

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 39.—JANUARY, 1897.

I. REGENERATION, REAL, NOT FIGURATIVE.

THERE are doubtless those who think that in a discussion of regeneration nothing new can be said that is true, and nothing true that is new. However this may be, it is certain that opinions differ widely, and that much confusion prevails. It is not our purpose to review the variant and widely diverse opinions which are held on this subject. That were a profitless task. We propose to study the subject anew from the standpoint of the Scriptures, and to compare the conclusion reached with the view generally accepted as orthodox. What is that view?

A very few years ago a report was made to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., by a committee appointed to revise *The Confession*. In that report the following words were found: "The act of regeneration wherein being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit he is enabled to answer God's call and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." Had this been approved, new matter would have been added to *The Confession*. This report teaches that the act of regeneration enables the subject to believe on Christ. That this is the commonly accepted view a few citations from Doctors R. L. Dabney and A. A. Hodge may be allowed to show. Dr. Dabney in his *Syllabus and Notes* (Student's Edition, Part II., p. 85) says under the caption "Regeneration properly defined," "we prove that regeneration is not a mere change of human purpose, occurring in view of motive; but a supernatural renovation of the dispositions which determine the moral purpose and of the understanding, in the apprehension of moral and spiritual truth." Says Dr. A. A. Hodge in his *Outlines*: "In the new creation God

recreates the governing disposition of the regenerated man's heart holy. These dispositions are anterior to moral action, and determine the character as to good or evil. . . . When it is said that regeneration consists in giving a new heart. . . . What is meant by the term heart? The term heart signifies that prevailing moral disposition that determines the volitions and actions." (P. 458.) "What relation does sanctification sustain to regeneration? Regeneration is the creative act of the Holy Spirit, implanting a new principle of spiritual life in the soul. Conversion is the first exercise of that new gracious principle in the spontaneous turning of the new-born sinner to God." (P. 521.) Again, "The instant God regenerates a sinner he acts faith in Christ." (P. 522.) And so, according to this view, regeneration is a change of disposition which enables the sinner to believe on Christ. We are in perfect accord with the psychology of the foregoing statements; and also with their scripturalness, except in one important particular. We heartily concur in the view that the Spirit works in us a change of disposition, "whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel." But this is defined by the Catechism of the Westminster divines to be "effectual calling"—not regeneration.

In entering upon a scriptural study of regeneration the first thing to determine is this: What did the Son of God come on earth to do? He himself has answered the question. "He came to fulfil all righteousness." He was made under the law. According to the law, the soul that *doeth* these things shall live by them. Jesus said: "Therefore doth my father love me because I do always those things which please him." Says the law: To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life will God award. Of Jesus it is said: He was obedient in all things, wherefore God hath highly exalted him. By the deeds of the law this man earned the reward of righteousness. Only he is called the Holy One and the Just. He finished the work the Father gave him to do.

That this man was entitled to glory is plain enough. But while he was successful it is equally plain that all other men are failures. The Scripture is obviously true which says: "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified, for by the law is the knowledge of sin." If Christ came to save us by example alone, he is, as a Saviour, a manifest failure.

The question, then, may be justly raised, What good can come to us because of his success? What good can it do us that he has won the reward of righteousness? We have not. And yet, the possibility of lawfully entering upon another's labors is not unfamiliar. The young lad who has never earned a dollar enters into the possession of his father's estate. We say he is entitled to do so as the next of kin. The close tie of consanguinity makes him his heir. This view of redemption is presented in all those Scriptures which speak of the saved as the sons, and, therefore, the heirs of God, because joint-heirs with Christ.

But let us suppose the young man has violated the criminal law of the land, and by a jury of his countrymen has been adjudged guilty and condemned to death. What good will the estate now do him? He cannot come into possession. There is a rope about his neck. And there is a halter about our necks. We, too, are under the condemnation of the law. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." We have not only come short of the glory of God, in consequence of failure to comply with his law, but we have incurred the penalty which it imposes for disobedience.

And just here it is to be noticed that this man Jesus not only obeyed all the precepts, but submitted also to the penalty of the broken law. "He was obedient in all things, even unto death. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him." Had he been a sinner he would have continued under the power of death. But God would not suffer his Holy and Just One to see corruption. He rose again from the dead, and is crowned with glory and honor. Had he remained under the power of death, there would have been no salvation for any, "for if Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." We are begotten again to a living hope by his resurrection from the dead. Here, then, is a man who has earned eternal life by submission to the penalty of violated law,

and if it be possible for any one to share it with him, it is possible even for the sinner with the rope about his neck—under condemnation of the law.

