

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



4226

b 20

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS,  
"THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD."

A Dialogue.

BY

J. M. C.

LONDON:

J. B. BATEMAN, 22 PATERNOSTER ROW.

W. YAPP, 70 WELBECK STREET.

MDCCCLX.

PRICE FOUR-PENCE.

4226. b. 20.

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS,  
"THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD."

A Dialogue.

BY

J. M. C.

*K*



LONDON:  
J. B. BATEMAN, 22 PATERNOSTER ROW.  
W. YAPP, 70 WELBECK STREET.

MDCCCLX.



# IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

## A DIALOGUE.

---

*A.* I am very glad to see you. I have been wishing to have a conversation with you on the subject of imputed righteousness. I have lately read several treatises respecting it, and I acknowledge that my notions are still very confused. I know that you have considered it carefully, and I should like to discuss the matter with you.

*B.* I shall be happy if I can assist you in ascertaining the true Scriptural doctrine. I have studied the Scriptures, I admit, somewhat carefully, and I desire ever to wait on the Lord for increasing light. I doubt not that He will lead us into the truth, by His Holy Spirit, if we search the Word diligently, in a prayerful spirit, and with an unbiassed mind.

*A.* I have been taught to regard the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ as one of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. Do you not agree with me in this?

*B.* Before I answer your question, may I ask you to explain what you mean by "the imputed righteousness of Christ?"

*A.* I mean that Christ was the substitute of his people, and that, therefore, his obedience and sufferings are imputed to them.

*B.* Does your statement apply to his life, or to his death, or to both?

*A.* That is a nice question, and one which I am not quite prepared to answer. My own views on this point are not very clear; but I know that some hold that our Lord Jesus Christ was always the substitute of his people, and that, therefore, from his birth to his death, he was bearing our sins, and making atonement for them. Is this your view?

*B.* No; by no means.

*A.* Then I should like to know why you reject it. Do you deny the great doctrine of imputed righteousness?

*B.* Deny it! On the contrary, I glory in it as that which alone constitutes my acceptance with God. It is my only title to eternal blessedness. I repudiate every thought that would call it in question.

*A.* Well, this seems strange. You hold the doctrine of imputed righteousness, and yet you seem to deny the only foundation on which the doctrine rests—the vicarious obedience of Christ—that obedience which was perfect from beginning to end.

*B.* I both hold the doctrine of imputed righteousness, and I hold that the vicarious obedience of Christ is the sole foundation on which it rests; yet I do not hold that his life, all through to the cross, was vicarious and sin-bearing. His death on the cross I regard as strictly vicarious, or substitutional.

*A.* Then, my friend, how can you say that you

hold "the foundation;" for can there be such a thing as imputed righteousness unless Christ was always our substitute, and, as such, obeyed in our stead all his life?

*B.* Perhaps we may better understand each other if you would kindly state more fully your view of the doctrine.

*A.* As I have already said, I am not prepared to give you any definite view of my own; but I will give you the view of others as faithfully as I can. Thus, it is said, we are all, as creatures of God, responsible to obey Him. The only rule of obedience given to man is the law—I mean the ten commandments, summed up in the two which contain our duty to God and to man. We have all broken this law, and incurred its curse. But we can never enter into life and glory except as righteous persons—that is, as keepers of this law. Now, as we could never do this personally, the Lord Jesus Christ did it for us substitutionally. He, as our representative, "magnified the law, and made it honorable," by his perfect obedience during life; and by his death he made an atonement for our transgressions; so that we are justified, or dealt with as righteous, by having put to our credit what our substitute did for us. What he did is reckoned to us as if we had done it ourselves. Thus we are entered in God's book as obedient—as law-keepers—as legally righteous; and treated as if we were not sinners, but had fully kept the law. This is what I believe is meant by "the imputed righteousness of Christ."

*B.* But is this the imputed righteousness of the New Testament? As a statement of Christ's



righteousness, it is defective, for it limits it to his obedience to the law, whereas, in his service to God, he went far beyond the law. The system you speak of is not "*the true grace of God.*" Notwithstanding its speciousness—as a definition of justification through faith, it is very like something earned by us, or for us, legally, and that, by a sort of compromise of the strictness of the law's demands upon us personally. Surely, by this theory—that we are justified by Christ's doing our works for us, and *as us—we* thus keep the righteousness of the law, and therefore have a *legal* claim to the reward thereof. *His* obedience thus becomes *our* obedience; for, in principle, it is the same thing whether the obedience be performed by the sinner personally, or vicariously by Christ as his representative. The sinner, in either case, is viewed as having done his own works of law-righteousness, and by these works he is righteous, according to your statement.

Now, this view appears to me in direct collision with the declaration of the Scripture which says—"To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him *that worketh not, but believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, *his faith is counted to him for righteousness.*" (Rom. iv. 4, 5.)\* Besides, by this view, you make Christ the justifier by doing our work for us, and God's part in the matter is merely to receive the righteousness which we bring to Him.† According to this

\* Throughout this Epistle (Romans) there is not a word about Christ's fulfilling the law for our righteousness. How, then, can it be the object of faith?

† It seems to be quite puerile to say that we are not justified by *our own* works, but by Christ's; for the great question in Romans is, whether we are righteous by works at all, or through faith.

theory, God is not ostensibly the direct giver of righteousness at all. He may have given Christ to work it out on our behalf; but, in reality, He is the receiver, not the giver of righteousness. He sits as a Law-giver or Judge, and *declares* us righteous when we have done the works. But, according to Scripture, God the Father holds the supreme place in the great action of a sinner's justification. He sits upon the throne of grace, not on Mount Sinai; and freely and immediately *gives* righteousness, or justifies the sinner—the ungodly person, who has no works, either personally or vicariously, but who believes in Christ *crucified*. This exercise of God's prerogative as the gracious and immediate justifier of the sinner who believes, is materially affected by the doctrine you propound; for, if I am supposed to have kept the law, and to be thereby just, how can God, as an act of free grace, justify me Himself, on account of the *blood* or death of Christ, as it is written, "Being now justified by his blood"? How can I be legally just by the doing of the commandments in thought, word, and deed, and yet justified *by blood*? How can both be true?

