

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

SOTERIOLOGY

DR. E. C. BRAGG

SOTERIOLOGY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Objective Soteriology

A. God's Eternal Purpose in Redemption

1. Eternal Decree
2. Motive of Redemption
3. Election and Fatalism
 - a. Negatively Considered
 - 1.) Leads Sinners to Suppose Safe in their Sin
 - 2.) Against Whosoever of the Bible
 - 3.) Confuses God's Foreknowledge and Decrees
 - 4.) Tends to Fatalism
 - 5.) Providence of Will
 - b. Positively Considered
 - 1.) Definition of Election
 - 2.) Purpose vs. the Act of Election
 - 3.) Purpose or End of Election
 - 4.) Nature of Election
 - 5.) Difficult Texts

4. Relation of Infants to God's Plan of Redemption

B. Christ's Mediatorial Office in Redemption

1. Christ as Prophet
2. Christ as Priest
3. Christ as King

C. Atonement

1. Reality of the Atonement
2. Terms Used of the Atonement
 - a. Atonement
 - b. Reconciliation
 - c. Propitiation

- d. Redemption
- e. Substitution
- 3. Necessity of the Atonement
 - a. Grounded in the Divine Attributes of God
 - b. Grounded in Moral Government
- 4. Philosophy of the Atonement (Theories of the Atonement)
 - a. Moral or Unitarian Concept of the Atonement
 - b. Substitution Theories
 - c. Extent of the Atonement

II. Subjective Soteriology

- A. First Works of the Holy Spirit in the Individual's Salvation
- B. Conviction of Sin
- C. Repentance toward God
 - a. Negatively Considered
 - 1.) Not Conviction
 - 2.) Not Sorrow for Sin
 - 3.) Not Fear
 - 4.) Not Confession of Sin
 - b. Positively Considered
- D. Conversion
- E. Saving Faith
 - 1. Not Intellectual Consent
 - 2. Not Located in the Sensibilities
 - 3. Not a Gift of God
- F. Regeneration
- G. Adoption
- H. Justification
 - 1. Not by Works of the Law
 - 2. Free Gift of God'

I. Sanctification

1. Definition of Terms
2. Gifts of the Spirit
3. Fruits of the Spirit
4. Indwelling of the Spirit
5. Earnest of the Spirit
6. Anointing of the Spirit
7. Communion of the Spirit
8. Baptism of the Spirit
9. Infilling of the Spirit

J. Glorification

1. In Spirit
2. In Soul
3. In Body

SOTERIOLOGY

In the study of Soteriology we are arriving at the culminating point of doctrine, the end and purpose for which all other doctrines are given and tend. Every revelation of each member of the Godhead and His specific work for man is for the end of Soteriology, hence the importance of the study of this doctrine.

I. Objective Soteriology

There are two great divisions of the doctrine of Soteriology, which we shall pursue; first, the basis of salvation resting upon the work of Jesus, in His atoning death; and second, the application of that work in the salvation of the sinner. First would be salvation bought and second salvation wrought, first the foundation or basis or ground of salvation; second the nature or application of salvation to the individual sinner, We have reserved the work of Christ in His propitiation for this doctrine rather than put it in Christology, as it is so closely linked together with the out-working of that salvation in the individual case of man's redemption. The first part of our consideration of Soteriology shall be taken up with the study of redemption as an eternal decree of God, conceived from all eternity and wrought out in time. In relationship to this we shall consider election and pre-destination and the errors of fatalism and false fore-ordination. The next subject shall be the three-fold office of Christ as prophet, priest, and king, as the "one mediator between God and man." The concluding subject under part one shall be a consideration of the atonement. This is the heart of Soteriology.

The second part of Soteriology shall consist of the elements of redemption in the individual sinner, his standing in Christ and his position in Christ, his conviction, repentance, conversion, regeneration, union with Christ, justification, and sanctification. The redemption accomplished for him is now wrought out in him.

In studying the plan of redemption it is well to bear always in mind the vast scope of our study. To be right here is to find eternal salvation. Keep in mind that this is not a dry didactic thesis on philosophy or a moral essay, but God's gracious provision for the sinner's greatest need, salvation from sin and rein-statement into fellowship and relationship with God. In the study of the atonement of Jesus Christ, "The decrease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem," we are witnessing the accomplishment of the eternal plan of God, the "finishing of the work which the Father gave Him to do," the only perfect measurement of the love of God, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son," and the measurement of the love God, "He loved me and gave Himself for me." Every doctrine of the Word of God is bound up in the one great work of Christ, which gave a complete satisfaction to divine justice and opened the "new and living way" into the presence of God for guilty sinners, giving them perfect exoneration or justification from all sins.

Dryden, the poet, expressed it this way:

"Look humbly upward, see His will disclose,
The forfeit first, and then the fine impose; a mulct thy poverty could never pay,
Had not eternal wisdom found the way,

And with celestial wealth supplied thy store;
His justice makes the fine, His mercy quits the score. See God descending in the human
frame,
The offended suffering in the offender's name; all thy misdeeds to Him imputed see,
And all His righteousness devolved on thee."

In this division we are to consider the work of redemption wrought out according to the divine plan by God and accomplished without the conscious co-operation of the sinner or consent of the race for which it was accomplished. With this part of redemption man had nothing whatsoever to do. God decreed it and accomplished it apart from any consent of man. That is why we term it objective Soteriology. The second great division shall be occupied with Subjective Soteriology, the individual accomplishment in each person of that redemption, and it must be with the consent of that individual. God worked out His plan after His own sovereign decree and purpose, and no one could stay His hand. When working it out in the individual for his own personal redemption, it must be always, with his consent, and his free moral agency, as the fullest way possible to man. It is well to remember this when reading the Scripture, which seems contradictory; one speaks of God's side of redemption, another of man's.

A. God's Eternal Purpose in Redemption

Here we are interested in the fact that redemption was not a system of restoration which took advantage of circumstances as it progressed, until God finally worked out a contrivance to save man; contrariwise, "Known unto God are all His works from the creation" and "declaring the end from the beginning." His attribute of foreknowledge makes Him to know all things past, present, and future in one, intuitional redemption should follow. Being omnipotent and omniscient, nothing could stay His plan. This is what we mean by God's plan of redemption and His eternal purpose in redemption. What He has eternally decreed, He is able to perform.

1. The Eternal Decree

There are many passages of Scripture and many more which infer the teaching that salvation is a thing decreed in eternity though wrought out in time. Sin did not take God by surprise. God did not make man, unaware of his impending fall and without provision for his fall. After man's fall, God did not have to change a lot of things in His plans in order to restore man. First let us look at a few passages, which undoubtedly teach that Christ's sacrifice for sin was divinely decreed of God back from eternity, the plainest would be the ones which speak of Christ as the "Lamb slain from the foundations of the world," Revelation 13:8. See the following passages: Titus 1:2; II Timothy 1:9; I Corinthians 2:7 or notice Christ's coming into the world and His death was according to God's plan and will, Acts 2:23, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain; John 12:27, "Now is thy soul troubled; and what shall I say, Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I into the world." The deductions from these portions are easy to arrive at; they teach, that before God made man or created the world, in His infinite foreknowledge He knew he would make the wrong choice, and God allowed it; therefore, in the eternal Trinity

of the Godhead the everlasting covenant was made, that Christ should come into the world and die in man's stead and save such as should believe from hell, In this sense He is "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world." You can see this in the many prophecies of His death, and the types, such as Isaac, the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and His own predictions.

This much is Scriptural and an object for faith alone. When we try to reason out the purposes of God's decree and the why of His allowing sin to enter, we run into mystery and can only arrive at a very small answer to the all-embracing question of God's plan of the ages. We do not question His wisdom in the course He has decreed, but the enquiring mind would try to fathom some of His purpose. Here we are at the fountain-head of all inquiry into the why of sin and misery in the world.

Folks have asked, 'Why did God permit sin to enter? Why didn't God kill the devil before the long train of sin and misery could mar His world? Why did God allow fallen, sinful Adam and Eve to have children and perpetuate into myriads of generations their own fallen sinful natures and necessitate God's own Son to be smitten because of it?' We want to briefly consider this question as far as we can possibly go.

In God's council to make man, which He knew he would from all eternity, He also knew or anticipated his fall and therefore eternally decreed the perfect sacrifice, Christ, as His eternal plan of redemption from that fall for both Adam and his posterity. He decreed redemption, therefore, but the question, which has agitated theologians, has been "Did He decree sin?" Some have said, "Yes, He must have, or He foreknew it and could have prevented it; therefore, by allowing it He originated it and decreed sin." What a blasphemous conclusion, to make Almighty God, the only Holy One, the Originator, the author of sin. "How could it be sin," we might ask, for sin is the antithesis of God and His nature. If it emanates from Him, then it is not sin, nor would it bring guilt upon man.

Here again you have the two parallel truths lost sight of by so many: the divine sovereignty of God and the free moral agency of man. The fact that God works out His plan of redemption without man's will but only in His own will shows; therefore, He can decree it, for He shall work it out. The whole truth is that in decreeing redemption He also decreed that from which sin originated, "man's freedom of will." In making man a free moral agent, He decreed that freedom to man, which His foreknowledge knew would lead him to sin. God did not originate it, however, or decree sin itself, but the creature with the ability to sin.

The problem then revolves around this proposition. Whenever God decreed to create the world and man, He at the same time, for reasons within His own sovereign will, decreed to make man a free moral agent with the ability to sin, foreknowing for certain that he would fall, therefore foreordaining or decreeing Christ to die in his place.

When you try to answer why to this plan, then you reach far beyond man's finite wisdom and arrive at the infinite wisdom of God Himself, for the purpose of His decrees are to be found not in man, nor the plan itself, but in God. Illustration: In anything man makes you will not find the purpose for its existence in itself, but in the inventor who makes it. It is the same for the plan of redemption, its purpose lies in God Himself, and for want of a better name we call it "The Glory of God." "Wisdom

is justified of all her children or works." Someday we shall see the wisdom of God in His decrees, but now they are but faintly glimpsed.

God schemed the whole world plan from beginning to end from all eternity, in one all-comprehending purpose, not for any reason in the scheme itself, but for a purpose within Himself. You may glimpse but briefly that thought in Ephesians 3:9-10, "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ; to the intent (purpose) that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." In short, God's infinite wisdom in decreeing what He had decreed in His plan of redemption by allowing man to sin and Christ to die, shall be fully justified before heavenly onlookers, by the special work in the church. The redemption of all men who have ever been saved or ever shall be is not the chief exhibit in glory of God's wisdom, but the church holds the highest place, exhibit number one or the "richly variegated wisdom" of God in the church is the prime justification of God's plan of redemption, but not the purpose of it. She is the number one witness to the effectiveness of the plan, but the purpose of the plan is to be found only in God Himself. He didn't work it out for our sakes but for His own "Name's sake." Man is made for God, should live in God, and is redeemed unto God; the answer to the "why," if at all, is to be found in God's own person. That is why the nearer a person gets to God, the more the questions fade away and the more he understands of the why of it all.

Nevertheless, the Scriptures plainly teach that God did decree that man should have a freedom of will to depart from Himself, through He knew that is exactly what he would do; therefore, He decreed His plan of redemption and decreed that Christ would die in substitution for erring man. We might note that what we call forethought is only a human way of saying that God knows all things to come. There is really no succession of thought with God; He knows all things as present perfect intuition, and what He knows He knows eternally.

This consideration of the eternal decrees of God brings us face to face with another much discussed and misunderstood truth which shall occupy our next interest; the thought of predestination and election.

2. The Motive of Redemption

By this we mean, why did God see fit to work out this plan of redemption for man? What was the purpose? Was man lovely or loveable? In human love, love is always created in the heart by the object loved and is increased by contemplation of the attributes and perfections of the one loved. The great motive of God's provision of redemption of man was His love; and that love was not excited by any lovely attributes in fallen man, nor because he is loveable, but solely because "God's plan of redemption" was through the "love of God;" "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." Note the many times in the New Testament, and the Old, too, how the love of God is always connected to any of His provisions for man.

3. Election and Fatalism - God's foreknowledge and predestination

In considering the divine decrees of God and His fore-knowledge of all things in the out workings of His plan of redemption, we are brought face to face with the questions arising out of them of the truths embodied in the doctrines of election and foreordination, with the accompanying errors of fatalism and unconditional election.

The first thing we wish to examine is the teaching of Calvin embodied in a lot of the modern errors taught about election. In brief, it is that only a certain class of sinners is elected to salvation, and only to them is any saving influence ever given to lead them to salvation. All others are lost, not because of any fault in themselves, but only because they are not one of the elect. God has decreed their eternal damnation, not because of any rejection on their part, but from eternity had so decreed that they should be lost,

Let us first establish the fact that this is so taught: The doctrine of unconditional election carries with it the doctrine of unconditional reprobation. The idea of choosing some carries with it the idea of rejecting those who are not chosen. Some writers try to hold to the doctrine of unconditional election without accepting the other doctrine of reprobation, but that is impossible. Even Calvin recognized that, "Many indeed, as though they would drive away the malice from God, do so grant election that they deny that any man is reprobated; but this they do too ignorantly and childishly for, as much as election itself could not stand unless it were set contrary to reprobation; therefore, whom God passeth over He rejecteth; and for no other cause, but for that He will exclude them from the inheritance which He doth predestinate to be His children." Of man it might be said that they can choose one thing without rejecting all others, but of omniscient God it cannot be said; His choice of one would mean the exclusion of all things.

Calvin says in his *Institutes of Religion*, section 5, chapter 21, Book 3: "Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, whereby He had determined with Himself what He willed to become of every man. For all men are not created to like estate; but to some eternal life and to some eternal damnation is fore-appointed." Here he teaches that some are specifically created, brought into existence, for the expressed and definite purpose of damnation and for no other, with their own actions or wills having nothing to do with it. The confession of the Church of Scotland says concerning these same reprobate creatures: "As for these wicked and ungodly men whom God, as a righteous judge, for former sins, doth blind and harden, from them He not only withholdeth His grace whereby they might have been enlightened in their understandings and wrought upon in their hearts, but sometimes also withdraweth the gifts which they had and exposeth them to such objects as their corruption makes occasion to sin, and withal gives them over to their own lusts, the temptation of the worlds, and the power of Satan, whereby it come to pass that they harden themselves." Here it is declared that the sinner might have been saved; but to keep him from it, God not only withdraws methods of grace lest he should, but deliberately puts temptation in his way so that he will undoubtedly be lost because he is not one of the elect, not just negatively withhold His grace, but making certain by entrapping him.

The real sum, then, of the doctrine of unconditional election is this: "All men are not created to like estate;" some of the human race coming into existence as elect infants is unconditionally and irreversibly destined to eternal happiness; all the rest of mankind coming into existence is unconditionally doomed to everlasting damnation. Therefore, strictly speaking, Christ died only for the former, not the latter, and having

no interest in the atonement, their only purpose of being brought into the world is to satisfy God's righteousness in judging sinners. Free moral agency has nothing to do with it. The elect were chosen as elect before the world began and since babyhood could never be lost; the sinner not being chosen can never be saved, no matter how much you preach to him. Some, therefore, have gone so far as to declare that God judgeth infants who die in infancy according to what He knew they would have done if they had lived; so some babies are saved and some are lost.

Now, there are many modifications and interpretations of this erroneous theory by modern counterparts. Some of its glaring statements have been smoothed out to fit modern ideas, but to my mind you have to take it all and follow it to logical conclusions, or reject the whole system as a gross lie. It all starts with the false assumptions of Calvin, "All men are not created to the same estate." Yet, Paul in Ephesians 2:3 tells us, "We were all in times past children of wrath, even as others;" and further it is stated, "He that believeth not is condemned already." Yet, the verse they use so much is, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" These same elect did have something laid to their charge before they were saved.

