

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Christ's death pay the exact penalty you deserved?**

**Did Christ's death pay the exact penalty you deserved? - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/7/24 20:36**

(edit: I changed the title to make it clearer what the subject was)

This is from ([http://www.gospeltruth.net/Barnes\\_atonement/barnesindex.htm](http://www.gospeltruth.net/Barnes_atonement/barnesindex.htm)) The Atonement by Albert Barnes chapter 7. It is the #1 recommended book by Leonard Ravenhill.

I think this is very good teaching.

btw, the doctrine he's refuting is called "Imputed Righteousness".

edit: Let me make it clear by "Imputed Righteousness" I am referring to the doctrine in which Christ's track record becomes your track record, where God doesn't see you but sees Jesus, where Jesus' righteousness is transferred to your account. I am not talking about God imputing to a man righteousness as it says in James.

---

**(3.) It is not implied in the doctrine of the atonement that the same kind of suffering was endured which would have been by those for whom it was made.**

It cannot, indeed, be denied that this view has been, and is still, entertained by some who believe in the doctrine of the atonement; and it would be difficult to avoid this if it were an essential part of the doctrine that Christ endured the literal penalty of the law; for then the atonement would require the same kind of suffering, as well as the same amount of suffering, which the law demanded as a penalty for its violation.

But in reference to this view of the atonement the following considerations are decisive:

(a.) The essential idea in the doctrine of the atonement is that of substitution or vicariousness. If the doctrine of substitution is admitted at all, it would seem to be most probable that it would extend to the kind of suffering and to the amount of suffering, as well as to the sufferer himself. For the same reason that it is admissible in reference to one of these points, it must be admissible in reference to the others also; and it cannot be assumed that there is a substitution in one of them only, or that the same principle may not be extended to all that enters into the notion of the atonement.

(b.) It is nowhere affirmed in the Scriptures that the Redeemer endured the same kind of suffering which they for whom he died would have endured if they had borne the penalty of the law in their own persons. It is, indeed, abundantly affirmed that he died for sinners; that he bore the sin of many; that the Lord had laid on him the iniquity of all; that he was made a curse for us; that he was wounded for our transgressions and was bruised for our iniquities. But it is nowhere affirmed that the sufferings which he endured in behalf of the guilty were of the same nature as those which the guilty themselves endure for their own crimes; and it would be impossible for man to embrace such a doctrine if it were affirmed.

(c.) It would be impossible for a substitute to endure the same sufferings which the sinner himself will endure in the future world for his sins. There are sufferings caused by sin which belong only to the consciousness of guilt, and these sufferings cannot be transferred to another. The sin itself cannot be transferred; and, as it is impossible to detach the suffering from the consciousness of guilt, it follows that a substitute cannot endure the same kind of suffering which the sinner would himself endure. Remorse of conscience, for example, one of the keenest sources of suffering to the guilty, and which will be a most fearful part of the penalty of the law in the future world, cannot be transferred. I cannot be made to feel remorse for what another has done. I may feel deep regret that it was done; I may feel shame, mortification, and humiliation from the fact that it was done by one who is intimately connected with me; I may suffer deeply in person, in property, or in my social position, on account of the offence; but I cannot be made to feel remorse. There is no way conceivable by which this feeling can be transferred from the guilty to the innocent. To transfer it is not an object of power; for, by the eternal and unchangeable constitution of things, it is attached only to the crime and the criminal; and, as it is impossible that the guilt should be transferred, so it is impossible that the remorse which belongs to it should be made over to another.

It follows, therefore, that, whatever may enter into an atonement, it cannot be implied that the substitute endured the sa

me kind of sufferings which the guilty would themselves endure.

**(4.) It is not meant by the atonement that the same amount of suffering was endured which would have been endured by the guilty themselves.**

It is not to be denied that it has been maintained that Christ did actually endure the same amount of suffering which the elect would have suffered if they had borne the penalty of the law themselves. This, indeed, has been held to be essential to the very nature of the atonement; and the whole conception of the atonement, according to this view, is that it is a mere transfer of guilt and suffering from the guilty to the innocent.