A. It seems to me that this reasoning is inconclusive, and would, besides, prove too much. Inconclusive, as it confounds two things which essentially differ, viz., the fulfilling of the law in our own person, and, in that of a substitute. Besides, if this confusion were allowed, the argument based upon it seems to me to prove too much. We all agree that believers are reckoned to have died in Christ—"our old man has been crucified with him." Will it do to apply your reasoning to this fact? Is it "in

principle the same thing" to have died oneself to sin, apart from Christ, and to be reckoned as having died with him? If not, why use an argument in the one case which is inadmissible in the other?

*B.* My reasoning is against the statement that God required that I should do my work, and that Christ did my work for me, by virtue of which *I have fulfilled the law*, and am accepted as legally righteous by the Lawgiver, who accounts me as having done my works. I argue that this view disparages and throws into the shade the gracious character of God's act, as the justifier of the ungodly, without works of law or any works; and presents Him in the aspect of *Law*, requiring *from me* the fulfilment of my legal obligations, on condition of which He accepts me, and then *declares* me to be righteous. I still assert that it is the same thing, in principle, whether I do the works, or Christ for me. Christ does them *as mine*, and it is by works of law that I am righteous. I beg to say, there is no analogy between the supposed case of Christ's doing my legal works as if it were I that did them, and his vicarious death. If he had died *my death*, in the same sense as you allege he performed my legal duty, then the same reasoning would apply to both cases. But did he die *my death*? Was not his death, *his own peculiarly*; and is it not this which constitutes its atoning sufficiency? You say that we obeyed the law *in him*. Will you not also say that we made atonement in him? For you say that "we are reckoned to have died *in him*." Now, Christ did not die our death, but when we believe in him we are graciously reckoned

to have been crucified *with* him, because he died *instead* of us. It is as unscriptural to say that we died *in* Christ, as to say that we obeyed the law *in* him. If you had said that we obeyed *with* Christ, it would have been more analogous with the Scripture which says that "our old man has been crucified *with* him."

*A.* But may you not be too precise in thus insisting so pointedly on God's part in the act of justification? Is it not all God's work through Christ?

*B.* I am not more exact than the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, who assigns to God and to Christ their distinct parts in the glorious transaction of the sinner's justification. Christ is there described as God's servant, doing a work for Him in *his atoning death*, on account of which God righteously exercises His sovereign goodness in justifying him that believeth. But let me hear what Scriptures are advanced in support of the view which you have set forth.

*A.* It is written in Rom. v. 19, "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Do we not here find that as the disobedience of Adam is imputed to his offspring, so the obedience of Christ is imputed to those who believe?

*B.* I think not. The analogy instituted here is not between the imputation of Adam's *sin* and the imputation of Christ's *obedience*, but between the *consequences* resulting to us from the one and from the other. The passage simply declares that by means of one man's sin many have been constituted sinners,

and that by means of one man's obedience many shall be constituted righteous. If we might suppose Adam to have always obeyed, would his obedience have been reckoned to us as *our* obedience? 'This text does not prove the point. It states the foundation-cause, or righteous reason of imputed righteousness, but no more. It affirms a fact, and it assigns a cause, and here we are perfectly agreed; but it does not define the mode by which that fact is accomplished. It does not define the righteousness in which the believer is constituted righteous. This being so, I must look to you for another proof.

*A.* I refer you, then, to Phil. ii. 8, where we are taught that Christ, "being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Here we see that his death was the continuation and consummation of his substitutional obedience, and had the same legal character as his previous life all through. He was born "under the law," lived under the law, and died under the law. In what sense, and for what purpose was he "made under the law," if, from his very birth, he were not the substitute on whom our sins were laid?

*B.* If you examine this passage in its context, you may perceive that it is not the design of the Spirit of God in this place so much to speak of Christ as a substitute, as to present the merit of his voluntary self-abasing obedience, and its consequent reward. The height of his exaltation into heavenly glory is on account of the depth of his earthly humiliation. As the humiliation was his exclusively, so also, in a peculiar sense, was the exaltation his.

But this very passage you will find, on examination, refutes the notion that Christ was always, from his birth to his death, our sin-bearing substitute. It states, 1st, That being in the form of God, he emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant: 2nd, That being in the form of a servant, or being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

Now, if our sins were imputed to him from his incarnation, he must have been always exposed to death as the penalty of sin, and, consequently, there was no room for him further to humble himself. But if he were free from that imputation up to a certain point of his human life, then he could meritoriously humble himself, *as man*, to bear our sins, and die for them.

A. You don't seem to understand the meaning of this text. (Phil. ii. 7, 8.) What is the meaning of *μεχρι*—"unto," or "even unto death"? When was our Lord not obedient—when not "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief"? What "marred his visage" more than any man, if he were not always obeying and suffering as our sin-bearing substitute?

B. You are much mistaken if you think that I for a moment question the great truth that our Lord was always obedient, and always a man of sorrows. I admit and affirm this truth. But what I question is this: that because he was always obedient, therefore his obedience was always, in your sense, substitutional; and because he was always a sufferer, therefore he was always bearing our sins, and suffering for them as a victim.

A. But what do you say of the agony of our blessed Lord in Gethsemane? Was it not caused by the burden of our sins, and the wrath of God then pressing him?

B. I do not believe it was. "The exceeding sorrow unto death," and the agony of his soul, were not, as I judge, from the hand of Divine wrath then lying heavy upon him, but from his sensitive anticipation of the dreaded scenes—the horrors through which he was about to pass. He was about to be "delivered into the hands of sinners;" to be "made sin" for us, though he "knew no sin," and "hated iniquity." He was about to be "bruised and put to grief," and "forsaken" by Him who loved him, and whom he loved, and "whose favour (to him) was life." It was, in my apprehension, *the anticipation* of this cup which constituted the agony of that awful hour. The curtain of his privacy is here withdrawn, and we are permitted to behold the sore struggle of his distressed heart in communion with his Father. We know the issue of that fearful conflict, blessed for ever be his name! He yielded himself to be the victim in willing, obedient acquiescence to his Father's will, because he loved *the Father and us!* and because it was impossible that God could be glorified in our salvation but by his atoning death. By this conflict and victory of suffering love, we may know what it cost him to face the dreaded cross and its bitter accompaniments; and hereby we may know *how really* and *how greatly* we have been loved.

