much more, how it could have been executed if it be a fact. No one that I know of has dared to charge Christ with unrighteousness to man, or with a want of devotedness to God. See then, it is so. We do not stay to prove his righteousness any more than we did to prove his Godhead. The day is coming when men shall acknowledge him to be Jehovah, and when looking upon all his life while he was incarnate here, they shall be compelled to say that his life was righteousness itself. This is the saved rivet by which our souls are joined to him. This is the blessed hand with which our soul toucheth him, and he becometh to us all in all, "Jehovah our Righteousness" You will now observe that there is a most precious doctrine unfolded in this title of our Lord and Saviour. I think we may take it thus: When we believe in Christ, by faith we receive our justification. As the merit of his blood takes away our sin, so the merit of his obedience is imputed to us for righteousness. We are considered, as soon as we believe, as though the works of Christ here our works. Accordingly, if you will turn to the thirty-third chapter of this same prophet Jeremiah, and look at the sixteenth verse, you will see it written, "This is the name wherewith she shall be called, the Lord our righteousness. Many men use their own names when they are applying names to other persons; they are so well acquainted with their own characters, and so suspicious of themselves, that they think it best, before another can express the suspicion, to attach the very same accusation to someone else. Now we hold, you know, that this doctrine is not execrable, but most

delightful, that it is not abominable, but Godlike, that it is not licentious, but holy:

### 9: Imputed righteousness - Wikipedia

*"And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness" (Genesis ). Why was Abraham able to simply believe God in place of merit or good works? It's simply because Jesus paid the price for mankind's sins.*

To appreciate the answer to this question, we must realize that the giving of the Ransom has various features. The life which He surrendered was a perfect human life, one to which He had a full right. Paul tells us that He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. Nothing more was needed. During the three and a half years of His ministry our Redeemer laid down His life. He completed that work at Calvary, saying there, "It is finished! But He has not yet made any application of this human life to Adam and His race. It was a life that had not been forfeited, that had not been mortgaged, that had not been embargoed. He was put to death in the flesh and was raised a spirit--quickened in spirit. This quickened One of the new nature had this new life as a reward for His obedience in permitting His earthly life to be taken from Him. But he had not forfeited His right to the earthly life; hence as a New Creature He still retained this right to perfect human life. Everything that belonged to a perfect life belonged to Him. He had permitted the Jews to take away His life, but he had neither surrendered nor forfeited His right to life. So when He was raised to life by the Father, He had not only the right to the spirit nature, but also the right to the earthly nature--not that He would have use for this for Himself; for any one having the Divine nature would have neither use nor desire for the earthly nature. The specific right that He had was the right to give, to bestow freely upon Adam and his race, human life--the very object He had in mind when He came into the world. So when the Lord Jesus arose from the dead and ascended up on High forty days later, He retained all the rights that He ever had. He had the right to human life, never having forfeited it; He also had the Divine nature, the reward of His obedience--a superior right, a superior nature. But when He ascended up on High, He did not apply the merit of His sacrifice for the world of mankind; otherwise the whole world would not now lie in the Wicked One. If our Redeemer had made an application of His merit for the world when He ascended, it would have taken away the sin of the world; but He did not do this. The Scriptures tell us that the Church alone has escaped from the condemnation upon the world. Evidently, then, the world is still in the Wicked One. The only ones who have escaped from this condemnation are those who have accepted the arrangement of this Gospel Age. Nobody else except the consecrated class has had merit and justification from Christ. We answer, Not directly. If He were to apply His merit directly, it would give the Church human life, human perfection. God has some better thing for the Church--that the Church might attain to the same Divine nature to which Jesus attained. The Church attains this by following in the footsteps of Jesus. This signifies that as He sacrificed His human life, and laid down His earthly rights according to the will of the Father, so all who would become members of His Bride class must do the same, must surrender their earthly life, in order to be associated with Him. Only if we suffer with Him shall we reign with Him. Whosoever will so do during this Gospel Age will attain to the same Divine nature, the same glory, the same immortality--the difference being that our Lord will always be Head over all, the Chief over the Church, which is His Body, and that they will always be His members in particular, the Church in Glory. The question, then, comes up, if it was necessary for Jesus to be pure, holy, how could the Church be acceptable to the Father, when they are of the depraved human nature? The answer of the Bible is that to this class who become His disciples Jesus imputes the merit of His sacrifice to the extent of covering their blemishes, their imperfections. We are to discern between give and impute. He will give His merit to the world by and by. But now He is making an imputation to the Church. By this term imputation is signified, that if the Church had remained of the earthly nature the same as the world, they would by and by have the right, the same as the world, to come up out of degradation to human perfection. But this class, the Church, forego all those rights to human perfection. When we consecrated ourselves to God, we gave up our right to become inheritors of the earth and earthly things; we gave up all our rights in the sense of merely surrendering them. By faith we believe that Jesus would in due time have given us those blessings of Restitution the same as to the whole world of mankind. By faith we accept those blessings and by faith we surrender them. The only thing left for the Church to do is to surrender their earthly lives. Some may have more vitality, and some may