But the objections to this view are so insuperable that it is remarkable that the opinion has ever been held.

(a.) It is impossible that this should have occurred unless the Divine nature actually suffered. If that were so, then it might be conceivable that an amount of suffering might have been endured in the time during which the Redeemer was on the cross which would be equal to all that those for whom he died would endure if in their own persons they bore the penalty of the law forever; for, if an infinite Being could thus suffer, the very fact that he is infinite would make such a supposition possible. But on no other supposition can it be conceived that, in the hours in which the Redeemer hung on the cross, or in the whole length of a human life, an amount of suffering could have been endured which would be equal to what countless millions could endure in the world of woe if prolonged to eternity.

(b.) The supposition that such an amount of suffering is necessary, is contrary to the essential notion of an atonement. An atonement is, properly, an arrangement by which the literal infliction of the penalty due to sin may be avoided; it is something which may be substituted in the place of punishment; it is that which will answer the same end which would be secured by the literal infliction of the penalty of the law. It is not a commercial transaction, a matter of debt and payment, of profit and loss. It pertains to law, to government, to holiness; not to literal debt and payment. Sin is crime, not debt; it is guilt, not a failure in a pecuniary obligation. The atonement pertains to love, and mercy, and truth, and kindness, as well as to justice. It looks benignantly on a world of sinners; it regards a race of offenders with compassion; it seeks to alleviate and lessen suffering; and it is not, therefore, the cold and stern business of paying a debt, of meeting the mere demands of justice and of law. It seeks to bring back wanderers by the consideration that God loves them, that they may be forgiven, that salvation is free for all men if they choose to avail themselves of it. It is real and not imaginary salvation. It proceeds on the supposition that there is gain to the universe by the atonement, and that it will lessen the amount of misery; not that it is a mere transfer of pain from the guilty to the innocent.

(c.) If the same amount of suffering were endured by him who makes the atonement which would have been by the guilty themselves, it is obvious that there would have been no gain to the universe; no augmented happiness, no diminution of suffering. The simple and the sole account of the matter would be, that there had been a transfer of just so much suffering from the guilty to the innocent; a setting over of so much debt from him who owed it to him who did not. There might, indeed, be benevolence in him who assumed the debt or who endured the pain, but there would be no diminution of the actual suffering endured in the universe; and it would be impossible to answer the question which would be asked, whether it is desirable that punishment should be transferred from the guilty to the innocent; whether it would not be better, if the same amount of suffering is to be endured, that it should be borne by him who does deserve it than by him who does not. This question it would be difficult to answer even if the substitute were wholly voluntary in assuming the suffering in the case: it becomes wholly impossible to answer it if it is imposed upon the sufferer and exacted of him.

(d.) It is clear that, if such were the nature of the atonement, there could be no mercy in the case. When a debt is paid, there is no forgiveness; when a penalty is endured, there is no mercy. It is an affair of strict and inexorable justice. In the case of one who should be willing to pay the debt or to endure the suffering, there may be the highest benevolence; but there is no mercy exhibited by him to whom the debt is paid or the penalty of whose law has been borne. If it is a pecuniary transaction, it is a matter of indifference to him to whom the debt is owing whether it is paid by him who contracted it, or by a friend; and in a case where it is supposed that the exact punishment due to sin is borne by another, whatever kindness there may be in him who endures it, there is no mercy in him who has exacted the penalty, though he has accepted the offering made by the substitute. The full penalty has been exacted, and all the demands in the case have been complied with. It would have been kindness, indeed, in an Egyptian to have come in voluntarily and aided the oppressed and burdened Hebrew to furnish the 'tale of bricks;' but there would have been no kindness or compassion evinced by the taskmaster who had appointed the task, for the whole demand would have been complied with. So far as he who performed the work was concerned, and so far as the burdened Hebrew was concerned, it would have been a transaction of mere law and justice; so far as the taskmaster was concerned, there would have been in the case neither mercy nor compassion.