That the agony in the garden was occasioned by the *prospect* of what awaited him at the cross, will appear, I think, from two considerations:—

1st, He was there in full communion with the Father, in the consciousness of His perfect complacency. God helped him there—sending an angel from heaven to strengthen him; but on the cross He forsook him, and was “far from the words of his roaring.” How shall we account for the difference of Divine treatment, except by the solemn fact that on the cross he was bearing our sins as our substitute, and consequently *was there dealt with in judgment?* The prospect of this termination of his earthly course was often, during life, the occasion of the keenest anguish. In the 12th of John, for instance, he suddenly breaks forth in the affecting words—“Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour.”

2nd, The words of his prayer—“If it be possible, let this cup pass from me,” do surely indicate that he was not then actually drinking the cup. Does not this prayer—if it were possible, to remove the cup—plainly tell us, that, even then, the drinking it was still future? And do not his words to Peter, after this scene was past—“The cup which my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it?” as plainly lead to the same conclusion?

A. These explanations, I must admit, appear natural and easy, and are deserving of prayerful consideration. But before I allow myself to come to a conclusion on such an interesting point, I should like to add some other passages of Scripture which are adduced in support of the view which you reject. For instance, 1 Pet. ii. 24, which, it is maintained, should be translated, “Who his own self bare our



sins in his own body *up to the tree.*" Now, if this rendering be correct, do we not learn from it that our sins had been laid on him long before, and that he carried them *to the cross*?

*B.* Let us examine this passage. But, first, let me observe, that I am suspicious whenever a different rendering from the Authorized Version is resorted to in order to support a doctrine; for I regard our English Bible as one of the noblest works of man. I do not say that it has not its imperfections, but I am jealous of alterations.

The primary and proper meaning of the Greek preposition, (*ἐν*), which is here used, is "upon," and the contextual import of the passage in question, as well as the general use of the New Testament, is against your translation; and, therefore, a solitary word, forced out of its ordinary meaning, cannot weigh against such testimony.\* The apostle says, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, *being dead to sins*, might live unto righteousness." What has Christ's bearing our sins all his life to do with our being *dead*? How is it that we are dead, but by being *crucified* with him? Is it not the purport of this passage to fix our attention upon the substitutional *death* of Christ?

*A.* But what have you to say of Isaiah liii.? Does it not speak of his sin-bearing life, as well as of his propitiatory death? The fourth verse is very explicit—"He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows;" and it becomes more so, when con-

\* Where "up to," or "unto," is the meaning, as in Phil. ii. 8, the word is *μεχρι*.

nected with the statement in Matthew viii. 17, as to its finding its accomplishment in the *miracles* of Christ. Does not this reference to it by the Evangelist show, that the grief-bearing and sin-bearing of Christ were exemplified in his life, as truly as in his death? Was it not as the sin-bearer that he wrought the miracles there recorded;—nay, were not the miracles themselves the manifestation of his sin-bearing work and character? “When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.*”

B. I do not understand how *sicknesses* and *sorrows* could be imputed to Christ, neither does this Scripture prove it. *Sin*, the source of all our sorrow, was imputed to him, and expiated by his death. But as to infirmities and sorrows, he took them, as I believe, only in the way of *gracious sympathy*, and, in that grace, removed them. This view is comforting to the heart. It has the same meaning as when of old it is said of Israel—“In all their affliction He (Jehovah) was afflicted.” (Isa. lxiii. 9.) Again: it was when Christ cured their diseases, that St. Matthew tells us he took them—not when he came into the world.

This passage, observe, does not speak of *sin*, but of *the effects of sin*; and we must distinguish between them. That Christ’s life was a life of sympathy with human suffering and sorrow, which are the effects of sin, I hold as strongly as you do;

but that this passage does not establish the point for which you adduce it, is, in my judgment, perfectly clear.

Now, let me submit to you a few plain questions for your consideration. What is the meaning of Christ's revealing the Father, and doing miracles as an accursed sin-bearer? Was he bearing sins when teaching and feeding the multitude, and casting out devils with divine authority? Were our sins upon him when he was transfigured—when he entered into "the excellent glory"? Was he bearing our sin, and God's curse and wrath, when he presented himself as King to Jerusalem? Was he our Substitute in these things? And when were we responsible, under the law, to do these things, that he should do them instead of us? You see into what inconsistencies we fall, might I not say, absurdities, when we do not keep closely to Scripture.

*A.* But in all these things he was glorifying God; and we reap the benefit of them all.

*B.* True; the whole benefit and excellence of Christ's life is ours. I hold that, as decidedly as you do, though in a different way; because I say that it is ours only when we are "*in him*," or united to him. Then, as he is, so are we. (1 John iv. 17.) But what I am now maintaining is, that in doing these things, Jesus was not acting *as our sin-bearing substitute*, nor *as our substitute in any sense*.

*A.* Well, I have never made these distinctions.

*B.* But if Scripture makes them, should not we observe them, even though not sufficiently instructed to perceive their importance. Now I ask you a question. During the public ministry of our Lord,

beginning from his baptism in Jordan, was he, in your sense of substitution, doing our duty to the *law*, or was he, as the Son, revealing God's *grace* to sinners?

*A.* Were I to make a distinction, I should say, the latter. His public ministry speaks for itself as the declaration of the Father's name in grace to sinners.

*B.* I maintain, therefore, that during that period his service, in a peculiar manner, was marked by a character which was specially his own, and which could not have belonged to any one else. He made a presentation of God to sinful man, which it was not in the power, because not in the nature of law to make. In him we behold the *man* who fully vindicated the majesty of God's authority, while, at the same time, he glorified Him in the declaration of His wondrous love to us. This was *his own personal, human obedience*, throughout his whole life, but eminently in his public ministry, and super-eminently on the cross. Now, I pray you to mark. At his baptism in Jordan the heavens were opened unto him, and the Father audibly testified His delight in him. He sent him forth anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, and was "with him" in a special sense beyond what could have been previously said. But on the cross, what a difference! *There* God forsakes him. Why? Because of our sins, then and there imputed to him. But you intimate that our sins were always upon him. Why, then, was he not always forsaken?