Some objections to this teaching:

a. Negatively Considered

1.) It leads unconverted sinners to suppose they are safe while still in sin. If he were one of the elect, then he shall be saved no matter what; but, if he were not one of the elect, then he is one of the reprobates, and why worry about it, for no amount of worry will change the election? That is the plain conclusion of the doctrine. They say, "Election is not for man to know, and no one is to know until saved if he is one of the elect." Why then teach it so strongly? Ignorance does not alter any of the facts; there is still no gospel to be preached to the reprobate. There are even some who have been saved and felt God's convicting power, who are still in doubt they could have any assurance that they are elected,

2.) Where is the truth in the "whosoever" of the Word of God, the universal gospel message; "Good tidings, which shall be to all people?" How is this so under this system? It shunts up to hell a vast unsaved multitude of sinners and throws the blame, not where it belongs upon the sinner, but upon an inflexible decree of God, Christ said, "Ye would not come unto Me that ye might have life." He should have said, if Calvinism were true, "Ye cannot come unto Me, for My Father so decreed it." He puts the responsibility of their lost condition where the whole Bible puts it, on the unbelief of the sinner and his set will against God.

3.) The third objection to this theory is the confusion on their part of God's foreknowledge with His decrees. They make His foreknowledge a secondary thing emanating only from His decree. He knows only because He has decreed it; and because He has decreed it, they say, the only thing God knows is what He has decreed. They limit His knowledge to that without His ability to know what other free beings shall do, Their argument

lies along the line of reasoning: "God can only know that which is certain, and it is only certain if God has decreed it." Their timeworn argument can be thus phrased, "God knows from all eternity who shall be saved and who lost; therefore, it is fixed from eternity by God, else how could He foreknow from eternity, but only guess it." They lose sight of the fact that God could foreknow a thing without "fixing" or decreeing or originating it. Foreknowledge, like after knowledge, doesn't have to originate anything to know it; my knowledge of what happened yesterday has nothing to do with the cause of it, nor did it cause it to happen. So it is with foreknowledge. The Calvinist argues that God's infallible knowledge of all events involves on His part the necessity to cause them to happen, as though nothing could be known for certain as going to happen, without Himself causing it to happen. God also knows every sin, which shall be committed; yet to suppose that He originated it or decreed it in order to foreknow it is blasphemy.

They mean to affirm that God's omniscience is dependent upon His omnipotent power to decree it and perform it. Calvin says, "God foreknow the end of each man because He had so ordained by His decree." Chapter 23, Book 3. Dr. Bonar says, "It is of some importance that we should settle the nature of these two things: predestination and foreknowledge, and ascertain which is first, the question is does God fix a thing simply because He foreknows it, or does He foreknow it because He fixed it? I answer unhesitatingly, that predestination must be the foundation of foreknowledge. God foreknows everything that takes place because He has fixed it," Here he advances the absurd idea that only as God decrees can He foreknow, and, the worst idea, that all things which are, are because God fixed it (sin included). What kind of foreknowledge is that? It isn't foreknowledge at all. It is merely a present determination rather than foreknowledge. Illustration: If a man tells me that so and so is going to die on such and such a day of a gunshot wound, I'm amazed at his wonderful foreknowledge; but, if I find out he is the one who does the act, then, where is the foreknowledge but telling me what he was going to do and of his own present determination? The meanest man can have that kind of foreknowledge in a small decree. No man possesses the type of foreknowledge the Bible ascribes to God, He not only knows His own works, but every choice which shall be made by free moral agents, and that "knowledge is too wonderful for me,"

The Scriptures always base God's foreordination upon His foreknowledge, and not the reverse. Note Romans 8:29, "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate;" I Peter 1:2, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God." This system, then, which would require God to decree before He can foreknow tries to measure God's infinite wisdom by puny human standards. Note the Psalmist 139: 1, "O Lord, thou hast searched me and known me. Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising; thou understandest my thought afar off (before I think them). Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways; for there is not a word in my tongue but, lo, Oh Lord, thou knowest it altogether.

Thou hast beset me behind and before and laid Thine hand upon me." Did the Psalmist try to account for such wonderful knowledge along the Calvinistic line, "You know it because you have decreed it?" No, he immediately accounts for it: "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it,"

4.) The system tends to fatalism, to the exclusion of human freedom of will. Where can human volition have any part, where everything in his life of good or had is fixed by a divine decree before he is born; and, if he could do differently, he would destroy the decree of God Himself. Man is an automaton who must go on in a rut too deep from which to escape, no matter the horribleness of the way in which he trod. The fatalist philosophy is incorporated into Christianity, "What is to be, will be," no escape. Remember that what God has willed and decreed to come to pass shall come to pass, and nothing man can do can prevent it, Yet, within every human being there is the feeling of personal responsibility for his actions. The reminder, "I should not have done that;" but why, if he could not have done otherwise, but was made to do it by unalterable divine decree? The thought, I could have done better is the compunction of every sinner to higher life even if he finds himself so bound by Satan as to be unable to carry it out, that he has the ability within to choose differently.

5.) There is one more consideration of error in unconditional election, which we want to consider before considering the true Biblical doctrine of election. It is the precedence of will; is God's will first in everything? Does God have to will a thing first for it to happen? One Calvinist (Dr. Bonar) says, "Nothing in the universe takes place without the will of God." It is asked, then, "Is His will first in everything?" I answer, "Yes." The will of God goes before every other will. It does not depend upon them, but they depend upon it. Its movements regulate them, The "I will" of Jehovah is the spring and origin of all that is done throughout the universe, great or small, among things animate and inanimate, Everything in the world happens according to God's eternal arrangements. Nothing takes place except what God causes to be or permits to be; and, whatever happens in time is decreed from eternity. Even the wicked deed of those who crucified the Lord of Glory is said by the apostle "to be determined before by the hand and counsel of God."

The real question without going over again the same ground brought up this quotation is "Which is first; the will of God in everything?" That His will is first in the conversion of the sinner is evident; but "is His will first in everything?" We say, "No." God's will is not first in everything; it is "not the spring and origin of wickedness;" "Every good and perfect gift cometh down from above from the Father of lights," but only these. The origin of evil is traced back to God by the Calvinist, though James says, "God tempteth no man; neither can he be tempted with evil."

The Scriptures affirm that the will of God for all men is their salvation, II Peter 3:9, "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should

perish, but that all should come to repentance." Can any man say, in the light of that portion, that it is God's will and decree to create some men only for hell, and has willed from all eternity to send them there? Rather, is it not plain that His will is for their salvation, and their will for their own damnation? Let us put the blame where Scripture puts it, not upon an irreversible decree of God shutting out some from salvation, but upon man's own willful rejection of God's proffered mercy. No twisting of Scripture can make them to teach that God willed and then fixed by divine decree to make a devil out of Lucifer, a sinner out of Adam, and creatures of torment out of men. Scriptures, such as Acts 2:23 and 4:25-28, have reference to the fulfillment of God's plan of redemption by the sacrifice of Christ, rather than a fixing by decree the wickedness of the men who perpetuated the dead.

Note: There is a moderate teaching among Calvinists today who would do away with the objectionable side of Calvinism and would escape the rightful censorship that logic leads one to make regarding the doctrine. It says that Christ died for all men all right, not only for the elect, but, for the non-elect, but "that God allows His Holy Spirit to give his special, saving influence to the elect alone and that this influence is irresistible, and, therefore, he cannot help being saved when it is exerted, but that the irresistible influence is withheld from the non-elect." I can't see much advantage of this theory over ultra-Calvinism, and, it is not nearly as consistent. Bancroft (page 165) says of the doctrine of reprobation: "The decree of reprobation is simply a decree to do nothing, a decree on the part of God to leave the sinner to himself. The natural result of this judicial forsaking on the part of God is the hardening and destruction of the sinner." He goes on then to a softening of the conclusion his Calvinism leads him into, by saying that this forsaking is not due to any efficiency on God's part, but by rejection on man's part. If God withholds the only saving influence of the Holy Spirit, and the Bible certainly teaches there is no salvation without it, then, where is this doctrine relieved of its obnoxious element? Was David's method of murdering Uzziah the Hittite any less murder than Cain's? Yet David only had him transferred to a place of danger, but for the purpose of disposing of him; and God dealt with him for murder. What if I see a man dying, and I have in my possession the means of saving him, but withhold it? Is my withholding a negative sin or positive? Or, as Bancroft says, 'the decree of reprobation is simply a decree to do nothing, a decree on the part of God to leave the sinner to himself. The natural result of this judicial forsaking on the part of God is the hardening and destruction of the sinner.' Is it any less positively an efficient murder in the eyes of society? Under the Law of Moses, to see a man's donkey in the ditch and not help him, made you guilty of killing it; just withhold the means of saving it. Shall not that same charge be brought against this doctrine of election and reprobation? The question of man's deserving any of God's grace does not enter into the discussion, nor relieve this doctrine of its odium. To say that 'special influence' is only given to the elect, and the non-elect cannot be saved without it, is to consign the non-elect just as much to hell as to say

with the ultra- Calvinist, Christ didn't even die for him at all, but only brought with His blood power over him to send him to hell. The Scriptures teach that God's Spirit is not irresistible, but many have gone down to hell resisting His saving, convicting influence, Genesis 6:3; Acts 7:57.

This will be enough examination of these deductions of Calvinism from the Biblical teaching of election. They outlaw common sense, as well as plain Scripture, which sends the equal offer out to all men anywhere and everywhere to repent, and to go into all the world and preach the Gospel, and whosoever will let him come and take of the water of life freely, and the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. There is no irreversible decree standing in any sinner's way of heaven, but, if he is excluded, it will be the result of his own free choice of rejection of Christ. We shall in our next section try to determine from the Scriptures a true doctrine of election. We realize the mysteries attached, to reconciling sovereign will and foreknowledge to His allowing man to have freedom of choice even to denying God; yet, the Scriptures give us some light on this great doctrine.

b. Positively Considered

It is well to keep in mind that some of the great truths in the Word of God have a Divine side and a human side; and many times the two are not reconcilable. Our minds are but finite and it is to be expected that they should falter and fail in their efforts to comprehend infinite ideas and truth. Some truths are too large for us to understand all there is to know about them. God's Divine sovereignty is one of those truths, and man's freedom of will is another. They are two arcs in a great circle of truth; taken separately we can study them, but to bring them together with effort at reconciliation, our minds fail. There are too many missing complements to the circle for us to get the connections right. We can accept by faith, however, what the mind is incapable of grasping. Now, because election is made up of both the Divine sovereignty of God and man's freedom of will, we find truth here, which must be divided and studied separately. We may separate it from the human standpoint or the Divine; but to try to reconcile them is impossible except superficially and, at the expense of one or the other; here is the fault of Calvinism and Armenianism. Calvinism lit up the Divine sovereignty of God and sees only that, ignoring or explaining away every portion of God's Word, which in no uncertain terms makes all of God's dealing with us conditional upon our co-operation and free choice. Armenianism went to the other extreme and made man the head, ignoring the Divine sovereignty of God, made man too much the captain of his own destiny and God too much at the beck and call of men, He based man's salvation too much upon the efforts of man, without fully allowing for the over-ruling grace and power of God, who can turn "all things to work together for good to those who are called according to His purpose," He who is able to "work everything after the council of His own will."

With this preliminary thought in mind, we want to first consider election from the human standpoint with its conditional characteristics. We shall at the close of

this section briefly consider some difficult texts, and God's side of election. That the Calvinistic extreme doctrine of election is erroneous certainly has been seen from Scriptures, as well as from common sense and experience, but that election is taught in the Word of God is evident. What then is the true doctrine of election? We shall of necessity have to be briefer in our consideration than we ought, but we shall try to clarify the Scriptural teaching of election in your minds.

1.) The Definition of the Word Election. The word denotes the act of selection, or separation of one object from surrounding objects. That is the simple real meaning of the word, selection and separation. We use it every day in voting called "elections" or selections of one object over another. Such is the meaning of the verse, "The Lord hath set apart him that is godly for Himself." Here is the word election meant without using the word itself, "a setting apart" of a certain class of folks for Himself. In Scriptures it means the right to select or choose or separate some.

2.) The radical difference between the purpose of election and the actual act of election. You cannot fail to notice the important difference between the purpose to select and the act or process of selection. The purpose of selection exists as a reality as soon as you have made up your mind, but the actual process has no real existence until the time when you actually carry out your purpose of selection. Until that is carried out, there is in reality no election. How important this distinction is; to say that God has purposed the election of every saved person from eternity is one thing; but to say that He decreed their election from eternity so that, in fact, before they are born they had a real election is another thing and runs contrary to some plain Scriptures. We note an illustration from the election of Aaron to the high priestly office, that God purposed from eternity to make Aaron priest is right; but to say that, in fact, the election was carried out from eternity is wrong, as can be seen from the story of its carrying out, Numbers 17:5, "And it shall come to pass that the man's rod whom I shall choose shall blossom;" not that God did not purpose before, but, actually not until Aaron was anointed, did election take place.

This is the proper meaning of election. It is the actual deed of separation, "Set apart him that is godly for Himself," but not until he is godly, and only the godly; the sinner is nowhere in God's Book called elect. Only the saved bear that name. Whenever the Scripture speaks of election as from eternity, it means and can mean nothing else than the election in the purpose of God.

There are a number of elections in the Word of God: angelical election - "elect angels;" national election - Israelites were divinely chosen from all other nations as His peculiar treasure and were an elect nation; sacerdotal election - as the case of Aaron and the Levitical priesthood; regal election - the choosing of Saul and, after his rejection, the choosing of the house of David to rule Israel; mediatorial election - for Jesus the Son of God was styled, "Mine elect in whom my soul delighteth;" then lastly, there is the evangelical election (the one which has troubled folks) - -which consists in the separation of those who do believe upon Christ from all the world

around them into membership in the Church of Christ, but in all of these there is the same principle. God's purpose in election is one thing and the actual election to the office of elect is another, See Ephesians 3:11. Here the eternal calling of the Church to display the "manifold wisdom of God" is given as existing in the eternal purpose, which He purposed in Christ. The very name Church is "the called-out ones," and the words of Christ, "I have chosen you out of the world." Note: Elections from eternity in the mind of God in purpose, and we shall note at the close of this discourse that His fore-knowledge is the basis from which He purposes His election, but the actual election is when the sinner is saved, separated from the rest of the sinners who are non-elect. That act of separation and making godly is His election, if you please, and then, and not until then, the Scriptures refer to him as one of the "elect." God is the sole source of this election; He is the sole agent. To Him belongs all the credit and glory. No sinner would ever find God without God's influence and drawing him, and God does the separating or electing. God does the choosing or selecting; but as we shall see later, He does it by His foreknowledge. (Here we arrive at mystery again).

3.) The purpose of election, or the ultimate end, which God had in view in election. There is, of course, only one grand end in all that God has ever done or ever will do - it is the glory of God. There could be no other end than this, spoken of in the Bible as "for My own Name's sake," I Corinthians 10:31.

While this is the overall grand end and purpose in election, there are two subordinate ends; one has to do with the state of the subjects of election and the other with their character, in their state, to separate them from the world under the protection and daily cleansing and sprinkling of the blood of Christ, I Peter 1:2, "Elect unto the sprinkling of the blood of Christ," and II Thessalonians 2:13, "God hath from the beginning chosen you unto salvation." That is His purpose from the beginning.

In their character, they are elected unto obedience, I Peter 1:2; or Paul in Ephesians 1:4, chosen that they "should be holy and without blame before Him in love;" Called or elected unto salvation and perfect standing before God as to their state; and holiness of character as to their daily character; all that He might be glorified by the display of His unmerited grace upon unworthy, hell-bound creatures.

4.) The nature of election. That there is a point of similarity between all of the elections spoken of in Scripture is assured; but that they are all one and the same in nature, no one would venture to say. Therefore, to alight upon the reference by Paul of God's election of Israel in Rom. 8-9 for a perfect outline of His election of the Church is folly. Some of God's elections are unconditional, as the election of Israel as a nation unto Himself. Nationally, it was unconditional, but individually, conditional, "for they are not all Israel which are of Israel," and His election of David to kingship over Israel. This line of thought can be further traced, and we may have occasion to refer to it again at the close. What then are the distinguishing features of the

election of grace now? These conditions were not a part of the other elections.

To understand the nature of this election of grace, it is necessary to understand what two hindrances there are to election, and how election removes these two hindrances out of the way.

What hindrance is there to the daily enjoyment of a sinner to the sprinkling of the cleansing blood of Christ? It is the state of condemnation in which the sinner rests because of unbelief in the saving work of Christ. The second hindrance keeping him from believing in Christ's atoning work for him is his unregenerated nature, which is at enmity with God and voluntarily rejects God's testimony. Here is the two-fold hindrance to election, his state of condemnation and his evil nature, which keeps him there. God's election would remove those two hindrances, and, in its nature, it does just that. To remove the condemnation alone wouldn't be enough; that is justification. To remove the evil heart of unbelief would not be enough; that is regeneration. Both of these two are acts of God alone. Election, however, is both of these two: by that act of election he is removed from under the condemnation of his sin and the enmity from his soul by the implanting of a new, godly nature! This is true and proper evangelical election. Here it is different from all other divine elections. The elect angels never even fell, but are elect only because they never fell.