But was he unto death *obedient*? Our death is not an act of obedience. We are no more obedient therein than the criminal, who swings from the gallows. "God taketh away our breath." We have no option in the matter; we cannot help ourselves. But how was it with Jesus? He used remarkable language. He said: "No man taketh my life from me, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." His death within a few hours of his crucifixion was most remarkable. Pilate marvelled that he was so soon dead. The victims of crucifixion rarely ever died until the third day. Crucifixion did not terminate the lives of the two thieves on either side of Jesus. Because the next day was an holy day, the Jews besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. Neither was crucifixion the immediate cause of the death of Jesus. In process of time death would have ensued, but we read that "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, 'I thirst.'" . . . When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, "It is finished," and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost." The plain import of this language is, that when the last prophecy concerning Jesus was fulfilled he dismissed his own Spirit. Certainly his death was due neither to crucifixion nor to the vinegar which he drank. Jesus was active in his death. He was priest as well as sacrifice. As Hugh Martin says: "His dying was his grandest doing." Referring to Prof. Mac Lagan's beautiful "figure of the empty scabbard bound upon the warrior's person, while the unsheathed sword is in his hand," with which Mac Lagan illustrates the fact that in the state of the dead Immanuel's body and his soul remained, each in union with his Godhead, Martin justly asks, "Is there the action of greater power and prowess in the gentle ease with which that warrior, the battle being fought and won, returns the sword to its sheath (the spirit to its body), or in the prior princely, peerless act in which—what shall I say?—in which, having girt thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, thy right hand teach-

ing terrible things, flashed it forth for victory?" It may be objected that the voluntary surrender of life is not obedience, but suicide. It is a sufficient answer to cite the words of Jesus: "This commandment have I received of my Father, that I should lay down my life for the sheep." His dying was his own act of obedience.

Just here the fact should be emphasized, that obedience unto death is absolutely impossible for every one, save this man Jesus. Obedience is essentially voluntary; but the condemned criminal has no option in the matter; his life is wrested from him. Only the sinless man could say, "No one taketh my life from me." For the sinner, therefore, salvation by works is impossible.

It is important that we turn now to a somewhat closer examination of Christ's work as to its merit. 1st. The Father said of Jesus, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Why the Father was well pleased with him, Jesus himself explains: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I do always those things that please him." Jesus was obedient in all things, even unto death. What was it in the death of Jesus that pleased the Father? Certainly not as suffering did his death please the Father; for he taketh no pleasure in the death of the sinner even. Jehovah does not love blood and suffering. He is not sanguinary. There is nothing in the Bible to justify the idea that the Father found pleasure in the Christ's agony on the cross. It is true Jesus said, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life for the sheep." The Father found pleasure in Jesus, not that he was glad to see him suffer, but because of the merciful purpose to accomplish which he consented to suffer. "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? He has showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" The Father was pleased, not with the sufferings of Jesus, but that he should consent to suffer in mercy to others. What, then, was the virtue in Christ's death that was meritorious of blessings for others? Simply that obedience which satisfied all demands of law and justice. The sole merit of Christ's death was its obedi-

ence. Its sacrificial value is obedience. "If Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." But why is he risen? Because he was obedient. The merit we share who are risen together with him is his righteousness. 2d. This obedience was owed by Jesus, for the doing of that which is not required is not obedience. Inasmuch as unto death he was obedient, it is clear that death was required of him. But how could death, the penalty of sin, be required of a sinless man? That were an injustice; and yet the Scriptures say that though he knew no sin, he was made sin for us. Our sins were imputed to him—laid upon him—in the sense that he became liable to the penalty of sin. But how in justice? To condemn the just is an abomination in the eyes of Jehovah, say the Scriptures. Birth is the explanation. Being born of a woman, made partaker of flesh and blood, he has fellowship with us not only in our humanity, but in all our relations to the law.

Says Dr. A. A. Hodge in his *Atonement*: "The apostle declares that the principles upon which sin and misery came upon the race through Adam are identical with those upon which righteousness and blessedness came upon the elect through Christ." This is certainly true. We have fellowship by birth with Adam in his nature and death; we have fellowship by birth with Jesus in his nature and life.

With these reflections let us come back to the question, How can the success of Jesus profit others? How can God justly treat the unrighteous with all the favor and honor he bestows upon the righteous Jesus?