*A.* But long before he came to the cross,—even at his baptism,—did not John point to him as

“the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world”?

*B.* Certainly, for he was always the Lamb; but the Lamb was not always bearing sin.

*A.* But why do you press the point, that our Lord was not acting as our sin-bearing substitute during the time of his public ministry?

*B.* Because, from the time sin entered into the world, God had been testing man, proving what was in him. In the course of this probation, which preceded the cross, the ministry of the Son came last in order. By him God made an appeal to the heart and conscience of the natural man, which must have produced fruit, if fruit were in him. As in the parable, God said, “What shall I do? I will send my beloved Son: *it may be* they will reverence him when they see him.” The issue proved the total pravity and ungodliness of men in the flesh. As regards their appreciation of Christ’s most gracious work in his life, “he had laboured in vain, and spent his strength for nought.” They had “both seen and hated both him and his Father.” Now, on the supposition that all trial of man was past when Christ came into the world, and that he came in no other character, and for no other purpose, ostensibly, than that of being the sin-bearer and the substitute of his people, this “*may be*” of the parable has no meaning. I do not believe that man was formally and dispensationally proved to be helpless and irrecoverable in himself, till Christ was rejected and cast out, and till then, (though known unto God are all His works from the beginning,) “the hour” had not duly arrived for Christ to take the substitutional place of

bearing man's sins, and atoning for them by death, in order to vindicate the claims of God, and meet the extreme necessity of the sinner, in accordance with perfect love. But this climax in the development of human incurableness—this justification of the cross—this notable commendation of the exceeding riches of God's grace and love, brought out by the probationary character of Christ's ministry of the Father to men, you entirely overlook, by spreading the sin-bearing, wrath-bearing and atoning sufferings of Christ over the whole of his life-time on earth. By this ministry of the Son, man in the flesh has had his last trial as to any supposed goodness in him; and in the cross, faith sees "the end of all flesh," and the beginning of God's full salvation.

A. But on this view would it not have answered that he should be made a full-grown man at once, and so enter on his public ministry, and then die without passing through the previous stages of infancy, youth, and early manhood?

B. No; because in that case he should have been of a different nature, and not *related* to us: whereas in the Law it was enacted that the right of redemption belonged only to the *kinsman*. "Forasmuch then as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he likewise himself partook of the same, that through death," &c. He must be of the same nature that had sinned. He must be man's son in all that appertained to the truth of man's nature. Therefore it is that he so often spoke of himself as "the Son of Man." Thus in the very nature that had dishonoured Him, God has been the more abundantly

glorified. In "this Son of Man," God had in all these stages of human life "a light always before Him." It is by his *death* (being such an one) that he destroys him that had the power of death, *i.e.*, the devil, and delivers them who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage. And as to the value of his life, we must not forget that one important aspect of it is, that he "left us an example, that we should follow his steps."

*A.* But still, where is righteousness to come from, if not from his vicarious life? Must it not come from his life, and not from his death?

*B.* The Scriptures, I submit, are directly opposed to your thought; for instead of intimating that our righteousness is by his life, and not by his death, they with one accord testify that we are justified by his death, and they are entirely silent as to righteousness by his vicarious life.

*A.* Do you mean to say, that the death of Christ is the righteousness in which we stand?

*B.* No: his death is not our righteousness, but it is the ground of it. It is the foundation-reason, on account of which God justifies or imputes righteousness to him that *worketh not*, but *believeth*.

*A.* I should like to hear your proofs from Scripture.

*B.* From Genesis to Revelation Scripture has but one voice. All its teachings are summed up in the explicit, unambiguous statements of the New Testament; for instance—"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in *his blood*: . . . that he might be just, and the justifier of him which *believeth in Jesus*." Again: "Much more being

justified by *his blood*." Again: "We were reconciled to God by *the death* of his Son." (Rom. iii. 25 ; v. 9, 10.) Again: "Having boldness to enter into the holiest by *the blood* of Jesus." (Heb. x. 19.) Here the blood is presented to us as the alone ground of our righteousness, and of our qualification to enter into the presence of God. To continue: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." . . . To us "also it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was *delivered* for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." (Romans iv. 3, 23.) Here the ground on which God justifies, is not our believing in Christ *keeping the law for us*, but believing on Him who raised up from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ for our justification. "I declare unto you the gospel, . . . that Christ *died* for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. xv. 1, 4.) In these inspired statements of the Gospel, is there a word to favour your theory?

The Church's praise on earth is to "him that loved us, and washed us from our sins *in his own blood*;" and in heaven—"Thou art worthy, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God *by thy blood*." (Rev. i. 5 ; v. 9.)

A. I acknowledge that these Scriptures declare very decidedly that justification is by the blood or death of Christ alone; notwithstanding, I find a difficulty in the fact that Christ kept the law, for I cannot understand why he did so, if not for us



vicariously. Surely he ~~had~~ no need to keep it for himself!

B. I have already said, that all that he did was for our sakes in a general sense ; but I do not admit that all was done for us on the principle of *substitution*—that is, that he was acting as our representative. As “the man Christ Jesus” he did keep the law as part of his own proper obedience. Being, through grace, “made of a woman, made under the law,” it was *his* obedience to keep it, and to fulfil it in every jot and tittle. Moreover, he “magnified it, and made it honourable,” inasmuch as it was *his* obedience he was performing, and *not ours*. Our obedience could not *magnify* it. If we had done all that was commanded, we should still be unprofitable servants—we had only done our duty. I am persuaded that God’s authority as Law-giver, has been more profoundly honoured by the Son’s acknowledgment of its claims on himself when he was under it, than if he had obeyed it merely as the obedience of others.