Now, it need scarcely be said that this view is entirely contrary to all the representations of the atonement in the Scriptures. Nothing is more plain than that the whole transaction there is represented as one of mercy; that it is designed to illustrate the love, as well as the justice, of God.

If it should be said that there was mercy in the gift of a Saviour, and that so far as that is concerned the transaction is one of mercy, though so far as the law is concerned the transaction is one of justice, it may be replied that this is not the representation of the Bible. The idea of mercy pervades it throughout. It is not only mercy in providing an atonement; it is mercy to the sinner. There is mercy in the case. There is love. There is more than a mere exaction of the penalty. There is more than a transfer. There is a lessening of suffering. There is a substitution of a less amount of pain as actually endured in the place of the pain that was threatened. There is an actual gain of happiness to the universe; not a mere transfer of so much pain from the guilty to the innocent. This representation is apparent everywhere in the Scriptures; and no one can rise from the perusal of the New Testament without the impression that the scheme is one that lays the foundation for gratitude and thanksgiving as an exercise of mercy in the largest sense, and that the songs of the redeemed in heaven are not based on the idea that it is a transaction of mere justice, or on the idea that it is a mere commercial transaction, a quid pro quo, but on the idea that a new provision has been introduced into the government of the universe, by which suffering may be DIMINISHED.

**(5.) It is not meant by the atonement that Christ endured the literal penalty of the law.**

The penalty of the law, as we have seen, is what is threatened or inflicted by the lawgiver as an expression of his sense of the value of the law and of the evil of violating it. The penalty may be measured or determined (a) by an actual statement on his part of what he will inflict, or what the violation of the law deserves, or (b) by what actually comes upon the offender under his administration as the consequence of violating the law. In other words, we may learn what is the penalty of the law from revelation, or from observation of the actual course of events, or from both combined. The actual threatening may or may not cover the whole ground; and what the penalty is, may be learned partly from the statement, and partly from observation. As a matter of fact, we ascertain, in a great measure, what the penalty of violating the Divine law is, from observation. Thus, we learn what is the penalty of intemperance, partly from the previous statement of what will be the consequences, and partly from an actual observation of the evils which come upon the drunkard. To know what the real penalty is, we must look at all those consequences on the body and the soul; on the property and the peace of the drunkard; on his family and his reputation; on the effects in delirium tremens, in his wretched death, in his dishonoured memory, and in the woes endured forever. All these, and not a part of them, are designed to express the Lawgiver's sense of the value of the law and the evil of its violation. To endure, therefore, the penalty of the law in the case of intemperance is to bear all the evils which it actually brings on the offender in this world and in the world to come. If a substitute, therefore, should endure the literal penalty of the law, all must be endured which would actually come upon the offender himself.

It should be added, moreover, that a penalty is what is denounced against the offender himself and no other. The law utters no threat against the innocent; it inflicts no suffering on those who obey it, which can properly be regarded as punishment. The crime and the penalty are in the same line; they pertain to the same person; they cannot be separated except as the penalty shall be removed by pardon or substitution; they are not shifting and vacillating; they are not capable of being transferred to different persons. They can no more be separated than the qualities of colour, ductility, malleability, or weight, for example, can be separated from gold and transferred to silver or lead.

If we look, then, at what actually follows from the infraction of the Divine law, and what is, therefore, a part of the penalty, we shall see that there are sufferings which could not by any possibility be transferred to a substitute. They are of such a nature that they always adhere to the offender himself; and it is absolutely certain, therefore, that the Redeemer did not endure them on the cross.