How different their election is from ours! Aaron's election consisted merely in God choosing him from among all others to fulfill the priestly office, requiring no greater change in his nature to do it. God's choosing of David to be king above all others was such an election, based upon God's foreknowledge that he would be a man after God's own heart. Jesus needed no work of grace in His own heart to be elected by God to be the only mediator between God and man. The election of grace, however, goes far beyond God's election of other men to their positions. The elect Church is justified and sanctified. Summed up, the election of grace is the removal of the evil heart of unbelief and the condemnation of guilt from the sinner, by the means of justification and regeneration, both accomplished only by God; hence, in truth, "It is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God who showeth mercy." This truth of election may further be illustrated by the fact that it is not declared as being something finished in the transaction from eternity, but as being accomplished by the use of means,

In II Thessalonians 2:13, Paul very distinctly says that we are "chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." It is not chosen to sanctification of the Spirit, but chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit. It is not chosen to the truth, but to salvation through the belief in the truth of the fact that, what God does in time, He purposed from all eternity to do. The actual election, according to this verse, is only by the means of the work of the Holy Spirit when the truth is believed; yet, that truth cannot have been believed by the sinner from eternity, nor can the sinner be said to have been sanctified by the Spirit from eternity.

Here is the imperative of the gospels appeal to sinners; God has provided the means for man's election entirely apart from man, without any aid from him. The sacrifice of Christ was accomplished; the Holy Spirit was given; and the good news, or the "Truth of the Gospel," to be believed had been sounded out to the sinner. All things are ready for the immediate election of the sinner, but inasmuch as the sinner is a free agent and is graciously furnished by the Holy Spirit with everything that is necessary for the unbelief of the truth," it is at this point that he is called upon to do his part, to accept "the truth of the testimony of the Spirit" about Christ. The sinner cannot be elected when he refuses the one conditional means to election, "belief of the truth." The only damning sin in the world is unbelief (apart from the unpardonable sin, which is, after all, a form of unbelief). Christ said so, John 3:18; 16: 8-9. As long as the sinner refuses to believe the truth, he cannot be elected unto Christ, separated from the world of sinners. There is no election out of Christ; Paul says, "Elect in Christ."

As long as he remains out of Christ, he is not elect, nor can be. When the apostle speaks of "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world," he is referring to the election in purpose, God's purpose to elect from all eternity; hence, the plan of salvation is an eternal plan. This purpose to elect was based on the infallible foreknowledge of God as to how undecreed man should choose, Peter calls it "elect according to the foreknowledge of God," See Romans 8:28-30 (interesting - all in the past tense.) Remember that His foreknowledge does not decree anything.

This idea of election is consistent with the whole Gospel, which is for every man. It throws the blame for man's impenitence where it belongs, on man and not God. It shows that God is not willing that any should perish but that all should come to acknowledge of repentance, and that Christ died for all men.

I know there are still difficulties, and we admit them, laying them to our own ignorance and finite minds, rather than lay injustice or iniquity to God. It seems to me, however, that the difficulties of ultra-Calvinism are greater than ours.

How can the Calvinist ever explain, for instance, this verse of Scripture, still adhering to the plain meaning of words, and yet keep his idea that God sends men to hell by a fixed decree from eternity and that man's election to salvation is fixed from eternity? II Peter 1:10, "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give all diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." If a man's election is settled in eternity past by divine decree, how can any man make it surer? It would be blasphemy to try to add to the work of God. No one could make it less sure or surer. The Calvinists have lamely said, "He meant make themselves sure," but that isn't what he says at all. It's your calling and election you are to make sure. Taking that we have said so far as the basis, you can easily see what Peter meant. If it's by means we are elected, then to assure the means would be to assure the election, It is thus we are to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling." But also remember, "It is God that

worketh in you both to will and do of His good pleasure.

5.) Some difficulties and perplexing passages of Scripture. His dealings are based upon what He knows that individual shall do, even as we deal with a person on the basis of what he has done. We have nothing in human faculties to compare with that; the other difficulty hinges upon the divine sovereignty of God, how He can do everything after the counsel of His own will, yet allow any other free will to exist. Theologians have admitted the difficulty and stated it without attempted explanation as "Thy self-imposed limitations to Thy Sovereignty." In some manner, His sovereign will provides that man shall have a will which can be set in rebellion against His own; and yet, when we view any of God's works, whether in providence or redemption, from the Heavenly viewpoint we always see His divine sovereignty without any human ability to stay His hand. As Paul says, "Has not the potter power over the clay to make a vessel unto honor or dishonor?" That whole portion of Romans 9 views God's actions from the Heavenly viewpoint and shows God's untrampled sovereignty. It is a portion for faith and not for reason. We shall refer to it again. I might catch glimpses of bright light upon God's foreknowledge and sovereignty, but my vision is so limited and there is infinitely more than I can see, until it is no wonder I meet mystery and find difficulty reconciling it with mere human things. The difficulty here is not one for faith (for faith knows God is too great to be encompassed by human reason), but, for reason, because of inadequacy.

a.) Exodus 4:21. It seems harsh to the unconverted superficial reader to read that the Lord says, "I will harden Pharaoh's heart." God knew how Pharaoh would receive the request of Moses to let Israel go, but He did not fix by decree that that was the only way they could receive it. We see the same effect every time a gospel message is preached. (How many sermons, preached for the salvation of the sinner, have the actual opposite result of hardening his heart because he rejects it?) The same sun that melts the wax hardens the clay. This verse is quoted in Romans 9:17-18. God raised Pharaoh up to show abroad to all the earth His power. Pharaoh was so placed that he might have been the greatest benefactor to God's chosen people, but he rejected that opportunity; he became a "vessel unto wrath," but still showed forth the power of God; and His further glory He displayed upon His vessels of mercy, Israel.

The statement that God would harden Pharaoh's heart or the Egyptians' hearts does not mean that God would do so in spite of what they believed, or no matter in what way they received God's message to let Israel go. In His foreknowledge, He knew how they would react to the message, and He forewarned His servant Moses as to how he would be received by Pharaoh, in order to further prove to Israel His power and provision for them. He further hardened Pharaoh's heart that Moses might perform the miracles God gave him to do. That is all that is meant; to read into the passages any fixed eternal decree of God

to make Pharaoh a wicked man, is to read into the Scriptures some human philosophy.

b.) Another Scripture, which would seem harsh to the natural mind, unacquainted with the full truth of the Scriptures is to be found in Romans 9:13-23. They say it shows respect of persons for God to say, "Jacob have I chosen but Esau have I rejected;" that it is in His purpose to make a nation like Israel. Esau might have later been saved. God was not speaking of eternal salvation, but only of His purpose of electing a nation to bear His name. The promise made to Abraham, then Isaac, and then to Jacob or Israel, was renewed by the same sovereign freedom of action on the part of God to Jacob rather than Esau. God reserved the freedom to choose whomsoever He willed to head the nation of promise. God was not obliged to choose either one, and did so by no derived right but by virtue of the fact of His own sovereignty. In reading the history of the two men, who can deny which was the better fitted for the place? God could see something in deceitful Jacob to fit him to be the father of Israel, and could see the nature of Esau in selling his birthright, or despising it as not worth the price of beef stew, as not worthy of the place. God acted in His choice with divine freedom, but certainly His foreknowledge was the basis for it. In this same way, Jesus called Peter a stone, when He knew he would deny Him; but, in His infinite foreknowledge, He could see the Pentecostal preacher. It is thus God can see the perfected saint in the called sinner. This exposition of Romans 9:13 can easily be proven when you consider the verse Paul is quoting from in Malachi 1:2; there the reference is not to merely the two men, but the nation of promise.

With this in mind there is no difficulty in understanding the rest of the argument which Paul is giving to the Jews who thought they had a chosen corner of divine grace, and that God owed them salvation because of their physical lineage back to Abraham. This and this alone is what Paul was dealing with in this portion and not with any so called eternal decree to send some to hell while to divinely pick a few for salvation. He quotes Moses, "I will have mercy upon whom I will have mercy;" and, likewise, "whom He willeth He hardeneth;" but who would dare to say more than that and say that there is unrighteousness with God, by saying that He willeth to harden any that would be penitent. His foreknowledge enables Him with infallible justice to deal with all men with infinite freedom of choice, but also according to that individual's freedom of will. In reading the rest of the argument to verse 23, keep it well in mind that Paul is not here arguing to any eternal unconditional election by divine decree of any man's damnation or salvation, but is arguing with Israel and their divine election, as a matter of perfect freedom on God's part and, far from being unconditional, depended upon their obedience. The Jews had lost sight of the great truth of God's sovereign freedom to do as He willeth, even to grafting in the wild branch of the Gentiles and cutting

off the natural branch of Israel. They had thought that when God covenanted with their fathers to make them His chosen nation, that He had surrendered His freedom and sovereignty and was bound to save them, no matter how they acted (pretty close to some modern-day electionists). They had long been the only vessel of honor upon the earth, and the Gentiles the vessel of dishonor. Paul here is only reminding and warning them that God has retained the right to reverse this purpose according to the acceptance or rejection by the Jews. The same dealings may be seen in individuals; God has gifted some wonderfully, while others not so much, some are given ten talents, some five, some only one; surely giving according to the wisdom and foreknowledge of God as to who would use them wisely. Yet "the Spirit giveth the gifts severally as He willeth," freedom to act. He always acts righteously and perfectly wisely, however, in His choice. If that election is squandered by the receiver, then how many times has God dealt with them as He did with Israel, before reversing His choice? Paul said, "I keep my body under subjection, if least having preached to others I myself become benched."

c.) With all the preceding thoughts in mind regarding election we might consider briefly the Scriptures where the word "predestinate" occurs in the Bible. The word "predestinate" occurs only six times in the Greek text, twice in Romans 8:29-30; twice in Ephesians 1:5, 11; once in Acts 4:28, "determined;" and once in I Corinthians 2:7, "ordained." It means literally "to mark off beforehand." Its literal meaning has to do with the purpose of God rather than any former decree. Such may be seen from one of the references in Ephesians 1:5. Twice in Romans 8:29, we can see that the reference is to saints, not sinners, and is based upon God's foreknowledge. Because God can know how each free moral agent shall choose, He can in His divine purpose predestinate that one that shall choose Christ to be conformed to the Image of His Son. Do not divorce verse 29 from verse 28. The 'for' links the two, the "called according to purpose" (leave out the "His"); what purpose? God's purpose in election from eternity past was to call out a people for the name of Christ to be conformed to His image and finally glorified, after being justified from all things. That is the meaning of this text. Those who are the called-out ones, according as God purposed from eternity, are predestinated, purposed of God to be like His Son; and it is these elect ones, verse 33, which cannot be charged with anything, for God has justified them.

Note in Ephesians 1:5, going from verse 4, "chosen in Him before the foundation of the world unto holiness;" "predestinated unto the adoption of children." Now note: "According to the good pleasure of His purpose;" it is the sovereign will of God to so choose. We do not rob God of His infinite sovereignty; but in His infinite sovereignty He has willed that I could have the power to will.

This same sovereignty is seen in verse 11 of chapter 1: "in whom (in Christ again; there is no such thing as election out of Christ) we have obtained an inheritance being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own Will." There is all the truth about predestination. What could man do without God willing it to be so? He must will man the ability to deny God Himself, and we see that everywhere; but He has also willed or purposed for those in Christ to have an eternal inheritance.

"The very most we can say of predestination in the light of every Scripture which allows man to have the moral responsibility for his own actions, is that every man, who is eternally foreseen as being in Christ, God has predestinated unto eternal life; and everyone who is eternally foreseen as being out of Christ is predestinated to be lost." (Robert Foster, *Systematic Theology*, p. 521)

We cannot go any further than that in understanding the divine side of election and predestination. We must always remember that God, in His exercising of His sovereign will, included in that plan for all the ages the right of man to choose for himself life or death.

d.) The relationship of infants to God's Plan of Redemption. Since infants possess a living soul, yet the condition of that soul cannot depend upon any choice or responsible action of itself, we must make some place in our theology for considering the case of that infant dying in infancy. We consider that probably more than half of all humans born into the world die in infancy or before they come to the age of accountability; they form a vast multitude of human souls, for which an account must be made. Dr. A. B. Simpson estimated that 60 generations have gone by since the time of Christ. I think that to be a little high, but he goes on to say that, out of that, only 10,000,000 were saved adults out of each generation. So 600,000,000 saved adults have lived since the time of Christ, but thirty billion infants have died during the same period, *Christ in the Bible*, p. 171. If his figures are close, there are thirty billion human souls for which to account. Are they saved or lost?

(1.)The early Pelagians tried to account for them by saying that they were neither saved nor lost. They are not included in Christ's atonement because they didn't need it. These denied hereditary sin, so they needed no salvation, for nothing in them needed saving. In other words, they would form a vast class all by themselves and are not included in God's present plan of redemption; of this the Scriptures say nothing. They do say much about the hereditary sin, however, "In sin did my mother conceive me."

(2.)The early Calvin method of dealing with the question is to bring them in under the same condition as adults, save that they do not go through repentance and believing. Based upon the false

idea of election and predestination, some infants are elect and others are not elect. Those elect infants are saved because of the fixed eternal decree of God, making them one of the elect; but the non-elect, being not decreed unto salvation, are lost, even though dying in infancy. There is no authority for later day Calvinists to assert that the very fact that one dies in infancy is proof that he was one of the elect. That is wishful thinking or hopeful thinking, inconsistent with the doctrine of election taught by Calvin. The Dort confession says hopefully, "Godly parents have no reason to doubt of the election and salvation of their children whom it pleaseth God to call out of this life in their infancy." Isn't that inconsistent with their own theory that election is not conditioned upon any human actions whatsoever? Why should all infants of godly parents be sure of election, while the infants of ungodly ones are not?

Many modern believers in Calvinism repudiate the idea of infant damnation, and some go so far as to deny that Calvin ever so taught. Let us see if he did. To be consistent with his own doctrine of eternal election stated by Book III, p. 21: "And we call predestination the eternal decree of God whereby He determined with Himself what He would have to become of every man. For men are not created (brought into existence) to like estate; but for some eternal life and for some eternal: death is appointed." Calvin must have believed in elect infants, and contrariwise, non-elect or reprobate infants. If all men are not brought into this life or born or "created" to like estate, then the time element has nothing whatsoever to do with it. They are predestinated back in eternity so that, from the moment they are born, they are either saved or lost, according to this theory of election. Whether then that infant dies in infancy or lives a life to a wicked old age has nothing to do with its salvation or election; it is elect at infancy, not at adult life. If Calvin means anything, he means that men are elect at infancy. "All men are not created to like estate;" all men are not born or brought into life in the same election: some are specifically brought into existence for eternal life, and some are born only for damnation from the time of their creation. He had to believe in infant damnation to be consistent with his false idea of election.

In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book IV, 21: "If those therefore to whom the Lord hath vouchsafed his election (Note, only, then, those who are elected, which excludes those not elected), having received the sign of regeneration (what is the sign of regeneration he is talking about?). He tells you in the whole chapter written in defense of infant baptism, those who have received the sign of infant baptism (What of those who haven't?), depart this life before they grow up, He reneweth

them by the power of His Spirit. What is this whole teaching, but the consistent application of his whole doctrine of election by unconditional decree from eternity to infants? He teaches here that only infants to whom God vouchsafes His election, by the sign of regeneration, which is infant baptism, are renewed by the Spirit, or saved. If you doubt this to be his meaning, look further in his teachings. In this same chapter on infant baptism he says, "They are embraced in the covenants from the womb; by what right would we omit them to baptism, except they are heirs of the promise, for unless already before it the promise of life pertains to them, he would profane baptism who would give it to them," He doesn't inform us how one is to know which ones are heirs of the promise so we would not profane the rite of baptism by baptizing the wrong infants.

Note also Book III, 23: "Therefore even from their mother's womb they are born the children of death who by their destruction glorify His name." In the next division he says that God made them in that lost estate because He foresaw their wickedness, which was to come. God made them wicked because He foreknew that they would be wicked, Fine reasoning!