As man, Christ recognised the claims of God in every way in which all others of mankind had set at nought His authority and name. Did God require that His law, which man had broken, should be magnified? Did He require that His grace should be displayed by manifesting His Fatherly name to sinners? Did He require, finally, that one in whom there was no sin, should bear the sin, endure its penalty, and make atonement for those who had trampled on His law, and despised and hated His Fatherly name? To all this requirement, the Son, who was in the bosom of the Father, was

"obedient unto death—even the death of the cross." Therefore he could say, what none beside could say—"I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." All this was emphatically and exclusively *his obedience—his merit* before God.

A. I fear I must try your patience over much; but you will excuse me if I say I am not yet satisfied. I want to know why God should put us under His law, which says, "Do this, and thou shalt live," and yet, after all, dispense with our obedience to it, either personally or vicariously?

B. You must remember to distinguish between Jews and Gentiles. *We* are not "Jews by nature, but sinners of the Gentiles." Now the Gentiles were never put "under *the law*." The Scriptures describe them in contrast to Israel, as "*having not the law*," as "*without law*." (Romans ii. 12, 14.) Israel, Abraham's seed according to the flesh, were the only people who were put under the law by God. But previous to that covenant-relation, they had been redeemed out of Egypt by *the blood* of a lamb—the type of Christ our Passover.

Not, however, to insist on that distinction, still I say this—that if Israel were put under the law, it was to demonstrate their utter corruption and ruin by sin, in common with all flesh, and to commend the grace by which God had freely brought them out of Egypt, through blood—even the same grace by which He imputed righteousness to their father Abram, *long before the law was given*. (Rom. iii. 20; v. 20; Gal. iii. 19.)

But although all were not dispensationally

“under the law,” all were “under sin”—Jews and Gentiles alike—and were alike under a condemnation incurred ere the law entered, as it is written—“By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation.” (Rom. v. 18.) To embrace, therefore, the need of *all* God’s people, a provision was necessary which should answer, not merely for the liabilities of those who were under the law, but which should reach backwards to Adam, and onwards to the end of time, and atone, both for the transgressions that were under the law, and for the deadly disease of “sin in the flesh”—the source of all transgressions. This sufficient and all-embracing provision is the blood of him who knew no sin, and who was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. (2 Cor. v. 21.)

*A.* Do pardon and bear with me a little. I do not wish to object to what appears clear and Scriptural. But if Christ did not obey the law as our duty, I cannot see how we can have any righteousness at all; for does not righteousness consist of *works*? But what you contend for as righteousness, appears to me nothing more than the blotting out or forgiveness of sins; for instance—a man’s debts may be forgiven, or even paid, but that does not make him rich; he may be a pauper after all. Now the law says, “This do, and thou shalt live;” “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” It does not merely prohibit what ought not to be done, but it positively commands what ought to be done.

*B.* Here, again, I think you are quite mistaken.

Christ's work, I know—his work of full obedience—is the ground of righteousness; but still works do not make a man righteous. They may declare what he is;—they may manifest whether he be righteous or unrighteous in nature; and it was to demonstrate that men were sinful in their nature, that the law was given: "*The law entered that the offence might abound.*" "The righteousness which is of faith," or, in other words, imputed righteousness, is declared to be a righteousness "without the law;" that is, apart from the law: it is not derived from the law, neither is it constituted of works in any-wise. It is expressly defined to be, "*righteousness without works*;" and this righteousness is "witnessed by the law and the prophets." (Rom. iv. 6; iii. 21.)

Thus "David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord will not impute sin." (Psalm xxxii.; Romans iv.) This proves, beyond question, that, in God's mind, or as Scripture treats the matter, the *non-imputation of sin is the imputation of righteousness*. The man is righteous "whose iniquities are *forgiven*," "whose sins are *covered*," and to whom "the Lord will *not impute sin*." Is not this in direct opposition to your view? Peter makes mention of "*remission of sins*" and nothing else, as qualifying the three thousand on the day of Pentecost to receive the Holy Ghost. (Acts ii. 38.) And in Acts iii. 19 he says, "Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be *blotted out*." Philip preaches Christ *crucified*, and no more,

to the Ethiopian. (Acts viii. ; Isaiah liii.) St. Paul tells us in Acts xxvi., that they who believed in Jesus, received *forgiveness of sins and inheritance* among the sanctified. This shows that forgiveness of sins is the sufficient and only title to glory. In the synagogue of Antioch the Apostle preaches, through Christ crucified and risen, "forgiveness of sins," and that every one who believes in Him, is "*justified from all things*," &c. Thus he plainly declares, that a forgiven sinner is a justified person—"justified from all things." Where God sees no sin, *there* is righteousness with Him, whatever we may think.

Now, in conclusion, I ask—If imputed righteousness consist of imputed works, how is it that such a doctrine is nowhere to be found in Scripture? If Christ's obedience to the law be that which is imputed to us for righteousness, how is it that it is nowhere so stated? And why is the blood, or a crucified Christ, the object presented to faith as the only ground of justification, and the only theme of praise in earth or in heaven?

A. But, I would ask again, if the obedience of Christ to the law be not imputed to us, what is the righteousness imputed to us?

B. "The righteousness of God."

A. What is that?

B. God's own righteousness—His righteousness revealed in the Gospel. It is manifested in His way of dealing towards Christ and towards us.

1st. It is manifested in His way of dealing *towards Christ*. Christ, the Son and servant of God, having perfectly glorified Him in reference to our sins, God, for this meritorious service, has manifested His righ-

teousness in glorifying him with Himself. As God has been glorified by Christ on earth, so Christ has been glorified by God in heaven. The way in which Christ has eminently glorified God, is by "putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" and his glorification with God in heaven is the proof, as well as the righteous consequence thereof. The whole character of God—His moral glory—has been made good and vindicated by Christ. Jesus glorified God's righteousness by the death of the cross. It was for us he did this work. It was when dealing with the great question of sin that he thus glorified God touching His righteousness, and God in righteousness has rewarded him. How simple, yet how profoundly precious and blessed!