Let us see what some others say in answer to this question. Say some, the merits of Christ Jesus have justified the Father in requiring less of man than perfect obedience. His blood wipes out all their sins, and the residuum of sincere obedience is accepted in lieu of perfect righteousness. This theory does not explain how the blood of Jesus wipes out sin. We have seen that the merit of Christ's sacrifice was his obedience unto death. How the obedience of Jesus secures favor for any besides himself is the very problem to be solved. And, again, that the obedience of one man can charm God into greater tolerance of sin is a theory which is self-contradictory and violative of morals,

common sense, and Scripture. So pleased with perfect righteousness, that he will henceforth be equally pleased with imperfection! Surely this theory need not be seriously considered for a moment.

The commonly received opinion is, that the believer is entitled to the same reward Christ earned through his obedience simply because God has promised it to them who accept it by faith. It is, of course, a righteous thing in God to perform his promises, but this solution only removes the difficulty a step further back. How could God justly require less of one than another? How could he righteously give to others, merely because of their faith, that reward which Jesus earned by perfect obedience? Question seventy-three of the *Larger Catechism* of the Westminster divines wisely repudiates the idea that faith deserves salvation: "Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruits of it; nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof, were imputed to him for justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness." Faith, then, justifies because it receives Christ's obedience as the ground of eternal life. This is still more explicitly set forth. Question thirty-three of the *Shorter Catechism* reads: "Justification is an act of God's free grace wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone." Question seventy-two of the *Larger Catechism* thus defines justifying faith: "Justifying faith is a saving grace, wrought in the heart of a sinner by the Spirit of God, whereby he receiveth and resteth upon Christ and his righteousness for pardon of sin, and for the acceptance and accounting of his person righteous in the sight of God for salvation." Most true it is, that faith accepts and God imputes the righteousness of Christ. Christ's obedience is the sole ground of the sinner's salvation. As in consequence of the imputation of our sins to Jesus, he died; so in consequence of the imputation of his obedience to us, we live. But why? The question persistently demands an answer. How can God justly reckon the sinner entitled to the

reward which Jesus earned? As we have seen, the merit of Christ's obedience entitled him to reward. This obedience was due from him as the legal condition of his personal exaltation. And yet the symbols of the Presbyterian Church only echo the Scriptures which declare, that by the obedience of one many are made righteous. Our quest is for the righteous ground of the imputation. Certainly it is not to be found in any change of our dispositions towards God whereby we are enabled to accept Christ and his righteousness by faith. If "faith does not justify because of the graces which always accompany it, or of the good works which are the fruit of it . . .," much less does it justify because of the dispositions of which itself is the fruit. This change of the disposition, therefore, which, as we have seen by citation from Dabney and Hodge, is commonly called regeneration, is not the righteous ground of Christ's imputation and the sinner's salvation. Regeneration, as defined by Dabney (*Syllabus and Notes—Student's Edition, Part I., p. 224*) to be "a radical moral change, being not merely a change of purpose of life by volition, but a revolution of the propensities which prompt our purposes," is certainly not the righteous ground of imputation.

Reference has already been made to the lawful entrance of a son into possession of his father's estate. We have seen, too, that the Scriptures commonly speak of Christians as sons of God and heirs because joint-heirs with Christ. Most unquestionably, if Jesus be only a man, we can find no title to his estate of glory by virtue of the filial relation. We are not the children of Jesus according to the flesh. "He was cut off from the land of the living, and who shall declare his generation?"

Nevertheless, continued the prophet Isaiah, "he shall see his seed." Jesus was not man merely; he was also God. The Spirit of God is the Spirit of Christ. By making us "partakers of the divine nature," by communicating to us his Spirit, we have, in the fellowship of the Spirit, fellowship with the Father and with his Son Christ Jesus. The imputation of Christ's obedience is just, because the believer is one with Christ by being partaker of his Spirit, just as we have seen that the imputation of our sins to Jesus was just, because he became partaker of our flesh and blood.

Dr. Dabney has scriptural warrant for his statement that "it is through his union to Christ that the whole application of redemption is effectuated on the sinner's soul." Fellowship (communion, partnership, *κοινωνία*) is the grand doctrine of the Bible.