The first *Westminster Confession* was a lot more Calvinistic than all later American editions. The first *Westminster Confession* X:3 reads: "Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated," That can mean nothing else but that non-elect ones are not, The American Supplement of 1903 added these words to their credit: "It is not to be regarded as teaching that any who die in infancy are lost. We believe that all dying in infancy are included in the election of grace (can't get away from Calvinism), are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit." This is saying again, "All infants dying in infancy are saved because the very fact that they die in infancy shows that they are of the elect. Zwingli was the first to propound this theory: "All elect children who die in infancy are saved, whether they be baptized or not, whether pagan or Christian; and further, all who die in infancy are elect, since their early death is a token of God's peculiar mercy, and therefore of their salvation." (Vol. II, Infant Salvation, p. 1080, *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*)

Peter Martyr and Spanheim asserted the certainty that the infants of all unbelievers were lost since their parents did not have faith. Some, like John Owen, went a little farther and said maybe some infants of unbelievers were saved, since the faith of grandparents or, even more, remote ancestors may constitute children as the off-spring of believers." The Dort theologians said, "That there is an election and reprobation of infants, no less than adults, we cannot deny, in the face of God, who loves and

hates unborn children." (Acta Synod, Dordr, Judic 40 "Swiss Theologians") The Presbyterian Fundamentalist Organ of the Dallas Theological Seminary frankly admits that Calvin taught the damnation of some non-elect infants, while giving hope to some that their children were among the elect, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Oct.-Dec. 1944, p. 479: "Calvinism has taught the reprobation of infants in some instances, yet all the while strengthening the doctrine of free grace which allows for the salvation of all dying in infancy."

(3.) Even worse than the early Calvinistic creed concerning infant salvation is that first held by St. Augustine and adopted by the Catholic Church and held on by the Lutherans, the so called sacramental regeneration: that only those baptized by the church are saved; only baptized infants, therefore, are saved. Saving grace, they say, can only be communicated by the church through the sacraments. Therefore, all heathen children dying unbaptized are lost.

St. Augustine said, "Let there be then no eternal salvation promised to infants out of our opinion, without Christ's baptism," and "It may therefore be correctly affirmed that such infants who leave the body without being baptized will be involved in the mildest condemnation," Schaff's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 5, p. 23,28,71.

(4.) The great burden of the testimony of most Protestantism is the absolute salvation of all who die in infancy. We have already seen the amended *Westminster Confession*, giving the doctrinal bi-point of the American Presbyterian Church. Dr. Hodge (Chas.), one of the great Calvinistic theologians of the nineteenth century, in his work of 1871 wrote: "The common doctrine of evangelical Protestants is that all who die in infancy are saved," *Systematic Theology*, Vol. 1:26.

Strong, the outstanding Baptist theologian, said, "The descriptions of God's merciful provision as co-extensive with the ruin of the fall also leads us to believe that those who die in infancy receive salvation through Christ as certainly as they who inherit sin through Adam," A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, p. 661-662.

Robert Foster, *Systematic Theology*, spokesman for the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, teaches emphatically that all infants dying in infancy are saved, p. 540.

(5.) The Scriptural basis for believing in the salvation of infants. It is difficult to arrive at a complete understanding of what the Scriptures teach concerning the salvation of infants. This is due to the fact that the doctrine is not clearly stated in any one place, but is dealt with only collectively as with the whole race, this is understandable. The child has no rational choice, its sin is not

because of individual choice, but inherited; so its redemption is not because of individual choice, but contained in the universal purchase of the human race by the atonement of Christ. Therefore, there are no particular verses explicitly stating that all children are saved, so stating it as a doctrine, but it is taught in passages which show Christ's atonement as covering all men, implied in many portions showing God's care and love for children, and understood in other portions, showing the state of children departed.

(a.) Infants are born into the world with sinful natures and need a Saviour. The inherited sin is punishable, carries condemnation, and guilt; therefore, they must have part in the atonement to be saved. Since they cannot use their wills to accept the provision of grace in Christ, they are born under the "sovereign protection" of Christ's sacrifice, until such a time as they may exercise free moral agency. In this sense Christ's sacrificial work is said in the Scriptures to cover all men. Some texts to see:

I Corinthians 15:32, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The primary meaning here is the assurance of a resurrection for all men, some to everlasting life and some to everlasting contempt; but, in one sense, it shows that at one period of man's existence the Atonement covers him. This is seen more clearly in two other texts, I Timothy 4:10, "We trust in God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." The sufficiency the gospel saves all men, when in infancy, in procuring redemption if they will believe, in removing the obstacles in the way of their salvation, and last, in staying the sentence of hell until they can be saved.

Romans 5:18 (in particular, though, the whole tenor of the chapter) would show the covering of Christ's atonement is just as universal as the condemnation brought on by the first Adam, If the condemnation of the first Adam could pass on to the innocent child the condemnation of guilt and the sentence of death, how much more should the work of the Last Adam, Christ's "obedience" bring upon the same, thus theologically, infants must be covered by the atonement of Christ and saved to carry out consistently the whole tenor of the Scriptures and the complete work of Christ,

Strong, in, *Systematic Theology*, outlines this thought this way:

(1.) Infants are in a state of sin, need to be regenerated, and can only be saved in Christ.

(2.) Yet compared with those who personally transgress, they are recognized as possessing relative innocence and of submissiveness and trustfulness, which may serve to illustrate the graces of Christian character.

(3.) For this reason they are the objects of special divine compassion and care, and through the grace of God are certain of salvation.

(4.) The descriptions of God's merciful provision as co-extensive with the ruin of the fall also leads us to believe that those who die in infancy receive salvation through Christ as certainly as they inherit sin from Adam," p. 661.

(b.) The attitude of Jesus Himself while upon earth certainly, in clear tones, teaches the salvation of infants. He uses their character as an illustration of the graces necessary to a Christian, Matthew 18:1-6. Note in particular vs. 10-11; He links them with the very purpose of His mission.

See also Matthew 19:13-15 and the words, "For of such is the kingdom of heaven," In the light of that portion alone bereaved parents can take consolation that the infant is saved and gathered into the arms of the Great Shepherd who leads His sheep, but carries the lambs in His bosom.

(c.) There are a few verses, even from the Old Testament, which indicate that infants are saved. Just to note some: the incident of David's son born out of wedlock, a child of adultery. Though God forgave David his sin, yet He must needs take the child in death, David's consolation is a beautiful thing, II Samuel 12:23, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." David was a saved man, assured of his pardon; he certainly didn't mean the grave, but the place of redeemed souls. See also II Kings 4:26, Shunamite says it is well with the child even though dead.

B. Christ's Mediatorial Office

We have in our study of the doctrine of Christology studied the wonderful personality of Jesus Christ as the God-man, very God of very God and very man of very man, containing in one personality the union of His divine nature as the second Person of the Holy Trinity and His true humanity, born of a natural mother, conceived of the Holy Ghost

as His Father. This was entirely for the accomplishment of redemption. "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." Now it is in this work of redemption that Christ fulfills His mediatorial office as the only Mediator between God and men; I Timothy 2:5, "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." It is as "the man" Christ Jesus, that Christ sustains His office as Mediator. He had to partake of our nature if He were to carry our burden of sin, to expiation on the cross and lift us from sin, starting a new race of redeemed men, and be a faithful high priest, able to be touched with the feelings of our infirmities.

Man in his estranged position from God needed a mediator, or daysman, to come in between and bring reconciliation. In His redeeming work on Calvary, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself;" God, "satisfied with that sacrifice, is reconciled to the world." Now the ministry of reconciliation is to get sinful men reconciled to God. That is the message we bear: "Be ye reconciled to God," II Corinthians, 5:19-20, also verse 18. That is the ministry of a mediator: as Prophet, Christ is the wonderful Logos bringing God's message of instruction to us; as Priest, He offers the acceptable sacrifice to God for our sins, even His own blood; as King, He brings to completion the work of redemption and reigns over the kingdom of redeemed men.

1. Christ as "the Prophet"

Moses was the first to predict the prophetic office which Christ should fill, Deuteronomy 18:18-19, "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee." Christ also called Himself thus, Matthew 13:57, "a Prophet is not without honor save in his own country." Peter in Acts 3:22 quotes Deuteronomy and applies it to Christ as did Stephen in Acts 7:37. A prophet taught, predicted, and healed, how wonderfully Christ fulfilled these things! As Prophet, Christ was the express revelation of the Image of God; He came to reveal God. How, as the Logos of John 1, Logos is conveyance of thought, speech, or word spoken; Christ was the literal spoken Word of God, God's last message to man. See Hebrews 1:1, "God who at sundry times and divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by (or more accurately 'in') His Son." Christ is the perfect revelation of God the Father, so that He could say, "He that hath soon me hath seen the Father."

In the Old Testament a prophet was one who literally communicated between God and man to make the will of God known to man, God again and again refers to "rising early and sending the prophets unto you." Men always inquired of the prophets to find out the will of God; to rebuke kings, warn of judgment, admonish, teach, or foretell; He used the prophets. Christ is the prophet that should come. He appoints His apostles in their prophetic office, but the order of the prophets as seen in the Old Testament culminates and reaches perfection in Christ, God's perfect revelation of Himself to man,

2. Christ as "Priest after the Order of Melchizedek"

The prophetic announcement that Christ should be a Priest is found in Psalm 110:4, verse 1, quoted in Hebrews 1, tells us of whom the prophet is speaking; "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." This was quoted by Jesus and a number of the apostles. Now, verse 4, "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a priest forever after the order of

Melchizedek.”

Paul in Hebrews explains the difference between the order of Aaron and the order of Melchizedek, The order of Aaron was a changing priesthood, cut short by death, and passed on to the children; but Melchizedek was a never-ending priesthood, not passed on, received by direct gift from God, and typified by the fact that Melchizedek’s genealogy was not recorded among men. See Hebrews 7-8, for an explanation by Paul. Christ’s priesthood is in the Heavenly Tabernacle, Aaron’s in the earthly; Christ is called our ‘high priest’ in the only sense in which the name can mean anything; that is, the way the Jews knew, after the manner of the earthly ordained high priest of the Old Testament. His was a two-fold work: To make atonement for the people and to make intercession for the people to God. The work of making atonement is given in Leviticus 16 and finds its perfect commentary in Hebrews, especially 8-10, and finds its fullest expression in Hebrews 10. Christ is both the Lamb of God without spot or blemish who gives His life, that His blood may save men, and the High Priest who offers His own blood upon the true mercy seat in the Heavenly Tabernacle pitched in Heaven, the final perfect sacrifice which could take away sin, the one perfect sacrifice which is adequate to the need and satisfactory to God, and He intercedes for us now in His living capacity, a faithful high priest, Hebrews 7:25, “He ever liveth to make intercession for us,” Romans 8:34. In John 17 we have one of His earthly intercessory prayers, which is still in effect today. He tells Peter, “Satan hath desired thee. But I have prayed for thee.” Such is the teaching throughout Hebrews. The need of an ever-living high priest to intercede now is seen from a two-fold standpoint, In His expiation, He could say on the cross, “It is finished;” and, in Hebrews, Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and 10:10, By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all;” and “this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down (signifying a finished work) at the right hand of God. The work of offering the sacrifice and sprinkling the mercy seat and expiating the sins of men is finished. The daily sprinkling of God’s people from their sins and bringing sinners to God, however, will not be finished until the plan of redemption reaches its culmination.

3. Christ as the “King of Kings and Lord of Lords”

That Christ is a King, the greater son of David who should rule over a literal kingdom, is the real literal interpretation of many Messianic prophecies. The promise to David that he should never fail to have a son to sit on his throne, I Chronicles 17:1-14 and Psalm 89:35-38, Christ Himself applies these Messianic prophecies to Himself as David’s son. In Matthew 22:41 He quoted David from Psalm 110:1, where David calls his son Lord. The renewal of this promise was made to Mary by Gabriel before Jesus’ birth, Luke 1:32-33. The book of Matthew opens with the question, “Where is He that is born King of the Jews,” and ends with the question of Pilate, answered in the affirmative by Jesus, “Art thou the King of the Jews,” and with the superscription written over His head on the cross, “This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.” Paul says, I Timothy 6:15, “Our Lord Jesus Christ; which in His time He shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords.” In His final great appearing in Revelation 19 we read, “On His head were many crowns; on His thigh a name was written, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.” You may trace His lordship and Kingship throughout the Scriptures.

His kingship involves a literal earthly kingship over a literal earthly kingdom with Israel as the head nation and Jerusalem as the capitol; a spiritual kingship over the redeemed) called the kingdom of God's dear Son." He is our King in this sense; and a universal kingship over all things both spiritual and material, I Corinthians 15:24-25. This kingship signifies His absolute authority delegated to Him of the Father over all things Thus He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey Him, and "All power is given unto me both in heaven and in earth." This kingship is in His mediatorial capacity apart from His lordship as creator and sustainer of the universe; thus it is spoken of as being derived, given to Him of the Father. In His creatorship and position as Second Person of the Trinity, He has the same authority and lordship as the other members of the Trinity; hence, I Corinthians 15:24-25 speaks of this kingship as being delivered over to the Father sometime when this mediatorial office is no more needed, and God's great plan of redemption is completed.

C. The Atonement

There have been many objections of the use of the word 'atonement' to designate the work accomplished by Christ in redeeming man from his sins. Part of that objection arises from the fact that the word occurs only once in the English New Testament, in Romans 5:11, where the Greek word means 'reconciliation.' It is an Old Testament word used very often of the sacrifices on the Day of Atonement, which Paul interprets as referring to the perfect Sacrifice our High Priest has offered for us, thus men have brought the great word down to the level of the purely human usage of it: atonement, "at-one ment," merely the effect of reconciliation, without including in it the cause of that reconciliation. They have stressed the bringing back into harmony with God, while ignoring the grounds of that harmony as founded in a finished basis of atonement in the death of Christ. The word has a broader meaning in its usage in the Old Testament than the mere bringing together of two estranged parties into harmony or reconciliation. It has the meaning of the giving of satisfaction or compensation as a grounds for that reconciliation; that is, to expiate. In Leviticus 5:16 the priest shall make an atonement for him and expiation, or satisfaction for his guilt. The word 'propitiation' used in the New Testament means satisfaction. Justice does not merely wink at sin and smilingly look the other way and forgive it as non-consequential, but the claims of justice must be met by payment in kind. It's just claims must have the penalty paid; it must be satisfied before reconciliation can be made; hence 'Christ is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.' His atoning death upon Calvary was the satisfaction, enough payment in kind acceptable to the justice of God for the sins of all men.

The word to atone, even in its human usage, carried the meaning, 'to make up' for a sin, whether of commission or omission, that the parties might be brought together again on a mutual harmonious footing. We should not be willing to throw out the word merely because it does not occur in that form in the New Testament in the English translation. It occurs every time the word 'reconcile' occurs, for the same Greek word is used to translate the Hebrew word in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. It does not carry all the meaning to our minds, but, taken with the other New Testament words speaking of Christ's work on the cross, we can arrive at more comprehensive understanding of His redeeming work.

The Hebrew word for "atonement" was "Kaphar," literally 'to cover;' to reconcile the sinner to God by covering his sins from the holy eyes of God. The method of that covering was by blood, typifying the perfect blood sacrifice of Christ, which would blot out instead of covering. The atonement of Christ as reconciling the whole world unto God puts the sinner in the place before God whereby God is freed from the necessity of punishing his sins. God, in His holiness and justice, could see the sinner through the covering blood as one upon whom the penalty for sin need not be inflicted. It covers, or is a propitiation for the whole world; but since it is done for the sinner without his cooperation or consent, it merely delays the execution of the sentence and gives grace to repent. The sinner must personally appropriate the substitution for his own, in order for that atonement to be efficacious for him.

The atonement, then, is the basis for all salvation. The New Testament never fails to base all God's dealings with us on the blood of Christ; through that perfect satisfaction God is rendered propitious, that is, now it is consistent with His very nature to forgive sins. Without that vicarious satisfaction, God could not have been just while justifying the ungodly. The word 'propitiate' means appeased or placated. The name 'Mercy seat is literally 'propitiated seat,' a place where the holy God, looking through the blood, could meet with a sinful people and be kindly disposed toward them in spite of their sins.