2ndly. It is manifested in His way of dealing *towards us*. God having been glorified by Christ as to our sins, now manifests His righteousness in justifying or imputing righteousness to him that believeth in Jesus. God's righteousness in glorifying Christ is only the just recompense of reward due to his desert; but in justifying us, though His righteousness be indeed displayed therein, because of atonement, yet it is not as a matter of debt, (save to Christ himself,) but of grace. "The *gift* of righteousness" is graciously bestowed on us in righteousness. The meet recompense to Christ for his meritorious work is that the righteousness which he has glorified should be imputed to us on whose account it has been glorified. The *value* of this work of Christ (the work itself was exclusively his own) is therefore reckoned to us. In justifying us in the very righteousness which has been glorified—*emphatically by his atoning death*—

God only gives Christ's claim its due. This righteousness is reckoned to us—it is ours—we are it—“made the righteousness of God in him.”

A. I must admit that “the righteousness of Christ” is not the Scriptural expression, yet I find great difficulty in defining the exact meaning of “the righteousness of God.” Is the attribute of God imputed to us?

B. We may find difficulty in explaining it, but this is no reason why we should supersede what is Scriptural by what is not. God is wiser than men. You ask, “Is the attribute of God imputed to us?” Scripturally speaking, I don't know what you mean, for such a word is not used in Scripture. All I know is, that the righteousness of God, which Christ glorified, is the very righteousness in which we stand accepted. Christ's own condition in resurrection—his exaltation in heavenly glory—is founded on his work; and you and I, as the issue of that work—estimated and acknowledged thus by God—are in *him*; (not merely in his work;) in him who is where he is, and what he is there, because of his work.

A. You don't mean to say that we who believe are accounted as righteous as God Himself?

B. Most assuredly I do. If God imputes righteousness to a man, it must be His own righteousness; for He acknowledges no righteousness less than His own as the title to heavenly glory. His righteousness is not made up or constituted of works, though it is manifested by His works. Christ, personally, is the living expression of this righteousness. When we are in *him*, he is “the Lord our Right-

teousness," and we are "made the 'righteousness of God *in him*."

A. Well, is not this, in substance, very like what I have been saying all along? These last-mentioned Scriptures are the very texts by which I would prove my view of imputed righteousness.

B. Yes; but you attach to these passages a signification which, in my judgment, is wholly unwarranted. The doctrine which you have been propounding is, that we are righteous by imputing to us a legal obedience rendered *for us*, and which *we* are therefore considered as having rendered. Whereas the Scripture states that, in the exercise of His free grace, God bestows upon us "*the gift of righteousness*"—even His own righteousness. Now although there is no separating between Christ and his work, the merit and savour of which are always connected with his person, always pleaded for us in his priestly office, and always acknowledged by God, yet is there not a vast distinction between maintaining that Christ has wrought out a certain amount of good works, which are placed to our credit, as done by us; and maintaining that, being made one with him in resurrection, we participate with him in all the results of his sin-atonement, God-glorifying death, as well as in all the fragrance of his life, which is ever connected with his person? *He himself* is our righteousness—not his work.

A. I have always interpreted the words, "made the righteousness of God *in him*," as if they meant "*through him*"—that is, through the imputation of his work.

B. I am not aware of any place in Scripture



where the words "in him," have that signification. In this dispensation, when we believe in him, we are "*in him*;" and the being in him does not carry the idea of substitution, but of oneness—of union. He is now the Head of his body, the Church, and we are individually "members of his body—of his flesh, and of his bones." A woman, when married, is one with her husband, and participates with him in his name, honours, and possessions. In him—in all that he is and has, she glories; yet she never thinks of saying that what he has done, she has done, nor is she ever considered as having done it. Thus it is with us in our relation to Christ. "As he *is*, so are we in this world." It is not said, as he has done, nor yet as he was, but "*as he is*." This is the measure of our acceptableness before God, as well as the measure of His perfect love to us. (1 John iv. 17.) God "hath called us to the fellowship of his Son." "*In him* we have redemption." "*In whom . . .* ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." "There is no condemnation to them which are *in Christ Jesus*." We are "*accepted in the Beloved*." "Blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places *in Christ*."

A. Speaking of being "in him," reminds me of a point which I ought to have advanced before this. Is there not a parallel drawn in Romans v. between the first Adam and the second? As we were in the first when he sinned, and thus have sinned in him, may it not be inferred that so we were in the second Adam when he obeyed, and have thus obeyed in him?

B. Do not be offended if I tell you that the

theory which you set forth, taken as a whole, is indigested and self-contradictory. Hitherto, you have been maintaining that Christ did everything *for us, instead of us, as our substitute*; so that we, *through him*, have obeyed. Now you shift your ground, and intimate that we were *in him* when he obeyed, and have thus in him fulfilled all righteousness. But how can both be true at the same time—substitution and union? How could he act *instead of us*, if we were *in him*—in union with him—as part of him? If we did these works of righteousness as being one with him, this is not substitution, for how could he act instead of himself? Neither is there imputation in this case; for how could that be imputed to me *as done by me*, which has been *actually* done by me?

But, on the supposition that we were in him, by union, when he obeyed, let me ask, what was our supposed personal condition then? Was it as “in the flesh,” or, as “in the spirit”—carnal or spiritual? If “in the flesh,” then carnal-minded sinners were in Christ—had union with him; which is impossible, seeing that righteousness hath no fellowship with unrighteousness, and light hath no communion with darkness. If, on the other hand, you will say that we were one with him “in the spirit,” then as spiritual, we died on the cross, and made atonement also!

A. Then if I understand your view of our relation to Christ, it is this:—our union with him was the eternal purpose of God; but we are actually united to him only when we believe: and we are united to him, not as a man “after the flesh,” (2 Cor. v. 16)—

not as a Jew, under the law ; nor yet as our substitute on the cross (which he *was* ; ) but we are united to him as he now *is*—risen from the dead, and glorified in heaven.

*B.* Yes, just so. His resurrection from the dead, and glorification in heaven, are the result or consequence of his obedience, even unto death, on earth. Into fellowship with him, in this risen and glorified state, we are called by the grace of God. We are in Christ as the glorified Son of Man, and, in him, *we* are made the righteousness of God, even as *he* is.