(a.) Remorse of conscience is manifestly a part of the penalty of the law; that is, it is a portion of what the law inflicts as expressing the sense which the Lawgiver entertains of the value of the law and of the evil of its violation. But this is connected only with the personal violation of the law. It is never found in an innocent bosom. It never springs up from the performance of a right action. It can in no way be connected with the consciousness of innocence. It has all the marks of being a mere Divine appointment designed to furnish evidence to the soul itself that what has been done is wrong, and to be a measure, of the wrong as it is estimated by the lawgiver. There is no more certain proof that there is a moral government, and that God is a lawgiver, than is furnished by the fact that the mind is made to judge of the evil of its own doings, and that this silent but terrible infliction comes upon the violator of law through the action of the mind itself. It is an internal arrangement, connected with the very workings of the soul, which could have been originated only by the Maker of th

e soul, and who intends that sin shall always be punished.

Yet it is certain that the Redeemer never suffered remorse of conscience. In the history of his life there is not a hint that can be tortured into evidence that he did; and in the nature of the case it was impossible that he should. For remorse cannot be attached to innocence. It is the result and companion of guilt, and it CANNOT be transferred from the guilty to the innocent. I may weep for the sin of others; I may be involved in calamity on account of their guilt; I may hang my head in shame when one who is closely connected with me has been guilty of crime; but I can never be made to feel remorse on account of the guilt of any other being but myself. It is not an object of power to make this feeling spring up in the mind of any other than the offender himself. And if this is true, then it is certain that there is one portion of the penalty of the law which the Redeemer did not endure in making an atonement.

(b.) Equally certain is it that he did not endure eternal death.

It will be admitted, by those who believe in the necessity of an atonement, that eternal death was the penalty of the law. So far, therefore, as they are concerned, this may be assumed; and this is all that is necessary to be assumed in considering the point now before us.

Assuming that the penalty of the law is eternal death, then it is plain, as a matter of simple fact, that the penalty was not endured in making the atonement. Fearful and awful as the sufferings of the Redeemer were, they were not eternal. They were closed in a few hours; and by no possibility of fiction can it be imagined that they were eternal. If it should be said that they were equal in amount to the eternal sufferings of those for whom he died, whatever might be true on that question, yet as a matter of fact they were not eternal duration. But, if the punishment of the wicked will be eternal, it is clear that that is a part of the penalty of the law. The lengthening out of the duration of the suffering to eternity is not a circumstance which has been added since the law was broken as supplementary to the original threatening, and it is not that which springs up from the mere nature of the case independently of the Divine appointment. No man can possibly hold that the Redeemer endured eternal sorrow; and no man, therefore, who believes that the penalty of the law is eternal death, can consistently maintain that he endured the literal penalty of the law.

**Re: Did Christ pay the penalty you deserved? Are you sure? - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/7/24 21:05**

Brother what is your purpose in posting these things other than to bicker? Why would you want to overthrow the faith of some, who are trusting in Christ alone for their salvation, and have a clear conscience, only to have you bring in these kinds of things?

Does this not do away with your theory-

Isa 53:4 Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

Isa 53:5 **But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.**

Isa 53:6 All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and **the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.**

Isa 53:10 Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: **when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin**, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.

Isa 53:11 **He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.**

Could there be a reason Peter quotes from this very chapter in his First Epistle-

1Pe 2:24 **Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree**, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.

1Pe 2:25 **For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.**

What of Christ's own words-

Mat 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and **to give his life a ransom for many.**

Mat 26:28 For **this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.**

Or this-

Heb 9:28 **So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many;** and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

Or this-

Eph 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, **even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;**

**Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/7/24 21:19**

I'm not sure what you mean roaringlamb. None of the scriptures you mentioned say anything against what was posted.

Let me post this follow-up as to what the author believes the atonement achieved. These are excerpts from the book.

---

(1.) The atonement is something substituted in the place of the penalty of the law, which will answer the same ends as the punishment of the offender himself would. It is instead of his punishment. It is something which will make it proper for a lawgiver to suspend or remit the literal execution of the penalty of the law, because the object or end of that penalty has been secured, or because something has been substituted for that which will answer the same purpose. In other words, there are certain ends proposed by the appointment of a penalty in case of a violation of the law; and if these ends are secured, then the punishment may be remitted and the offender may be pardoned. That which will secure these ends is an atonement.