have less; some may have more talents, and some less; some may have more years, and some less; but whatever each has it is to be given up, surrendered. So, then, at consecration the Church class voluntarily surrender their earthly nature. They surrender all the earthly rights that they have of the present time, and also those rights that would have been theirs had they remained part and parcel of the world. Jesus does not give to the Church at the present time any part of the Ransom-sacrifice, but merely imputes to them, counts to them, that part which they might have had if they had remained a part of the world. When Jesus died, He did not pay over a ransom as an offset for Adam. When Jesus was raised from the dead, He had not paid a ransom; and when He ascended to the Father He did not pay over a ransom for the world. He has been imputing of this merit down through the Gospel Age to the Church only, but now He has about finished the imputing to the Church, and the work of giving to the world Restitution is about to begin; and before it begins the merit imputed loaned to the Church must be actually paid over to Divine Justice as the basis for human Restitution. That bullock represented our Lord Jesus, the perfect man, and the priest represented our Lord, the New Creature. Thus He typified the consecration of the human nature and also the condition of the New Creature, still in the fleshly body, typed by the priest in the first Holy. Our Lord was in this condition of the Holy during the three and a half years of His ministry. At the end of the three and a half years, having finished the work of sacrificing Himself, having burned the antitypical incense, He passed under the Second Veil. On the third day our Lord arose on the other side of the Second Veil--on the spirit plane--fully perfected as a New Creature, no longer in any sense of the word a man. He could go and come like the wind. He remained with His disciples to convince them that He was no longer a man--going and coming like the wind, and appearing in various bodily forms. The blood signifies the life of the sacrifice. He appeared in the presence of God, and there He sprinkled of the blood on the Mercy-Seat. This sprinkling of the blood on the Mercy-Seat was to make atonement for a certain class. That atonement we see was made only for the priests and the Levites--not for the world. After the High Priest had finished making the atonement for the priests and the Levites, he went out into the Court again and there began a different work. Our Lord made application of the blood for the antitypical priests and the Levites during the ten days between His [R He made application of His merit for the Church. We know this; for this satisfaction for sins was followed by the pouring out of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the evidence that Divine mercy had come to them. A goat is inferior to a bullock. The Lord Himself was typified by the bullock. It has been the work of the Gospel Age to offer up the Church. Not that they were able to offer up themselves; for being naturally the members of the condemned Adamic race, they were not fit to be priests, and could not be priests until the great High Priest had made an imputation of His merit for them. Therefore, the great High Priest who offered the bullock also offered the goat. Then we see the conclusion of the matter. In the type the blood of the goat was taken into the Most Holy and was applied, not for the priests, not for the Levites, but for the people. The blood of the bullock was applied only for the priests and the Levites; the blood of the goat, for the people. These two sacrifices represent all the sacrifices of the Gospel Age; the superior sacrifice was that of the Lord Jesus, the inferior sacrifice was that of the Church. Only those who have the privilege of sharing in the sacrifice have the privilege of sharing in the glory. It was not necessary for the satisfaction of Justice that any of the Church should die; but it was necessary in order for them to partake of the promised glory. He makes the sacrifice; it is not our sacrifice. As the Apostle Paul points out, we merely present our bodies. God would not accept our sacrifice except through Christ; we are accepted only in the Beloved One. Our Lord, therefore, has still a human life ungiven away. He does not give to the Church human life. He does not part with even a particle of the right to human life which He had. The Lord does not need an earthly body; neither will His Church need earthly bodies. What use would Jesus make of earthly rights, or what use would we make of them? We never intend to become men again; nor does He intend to become a man again. The merit of Christ was imputed to us only for the purpose of making us acceptable sacrifices; and this merit becomes released again when the last member of the Church is glorified. Therefore, as soon as the merit of Christ is appropriated for the world, He will immediately take charge of His purchased possession. He will then take His great power and reign. Then to all those redeemed ones for whom He will appropriate the merit of His sacrifice He will be ready to give the long-promised Restitution blessings. This, we believe, is at the door. The Lord is about to take possession of the Church, which is the jewel class of the whole world. The