*A.* But do you hold that Christ's living obedience has nothing to do in the great matter of our acceptance with God ? If so, I should feel that I had suffered much loss.

*B.* And so should I. But this is not the case ; for although the Scriptures always base our justification upon the meritoriousness of his atoning death, yet the value of that death is, that it was the consummation of an obedience which marked the whole of his previous life. "He knew no sin," but he was "made sin for us." If in his previous life he had known sin, he could not, at its close, have been "*made sin*." The absolute perfection of his life from the beginning of his course on earth—free from every taint and imputation of sin—beautiful in God's eyes—sets forth more conspicuously the value of his substitution, when, at its close, he was "made sin for us."

In truth, his whole life on earth, even to the death of the cross, is looked upon as one continuous act of obedience ; and although what you call his living obedience was not substitutional for sin, yet

was it connected with his person, and constituted very much indeed of the sweet smelling savour of his sacrificial death for us. God looked down from heaven with infinite complacency upon his whole path of suffering obedience. "Behold mine Elect, in whom my soul delighteth." And this was not a silent approbation. On more than one occasion it was audibly declared. After Jesus had passed thirty years in private, God opened the heavens over him, and said, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." When he came to the close of his public ministry, God's excellent glory overshadowed him, and His voice declared—"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." And when He raised him from the dead, and set him at His own right hand, He testified His delight in him as the accomplisher of our redemption. It is in him—so infinitely well-pleasing unto God—it is in "*the Beloved*" that "he hath made us accepted." We therefore, as being in him, share with him in all God's delight in him. Not one jot or tittle of all that he did on earth, is forgotten by God, nor can the sweet savour of his precious service be ever separated from his blessed person now glorified in heaven. His "fruit remaineth." In him, I say, we are accepted. His acceptableness is ours. God delights in us as being in him.

Do not then imagine, because I view things in a different light, that I attach little value to the life of Christ. In my judgment, *I* put more honour upon it than *you* do. Neither give place to the idea that you are robbed, by this doctrine, of anything that you have in Christ. Instead of being a loser, you are

a gainer by it. *You* esteem his life as constituting merely a legal righteousness; *I* esteem it as constituting much more. I maintain that we are justified, or made righteous, by his death; and that being so justified, we have, *by union with him*, fellowship with him in all the acceptableness of his perfect life, which is ever inseparable from his *person*. We are "accepted in the Beloved." This, as I judge, is much more than is implied in the conventional idea of "the righteousness of Christ."

*A.* I must acknowledge that your view of imputed righteousness appears more simple, and more comprehensive and magnificent, than that which I have been accustomed to hold. It appears also to exalt the grace of God in the *free* bestowment of righteousness. According to it, I also perceive, that by union with Christ, I have all the value of his perfect obedience during his life, instead of having it, as I supposed, by way of substitution. And I acknowledge also that I can more readily apprehend and realize my justification and title to all blessings by my conscious union with him in heaven, than by looking back to his obedience on earth, although the one is inseparable from the other. This, I think, I see plainly. I must admit, also, that you have pointed out difficulties and inconsistencies in the other view which do not appear in this. However, I must not form a hasty decision; for what you have brought before me is so contrary to that which I have hitherto held, that it would not be right, without prayer and mature consideration, to decide on such an important point.

*B.* It is, indeed, an important subject, and the

difference between the opposite views is not one that consists in mere words. It is a difference which involves right apprehensions of the marvellous greatness of God's love, in making us, by His own free gift and act, nothing less than "the righteousness of God" in His glorified Son. It is a difference which involves a right estimate of the security and heavenly character of our acceptance, and the motives which lead to elevation of walk and holiness of life. For, my estimate of the righteousness in which I stand before God, will, of necessity, give character to the righteousness in which I believe I ought to walk before men. If it be a legal righteousness, my sense of obligation will be limited by the law. But if it be Divine righteousness, as exemplified in Christ, my sense of responsibility will be increased according to my more exalted privilege.

Besides, the conscience being enlightened as to how I ought to walk as a new and risen man in Christ, a mere legal righteousness would never satisfy it; for it is not for transgressions of the law that my heart so often condemns me, but for things inconsistent with my heavenly calling and position as one with a glorified Christ, who is the measure of my acceptance, the rule of my walk, and the great High Priest of my profession.

I need not pursue this subject now; but there are other truths which are totally obscured, if not virtually lost, by maintaining the merely legal and earthly character of the "imputed righteousness of Christ," as it is called.

A. Do you think that correct views on this point

are of vital importance, as involving the safety of the soul?

*B.* No, decidedly not; for though it is always of importance for the prosperity of the soul to have Scriptural views of the truth, (for we are sanctified through the truth,) yet I am far from saying that absolutely correct views on this and many other subjects of revelation, are essential to salvation. He that believeth in Jesus is "in him," though he may be ignorant of many of his blessings; but then, it is of the last importance to his growth in grace that he should learn what that grace is, by the greatness of the salvation in which he has part. Here, alas! we all come short; but God is "very pitiful and of tender mercy" towards us. He has compassion on us in our ignorance, and bears with our infirmities. He esteemeth right affections towards Himself more highly than clear ideas about doctrine without such affections. But our love, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, and the holy and heavenly character of our walk on earth, must be materially affected by the measure of spiritual light which we obtain from the Scriptures concerning the righteousness in which we stand accepted before God, and the largeness of the love which has bestowed it. We have been brought into the closest connection with Himself; insomuch that if we have not Christ, we have no righteousness, and if we walk not in him, we have no true experience of what God has made us in him. If we forget what we are before God in Christ, we lose power over the world, and are deprived of spiritual strength to glorify God on the earth.

*A.* There is something truly grand in being

“*made the righteousness of God in him*”—in the glorified Christ. I am very thankful for what you have communicated. I purpose to examine Scripture more carefully, and I hope with increased instruction and pleasure; and I pray that my eyes may be opened to discover more of the exceeding riches of His grace, and that through the Holy Ghost, I may be led, according to His promise, into all the truth.