We arrive, therefore, at a large meaning of the atoning work of Christ on Calvary, God needed no sacrifice to make Him love the world; but His love is restricted by His holiness. Sin intervenes, however, and He cannot express His love and redeem man because of the separating sin. The work of Christ in His death removes the demands of God's justice for full payment, making complete satisfaction or payment; so God is consistent with His own holiness when He forgets penitent sinners, "just while justifying the ungodly." The heavenly mercy seat is sprinkled with the blood of Christ, and those coming through Him can meet God there.

1. The Reality of the Atonement

The early church formulated no doctrine of the Atonement or saving work of Christ on the cross, but accepted it as an accomplished fact, a gospel of good news which was for them and liberated them from all fear of Divine punishment for sin and reinstated them in a holy place with God. It was only after so many false theories of the atonement crept into the church that, in defense, the holders of the truth must formulate some concrete interpretations of the work Christ accomplished for them. In our preaching, the great facts of Christ's saving power through His vicarious sufferings are to be proclaimed in the terms of Scripture, not doctrine. When trying to get men to accept Christ's work for them, do not forsake the language of Scripture for the wordage of men or the language of theology. The doctrinal lines will be stated later.

- a. The gospel is a message of salvation; the word "gospel" means "good news." It is called "the gospel of the grace of God," "The glorious gospel of the blessed God," Acts 20:24; "the gospel of salvation," Ephesians 1:13. The good news message is an overture of grace and forgiveness on the part of God to sinful men.

b. This salvation is in Christ. Christ Is the Saviour. The angel said concerning Jesus, "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins," Matthew 1:2; "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved," John 3:17; and many more.

c. This salvation should be through His suffering and death. Redemption from sin and God's forgiveness of sin and adoption was to be purchased on the basis of salvation; "Much more, than, being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath, through Him," Romans 5:9; "For Christ hath also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," I Peter 3:18, and the hundreds of portions which base our every blessing and acceptance with God upon "the blood of Christ."

d. The Scripture affirms the necessity of His redeeming death. "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations," Luke 24:46-47. There was no other means of salvation, For in Galatians 2:21 Paul states the truth, "For if righteousness come be the law, then is Christ dead in vain;" or in 3:21, "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law."

e. It is the only explanation of Christ's sufferings. He had no sin of His own, and He declared His ability and power to avert death. This alone explains the words, "Father, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless not my will but thine be done." He must drink of the cup of His sufferings, for "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission for sin." God had declared 1,500 years before the pathway back to Himself for man and forgiveness of sin, Leviticus 17:11, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." His death is mentioned over 175 times directly In the New Testament.

f. Some Scriptural statements of why Christ died.

1.) For our sins: Isaiah 53:5; Romans 4:25; I Corinthians 15:3; I Peter 2:24.

2.) He died as a ransom: Matthew 20:28.

3.) His soul was made an offering for sin: Isaiah 53:10.

4.) He is the propitiation for our sins: I John 4: 10; Romans 3:25.

The Holy God must pour out just wrath against sin, either upon the guilty or a substitute. The A.S.T. Version of Isaiah 53:6-8 states, "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath made to strike upon Him the iniquity of us all." "By oppression and judgment He was taken away; and as for His generation, who from among them considered that He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people to whom the stroke was due, satisfied the demands of God's holiness."

In Genesis 32:20, Jacob said (speaking of Esau, "I will send my

present before his face; peradventure he will accept it of me; so went the present before him,” Dean Payne Smith renders it, “I will cover his face with the offering which goeth before me;” Rotherham renders it, “I must pacify him with the present which goeth before my face,” and, then he footnotes it with the literal, “I will cover his face with my present;” He shall so be my present before men and instead of me, and not my guilt, but my present, thus pacifying his anger, thus the reason for God’s using the word for atonement, so it is as applied to Christ’s perfect work for substitution. The Sacrifice comes before His face, to see it instead of me. Thus, we are hidden away in Christ; His wrath falls upon the substitute. Many object to the thought of pacifying “God’s wrath against sin.” They forget that God is “angry with the wicked all day long.” His holiness must abhor sin. When we think of this, it is a great joy to know our present lives are seen through Christ. God is not only the one pacified, but the One who pacified with His own sacrifice and self; but the same word is rendered ‘purged’ in Isaiah 6:7, “This hath touched thy lips; thus shall be taken away thine iniquity and thy sin by propitiation covered,” Rotherham; even in the Old Testament God had a cleansing.

In Leviticus 17:11, God reveals the only basis for covering of sin, to be by blood or death, “The wages of sin is death;” therefore, the covering must be by death. It was the blood of the God-chosen substitute, which covered until God’s perfect Substitute, Christ, could come.

5.) He became a curse to redeem us from the curse, Galatians 3:10-13. The law had said, Cursed is everyone who continueth not in all things that are written in the law to do them.

6.) Christ died as our Passover Lamb, so that a holy God could pass over us when dealing out just judgment for sin, I Corinthians 5:7, compared with Exodus 12:13, 23.

7.) He died that we might be adopted into God’s family, Galatians 4: 4-5.

8.) He died to redeem us from the bondage of sin and the present evil world, Galatians 1:14; Colossians 1:13-14.

9.) Christ died for all, Romans 8:32; John 1:29; I Timothy 2:6; Hebrews 2:9. We shall deal with this more thoroughly under our subject, ‘Limited Atonement.’

Many other results of His death could be tabulated, such as our access to God by His blood, our sanctification, justification, glorification, resurrection, gift of the Holy Spirit, our identification with Him, blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances which were against us, purchased the church unto Himself, daily cleansing and sprinkling with the blood for the child of God, no charge can be laid to the child of God, no condemnation, cleansing of our consciences from dead works, freedom from self-condemnation, boldness to enter the heavenly Holy of Holies, right to the tree of life, and admission to the eternal city, the abolition of death, and destruction of him who has the power of death,

the devil, the redemption of all creation from under the curse, and, summed up, “He that spared not His own Son, but offered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?”

g. The importance of Christ’s death might be ascertained by noting the conversation between Christ and Moses and Elijah on the Mt. of Transfiguration. They talked of His ‘decease which He would accomplish at Jerusalem.’ This illustrates the fact that His passion was the subject of heavenly interest, or we might say great concern. Peter states that it was the subject of concern with the prophets and angels, I Peter 1:9-12; and Paul, in I Corinthians 15:1-14, links it with the resurrection as the two important contents of the Gospel, which he delivered, which saved men,

2. The Terms Used in the Scriptures to Describe Christ's Saving Work

There are five of these terms each adding something more to our understanding of what Christ accomplished on Calvary for us. Each in itself is not sufficient to tell us all He did, but, taken together, they outline His work: the Father’s interest, the Son’s work, and Man’s part, Atonement, Reconciliation, Propitiation, Redemption, Substitution.

a. Atonement

We have in our introduction considered somewhat the term atonement, with the objections that many use to its being used to cover the whole subject. They are well founded, as it is not a New Testament term; yet it does convey the Old Testament meaning, to cover, blot out, discharge from punishment; in the noun form, it means an expiation, sacrifice for sin. To get an accurate meaning of the word atonement we must go back to the Old Testament where the word is used. Men have tried to give it the meaning of at-one-ment, which is the result of the Atonement rather than the atonement. The law of first reference works here again - find out where the word first occurs and the context invariably explains its meaning. The Hebrew word *kaphar* or *kaphar*, the primary root, first occurs in Genesis 6:14, literally, atone the ark within and without with atonement. Here the meaning is simple, cover with a covering. When used of an offering, the meaning would be to cover the guilty soul with an expiatory offering or, as Dr. Hodge says, to make moral and legal reparation for a fault or injury. Atonement, therefore, expresses what Christ gave to God on our behalf. God looks at us through Christ’s blood, hence, "Our lives are hid with Christ in God; Psalm 32:1, atoned for and covered by an appeasing sacrifice.

b. Reconciliation

There are three Greek words, very much alike in meaning: two of them are taken from the changing or exchanging of money; hence, mutual exchange of differences, adjustment of a difference, a restoration to favor (*katallasseo* and *katallage-katalagay*). The meaning may be determined where it is used of a woman being reconciled to her husband, I Corinthians 7:11. Scofield states in his note in Colossians 1:20-21; this word is never used of God for there could

be no change in Him, but is used of man. Propitiation is used of God in Romans 5:10, "For if, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, not merely being reconciled by His death, we shall be saved by His life." This is the reconciliation of enemies; upon the basis of Christ's death, the changing of our enmity to love and trust. His death brings the basis, which is the payment of our debt, so our trespasses can be cancelled. Christ, being the propitiation for our sins, and God being satisfied, with His Son's sacrifice; all that remains is for the sinner to be completely reconciled or satisfied with God's adjustments of the difference and changes. Hence, the ministry of reconciliation is given to us, to preach to sinners, "Be ye reconciled to God; God as in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." Here is the universalness of the reconciliation - On God's side nothing remains in the way. His side is stated in a two-fold way: Not imputing their sins unto them; and II Corinthians 5:18.-21, giving the ministry of reconciliation.

God's enmity against sin is not upon Christ at Calvary, The necessity to execute sentence is stayed; and now He may freely forgive sin for the sinner who accepts the message of reconciliation. We have a gospel to preach, therefore, to all men. This does not mean that God complacently looks upon sin and is willing for it to continue, but only that the Godward side of the enmity is propitiated; and, on the basis of Christ's atoning work, God can forgive sin and restore the estranged sinner, if he will accept Christ (even as God has accepted His mediatorial work).

Paul even takes the Greek word a step further and adds a prefix, completely; Apekatallasse (apeka tal lasse), 'To change thoroughly or completely from.' He uses it in Colossians 1:20-21 and in Ephesians 2:16, peace through the blood of the cross, to reconcile all things unto Himself.

c. Propitiation

This word comes from the Greek nouns hilasmos and hilasterien. Thayer gives the meaning thus: "relating to appeasing or expiating (making reparation), placating, removing enmity, by the appeasing or making of reparations." It does not necessarily carry the meaning of having to placate a vengeful God or to make Him of a mind to love us. This He already did: mercy He already had; but justice and holiness demanded reparations. Sin must be punished; enemies by dead works could not be reinstated regardless of offences.

Christ's death, as called 'a propitiation,' removed all moral hindrances in the mind and nature of God to show elegance or mercy in forgiving sinners. Propitiation is anything which would render an offended party of a mind to show mercy, clemency, and to forgive. The word "propitiate" occurs eight times in the original, four times 'propitiation,' Romans 3:25; I John 2:2; 4:10; rendered 'mercy seat' in Hebrews 9:5; in Luke 18:18, 'merciful;' in Hebrews 2:17, reconciling.

This portion has been called 'the marrow of theology,' and Calvin declared, "There is not probably in the whole Bible a passage which sets forth more profoundly the righteousness of God in Christ." Cowper, the songwriter, near to despair and contemplating suicide, agitated, pacing his room, at last seated himself near a window and took up the Bible. He says, "The passage which met

my eyes was the 25th verse of the 3rd chapter of Romans. On reading it, I immediately received power to believe. The rays of the Sun of Righteousness fell on me in all their fullness; I saw the complete sufficiency of the expiation, which Christ had wrought for my pardon and entire justification. In an instant I believed and received the peace of the gospel." He added, "If the arm of the Almighty had not supported me, I believe I should have been overwhelmed with gratitude and joy; my eyes filled with tears; transports choked my utterance. I could only look to heaven in silent fear, overflowing with love and wonder,"

To get a closer meaning of the original and the full beauty of Paul's masterful wording, let us see Godet's reading: "He hath established beforehand, as the means of propitiation through faith in His blood, for the demonstration of His righteousness on account of the tolerance shown toward sins that wore past, during the forbearance of God, for the demonstration of His righteousness at the present time, that He might be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus."

Note the Scriptural interpretation of propitiation: that God might be righteous and yet tolerant toward sin, both past and present, not at the expense of His holiness or righteousness, but so that He could at the same time be just, yet justify the ungodly.

d. Redemption or Ransom

The term means the releasing from captivity, slavery, or death, by the payment of a ransom price, literally, buying back. The number of Scriptures referring to Christ's death as a ransom or our redemption through Christ are very numerous; see Matthew 20:28 and I Timothy 2:6. In every passage the word for ransom or redemption has the preposition before it, meaning in the stead or "in the place of." The same preposition occurs in Matthew 2:22, Archelaus was reigning in the room, or in the stead, of his father. See also Matthew 16:26, "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" It always means the price in exchange for dealing with Christ's atonement as a redemption. I Corinthians 6:20, "Ye are bought with a price;" Revelation 5:9, "Thou wast slain and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe," The price or ransom then was 'His blood;' also I Peter 1:18-19, "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold but with the precious blood of Christ." Leviticus 25:47-49 clearly shows the meaning of redemption: a price paid to buy back a person or thing for which it is held in captivity. Romans 7:14 speaks of 'Sold under sin.' There needs to be the caution when you hear that God paid this debt to the devil; that is not so. The debt was a 'Debtor to the whole law if you broke one commandment.' The broken law and God's own holiness and justice received the payment. 'The wages of sin being death,' the ransom price must be of the same kind, and infinite in character, so that Christ could, "taste death for every man."

Thus He bore our penalty of the broken law of God, Romans 14:25, "He was delivered for our offences." He paid my debt in full. Is it to be wondered at then that when I accept Him as my "Near Kinsman," the Old Testament Redeemer, that God marks off my debt? It is paid in full.

e. Substitution

Though the word Substitute is not formally a Scriptural term, yet it expresses the real sense of numerous texts, which clearly state the work of Christ as 'vicarious.' He took my place. Homiletically speaking, I have often expressed it thus, "He took my humanity that I might partake of His Divine nature; He took my sin that I might take His righteousness; He took my hell, that I might take His heaven; He took my death that I might take His life; He took my poverty, that I might have His wealth. How abundantly do the Scriptures testify to this truth! He who knew no sin became sin for us (Substitute) that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him, II Corinthians 5:21, Here is the real significance of the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement. Isaiah 53 clearly teaches His death as vicarious, the innocent suffering in the place of the guilty. Read Romans 5:6-8 and I Peter 2:24, 3:18.

3. The Necessity of the Atonement

There is, of necessity, a limitation to our discussion of the necessity of the atonement. In the first place it is not ours to determine its necessity. It is a subject of divine revelation and determination. Man has always been prone to sit up his finite, egotistical wisdom in judgment upon the decisions and actions of God. This the Scriptures constantly condemn. There is, further, a certain point at which we may arrive in determining the necessity of the atonement, beyond that we cannot go, for the greatest part of the truth of why God took the method He did to redeem fallen man is locked within His own infinite wisdom. 'He doeth all things after the counsel of His own will.' He did not consult man when He determined to send His Son to die in his stead to redeem him. He provided the way back to God of His own will, at His own expense, even the life of His only Begotten, and then He sends out the invitation to man, leaving only his accepting that redemption by faith, as man's part. All of the answers to the why of His choosing this method, which He did choose, are locked up within His own infinite wisdom,

a. We have the necessity for the atonement first grounded in the divine attributes of God. God is infinite in Holiness. God only is Holy, intrinsically holy, so that the Prophet declares that He cannot look upon sin. Sin is the opposite of holiness, and opposed to it. There was an impenetrable wall of sin separating the sinner from a holy God, 'Your sins have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid His face from you that He will not hear,' Isaiah 59:2. The two-fold hindrance to the mediation of God and man or the reconciling consisted in bridging the gulf between God's holiness and man's sin, and the gap could not be bridged by the sacrifice of God's holiness. Man must be brought up to God. The second hindrance was man's need of holiness. His past transgressions must be dealt with, and his present need of holiness in order to fellowship with God must be met. By Christ partaking of our nature, and living a holy life in conformity to the law of God, and taking our curse upon the cross, His death satisfied the demands of God's holiness for sins which are past, while His holiness of life may be transferred or imputed unto us to fellowship

with God. "Christ is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption," I Corinthians 1:30. God's justice and righteousness is vindicated, and His holiness satisfied, He can meet us on holy grounds in the sacrifice of Christ. Paul, in the third of Romans, distinctly bases our redemption upon the attribute of God's righteousness, as revealed in Christ's finished sacrifice or propitiation. There was more to saving lost men than has been so lightly taught by many of the confession school or forgiveness school of thought. They deny the necessity of the atonement, stating only the need of confession for the forgiveness of sins, but there is the outraged holiness of God, the great debt of guilt, and the sinful fallen nature of man, which must be dealt with, to finish man's redemption.

b. The necessity of the atonement is grounded in moral government.