(2.) The atonement SECURES reconciliation between God and man.

1. On the part of God.

In the atonement it is supposed that Christ has done as much to maintain the honour of the law as would have been done, had it been personally obeyed by all who will be saved by him; that he has done as much to maintain that honour as would have been done had its penalty been literally borne by all for whom he died; that he has done as much to deter others from violating that law as would have been done by the infliction of the penalty on the offenders themselves; that he has done as much to show the sense entertained by God of the evil of sin as would have been done had the fearful consequences of sin come upon the guilty themselves. If all this was done, then it is clear that there would be no obstacle on the part of God to reconciliation with those who had violated the law.

2. The atonement removes the obstacles to reconciliation on the part of man.

We have seen that in human administrations of law one great difficulty in the way of pardon is that there is no security for the reformation and future good conduct of him who is pardoned, but that, if an influence could be connected with the instrument of pardon which would secure this, the difficulty would be removed. This is contemplated in the atonement. It is an essential idea in its nature that it will secure this effect, that in the gift of a Saviour, in his character, in the manifestations of his love, and in his sufferings in behalf of others, there is that which will secure repentance and reformation on the part of the sinner. By the greatness of the sufferings of him who made it, the atonement is adapted to convince the sinner of the evil of those sins for which he died; by the manifestation of love, it is adapted to make an appeal to the gratitude of man; by the fact that those sufferings were endured in our behalf, it is fitted most deeply to appeal to the hearts of the guilty. We are always more deeply affected with the sufferings of the innocent than with the sufferings of the guilty. The guilty we feel ought to suffer, and our judgments approve of the punishment if it be not beyond the desert of the offender. The feeling of compassion is checked and bounded by the fact that what is endured is deserved. We are deeply affected by the sufferings of others if they are the consequences of our own offenses. A young man might care very little about the calamities that would come upon himself as the consequence of a career of folly and dissipation, while he might be deeply affected at the suffering which he has brought upon a sister or a mother. When all else is ineffectual in recovering an intemperate man from his course of life, when his own disgrace and suffering fail to lead him to reformation, there is still one source of appeal that may be effectual. The sufferings of his wife and children may still be appealed to, with the hope that his heart may be touched with a sense of the calamities which he is bringing upon others, though insensible to the woes which he brings upon himself. So, also, in a penitentiary, as has been intimated before, there is no hope of the permanent reformation of an offender from the mere infliction of punishment. Probably a case has never occurred in which the darkness of a dungeon, severity of labour, starvation, chains and stripes, have melted the heart of an offender and brought him to repentance. So well is this now understood that the only hope of securing repentance and reformation in a prison is from a side-influence, an influence that goes forth from sympathy and compassion; not from the turnkey,

but from the heart of some coward, who comes to show the prisoner that he has another purpose than that of riveting more closely his chains. It is not law that reforms: it is love, compassion, kindness. In accordance with this view, it is a fact that the reformation of the world has been accomplished, as far as it has been accomplished at all, not by judgment and wrath, but by the gospel of Christ. The great instrument in bringing men to repentance and securing their reformation has been the story of the Redeemer's sufferings. Floods, flames, wars, earthquakes, the plague, the pestilence, have done little to reform the guilty. The human heart grows hard under the infliction of judgment; and though punishment may restrain the guilty and awaken them to reflection, it does not convince and convert. Crimes are multiplied even in the ravages of the pestilence, and men abandon themselves to licentiousness and to corruption when the plague is sweeping away its thousands of victims. It has been, in fact, the manifestation of mercy that has been made the means of melting the hearts of men and of turning them to God.