blessings which He then will give are human Restitution to the race of Adam and the bringing of the whole earth, their earthly home, up to the grandeur of the Garden of Eden. From this Scriptural standpoint the Ransom-price that Jesus gives has been a progressive matter, and is not yet completed. He began to give it when He became a man; He progressed in giving during the three and a half years of His earthly ministry; He finished the giving at Calvary. He has since been using that to which He had a right on behalf of the Church, by imputation. He will have all of this merit of His sacrifice to make satisfaction for the sins of the whole world--not a single individual omitted. During the thousand years He will be giving to mankind that which He has secured by His death, and which He will make applicable to them by sealing the New Covenant. That New Covenant will be sealed as soon as the Church shall have been completed, as soon as the Church shall have passed beyond the Veil. They acknowledge that Jesus was a spirit being before He came into the world, and that He experienced some kind of change of nature in becoming a man. But very inconsistently they seem erroneously and unscripturally to reason that, having become a man, He must stay a man to all eternity--"a little lower than the angels. The Scriptures indicate that there is a difference in natures.

Barker//s Delight, Large-Print Edition AutoCAD Release 14 Update Training Algebra and trigonometry third edition Christian writers market guide Ooze (Ghosts of Fear Street) Pordys Prickly Problem (Janette Okes Animal Friends 1st Chapter Books) Young indiana jones journal Definition of human capital development Science in a vacant lot. The most typical avant-garde Hunger in History Hoaxes, Fibs, and Fakes (The Real Deal) Crontab in linux tutorial Ibn Battuta and the Tatar princess Laura harris smith dream dictionary Placer examination; principles and practice Program implementation plan for ARTCC Maintenance Control Center (AMCC) Eight Black Horses (87th Precinct Novel) Developing and managing expert systems Move The Crowd 4th Wve Bb Due 7 23 A Spirituality in Tune with Nature/t741 Environmental science engineering notes Chapter 9: The Blank Canvas Christ and Krishna The Sport Americana Baseball Address List, No 7 (Sport Americana Baseball Address List) Bacon (Portfolio) Coming into the Light Sitting with suffering: growing through grief Corolla 2009 owners manual Chinese artists, texts and interviews Stephen Crane in transition Questionnaires (SAGE Benchmarks in Social Research Methods series) V. 7. Agnes of Sorrento. Biosalinity in action Modeling crop responses to irrigation in relation to soils, climate, and salinity Interior of Dr. Tyrells Office I Wonder Why Lemons Taste Sour and Other Questions about Senses (I Wonder Why) Women speaking up Blender reference manual The courageous children.