

Sola Fide Debate  
Nick's 5 Questions for Drake

**Question 1:** Jesus said: “For I tell you, unless *your righteousness* exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, *you will never enter the kingdom of heaven*” (Matthew 5:2). And in James 1:19-21 we read, “Know this, my beloved brothers: let every person be quick to hear, slow to speak, slow to anger; for the anger of man does not produce *the righteousness of God*. Therefore put away all filthiness and rampant wickedness and **receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your souls.**” Both of these texts speak of saving righteousness that comes result of our good works. **How do you explain this, considering the only righteousness that saves in your view is Christ's Righteousness imputed?** (Note that James uses the same Greek words for “righteousness of God” as Paul does, and it clearly cannot mean “Christ's Righteousness”)

**Question 2:** The 4<sup>th</sup> Commandment is as follows: “**Observe the Sabbath day**, to keep it holy, as the Lord your God commanded you. **Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath** to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, you or your son or your daughter or your male servant or your female servant, or your ox or your donkey or any of your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates, that your male servant and your female servant may rest as well as you. **You shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt**, and the Lord your God brought you out from there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the Lord your God commanded you to keep the Sabbath day.”

You had said that the Ten Commandments were part of the moral law of the Mosaic Law, and a summary of the moral law in the Covenant of Works. **How do you explain how only Israel was commanded to keep Saturday as the Sabbath, and that this is based upon God rescuing from Egypt?** In other words, I fail to see how this Commandment can be reduced to an alleged eternal moral law.

**Question 3:** Sorry but this question requires a long preface. Presbyterian Albert Barnes has a commentary on the New Testament (available online), here is what he says when commenting on Romans 4:3,

*Abraham believed God* - ... The reason why it was counted to him for righteousness was, that it was such a strong, direct, and unwavering act of confidence in the promise of God.

*And it* - The word "it" here evidently refers to the act of believing. It does not refer to the righteousness of another - of God, or of the Messiah; but the discussion is solely of the strong act of Abraham's faith... **When therefore it is said that the righteousness of Christ is accounted or imputed to us; when it is said that his merits are transferred and reckoned as ours; whatever may be the truth of the doctrine, it cannot be defended by "this" passage of Scripture.**

*Was counted* - ... The word [logizomai] occurs frequently in the Scriptures. ... [Psalm 32:2](#); [Psalm 35:4](#); [Isaiah 10:7](#); [Job 19:11](#); [Job 33:10](#); [Genesis 16:6](#); [Genesis 38:15](#); [1 Samuel 1:13](#); [Psalm 52:4](#); [Jeremiah 18:18](#); [Zechariah 7:10](#); [Job 6:26](#); [Job 19:16](#); [Isaiah 13:17](#); [1 Kings 10:21](#); [Numbers 18:27](#); [Numbers 18:30](#); [Psalm 88:4](#); [Isaiah 40:17](#); [Lamentations 4:2](#); [Isaiah 40:15](#);

Genesis 31:16. I have examined all the passages, and as the result of my examination have come to the conclusion, that there is not one in which the word is used in the sense of reckoning or imputing to a man what does not strictly belong to him; or of charging on him what ought not to be charged on him as a matter of personal right. The word is never used to denote imputing in the sense of transferring, or of charging that on one which does not properly belong to him. The same is the case in the New Testament. The word occurs about forty times," and, in a similar signification. No doctrine of transferring, or of setting over to a man what does not properly belong to him, be it sin or holiness, can be derived, therefore, from this word. Whatever is meant by it here, it evidently is declared that the act of believing is what is intended, both by Moses and by Paul.

Based on what Barnes has said, which virtually agrees with what I've been arguing, my question is: **can you show 3 verses where *logizomai* is used that directly challenge or even refute what he says in red?**

**Question 4:** I know you are a big fan of James Buchanan's major essay, The Doctrine of Justification. Here is what Dr Buchanan says in Part II, Lecture XII, Proposition XVII, of his tome:

*'There is not in all the Scriptures,' says one [opponent], 'an instance in which one man's sin or righteousness is said to be imputed to another. There is not in all the Bible one assertion that Adam's sin, or Christ's righteousness, is imputed to us; nor one declaration that any man's sin is ever imputed by God or man to another man. Having followed (the Hebrew and Greek verbs) through the concordances, I hesitate not to challenge a single example which is fairly of this nature in all the Bible.'*

These are bold statements, and may seem to imply a denial of the doctrine... **But the question is, Whether the same verbs [i.e. *logizomai*] may not be equally applicable to other cases, in which that which is imputed to him was not personally his own, and did not previously belong to him, but became his only by its being put down to his account?**

The debt due, and the wrong done, by **Onesimus to Philemon**, were not chargeable against Paul personally or previously, but he became chargeable with them simply by their being imputed to him: 'If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account,' or 'impute that to me;' 'I will repay it.' **In like manner, 'He, who knew no sin, was made sin for us,' and 'bore our sins in His own body on the tree,'—not that our sins were chargeable against Him personally or previously, but they became His by imputation on God's part, and voluntary susception on His own. If it be said, that the mere word 'impute' is not employed in this case, it may be asked, whether there be any other which could more accurately express the fact,** if it be a fact; and whether the word itself is not used in a parallel case, when God is said 'to impute righteousness without works,' as often as 'He justifieth the ungodly?'

I have said throughout this debate that the term *logizomia* is not used in Philemon 1:18, nor is the term used in reference to Adam's sin being imputed to man, nor to the believer's sin imputed to Christ. Buchanan was obviously aware of this charge. My question is, are **Buchanan's claims able to be**

**supported with clear Scriptures showing the use of the term impute in regards to Adam's sin to us and our sin to Christ? If not, why does this not automatically refute the Protestant understanding of Justification?**

**Question 5:** You said that the Mosaic Law offered eternal life for perfect obedience to it, citing Leviticus 18:5. I denied that, saying that the “life” mentioned was temporal blessings of health, wealth, large family, etc. Can you make an exegetical case for why the “life” in Leviticus 18:5 could only refer to “eternal life”?