Reconciliation is in fact produced between God and man by the atonement. God becomes the friend of the pardoned sinner. He admits him to his favour and treats him as a friend. The sinner becomes the friend of God. He changes his view of the character of God; he submits to his arrangements; he no longer opposes his plans; he is pleased with his government and his laws. He loves him as he loves no other being. He lives to promote his glory. He loves what God approves, defends what he has stated to be true, advocates the plans which he has formed, vindicates the doctrine which he has revealed, trusts in trial to the promises which he has made, flies to him in times of trouble and sorrow, leans upon his arm in death, finds in the mortal agony his highest consolation in the belief that God is his friend, and expects to find felicity in the future world only in God. There is no friendship so strong, so sincere, so tender, so enduring, as that between God and the reconciled sinner; and no work ever undertaken is so complete as that by which the reconciliation of God and man has been sought. It survives all changes through which man passes here; it is confirmed in death, and will exist forever.

(3.) The atonement may be an important means of sustaining the Divine government, and may thus have an important bearing on other worlds.

This is a point, indeed, on which we cannot argue with much certainty; for it lies at present beyond the sphere of our observation. But there are some things which may render it not improbable that there may be bearings of the atonement on other worlds which are now very imperfectly understood by us, and which must be in a great measure hidden until we are admitted to the revelations of the future state. In such passages of Scripture as the following it seems to be implied that the work of the Redeemer may have an important bearing on other parts of the universe, and may furnish to other worlds an illustration of the character of God which could be obtained from no other source. "Which things the angels desire to look into." (I Peter i. 12.) "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of this mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ; to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. iii. 9, 10, 11.) "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell, and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." (Col. i. 19, 20.) The same idea may be expressed also in Eph. i. 10: "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth."

There may be bearings of the atonement on other worlds which we cannot now understand; for as yet we see but little of the effect of the great work of the incarnation of the Son of God. It is possible that some of the highest developments of the effects of the atonement may yet be made on distant worlds. No one can demonstrate that the remark of Lord Bacon will not yet be found to be true: "All things in time and eternity have respect to the Mediator, which is the great mystery and perfect centre of all God's ways, and to which all his other works and wonders do but serve and refer."

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/7/24 21:41**

Brother perhaps I am mistaken, and I apologize if I jumped to a wrong conclusion. Is this saying what he(Barnes) says in this book?

*"Unto whom God imputeth righteousness - Whom God treats as righteous, or as entitled to his favor in a way different from his conformity to the Law. This is found in Psa 32:1-11. And the whole scope and design of the psalm is to show the blessedness of the man who is forgiven, and whose sins are not charged on him, but who is freed from the punishment due to his sins. Being thus pardoned, he is treated as a righteous man. And it is evidently in this sense that the apostle uses the expression "imputeth righteousness," that is, he does not impute, or charge on the man his sins; he reckons and treats him as a pardoned and righteous man; Psa 32:2. See the note at Rom 4:3. He regards him as one who is forgiven."*

*ven and admitted to his favor, and who is to be treated henceforward as though he had not sinned. That is, he partakes of the benefits of Christ's atonement, so as not henceforward to be treated as a sinner, but as a friend of God."*  
-Barnes NT Commentary on Romans 4:6

The word translated "atonement" in NT means "exchange"

&#954;&#945;&#964;&#945;&#955;&#955;&#945;&#947;&#951;&#769;

katallage&#772;

Thayer Definition:

1) exchange

1a) of the business of money changers, exchanging equivalent values

2) adjustment of a difference, reconciliation, restoration to favour

2a) in the NT of the restoration of the favour of God to sinners that repent and put their trust in the expiatory death of Christ

Strong's

&#954;&#945;&#964;&#945;&#955;&#955;&#945;&#947;&#951;&#769;

katallage&#772;

kat-al-lag-ay'

From G2644; exchange (figuratively adjustment), that is, restoration to (the divine) favor: - atonement, reconciliation (-ing).

**Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/7/24 21:49**

Quote:

-----  
roaringlamb wrote:

Brother perhaps I am mistaken, and I apologize if I jumped to a wrong conclusion. Is this saying what he(Barnes) says in this book?