For the believing heart there is no other argument needed for the necessity of the atonement than the fact that God has so stated in His revelation, and further, that He has sent His Son into the world, down the pathway of humiliation, despising, agony, shame, and death, which states He was a sinful man. We know, as with loving hearts we take our place around the foot of the cross, that if there had been another way to save men, God would not have taken this way. A guilty conscience, a fearful looking forward to of judgment, a fear of a holy God, a fear of death, a sense of ill-desert, a feeling of deep pollution in the presence of holiness, and the realization of the great gulf which had separated our souls from God, is answer enough for the Christian who has rested upon the sacrifice of Christ, of the almost infinite need of Christ's atonement, "He came to seek and to save that which was lost." To somewhat clarify the doctrine of the atonement and to keep our theological thinking straight, it will be profitable to inquire into the necessity of the atonement as it is grounded in the fact of man being under the moral government of God. If we are not under the law of God, then we have no sin (Romans 4:15, "For where no law is, there is no transgression," and Romans 3:20, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin.") If there is no law against speeding, how can it be a sin against the state to speed? If we had no sin, there would be no need for forgiveness, and, if there be no forgiveness, there would be no need for atonement.

God, being the creator of man and ruler of man, and man being created a moral nature which has the power to distinguish between right and wrong, having the sense of merit for right and demerit for wrong, this God must be a moral ruler and the One to whom man is morally responsible. Hence, man must be a moral creature under moral government, answerable to God as the only enforcer of the moral law. Man feels and acknowledges in every law he lays down, in every right action he makes, in his very penal codes, that he is bound by some duty to do right and shun the wrong, because of the rewards for right and punishment for wrong. Whatever philosophy of atheism or license to wrong man might contrive, he cannot escape the moral law of God written upon his soul, it is the intuitive sense of some things as right and some as wrong. He shows in his every action, which has moral value the fact that he is under moral law.

Let us see what constitutes a moral government:

- 1.) First, a moral government must have a rule of obedience. Under every dispensation the moral law is the rule of obedience. It is the eternal distinctions between right and wrong, grounded in God's own nature. Even under grace, we feel a standard of moral excellency toward which we wish conformity, and any deviation we feel to be wrong. God has laid down various rules and laws such as the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, etc, in written form, that moral law He wrote upon the hearts of men, This is in contrast to the ceremonial law. We know that under grace we are not any less to conform to the moral law than those under the Old Testament Law, There are some things which are right and some things which are wrong simply because God is what He is, a Holy God. The moral law is a revelation of what God is in His holiness; a moral government must have a moral law or rule of obedience. Subjects must know the will of their Ruler,
- 2.) A moral government must have an enforcer, or authority, which furnishes first of all the standard of excellency. Under civil government of a democracy, the common will of the majority furnishes that standard, and their representatives furnish the power to enforce those rules, An understanding of this principle shows how untrue to reality any system of ethics could possibly be which puts the standard in man himself. God's moral government is not a democracy; it is not of the people or by the people. That is reason for the degradation of heathendom and the immorality of modern culture. The only perfect standard of moral excellency is in God alone.
- 3.) The next essential element in moral government is grounded in the system of distributive justice, the rewards of obedience and the sanctions or penalties attached to disobedience. A pure moral government must reward or punish in strict proportion to merits and demerits. Otherwise, it would outrage our every sense of right and wrong. Man has a conscience, which gives intuitional cognitions of what is right and wrong, and passes judgment upon the wrong and commends the right, and further gives the sense of ill desert for the wrong, while commending the right. This primitive intuitional concept in man which points an infallible finger of condemnation to right and wrong, and connects happiness to the morally right, and misery to the morally wrong is the attestation in man of the written moral law. We know wrong should be punished, and right rewarded,
- 4.) Law knows no leniency, nor clemency for a single transgression. The whole merit of a life-time is erased by one deviation. A system of pure law, or merit, knows no compromise. A strictly moral government cannot balance the good and bad, when weighing them, Obedience is

merit; disobedience is demerit; and obedience ceases when disobedience begins. A perfect moral government cannot take a creature off probation. As long as he lives, he is under probation or until he sins; then it binds him to suffer the penalty for the disobedience until its righteousness is met. The reason why one disobedience cancels a whole career of virtue is obvious; man's life is one unit, and sin anywhere along the line means the wrecking of the whole. A straight line, if bent anywhere, no matter how much else is straight, is now a crooked line; an officer may serve for fifty years perfectly; then sell but one secret to the enemy, and he is a traitor to his country, and his past virtue is forgotten and will not alleviate his crime. The only kind of obedience the law knows is perfect obedience; herein is Christ's obedience perfect and ours imperfect. We have broken the least commandment and are guilty of all. There is none righteous, no, not one," and plainly Paul is judging them from the law proving all guilty.

5.) The Scriptural proof of this kind of moral government. When Paul would prove men guilty before God in the first three chapters of Romans, he does so by proving that man has broken the moral law of God, and all are thereby guilty, 2:6-11. He lays down the rule of distributive justice, "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing (note that phrase) seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God" (could not be in a moral government). His judgment is based upon the actual merit or demerit of man, tried by their works. Obedience entitles one to rewards, while demerits bring the penalties of the law. It is personal; every man must stand upon his own works. Do not imagine for a moment that Paul is here teaching that some may be saved by keeping the law. On the contrary, he gives this to prove that they never have kept the law nor ever could, so then they are guilty. He is laying down the law of legalized justification; it is perfect obedience. From this he shows the inability of man to stand before God in his own righteousness. See Romans 3:10-28. When one compares his obedience with the requirements of the perfect law of God, how hopelessly short he comes of the 'glory of God.'

In Ezekiel 33:12 this same principle of merit or demerit is laid down as an abstract principle. "Therefore, thou son of man, say unto the children of thy people. The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression. As for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live in the day that he sinneth," The merit of righteousness ends the moment he sins. The opposite truth here asserted is a provision of merit upon the sacrifice of

the Old Testament, and not under pure moral law. Primarily, however, the prophet was laying the broad principles that a righteous man cannot perish, while an unrighteous man merits punishment.

6.) Our conclusions drawn from this consideration of God's moral government is that it demands atonement. How often throughout the New Testament are the legal terms used to designate our salvation, as justification and redemption. Paul in Romans 5:19 states, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by one man's obedience shall many be made righteous." Paul's whole argument in Romans 5 is a legal one. The condemnation of the law was, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die;" and "The wages of sin is death." Do and live; disobey and die. Since all have disobeyed, therefore, there is none righteous, no, not one; therefore, there is a need for the One to come, who could be made under the law, keep it perfectly, and die under its curse, fulfilling its just demands, carry its wrath upon Himself as our scapegoat. He did for me what I could not do; and, because He did it, I'm freely justified from all things. He is my righteousness; hence we see the need for His atonement.

4. The Philosophy of the Atonement

Under this heading we wish to consider some of the false theories of the atonement wherein men seek to find a rational explanation of the saving work of Christ. At the very first of our consideration here we can't help admitting the unsatisfactoriness of any philosophy of the atonement. No complete understanding is possible. The Scriptures do not pry into any philosophy of the atonement. They give no detailed explanation, nor reasons, but are satisfied with the statements of the facts. The early church, guided by the Holy Spirit, was willing to use the Scriptural terms, without philosophizing on them. When speculation began to occupy the attention of the great minds in the church, it was only natural that this great doctrine would come in for a treatment by them. Much of the error that can be attributed to Satanic hatred is of this cardinal doctrine. Many of the errors nullify the saving virtue of the atonement. There have been as many as 18 theories tabulated along broad lines, and yet these have been condensed by Hodge into five; but along a strict line of reduction they may all be condensed into one of two theories. Along one side, we see that the whole responsibility for the solving of the problem of atonement is two-fold; man's sin and sinful propensity, and his restoration into harmony with God. The answers fall into two lines of thought; one tries to answer it by man's efforts at improvement, while the other class seeks the answer in God's provision. The first class of theories, therefore, follows the moral line, while the other great class follows the substitutionary line of argument.

a.) The Moral or Unitarian Concept of the Atonement

Under its various heads this theory of the atonement would constitute the atonement under the mere influence of Christ, rather than an actual substitution. These theories follow two lines of thought, either the mere moral example of Christ's wonderful life and self-sacrifice, or the infusion of some of His righteousness whereby the sinner is changed into a better man. The sin question is not considered, and is, in fact, considered immaterial. Sin is not sinful to the holders of these theories. Sin is a misfortune, a disease to be cured, rather than a crime to be expiated. It denies the presence of any cloud of divine wrath against sin, any penalty for sin needing payment, nor anything within man needing such a radical change to fit him for harmony with God. It makes much of an innate spark of divinity within man, which is in need of not a Saviour, but an example, hence most of these theories fit into the so-called Moral Influence Theories.

(1.) The statements of the theory of moral influence. The mediation of Christ was for the purpose of its influence, teaching a lesson to men. His Incarnation, teachings, works, death, resurrection, and ascension was to enlighten men, awaken love in grateful response to such consecration of so worthy a life to show them the way; to lead men to repentance and piety through the moral force of such a manifestation of the love of God; to furnish them a perfect example in the life of Christ, and through His personal influence to transform them into His likeness. Professor Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*, p. 326-328.

Each theory may stress or modify to some extent this concept of their theory, but they all follow the same ideas. Paustus Socinus in 1604 was probably the originator of this theory of the atonement, and it has found followers in all who would either deny the deity of Christ or the real fallen nature of man as needing an all-sufficient Saviour. It comes from a low estimate of sin and Christ and God's holiness, Socinus rejected the deity of Christ, therefore, of course, could not believe in His Saviourhood by substitution. This theory has found a following in the Irvingites and Swedenbergism, all modern Unitarians and Universalists, and many cults such as Christian Science (Christ is the way-shower), and all rationalistic Christianity, such as modernism, which deifies man and humanizes God. The Irvingites and Swedenbergism assert that Christ took sinful human nature, with all its vices and depravity (as bad as modernism, which asserts Him to be a human entirely and polygamous, married to Mary and Martha) with all of its inborn corruption and propensities or evil. By the power of the Holy Spirit Christ was not only controlled completely by this corrupt human nature, but by His suffering and struggle purified it until by His death. He completely extirpated its depravity and

united it to God. Now by faith men partake of this new humanity of Christ; they used atonement "at-one-ment." Modernism follows the old Socinian doctrine of moral influence. Modern theology has no place of a doctrine of the atonement built upon the all sufficiency of Christ's bloodshed in substitutionary sacrifice for sins. To them Christ is the way-shower, the great example. His death isn't the prime factor, but His life, His humanity. He lives and died to show us how to live and die.

Other forms of the moral influence theory are the Bushnelian theory and a like theory held by Young, Campbell and others that Christ's death held no propitiation but was merely the consequence of His incarnation, the termination of his humanity, not to satisfy divine justice, but to reveal divine love, to soften hearts and lead to repentance. It was not to remove an obstacle to the sinner's salvation, but to show him that there was no obstacle at all.

(2.) Objections to these theories. Any detailed objection here is unnecessary, as we shall deal positively with the true doctrine of the Atonement from the Scriptures; but to say enough to show the error here: The greatest objection with any moral influence theory is the fact that it fails to give a presentation of the complete plan of salvation as the Scriptures present it. There is an element of truth in the influence of Christ's life and death. He is our example of love, truth, sacrifice, etc. He is the greatest revelation of the pure love of God, but example is not enough. To tell me to live Christ-like because Christ did is to tell me to carry out an impossible task. His way of living and dying certainly gives me an altogether new idea of the will and love of God toward me, and changes my mind about Him, but unless His suffering is in an real sense connected with my release from sin, His death cannot have any saving influence upon me. They deny any such connection. They ignore all the abundant Scriptural testimony of His dying for me; "Christ loved me and gave Himself for me." In fact this theory has no such Scriptural proof, nor is sought. Swedenborg depended on visions and revelation; and Modernism depends upon reason and human ideas and rejects all Scriptural authority. This theory places the responsibility for man's salvation upon himself. His is the effort, the results and the glory. God furnishes only the pattern. You can see how this theory pleases man, more than God's plan, which counts man as hopeless, helpless and utterly unworthy and depraved. Man casts his anchor inside the boat, and not within the veil. The best objection to this theory is that it is no theory of the atonement. It admits no need of atonement, nor interprets aright the Scriptural testimony of the atonement. It is the 'way of Cain,' which constitutes a denial of the fact of the fall, the presence of sin as a crime against God, and of any separation between God and the soul, and the denial of a bloody sacrifice as the way back to God. It

makes God out a liar and man the truth. It rejects the verdict of God against sin and man, and, while rejecting the righteousness of God, goes about to establish its own righteousness.

b.) The Substitution Theories

While in this class, there is the confession of salvation as an objective truth, wrought out by God for man and in man's stead, there is a great line of divergence as to how this substitution is wrought, the value, the method, the reason, and the extent of the atonement. There are three primary forms which have been taught, and with which we shall deal, namely, the Commercial Theory, the Governmental Theory, and the Satisfaction Theory. With many modifications the last theory is the most correct to Scripture.

(1.)The Commercial or Anselmic Theory

It is called the Anselmic theory because it was first held by Anselm, of Canterbury, (1033-1109) who is said to have propounded the theory as an answer to the earlier wrong views of the atonement as a ransom paid to Satan. It is called the commercial theory because it claims that Christ paid the exact equivalent for the deserved punishment of the elect; by this exact payment, the elect are pardoned and regenerated. It can be admitted that this theory helped much at the time of its formulation to straighten out the views of sin as a debt to God rather than Satan and sin as a crime; but it puts the atonement upon too much of a commercial basis, so much payment for so many sins, and only for a certain elect, not for all, like Augustine. There are many other objections such as its failure to account for all the work of Christ and Scripture.

(2.)The Governmental Theory

This theory is so designated because it places Christ's atonement in its necessity, not because of the holiness of God, the penalty of man, but in the upholding of God's government. It originated with Hugo Grotius, Dutch jurist and theologian (1583-1645) and has been accepted by the Armenians. The Methodists are the chief upholders. Miley of Drew University was their chief American upholder. Miley says in his book on the atonement, "Imputation carried over no sin to Christ, hence no sin was punished when He suffered," p. 193. Thus they teach Christ suffered no penalty at all. He was our substitution but not our penal substitute. The atonement was not to satisfy any internal Holy principle in God's own nature, but only for the necessity of his government, to uphold his government. God must give an example of how horrible sin is, so, in Christ, God graciously accepts His atonement as a substitute for the penalty, but not the actual penalty. Miley, for instance, p. 191, could not be conscious

of an absolute substitution for all which still could be conditioned upon its acceptance, "An atonement for all by absolute substitution would inevitably achieve the salvation of all," p. 201, "The right to punish is not one of the rights of an absolute master or creditor these being merely personal to his character; it is the right of a ruler only. Hence God must be considered as a ruler, and the right to punish belongs to the ruler as such, since it exists, not for the punishers sake, but for the sake of the commonwealth, to promote the public good and maintain order," Quoted from Grotius. Is the punishment of the sins of men for a rectorial purpose? Is that the end of vices? Will hell ever change anyone? Does punishment ever really transform one into a better person? God did not pronounce, "The wages of sin is death" and consign the wicked to hell to make them better. It is his goodness that leads men unto repentance.

We might give two other quotations for the theory to clarify it somewhat; Dr. Whedon, an eminent, Methodist theologian, *Institutes of Religion*, "If the sinner accepts not the atonement but denies the Lord that bought him, Christ has died for him in vain; he perishes for whom Christ died. If the whole human race were to reject the atonement, the atonement would be a demonstration of the righteousness and goodness of God, but would be productive of the aggravation of human guilt rather than of salvation from it. The imputation of the sin of man or his punishment to Christ is but a popular conception, justifiable if understood as only conceptual; in strictness of language and thought; crime, guilt, or punishment is personally transferable." See also Dr. Raymond, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, p. 257, "The death of Christ is not a substitute penalty but a substitute for penalty. The necessity of atonement is not found in the fact that the justice of God requires an invariable execution of deserved penalty but in the fact that the honor and glory of God, and the welfare of his creatures require that His essential and rectorial righteousness be adequately declared. The death of Christ is an expression of divine justice, and a satisfaction in that sense, and not in the sense that is as a debt, the full and complete payment of all its demands."