Now, how did the Son of God take fellowship with us in our human nature? By birth of a woman. Our very word "nature" is derived from the Latin word signifying "born." Fellowship in nature comes of birth. To partake of the nature of anything is the necessary consequence of being born of that thing. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." How may we be one with Christ in his nature? Obviously, by birth. If one be born of the Spirit, and made a partaker of the divine nature, evidently, such a one is born from above. If they who are born of the flesh are born again of the Spirit, evidently, this birth is a new birth, a regeneration. Real regeneration is the righteous ground of the imputation of Christ's obedience, and of a share in his reward. Birth is the solution of the problem. The only righteous ground for treating Christ as a sinner was that he was born of a woman, and had fellowship with us in our human nature and in sin's penalty. The only righteous ground for treating us as saints is that we are born of the Spirit, and so made partakers of the divine nature and of piety's reward. We are justified in consequence of this real regeneration. Union with Christ by the impartation, not of the Spirit's influence, but of the Spirit himself, making our bodies his temples, this is what the Scriptures call regeneration. The word is misapplied when used as a synonym for "effectual calling." Such a use is only figurative. When assigning the processes of the application of redemption their logical order, Calvinistic theologians generally state them thus: (1), Effectual calling (regeneration, figurative); (2), Faith; (3), Justification. The scriptural order is, (1), Effectual calling; (2), Faith; (3), Regeneration (real); and (4), Justification.

It is passing strange that the grand fact which unites the soul to Christ, the fact which justifies God in saving sinners by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, cannot be so much as named among us, because the only word which literally and scripturally and aptly designates it has been misappropriated.

And, obviously, that which has no name among us will have no place in our thoughts. There is no excuse for this unnatural divorce of the name "regeneration" from the thing itself, for the Scriptures afford not one word of authority for calling a change of disposition a new birth. A birth is not a change; it is a new creation.

A real regeneration, giving us partnership of the Spirit, and thereby fellowship with Christ Jesus in the reward of his human righteousness, seems to us clearly demonstrated as the divine scheme of redemption. Let us now consider other lines of evidence which converge to this conclusion, and make assurance doubly sure.

1st. All the benefits of redemption secured by Christ are ours only because we are "in him." We are in Christ by birth, just as we are in Adam by birth. The person of Jesus is magnified by the theory of real regeneration. Figurative regeneration magnifies most conspicuously the work of the Spirit in us, changing our dispositions that we may believe; real regeneration avouches that none of the work of Christ can avail us anything unless we be "in him." And if we be in him, it is all righteously ours.

The Scriptures emphasize this—in him we have forgiveness; in him, an inheritance; in him we are complete; he is our all and in all; we are made the righteousness of God in him; in him we are accepted. All this is in perfect harmony with our reflections on the nature of Christ's work. We have seen that the work of Christ was obedience to all the demands which the law makes on the humanity with which he took partnership; that all he did was due from himself as born of a woman. The only conceivable way by which we may share his reward is by sharing the "Spirit in which he was justified"; by having fellowship with him by birth, as he took fellowship with us by birth. Hence, his frequent designation of himself as the "Son of man," while the regenerated man becomes a son of God. Hence, "Ye must be born again," and "of the Spirit." "By this we know that we are in him because he hath given us of his Spirit." Because we live in the Spirit, we are enjoined to walk in the Spirit. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of Christ dwell in you."

By one Spirit we are baptized into Christ. Thus we are plainly taught that union with Christ is effected by regeneration—by the indwelling of the Spirit.

Most treatises on theology recognize union with Christ and the indwelling of the Spirit as scriptural truths, but fail to consider them in their relations. The doctrine of the indwelling of the Spirit according to these treatises might be omitted without being missed as an essential part of the system of redemption. It articulates with nothing. As being essentially the new birth, it is utterly without recognition.

2nd. The work of effectual calling, which has been misnamed regeneration, retains its place in the scheme of redemption by fellowship. The logical order is, first, effectual calling; second, faith; third, regeneration; fourth, justification. And this scriptural theory relieves Calvinism from apparent contradiction of Scripture. The accepted definition of regeneration which identifies this with effectual calling makes the Bible at variance with itself. That repentance and faith are wrought in us by the Spirit of God is very clearly taught in the Scriptures. For example, we read in Acts xvi. 14 of Lydia, "Whose heart the Lord opened that she attended unto the things that were spoken of Paul." "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." (John vi. 37.) "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." "Blessed art thou, Simon-Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 17.) "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins." (Acts v. 31.) "Unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake." (Phil. i. 29.)