*"Unto whom God imputeth righteousness - Whom God treats as righteous, or as entitled to his favor in a way different from his conformity to the Law. This is found in Psa 32:1-11. And the whole scope and design of the psalm is to show the blessedness of the man who is forgiven, and whose sins are not charged on him, but who is freed from the punishment due to his sins. Being thus pardoned, he is treated as a righteous man. And it is evidently in this sense that the apostle uses the expression "imputeth righteousness," that is, he does not impute, or charge on the man his sins; he reckons and treats him as a pardoned and righteous man; Psa 32:2. See the note at Rom 4:3. He regards him as one who is forgiven and admitted to his favor, and who is to be treated henceforward as though he had not sinned. That is, he partakes of the benefits of Christ's atonement, so as not henceforward to be treated as a sinner, but as a friend of God."*  
-Barnes NT Commentary on Romans 4:6

The word translated "atonement" in NT means "exchange"

&#954;&#945;&#964;&#945;&#955;&#955;&#945;&#947;&#951;&#769;

katallage&#772;

Thayer Definition:

1) exchange

1a) of the business of money changers, exchanging equivalent values

2) adjustment of a difference, reconciliation, restoration to favour

2a) in the NT of the restoration of the favour of God to sinners that repent and put their trust in the expiatory death of Christ

Strong's

&#954;&#945;&#964;&#945;&#955;&#955;&#945;&#947;&#951;&#769;

katallage&#772;

kat-al-lag-ay'

From G2644; exchange (figuratively adjustment), that is, restoration to (the divine) favor: - atonement, reconciliation (-ing).

-----  
Yes, that is correct. I would agree with that also.

I'm sorry for not making it clearer what I meant when I said "Imputed Righteousness". I've been studying this a while and forgot that the term "Imputed Righteousness" is in some translations of the Bible.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/7/24 21:54**

Ok, now I am confused as to what is being discussed. Silly me, forgive me, I had a crown put on my tooth today, and it's a little bothersome, so I'm a tad slow.

**Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/7/24 22:19**

Quote:  
-----  
roaringlamb wrote:  
Ok, now I am confused as to what is being discussed. Silly me, forgive me, I had a crown put on my tooth today, and it's a little bothersome, so I'm a tad slow.  
-----

No problem!

The subject is on:

Did Christ pay the \*actual\* debt we deserved to pay, so that we no longer have a debt to pay.

-OR-

Did Christ pay a sufficient penalty that was enough to allow God to FORGIVE our debt, thus lessening the total debt paid.

I hope the distinction is clear...it seems like a rather important subject to me.  
Nile

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/7/24 22:22**

I'm on my way out the door, but how does this fit into what you're thinking-  
2Co 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

Blessings brother

**Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/7/24 22:27**

Quote:  
-----  
roaringlamb wrote:  
I'm on my way out the door, but how does this fit into what you're thinking-  
2Co 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

Blessings brother  
-----

Hmm, that's a good passage. I haven't looked at that one yet. I'll have to think about it and see if what I'm believing is reflected in it.

To be honest, I've never really understood that verse. What do you think it means?

Oh, and even though we disagree on some areas (possibly quite big areas!) I've enjoyed talking with you!

As iron sharpens iron,  
Nile



Re., on: 2007/7/24 23:52

Christ was made to be sin for us. But in the greek the same word "sin" is also translated "sin offering".

Martin Luther said that Jesus became the worst sinner in history, that Jesus literally became a fornicator, a homosexual, a liar, a thief, etc. Luther said that to deny that Jesus became a sinner would be to deny that Jesus took our sin.

But the bible says that "He died the JUST for the unjust" The moral condition of Christ at death was not that of a sinner, but that of a just man of God.

But sin is not some commodity that can be transferred. It is not some literal stuff that can be given to someone else.

Rather, Jesus symbolically bore our sin, in that, he was made a sin offering so that God could forgive us. Albert Barnes explains it the best in his book.

-----  
The penalty that we deserved was not to die once on a Roman cross, but it was eternal hell fire.

Jesus did not pay the literal and exact penalty of the law. Rather, the cross was substituted with hell, Jesus was substituted with the sinner. The blood of Christ was substituted with the penalty that we deserved. The blood of Christ was substituted with the payment of our debt.