In summary we might say that the theory advocates the ideas that Christ in no way literally took our penalty, but merely substituted some things for our penalty, and that only to give a horrible display of God's wrath against sin, all for the purpose of displaying before all creatures the righteousness of his government.

The objections of this theory are numerous. To say that Christ is the substitute for the penalty but not the penalty itself, is to make one thing stand for something entirely different, and there is no truth in anything. God, by designation, can make anything stand for something else, but the Scriptures affirm, "He took my sins, in

His own body on the tree;" not something that stood for my sins, not a substitute for my sins, but actually my sins, and my curse, or penalty.

Another objection is that it makes punishment rest not upon demerit, but only the good of society. It places the atonement upon mere expedience, instead of the atonement being the execution of the law in fulfillment of its just demands. It is merely a display of God's regard for His law so that now He can forgive sinners without them taking undue liberties and wrong ideas about Himself. Christ did not die merely to show me how much God hates sin, but how much He hates my sin. I'm glad the Armenians preach a better gospel than their theologians teach a philosophy of atonement, I John 1:9.

(3.)The Satisfaction theory, sometimes called the Ethical Theory and Orthodox Theory

It is the common reformed doctrine of the atonement. Augustine first intimated it as a doctrine, but with many objectionable features, and Calvin later clarified many points. Leaving out the limitations placed upon Christ's atonement by his theory of election, Calvin's theory of the atonement must nearly conform to the Scriptural presentation of Christ's atoning work,

We shall follow Dr. Strong's presentation of the Theory of Satisfaction as far as we deem necessary for a clear presentation. He treats the doctrine in two parts as the solution of two problems. First, what did the atonement accomplish, or what was the object of Christ's death, and secondly, what were the means used, or how should Christ justly die in substitution for the guilty? The first deals with the holiness of God as related to Christ's death, and the second, Christ's death related to His humanity.

(a.)First, then, Christ's death related to the holiness of God. This grounds the necessity of Christ's death for sin in substitution in the holiness of God, as contrary to the Moral Influence Theory which grounds it in man, as a moral example, or the Governmental Theory, which grounds its necessity in moral government alone. There is an ethical holiness of principle in God, which demands the punishment of sin. There is a principle in sin, which is ill-deserving of demerit, which must be punished because it is contrary to God's holiness. Universal consciousness gives proof of this. Every working of conscience attests its fact. This is not only based upon moral law; but that moral law receives its authority from the moral principle of holiness in God. Divine punishment of sin is a necessary reaction of God's holy nature against moral evil, the self-assertion of infinite holiness against that which is antagonistic and would destroy

holiness. This demand of God's holiness is devoid of passion, and is unchanging since it springs from His immutable attribute of holiness; hence, the atonement is a satisfaction of the ethical demand of the divine nature, by the substitution of Christ's penal sufferings for the punishment of the guilty.

God's infinite holiness, which cannot look upon sin, nor by any means acquit the guilty, is satisfied by an adequate substitute which meets its every demand; for penalty, while His love is satisfied in that it now can justify and save men, Psalm 85:10, "Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other.

In this relationship of Christ's death to the holiness of God, Christ stands as our substitute for the righteousness of God in a two-fold office. In his death He meets the righteous demands of a Holy God for sins which are passed. He pays the price of redemption from sins consequence, by taking its just penalty in His vicarious death. Since the law, however, demands perfection in its obedience, Christ's sinless, perfectly holy life is also accounted ours. He not only carries my punishment, but His holiness is imputed unto me. Here is double imputation. My sins were imputed unto Him, and He carried them away, but His righteousness is imputed unto me, making me holy in the sight of God. Such is the plain statement of Scripture, II Corinthians 5:21, where both imputations are mentioned and 1 Corinthians 1:30 and Philippians 3:9, hence Christ is all and in all. He is everything. He is not only my salvation, my surety before God, my propitiation, my perfection, and satisfaction before God for him, but He is my holiness and righteousness before a Holy God; His holiness is mine as well as His sacrifice for sin. What a wonderful truth to grasp! One turns from the uncertainty of trusting in his own efforts toward salvation and rests upon a perfect work already accomplished and accepted by God as satisfactory, and finds rest from the fear of judgment. One turns also from the weak, beggarly inadequate efforts at self justification and fleshly works of righteousness which are in the sight of God as 'Filthy Rags' and rejoices in the imputed righteousness of the indwelling Christ, knowing that Jesus is his holiness before a holy God. How we need the identification of self with Christ in death, that we might know the truth of identification with Him in His resurrection in a newness of life so that Galatians 2:20 becomes a living loving reality.

(b.) We now note how Christ's death is related to His humanity. When Christ "took upon Himself the nature of

Abraham of man," He also assumed the obligations to pay the demands of God's holiness, and does so perfectly pay, that God is satisfied with it and saves every sinner who accepts that Substitute as His own. By partaking of the common human nature passed down through natural generation from Adam, Christ partook of the common obligation attached to human nature, while not partaking of its depravity. He voluntarily came into the world by the method of natural generation to assume the obligation. "For this hour came I into the world." He must carry, by obedience to His passion, this obligation to full payment. See Matthew 26:53-54, "Must be." Had Christ come into the world by ordinary parentage, of human father, He must partake of humanity's depravity; but being born of the virgin Mary, conceived of the Holy Ghost, He was born without depravity, but still with the common human nature, with its obligation to be righteousness of the law of God. His atonement, therefore, covers only man, not fallen angels, as He did not partake of their natures; hence He was no substitute for them. He was not made sin for them. The truth of Christ's identification with humanity in natural birth, or by partaking of our nature, is the truth of His federal headship. As in Adam all die, so in Christ are all made alive, but only many made righteous, Romans 5. Christ stands to humanity in the same relationship that Adam did; hence, He is called the "Second Adam. As all could fall in the first, Adam's disobedience, so all could be substituted in the Second Adam's obedience. Christ, by partaking of the human nature by both natural generation by the Holy Spirit's conception, could partake of the whole human guilt of penalty, while not partaking of its depravity. Christ did not, as the governmental theory asserts, substitute for penalty, but literally took my penalty, and could do it, because He took my nature and my guilt. Therefore, in a true doctrine of Christ's vicarious sufferings, and also in His life, and all that He was and is in the world of redemption, you may put the words before them, "For me." He was born for me, lived for me, taught for me, worked for me, was tried for me, despised for me, rejected for me, suffered for me, was forsaken of God for me, and died for me; He arose for me, lives and intercedes for me, and is coming back for me. That is the true doctrine of the atonement; Christ both was and did for me what I wasn't nor could ever do for myself; and, in lieu of the fact that I couldn't, God looked upon the world of His Son and said, "I'm well pleased."

As for any human measurement both of the Divine

counsel of God in redemption and in the benefits of it, the finite mind cannot attain unto it, nor can it plumb the depths of the meaning or the suffering of the God-Man upon the cursed tree. That is as deep as the infinite heart of all living God, who hates sin with a holy hatred, yet loves the sinner with infinite love. God's great redeeming love met the tide of all human sin and cleared the way back to God for every man who will have it so.

5. The Extent of the Atonement

We have dealt more or less extensively with the same doctrines of election which would limit the atonement in its application if not in its sufficiency, so we shall not cover the same territory here. The primary differences of theories as to the limits for the atonement rest upon the Calvinistic Theory of Election, as being unconditional: It holds a general atonement, but in relation to a special election, a sovereign application of grace to only a few elected to grace. Christ died for all, so the Gospel is to be preached to all, but, since all reject its proffered grace because of moral inability, then God interposes and sovereignty applies the "Saving influence" (Monergism) in the salvation of the elect, but withholds this from the non-elect. Those elected, apart from any faith or willingness of their own, are surely saved by an irresistible influence of the Spirit' thus the atonement, in its absolute efficiency, is only for the elect, Dr. Hodge on this subject in *Systematic Theology* makes this statement of their doctrine plain, p. 545, vol. 2, also p. 547. They maintain that Christ died in a sense for the elect, which He did not for the non-elect. In dealing with the subject of a limited atonement it is well to find from where the limitations come.

- a. Since it is freely admitted both by Armenians and Calvinists that Christ's death is intrinsically sufficient to save all men, if there were any limitation to any peculiar class of men, the limitation is not for lack of worth of the atonement but only by divine appointment. God must do the limiting. Both agree here.
- b. The limitation has no respect of personages. It cannot be because some are worse than others; Calvinists maintain this also. The elect are elected, they say, out of no personal merit.
- c. We wish to reiterate here, Christ's obedience and sufferings were of infinite intrinsic worth, and He need not have suffered and died more to secure, if God so willed, the salvation of every man and woman that ever lived; so the limitation is not because of any limitation of Christ's atonement.
- d. Any limitation would have to be either on the part of the pleasure or the reconciling of a rebellious part of His realm to Himself, and His Son offers to make reparation. Now the number or extent of who is included would depend upon either the Father's will or the Son's. No one else has

any say so, for the transaction is between the father and the Son and no one else, as to who shall be included. Calvinists agree here also. If the atonement is to be limited, either the Son will not make it or the Father will not accept atonement for all, Dr. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, p. 357.

e. What is the pleasure of the Father as to limiting the Atonement? No arbitrary sovereignty will do here. Even an arbitrary Sovereignty on God's part might just as well conclude for a general as well as a limited atonement, but God doesn't deal in such arbitrary manner, His sovereignty is righteous, an arbitrary limitation to an atonement which is sufficient to save all, but is applicable to only an elect few with no other reason than its own arbitrariness,

The Scriptures constantly affirm that God's love for sinners is universal and not confined to the elect, for there was no difference in men to make Him love some more than others and elect them to life while damning the others with a divine decree. It was because "God so loved world that He gave His only begotten Son," that hence gives the universal application to "whosoever believeth on Him." There was nothing in any man to recommend him more to the Divine pleasure than any other man.

A divine choice of one over another would have no reason either in the love of God or conditions of man, and, in fact, it has no existence other than in the theology of election and not in the Scriptures. How God's righteousness can be vindicated on the grounds of a limited atonement which would pass over countless souls steeped in the same sin and misery which calls forth the redeeming grace of God and light only a few in the same condition and save them in spite of themselves is a mystery! It would remove salvation from the realm of God's infinite love and grace, and put it open an arbitrary sovereignty, which acts without compassion or love.

f. Neither can a limited atonement be upheld in the light of God's attributes: Justice - God's justice is perfectly satisfied with Christ's sacrifice as for all men. The elocutionists will so affirm. There is no reason in God's justice for limiting the atonement. Holiness, if God's holiness or glory is the heart of all atonement, and every sinner saved manifests His glory, the more sinners saved, the greater the glorification; Goodness, as manifested in His love. Can anyone affirm that God's goodness is more manifested by a limited atonement and not to the greater amount included? Is there the greater manifestation of the goodness of God in an arbitrary selection of a few out of a whole, while passing over the rest only because of God's decree with no respect of individual responsibility?

g. What sayeth the Scriptures as to the pleasure of God as to the extent of the atonement, Ezekiel 33:11, "Say unto them, as I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his wicked ways and live." He is not talking about physical death here, for He asks, "Why will ye die, O Israel?" His universal love toward all men is attested in John 3:16 and I Timothy 2:4, "Who will have

all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." God would be guilty of double talk if He said that, while all the time He knew that the atonement was only able to save the elect, II Peter 3:9, "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness, but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to the truth."

Nor can any limitation be based upon the Son's desire only to make atonement for some, and not for all; every argument in the preceding portion applies here also. His atonement is as wide as the fall which called it forth. It covers as wide as the fall, Romans 5:18 is conclusive; I Timothy 2:5-6 is also conclusive, as is II Corinthians 5:14-15.

The real reason for the teaching of a limited atonement arises out of the mistaken idea of unconditional election, If elected, they affirm that you are specifically included in the atonement; then your salvation is included too, and your salvation is certain apart from any conditions, for the saving influence of the Holy Spirit is irresistible, and you cannot help being saved. If not elected, then, that influence is not given to you; you could not then be included in the atonement in this specific way.

The truth concerning the extent of the atonement, consistent with Scripture, is that there is not a son of Adam for whom Christ did not die, He died for all, men in a real, active, substitutionary way. Not only is the atonement of Christ intrinsically sufficient to save all men (that is worth enough to do it), but it is actively able. Here is what is denied by some. It is adequate to all, for every man and woman to the end of time. Christ did not have in mind only a certain elect class of men for whom He specially died. The offer of saving grace is as wide as the ruin and the atonement as inclusive as the fall; there is no question of the right of God to exclude some, but the fact, has He? When a man rebels, he does forfeit all claims to clemency, but the question is of facts: Do the Scriptures reveal that God has excluded me? The answer is personal faith in Christ could not be the duty of all men if all were not equally represented in the atonement. Men are said to be damned in the Scriptures, not from any divine decree, but because they believed not upon Christ, John 3:36; Mark 16:15-18. The only limitation upon the atonement of Christ is not fixed by any decree of election on God's part, but rejection upon man's part; so it is testified constantly in the Scriptures, Romans 10:8-15. We could continue this discussion far beyond this, as it has been on both sides for centuries. It is a thing for which to praise God, that men even who theologically believe in a limited atonement have many times such a burning, God-given passion for souls, that they forget their theology long enough to preach a soul-winning gospel to all who will hear. Let us not formulate any doctrine which will restrict in any extent the words of our Lord Himself, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost;" and "God so loved the world, that whosoever believe in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,"

II. Subjective Soteriology

In this division we are to consider salvation as it is subjectively wrought out in its individual application to each person saved. Here is applied salvation. What has been purchased is now delivered. Until each individual appropriates by faith the finished atonement of Christ, he is just as lost as though Christ had not died for him. The access to God has been opened, the obstacles removed, the satisfaction made, all according to sovereign grace apart from the sinner's cooperation or consent; now, he must enter into active participation by the consent of his will and repentance of mind.

It is to be noted also that in this section of Soteriology we shall prominently display the workings of the Holy Spirit. We shall not be able to consider the doctrine of Pneumatology or the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, under this head; but shall incorporate as much as possible of the great teachings of the Word about the third person of the Trinity within this division of Soteriology. This is both wise and expedient, for the primary work of the Holy Spirit, as far as concerning the child of God, is wrought out in subjective salvation.

We shall consider the essentials of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit right along with this subject. As in objective salvation, the Holy Spirit was active in the earthly ministry of our Lord, and it was "through the eternal Spirit that He offered Himself to God." He was raised by the Spirit of the Father; so it is the specific work of the Spirit of God in this dispensation to "call out a people for His name," to convict of sin, to draw men unto Christ, regenerate them sanctify and infill them, perfect them, and, finally, glorify them. It is the Holy Spirit who now is the active member of the Godhead in redemption. In the Old Testament preparation times, Jesus said, "Hitherto the Father worketh, "but "Now I work," that is, during Bethlehem to Calvary, actively offering Himself as a sin offering; but it was expedient that He go away, that the Holy Spirit, the "gift of the Father," might come. Now it is He that worketh, carrying out the provisions of the atonement. It is He that broodeth over the face of caustic, sinful fallen creation, yearning over sinful men, activating God's saints to witnessing of the saving truth of the gospel, applying the truth in conviction to hearts, and saving those who believe the gospel.

The truth of this viewpoint of the Holy Spirit's relationship to the work of men now is apparent from many portions of Scripture. In relationship to the world of sinners, Christ says in John 16:8, "And when He is come, He will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment; of sin because they believe not on me." He was to follow up the ministry of Christ, applying its saving truth and convicting of unbelief. Christ in this same discourse in the upper room tells of the work of the Spirit to the believers; He was to be Comforter or "one who comes alongside and helps." The word "Another" signified He is to take Christ's place as active leader and helper. He was to bring to the disciples' minds the things Christ had taught them and to guide them unto all truth. He is to glorify Christ to the believer. These promises were not alone to the twelve disciples. Peter says in relation to this coming of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:39, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Throughout this dispensation of grace, the Holy Spirit is the active administrator of the absent Lord of the Church; He does not speak of Himself; His words and works are those of Christ, even as Christ while on earth did not speak of Himself but spoke the words of the Father and did the works of the Father. Christ is made real to the believer and lives and reigns in him through the indwelling Spirit of God.