*B.*—Before we separate allow me—though at the risk of saying some things over again—to make a few concluding remarks.

The manifestation of righteousness in a state of things where sin has entered, and has to be dealt with, is very different from righteousness where sin is not—I mean as to its vindication. If there had been no interference of God for the holy and glorious removal of sin, the elect unfallen angels might have seen the *punishment* of fallen angels and men, but they could not know the righteousness of God as manifested in dealing with sin on the cross. It is by the Gospel that “the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith.” The righteousness of the man who is just by faith, by far exceeds the righteousness of Adam before he sinned, or of an elect angel. In truth, the holy angels learn the glory of God’s righteousness by the cross. (1 Peter, i. 12.) Will any one say that the righteousness of unfallen angels is equal to God’s? But Christ’s righteousness is; for he manifested, vindicated, glorified it; therefore our righteousness is God’s righteousness,

C



for we are in Christ—"made the righteousness of God in him."

Your definition of God's righteousness is, that it is the law or decalogue delivered to Israel from Mount Sinai, and that the keeping of this rule is the righteousness in which we stand. Now God was only partially revealed in that dispensation; and therefore man's love to Him which it commanded, could, at best, be only according to the measure of God's revelation of Himself then and therein made. That law declared that God would "*show mercy to them that loved Him, and kept His commandments.*" It said nothing of His love to sinners. But Christ's obedience or righteousness was not merely to fulfil man's obligation thus defined—not merely to do what Adam, or his offspring similarly circumstanced, ought to have done. It immeasurably exceeded that rule, inasmuch as he dealt with *sin* to "put it away" from before God, "by the sacrifice of himself." This was not law-righteousness. It was no command of the law for one who was righteous to die instead of the unrighteous. But it was *God's will* that this should be done; and Christ obediently said, "I come to do thy will, O God." We know what that will was—"that by one offering he should perfect for ever them that are sanctified." Again: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. . . . This commandment have I received"—from God as the lawgiver? Nay, but from "my Father."

In the death of the Cross, righteousness is made known and honoured above any thing that law could

do; for while sin was forbidden by the law, but in vain, it has received, by the meritorious sacrifice of Christ, a judgment which, in the sight of God, constitutes its nullity. (Heb. ix. 26.) Yet this superlative act of obedience finds no place in your definition of Christ's vicarious righteousness, although, in laying down his life for us, he was truly and only, in the full vicarious sense, our substitute. Why do you not say that we get the credit of "putting away sin" by the death of the cross, seeing that, beyond all controversy, Christ died this death for us? and why do you rather say that he kept the law for us, so that we are credited with having kept it, although from beginning to end, the Scripture never intimates such a thing? The only place where mention is made of his substitutional work in connection with the law, is the cross. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a tree." Christ did more in the way of righteousness for glory to God, than consisted in keeping the law for us and our justification. He exceeded the righteousness of the law, but did he exceed the righteousness of GOD? No; he manifested it, and he is the "righteousness of God;" and this is what we are, through grace, in him. He is therefore "the *end* [not merely the fulfilment, but the termination] of the law, for righteousness to every one that believeth." (Rom. x. 4.) Why should Christ supersede the law *for righteousness*, if his obedience to it be the righteousness of believers? That this is the meaning of this text is plain from what follows in the same chapter; for after saying,

“If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved”—he adds, by way of explanation, “for with the heart man believeth *unto righteousness*.” Here the object of faith is God raising Christ from the dead, “who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.” (Rom. iv. 23–25.) But according to your theory, the object of faith is Christ keeping the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

There is another important point which I wish you would consider. It is the connection of *life* with righteousness. Though they are to be distinguished, they are not to be separated. St. Paul tells us (Gal. iii. 21,)—“If there had been a law given which could have given life, [or made alive,] verily righteousness should have been by the law.” Here we see that it is as foreign to the nature and intention of law to make alive, as to make righteous. All it could do was to minister death and condemnation to sinners. The question at issue under the law, was the prolongation of man’s natural Adam-life, and that *on the earth*—the scene of his being and of his blessings. The idea of his having a title *to heaven* by keeping the law is never contemplated; it is preposterous, and confounds the difference drawn in 1 Cor. xv., between the two Adams—the first being of the earth, earthy; the second, the Lord from (or of) heaven.

It is in Christ risen from the dead that we have the gift of life, as well as the gift of righteousness. “The gift of God is eternal life, through [or in, *εν*] Jesus Christ our Lord.” But on what ground is

this gift of eternal life bestowed?—on the ground of Christ's obedience to the law? Nay; but because he laid down his life for us. Throughout the Scriptures the gift of life is unquestionably based upon the *death* of Christ alone. One quotation will be sufficient for our purpose:—"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."

Finally: the exaltation of Christ to his present position on the throne of God, and his title to "all things," is not because he kept the law for us, but because of the excellent value of his death; by which consummate act of righteousness he so emphatically glorified God. It is true he could not have taken that position if he were not absolutely Divine; but it is equally true, if we look at his Godhead alone, that in that respect he was incapable of exaltation. We speak of him as "the Man Christ Jesus," who died, and "whom God hath highly exalted." Every step of his glorious progress from the grave is founded upon, and is the result of the priceless value of his obedient death.

Did the God of peace bring him again from the dead? It was "*through the blood* of the everlasting covenant." (Heb. xiii. 20.) Has he gone into heaven? It was "*by his own blood* he entered in once into the holy place." (Heb. ix. 12.) Has he sat down on the throne of the Majesty on high? It was "when he had by himself *purged our sins*." (Heb. i. 3.) Has he been crowned with glory and honour? It was "*for the suffering of death*." (Heb. ii. 9.) Has God given him a name above every

name?—shall every knee bow to that name, of things in heaven and things on the earth, and things under the earth—and shall every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father? It is because he was “obedient unto death, even *the death of the cross.*” (Phil. ii. 8–11.)

But Christ gave himself *for us*. Therefore his blood is the foundation of our righteousness, and of our title to share with him in all the glory resulting from his blood, to him and to us.

Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift!

26 SE60

THE END.