-----  
The atonement makes conditional salvation available to everyone.

Moral government theology teaches that Jesus paid a price for our sin, which was the price of his blood which make salvation possible. Without the Lambs blood there can be no forgiveness of sins.

But the atonement was not the penalty of our sin, so that we are automatically or unconditionally free from penalty weather we repent and believe or not. If the penalty has been paid for everyone, then nobody is in debt anymore. Once a debt is paid, there are no more debtors. So if Christ paid the penalty, or paid the debt, for the whole world, then for the past 2000 years nobody has been in debt.

But revelations makes it clear that the cup of God's wrath is still full. So the cup of God's wrath could not have been emptied upon Christ for all men.

The atonement rather makes it possible for God to passover us with His wrath, so that our penalty is not executed, so that His wrath is not poured out, upon condition of repentance and faith.

So the atonement was not the payment of our debt, but a Divine arrangment which makes it possible for God to forgive us our debt.

The atonement was not the pouring out of God's wrath, so that He has no more wrath for anyone. But the atonement was a Divine arrangment which makes it possible for God's wrath to passover those who are covered by the blood by repenting and believing.

So Christ did pay the price of His blood, He did pay the ransom. But the nature of the price, the nature of the ransom, was to make grace *available to all conditionally*, but not to make grace available to a few unconditionally.

#### **Passover vs. Poured out**

- The atonement makes it possible for God's wrath to *passover* instead of being *poured out*.

#### **Pardon vs Payment**

- The atonement makes it possible for God to *pardon* our debt instead of requiring the *payment* of our debt.

## Punishment vs Forgiveness

- The atonement was not the *punishment* of our sin, but Christ died for our sins, so that God could *forgive* us our sins.

That is why the Bible REPEATEDLY says that God actually forgives us our sin, and that God actually forgives us our debt. We are to pray "forgive us our debts as we forgive others" and remember the unforgiving servant, how the master "frankly forgave him his debt".

In summary, God required blood in order to forgive our sins. Christ was substituted for us and our punishment was substituted with Christ's blood. Public justice required that if God was going to set aside our punishment (hell) something needed to take its place to satisfy the same purpose of our punishment, so God substituted blood (cross) with our punishment (eternal hell-fire).

So God could forgive us our sins and pardon our debt by His grace if we repent and believe.

### Re: Did Christ's death pay the exact penalty you deserved? - posted by jarona (), on: 2007/7/25 1:06

what I deserve is eternal separation from God in hell and that will never change. God didn't die just to cover my sins with His blood, He died to save me from the just wrath, judgment, condemnation, and punishment I deserve for my wickedness and rebellion.

### Re:, on: 2007/7/25 1:40

Christ is our passover Lamb, so that the wrath of God can pass over us if we are covered by the blood.

And of course the blood only covers sins that we turn away from, and stay away from, Heb 10:26-31

### Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/7/28 16:24

Some might figure that Christ would need to have suffered in the amount to which was due for each and every person to satisfy justice.

This is to suppose that he needs to suffer an eternal punishment multiplied in intensity, and/or duration, by the whole number of the the human race.

Quote:

-----Lazarus1719 wrote:

The penalty that we deserved was not to die once on a Roman cross, but it was eternal hell fire.

However, the penalty of sin is **spiritual death**, the penalty of sin is not "to suffer an eternal hell fire punishment".

Jesus died physically & spiritually on the cross. Therefore, He paid the full penalty of sin.

Jesus died spiritually when He cried, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

He was separated from God which is spiritual death.

Jesus died physically when He cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. Mat 27:50, Luk 23:46, John 19:30.

The only reason that the damned suffer an eternal punishment is because they die without Eternal Life. If Eternal Life after death is in the presence with God, then to die without Eternal Life is eternal punishment. If one does not stay in the presence of Christ, there is no other place to be but in outer darkness where there is gnashing of teeth.