On the other hand, there is a formidable number of passages which plainly make the new birth consequent upon faith, of which the following are examples: "As many as received him, to them gave he power (right) to become the sons of God (regenerated), even to them that believe on his name." (John i. 12.) "Forasmuch as God gave unto them the like gift as he

did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xi. 17.) "In whom also after that ye believed (having believed) ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. i. 13.) "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since (or, did ye receive when) ye believed?" (Acts xii. 2.) "Ye are all the children of God (regenerated) by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. iii. 26.) "That ye might receive the promise of the Spirit through *faith*." (Gal. iii. 14.) "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith." (Gal. iii. 2.)

Now, it must be admitted that the class of passages beginning with Acts xvi. 14, quoted above, clearly teaches that the Spirit of God works in us to receive Christ by faith, and that the other class, beginning with John i. 12, as clearly teaches that the faith which receives Christ preceded regeneration. If this be so, then either the two classes of texts are contradictory, or regeneration and effectual calling are not the same thing. That they are not contradictory we know, for the Bible is the inspired word of God. Therefore, the common identification of regeneration with effectual calling is an error. The Spirit of whom it is written, that he was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified; the Spirit who, having been with the disciples, was soon to dwell in them; this Spirit they that believed on Jesus were to receive when Jesus should be glorified. This indwelling of the Spirit, in a way inscrutable for us, effects union with Christ and makes the believer a child of God. It consummates the work of redemption by establishing, as we have seen, the only righteous ground of imputation. And just here we quote Dr. Dabney: "The instrumental bond of the union is evidently faith; *i. e.*, when the believer exercises faith, the union begins. One of the results, or, if you please, forms, of the union, is justification. Of this, faith is the instrument; for Christ purifies our hearts by faith." When we exercise faith through the effectual work of the Spirit in us, then God regenerates by imparting his Holy Spirit to dwell in us, effecting thereby union with Christ and consequent justification.

We can see why God may make faith the condition on which he may graciously establish a relation between the sinner and Christ, by virtue of which relation the sinner's salvation is justi-

fied; but we can see no reason why the sinner's faith in Christ should entitle him to salvation, *i. e.*, no reason in justice why salvation should be given to them who are willing to accept it as a gift.

3rd. It will be contended by some that the passage quoted from John, "This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive," had reference to the pentecostal gift of power. This endowment-with-power theory has tended to obscure the Bible doctrine of a real regeneration. "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you," is frequently quoted by those who identify the gift of the Spirit with the power received after. People are urged to pray for a pentecostal outpouring, meaning thereby power to preach or work successfully in winning souls. But the word power is *δυναμις*, often rendered miracle, and always meaning a miraculous manifestation, such as believers never now receive. That power had been exercised during the ministry of Jesus; was suspended at his death; and now, when they ask if he is about to restore the kingdom, he answers that it is not for them to know, but, when the promised Spirit is come upon them, they should again receive the power of miracle working.

Again, let it be observed that this power-for-service interpretation of the pentecostal baptism assumes and implies that only some true Christians receive this baptism. On the contrary, the Scriptures unequivocally teach that all believers receive the gift of the ascended Saviour: "This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." In perfect accord with this statement are the epistolary references to the Spirit. "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" (Gal. iii. 2.) "If he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received." (2 Cor. xi. 4.)

This power for service, too, was nothing new, but this gift of the Spirit to which Jesus refers was never bestowed prior to Pentecost. Turn again to the passage: "This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive, for the Spirit was not given because Jesus was not yet glorified." Said

Jesus to his disciple: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Spirit will not come unto you, but if I go away I will send him unto you." Again, he said: "He is with you and shall dwell in you." The Spirit was with the disciples and with the Old Testament saints for effectual calling and for power, but he was not yet given as an indwelling Spirit. He could not be so given until the resurrection and glorification of Jesus. Why not?

A recurrence of birth, if it were possible, would not of necessity be profitable. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and continues flesh, even if born again—of the flesh. To be born of Adam an hundred times would leave the subject of such a regeneration still united to Adam in nature and destiny. To be a child of God, one must have the fellowship of the divine Spirit, must be a partaker of his nature. But rebellious man, still under penalty of violated law, cannot be in union with God. There is no fellowship possible between sin and holiness.

With the sinless man Jesus it was different. His humanity was the first temple, the first habitation of God through the Spirit. He was immanuel—God with us. His incarnation was the first union of the two natures. The Son of man was the Son of God also. Prior to the perfecting of his work as man, before his work of obedience was finished in death, previous to his justification by resurrection and ascension to glory, birth of the Spirit would have united men to one who as Saviour was not yet perfected by suffering. It is to the risen, living, glorified Saviour that birth of the Spirit unites us, and so the Spirit was not given until the glorification of the Lord. "If Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." But "he being ascended and having received of the Father the promise of the Spirit," he hath shed forth the Spirit of which the gift of tongues was the appropriate sign. The obedience of Jesus was his own; its results he shares with us. When his righteousness is said to be imputed, only its fruits are meant. It is the Spirit of the man who has earned glory which we receive.

4th. This, the reader perceives, is tantamount to saying that there was no regeneration prior to Pentecost. Such a statement

sounds horribly heretical, because the ear is so accustomed to associate the word regeneration with the idea of effectual calling, that the mind refuses to associate with it the idea of real birth in the gift of the indwelling Spirit himself. Nor is it easy for the mind so trained to conceive that "new birth" can have any other than a figurative meaning—a change of disposition.

And yet on this point the Scriptures are very explicit. The Old Testament saints who "without us were not made perfect," are spoken of as minors, as heirs, and are sharply contrasted with the New Testament saints who "are no more servants but sons." "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that ye might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) "He was made a curse for us . . . that (in order that) we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." (Gal. iii. 14.)

It is asked, How can one act faith until he has spiritual life? We answer:

1st. Jesus does not seem to think that one must first have "life" in order to believe. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." "Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life."

2nd. The Scriptures say, we are justified by faith. Then unquestionably we are not justified until we believe. But, protest the advocates of figurative regeneration, the sinner must be spiritually alive before he can believe. Then he is alive in Christ before he is justified; alive in Christ and yet under condemnation.

3rd. What is the character of the new disposition evinced in effectual calling? It determines to faith unquestionably. But is this state of mind wrought by the Spirit something holy? Let every saint recall his own experience. The Spirit "convinced us of our sin and misery," stripped us of all self-esteem and self-righteousness, and made us to see the shame of our nakedness. He showed us the odiousness of sin, and we shrank appalled from our own vileness. He showed us ourselves as lost, and we cried, Lord save, or we perish. He showed us our own loathsomeness

and helplessness, but he showed us also Christ as an all-sufficient Saviour, and to him we fled for succor and acceptance. He showed us nothing good in our life nor disposition, that we might find our all in the holy One, and the Just.

But, if there was no regeneration prior to Pentecost, how, it is asked, were the Old Testament saints saved? The Spirit was with them in the work of effectual calling, working in them, to rely on Jehovah for a salvation, which was yet to be accomplished, and which was predicted in word and type, as a salvation not yet accomplished. The indwelling of the Spirit is, indeed, essential to salvation, but not more so than that obedience of Christ in which regeneration makes us partners. We find no difficulty in the statement, that the death of Christ was anticipated for Old Testament saints; much less need we stumble over the obvious fact, that if Christ himself was anticipated, much more was union with a Christ yet to come anticipated. "He was made a curse for us, that (in order that) we might receive the promise of the Spirit."

In harmony with this view, it will be necessary to reconstruct our ideas as to Nicodemus. The common view is that Nicodemus stood in need of a new heart, that he was an unsaved sinner. The truth is, that Nicodemus was an honest Jew, a sincere worshipper of Jehovah; one who made frank confession of satisfaction with the credentials of Jesus, as of one sent of God, and who actually did place himself as a disciple under the instruction of Jesus. He needed regeneration, precisely as did Peter and John, whom Jesus pronounced "clean," or saved.

When were the dead saints of the old dispensation regenerated? Perhaps on the day of Pentecost. That was the day of first fruits. Then it was, perhaps, that they were translated from the paradise of Hades to be with Jesus, in the presence of God. Certain it is that they without us were not made perfect.

5th. Under the old dispensation the application of redemption was typified in the sprinkling of the sacrificial elements, the ashes of the sacrifice upon the defiled. Living water in which the ashes had been put was the vehicle of communication. That living water symbolized the Spirit by whom the redemption purchased

by Christ is applied to us. Baptism is the application of redemption. "We are washed, we are justified, we are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by (with) the Spirit of our God." Pentecostal baptism was the gift of the indwelling Spirit, the "washing of regeneration," uniting us to Christ, making all that he is and has ours, and thus applying to us the redemption he by his obedience earned. Regeneration is baptism with the Spirit. (Baptism of the Spirit is an unwarranted and unmeaning phrase.) This baptism with the Spirit was predicted by John. It was declared by Jesus and by Peter to be fulfilled at Pentecost. Not, therefore, till Pentecost was the indwelling Spirit given.

When the Scripture says: "There is one baptism," that one baptism can be no other than the baptism with the Spirit, which applies the redemption purchased by Christ. It is by one Spirit that we are all baptized into one body into Christ, and so regenerated. "The washing of regeneration" is unquestionably "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," whereby we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus, accepted in the beloved. To be in Christ is to be saved, and the baptism which puts us into Christ is not only the only baptism, but a baptism which is administered only once. To pray, as many do, that believers may be baptized with the Holy Ghost, is to pray for that which has taken place, and is never to be repeated, nor needs be repeated, because the believer has in Christ eternal life. To pray that we may be filled with the Spirit has scriptural warrant.

As corroborating this view we have the words of Peter: "Baptism doth also now save us, not the washing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Christ." Only one Old Testament ordinance could sanctify to the purifying of the flesh (and it could do nothing more than typically purify). Only the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer in the water of separation could put away the filth of the flesh. And so Peter, wishing not to be misunderstood as to the nature of the baptism which saves, says, that he means not the Old Testament baptism—the sprinkling of the water of separation—but the answer, or demand, rather, of a good conscience to-

wards God, a conscience void of offence towards God, which is secured by faith in Jesus, who was raised for our justification.

The worshipper once purged hath no more conscience of sins. Since Jesus is justified, we, too, who are in him, are likewise justified. And so baptism saves us, for we are baptized with the Spirit into Christ.

Only one real baptism there is, and one real sacrifice; one typical baptism and one typical sacrifice there was; one symbolic sacrifice and one symbolic baptism there is, in the Lord's supper and the sprinkling of pure water.

6th. Truth, like light, is clear and self-evidencing. By way of contrast, let us note the inevitable confusion of even able men when they attempt to expound Scripture in harmony with the theory of figurative regeneration. Bishop Ryle, of the Church of England, in commenting on John iii. 3, says: "Being born again means that complete change of heart and character which is produced in a man by the Holy Ghost when he repents, believes in Christ, and becomes a true Christian. In Ezekiel it is called, 'Taking away the stony heart and giving a heart of flesh'—giving a new heart and putting within a new spirit. In Acts it is called, 'Repentance and conversion.' (Acts iii 19.) In Romans it is called, 'Being alive from the dead.' In Corinthians it is called, 'Being a new creature.' In Peter it is called, 'Being made a partaker of the divine nature.' I believe that all these expressions come to the same thing in the end. They all mean that mighty inward change of heart which our Lord here calls 'a new birth,' and which John the Baptist foretold would specially characterize Messiah's kingdom. He was to baptize, not with water, but with the Holy Ghost. Jesus tells Nicodemus that he must be born again, or baptized with the Spirit." This extract fairly illustrates the confusion of thought so widely prevalent. In the first place, the eminently evangelical Bishop Ryle heaps up a great variety of passages descriptive of changed relations and gracious experiences, save only that one class which is most pertinent, that, namely, which speaks of Christians as God's sons, God's children. Surely, one who is born of God is a son of God.

Again, Bishop Ryle is certainly correct in identifying regeneration and baptism with the Spirit. He is singularly correct in saying that the new birth was foretold by John as something never before realized, and something which was especially to characterize the Messiah's kingdom; and yet he is inconsistent with himself, for he makes regeneration a synonym for repentance, conversion, and change of heart which most assuredly were experienced by the saints of every preceding age, and certainly not foretold by John the Baptist.

7th. The Scriptural doctrine of fellowship (communion) by real regeneration surrenders nothing of value. Salvation by regeneration and fellowship is purely a work of grace. Dependence on the person of Jesus is absolute. On the other hand, it removes stumbling blocks which the Scriptures have not put in the way of honest doubters. It gives them an intelligible explanation of the "Merits of Christ." It is simple. Best of all, it can be expounded in Bible terms. The fellowship theory enhances our appreciation of God as the Holy One who loves righteousness and hates sin. It removes all suspicion of cruel delight in blood on God's part, and affords a common-sense explanation of typical phraseology which foreshadowed the death of Jesus. It finds a righteous ground for the sinner's justification in the fact of union with Christ by literal regeneration and consequent partnership in his obedience.

8th. Its homiletic value is in proof of its scripturalness. It makes the sinner wholly dependent on Christ alone. It is common for the sinner, when urged to accept Christ, to ransack his consciousness for evidence of a new heart. He pleads he cannot receive Christ by faith till he has experienced a change of heart. He is true to his teaching. The theory of a real regeneration tells him that if he feels his need of salvation he may go to Christ, and that if he would receive the Spirit in regeneration, he must go to Christ who baptizes with the Spirit all who come, and to all who believe on him gives the right to become the sons of God. When Nicodemus asked of Jesus: "How can these things be?" Jesus replied, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up that whosoever

believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life." To be regenerated one must go to Jesus by faith. We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

9th. While it magnifies law and glorifies obedience manifested perfectly in the person of Jesus for our salvation, for that very reason it effectually crushes legalism. It utterly eradicates every fibre of plausibility in any theory of salvation into which our good works enter as a factor, not only by insisting on man's depravity, but by demonstrating that if any man be in the flesh he cannot please God; that no change of disposition can save him; that he must be really born of the Spirit as a Son of God; that he must be actually saved, as being in Christ a son and heir of God, before he can begin to please God. He must be saved first by baptism into Christ and acceptance in him as righteous before he can do good. A doctrine repugnant to the sinner; to the saint full of comfort and assurance and growth.

10th. Lastly—not to weary the patience of the reader—how is it to be accounted for that a so-called priesthood has for centuries dominated the consciences of millions? It is the function of a priest to offer sacrifice and to make intercession. The efficiency of the intercession depends upon the sufficiency of the sacrifice. We believe that Christ is the only priest, being the antitype of the Aaronic priesthood. His sacrifice once in the end of the world has perfected forever the saints, and his intercession prevails to save all who go to the Father by him. Rome impiously claims to have a real priesthood, and to offer real sacrifice anew of the body of Jesus; and this, too, in the face of the fact that the glorified body of Jesus is not flesh and blood. Flesh and blood, we are clearly told, shall not inherit the kingdom of God, and though the saints who are alive when Christ comes again shall not die, yet their vile bodies shall be changed in a moment like unto Christ's glorified body. Therefore, the glorified body of Jesus is not flesh and blood. Yet Rome claims to offer the real body and blood of Jesus on her altars.

Now, while the chasm between Rome and Protestantism is wide, and their differences radical, they do not differ so much as to the nature of Christ's merit in dying as they do in regard to

the sufficiency of his death. Protestants are scriptural in holding that by one offering he hath perfected forever all his saints. Rome holds that Christ's death is meritorious to procure deliverance from the eternity only of punishment, and that it must be repeated often to shorten the long years of purgatory. But both Romanists and the great body of Protestants shut their eyes to the truth that Christ satisfied the demands of law and justice by his perfect obedience. Long, long ago Jehovah declared that "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." "I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. . . . Wash you, make you clean. . . . Learn to do well." "Sacrifice and offerings thou wouldest not, but a body thou hast prepared me." "In burnt offerings and sacrifice for sin thou hast no pleasure. . . . Then said I, Lo, I come . . . to do thy will, O God." The righteous God loveth righteousness, and Jesus fulfilled all righteousness. Only obedience has merit.

Now, the true theory, that the birth of the Spirit initiates fellowship with Jesus in the reward-procuring merit of his obedience unto death, utterly sweeps away the whole fabric of Rome's invention. Jesus rendered the obedience which is required of man. Therefore death hath no more dominion over him, and by his one offering he hath perfected forever them who are in him.

And what of his intercession? His presence in the holy of holies is the guarantee of the present acceptance and future glorification of them who are in him. His bare presence at the right hand of God is our intercession. Our prayers are offered in the name of Jesus, and God sees and hears the Holy One and the Just. Hence the words of Jesus: "I say not that I will pray the Father for you; the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and believed that I came out from him." We are not to conceive of Christ's intercession as the pleading with a reluctant God to have mercy.

While Rome and her imitators have no true priests, there is a sense in which all God's people are a royal priesthood. They present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable service. God's people are serving as priests when obedient to his will, though, in the strict use of the

word, he only is priest whose obedience unto death avails to save sinners. And the intercessions of God's saints do not avail because of their own obedience, but, being made in the name of Jesus, they plead his merit solely.

Contrast this with Rome's doctrine of intercession. Saints and angels plead their own merit. Mary is represented as queen of heaven, who commands her Son to grant her behests. Surely, there is not enough truth in Rome to justify her recognition as a church of Jesus Christ. She has fatally corrupted the word of God, and is wholly given over to idolatry.

By one man's disobedience the many who are born of him are made sinners; by one man's obedience the many who are born of his Spirit are made righteous. In both cases birth is real.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

Greenville, Mississippi.