How important it is, then, that the child of God realized that the Holy Spirit is a person and not an influence? Some have taught that He was an irradiation of God, like the sunbeam is an

irradiation of the sun, but the personal pronouns and attributes applied to Him, as well as His personal works, all display His personality. He has knowledge, love, He wills, searches the deep things of God, speaks, intercedes, testifies, teaches, and guides; He can be grieved, done despite to, lied unto, and rebelled against. Likewise His deity is affirmed by the ascription unto Him of all the infinite attributes of the Godhead, as well as the works of deity; He can be blasphemed against, worshipped, and is called God. His name is also linked with the other two members of the Godhead, Matthew 28:19, II Corinthians 13:14.

A. The First Works of the Holy Spirit in the Individual's Salvation

There is a theological question of great importance, which is meeting us at the outset of our present discussion. This is the question of the sinner's cooperation or non-cooperation in his own salvation. It takes a three-fold question: First, does the unregenerated sinner alone from the outset, unaided by the Spirit, work out His own salvation? This is the theory of the rationalist, modernist, and some like groups. Secondly, does he cooperate with the Holy Spirit? Most Armenianism clings to some form of this. Thirdly, does the Holy Spirit accomplish the work in the sinner without any cooperation on the sinner's part? This is Calvinism. The argument has been around two words which give the opposite ideas: Synergism, or some form of cooperation; and Monergism, the willing or determinations or actions of the sinner has nothing to do with it; he in no sense of the word has any freedom of choice, but is acted upon by the irresistible influence of the Holy Spirit, most of the time, in a sense, against his will.

Which of these systems are true? They have both been ably defended. The question has revolved around the freedom of will again. One side says man can and does choose; the other that he cannot. Calvinism has confused the ability to choose with the ability to carry out the choice. Is a choice free, which, however, cannot perform its choice? Paul answers it in Romans 7:14-23. The error of the synergist is as bad as that of the monergist. They defend the complete freedom of the human will to fully cooperate with the Spirit. Charles Finney was one of its exponents. His treatise on natural ability is very close to the Scriptural truth. The truth lays at heart both sides of the argument. If every portion of the Scriptures is to be received, certainly man is always asked to do something when he hears the gospel; he is to will with God, accept the message, or refuse it with eternal consequences.

Finney gives this concession to Calvinism: That man will not naturally will with God. Because of his fallen nature, he will invariably take the wrong choice; but he steadfastly maintains that his personal responsibility rests upon the fact that he had the ability to choose otherwise. I think it would have been better to state that his responsibility rests upon the fact that he just personally chooses wrong. If he had chosen the other way, God's gracious enabling would have given him the power to walk in God's ways. There is a real difficulty in drawing the line between man's uttermost ability to choose, and the place where the Holy Spirit influences his choice. God does not set upon man an offer with regard to his individual choice. Every proffer of the gospel is given with the request for man to willfully accept. We have before tried to draw as close a line as possible. The natural, unregenerate sinner is totally depraved with wills as well as natures alienated from God, so that his every choice is away from God. His moral choices for betterment are an abomination to God, for they exclude His Son from their plans. In this position he could

never be saved without the intervention of the Holy Spirit.

First, in the personal application of the saving truth of the gospel to the conscience of the sinner, this is the "drawing" of the Father, John 6:44, "No man can come to me except the Father draw him." What is this drawing of the Father? It, no doubt, has all the elements of conviction of sin, the necessity of salvation, and the perfect satisfaction in Christ. The soul sees itself as lost, as needing a Saviour; then the Spirit draws that soul to rest upon Christ as that Saviour. Here is monergism. Certainly the Spirit works first, and everything the sinner does in his salvation is as a result of the Spirit's workings; but, if the plain teachings of the Scripture are to be accounted true, there is an individual responsibility arising from a free choice upon the part. The Holy Spirit in His full work of drawing the sinner to Christ removes every obstacle to his free choice.

He enables the sinner to think aright about himself and his past estate, about the Father's love, and Christ's saving work on the cross so that the for that choice he has absolute freedom. This is denied by the monergists. Certainly this is the import of John 16:8-9, "to convict the world of sin." What sin, because "They believed not on me?" How can they believe on Him? Romans 10:17, by hearing the Word of God; but believing is an act of mine, is it not? One for which I'm personally responsible, but responsibility is a result of freedom of choice. Without it there is no personal responsibility. The means employed to enable men to choose freely, and which influence his choice, do not irresistibly make him choose, but gives every inducement God can give for him to make the right choice.

B. Conviction of Sin

This is, no doubt, the opening work of the Holy Spirit in the soul of the sinner. There can be no further progress toward salvation until this groundwork is accomplished by the Spirit. It is His work. "He will convict the world of sin." Under the Holy Spirit preaching of Peter on Pentecost, "They were pricked in their hearts." What are some of the elements conviction?

1. It is first the Holy Spirit imparting to the sinner knowledge of which he is ignorant.
 - a. A depth of sin. Like a glass with muddy sediment; you do not know its depths of dirt until you stir it up.
 - b. His lack of righteousness. In the world of fallen man, he never knows he is fallen until he sees the unfallen. Filth does not look nearly so filthy until it is brought into the presence of purity. The Spirit brings the guilty vile soul into the spotlight of God's holiness, and its own so-called righteousness is shown up to be as filthy as rags.
 - c. The wrath of God against sin, "Judgment to come." The soul knows it merits punishment and feels the condemnation.
2. There is the second effect of conviction not only to know but also to feel that you are lost, "The pricked heart." Awakened conscience is set to work by the Holy Spirit not only to know but also to feel its guilt.

There is a difference between knowing a truth and feeling it. To illustrate: someone comes running up and says there is a house on fire over in the suburb. You are solicitous, a shame, someone is burned out, too bad, etc.," but, as you draw nearer, the truth sears your soul, "It is my house on fire." What is the difference? First, there is a personal application touching one's own self, followed by the feeling of the truth. See the illustration of the Philippians' jailer, trembling in the presence of God's working, he cries out, "What must I do to be saved?" Conviction comes, with a deep sense of the need of salvation because he was lost.

There is no possibility of saving anyone until they know and feel that they are lost. Would anyone seek guidance until he is conscious of the fact that he is lost? No one will rely upon Christ for salvation until he is made conscious of his lost estate by this work of the Holy Spirit. Here is the main reason for so many spurious, shallow confessions of salvation without reality. The Spirit of God has not been allowed to do His work for which He was sent, either because of shallow preaching, lack of spirituality on the part of the messenger, the prayer less state of the church, or misrepresentation of the Gospel, briefly stated to be the sinner's soul to its own danger and sinfulness, and to the gracious sufficiency of Christ to save. It is this grand work of the Spirit in the soul which paves the way to faith. Remember Christ said His primary conviction of sin would be "because they believe not on me." It is the one sin, which stands in the way of salvation.

3. Repentance toward God. There is quite a lot of mystery in the ordinary mind about the word repentance. It has lost its real meaning to man and has become synonymous with weeping or sorrow, yet it is the natural human reaction to the conviction of the Holy Spirit where the will says "yes" to God. That this is one element in man's cooperation with God should be apparent from the consideration of its usage in Scripture. "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent," Acts 17:20; see also Luke 13:1-5. When they asked Him concerning the Galileans, if they were greater sinners because of a peculiar judgment visited upon them, Jesus answered, "No, except you repent, ye shall all likewise perish," something for man to do, which will bring damnation if it isn't done by him. Remember he cannot repent, in its true sense, until the Spirit convicts, and it occurs, probably simultaneously with real conviction and conversion.

a. Negatively considered. It sometimes helps to find out what a thing isn't to better understand what it is.

1.) Repentance is not conviction. It, no doubt, includes it and proceeds from it but it in itself is not conviction. If it were, Felix would have repented, but he didn't, Acts 24:25; He trembled but procrastinated and never repented in the record. The awakening of conviction is not enough until acted upon; conviction is something the Spirit does for us, that we might do the repenting.

It is one thing to be awakened by the alarm clock at five, and another thing to get up. Conviction is to find out that you are lost; repentance is to do something about it. Conviction is to discover that you are drowning; repentance is to grab the lifeline,

2.) Repentance is not a sorrow for sin, though a sorrow for sin is a part of repentance and leads to it. If a sorrow for sin is repentance, then Judas truly repented, for when he discovered how far his act of act of betrayal was to carry Christ, he returned to the priest, threw down his bloody money, and, in soul anguish, committed suicide. How many altar workers confuse sorrow with repentance, saying, he hasn't repented enough," meaning by that "He hasn't sorrowed enough;" Paul says In II Corinthians 7:10, "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not be repented of," and works repentance unto salvation. So much sorrow for sin is not a godly sorrow for sin, but a sorrow that he cannot continue in it with impunity. This is what Paul calls in this same verse, "The sorrow of the world which worketh death."

3.) Repentance is not remorse, Remorse is a part of repentance, and is akin to sorrow for sin. If remorse were repentance, then hell would be full of saved folks, for we can see remorse in the rich man's words in Hades, but not words of repentance.

4.) Repentance is not fear, though fear has led many to repentance. Every time God put the screws a little tighter on Old Pharaoh, he was afraid, and called Moses to pray for the removal of the plagues, with the promise of letting them go; but, as soon as he was relieved of the plagues, he forgot his promise, much like the repentance of folks today in the presence of sickness, storms or earthquakes, but as soon as health or sunshine comes, the vows made under stress are forgotten. That isn't repentance; it is a fear of having to pay for their devilment.

5.) Last of all, repentance is not confession of sin. There can be no true repentance until there is a real confession of sinner-hood, but confession of sin is not enough to save. If it were, then every Catholic would be saved, along with some in the Bible who cried, "I have sinned." As Saul, king of Israel said, "I have sinned;" a real true confession of sin wrung out of an anguished soul, but there was no repentance. Acts I declares that Judas went to his own place, as Judas said, ""I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood;" again a real confession out of an anguished soul, but there was not repentance. You can rehash your own meanness in the ears of a priest forever, or confess them to God and, if they are not accompanied by true repentance, there will be no salvation.

b. Positively considered

Definition: There are two Greek words employed in the New Testament for the word repentance. The one is never used for real repentance toward God. It is the Greek word that means to "care for or be considered for one's self." It is just remorse, primarily. It is used when it says, "Judas repented." The word which is used of true repentance is "To take an after view" in the ancient Anglo-Saxon, an "Afterwit" or "Afterthought." Strictly defined, then, it would mean change one's mind as a consequence of, and in conformity with, a second and more rational view

of the subject." This is a change of choice, purpose; intention in conformity with the dictates of the intelligence. It means to reconsider and to change the mind because of the after-thought, and to act in another way because of the reconsideration.

There is a good illustration of this definition in Matthew 21:28-29, the parable of the two sons. The father told his two sons to go work in the fields for him. The first said he would go, but didn't. The other said he would not go, but Jesus said, "He afterward repented and went." Here is the meaning of repentance. He got to reconsidering and changed his mind about his father, his own duty, and, as a result, changed his course. Some of the things which are not repentance led to it: he might have been sorry for the way he had treated Dad, regretted it, felt conviction he was wrong, and had fear of punishment; his afterthought, though, was wrong, Dad's right"; and he turned about-face to do what he said he wouldn't do. That is repentance, true repentance. Christ said of them, "Which of the twain did the will of the father?"

There is another very clear illustration of repentance in the prodigal son. He was on the wrong pathway, but there came a time when he awakened to that fact; and all of the elements of repentance were present. You can see that in his awakening and reconsidering. It is interesting first to see that it wasn't until he came to the end of himself that he was brought to the place of repentance. First notice his change of mind; he comes to the place where he knows he was wrong; "I was better off at home with dear old Dad; I will arise and go back to my father," etc., and he did. That is true repentance. Note the elements: His mind underwent a complete change regarding his own life and its results about his father and his love, of himself and his sin, and the better state at his home, then the ensuing actions were based upon the change of mind. We shall see later that there is no such thing as true repentance without change of will and the "arising and going" as the prodigal son did.

The Psalmist said, 119:59, "I thought on my ways, and turned my foot unto thy testimonies." Here are the two primary elements of repentance; the thinking upon one's ways, and, from that reconsideration, a turning of the will to God. I must not only reconsider, but also do the will of the Father, or, as the prodigal, think of my condition and the advantages of home, but also arise and go to my father. Then there is true repentance.

True evangelical repentance now, in this present dispensation of grace, consists of a reversal of the entire life from one of self and all of its delights and gratification, to reliance upon God and giving all over to Him for salvation. The whole man is in reverse from the God-intended life of complete yieldedness and dependency upon God, the "seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness," to the self-centered, independent, proud, self-appointed life of sinful gratification. We see the need of repentance, conviction awakens the soul, enabling it to think aright; a godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation by enabling the soul to feel aright, a sensibility of sin's sinfulness, and the soul's pollution;

then repentance is the mind's reversal of its previous thoughts and the changing of the will to rely upon Christ's saving work.

The fruits of repentance are: contrition, conversion, and retribution. There is a change of feelings, a change of life, and a change of dealings with others.

D. Conversion

Conversion is a kindred word to repentance, for it means to turn around. To convert is to turn around, but it is throughout the Scriptures to designate another aspect of the work of regeneration of the sinner; while regeneration is alone the work of the Holy Spirit, conversion is the human aspect. The teachings of monergism have somewhat obscured and misapplied the word 'conversion.' In accordance with their theory of the work being wholly God's apart from any freedom of choice, they have maintained that the soul is regenerated first by the Holy Spirit; then, it repents, has conviction, saving faith, and is converted, the conversion being the change of will on the part of the sinner. They say he cannot change his will until regenerated. The subject is passive under regeneration, and, then after that, he can repent, believe, and love. This is putting the cart before the horse. The agencies leading up to the regeneration are made the actual outcome of regeneration, but regeneration is the breeding into the sinner the divine nature of God, and he is now a new creature (literally, a new creation); old things have passed away and all things have become new.

The real truth is that regeneration and conversion are simultaneous actions in the salvation of the soul. They are the simultaneous exercise of both the human and the divine agencies in salvation. You see the two in various Scriptures in the one action: God draws the sinner, he follows; God is said to turn him, and he turns himself. God raises him from the dead and says, "Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." God calls and the sinner hears; the Spirit convicts and the sinner repents; the Spirit commands and the sinner yields. Conversion and regeneration as used in Scripture seem to be synonymous terms. There is a brand new polarity in the redeemed sinner.

E. Saving Faith

1. In the negative, evangelical, or saving faith is not alone intellectual assent, or the belief that a thing is, with the mind.

There is a faith spoken of in the Scriptures, which means an undoubting persuasion, a firm conviction, an unhesitating intellectual assent, but saving or evangelical faith must mean more than that. Intellectual faith is passive and involuntary; arising out of intellectual conviction that a thing is so, while saving faith has positive virtue and something, which is commanded upon pain of eternal damnation. If it is a duty or a command, it cannot be a mere intellectual activity, an involuntary mental assent, or intellectual assent. The Bible itself distinguishes between saving faith and intellectual faith. James 2:17, 26 gives the contrast; the one is merely an assured knowledge of the truthfulness of a truth, the other produces action. One is unproductive; the other productive of good works. The mind is so

constructed that, when it is convinced of truth, it must give its assent; that is mere intellectual faith, but it does not control the will, or activate the life to salvation, Saving faith then is not a conviction or perception of truth, though that is a first element in saving faith.

2. It is not primarily, therefore, a feeling; it is not located in the sensibilities, as those are passive activities, while saving faith, as a virtue and a command or a duty, is positive and must be voluntary. Therefore, it is located in the will, which acts in response to the mental perception of truth.

3. Saving faith is not a gift of God. In its positive elements, saving faith is the efficient perception of the truth of the gospel and the embracing of it by the heart or will. It is the soul's yielding itself up to the saving truth of the gospel. It is a trusting in Christ for saving.

The same work which is often rendered faith in the New Testament is also rendered committal in John 2:14, "But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them because He knew all men;" and Luke 16:11, "If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteousness mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?" It is a confiding in Christ, a receiving of all that God has spoken concerning oneself and Christ's saving work, and committing of the soul to Him for saving, in accordance with Him in its essence, saving faith consists of:

a. An intellectual perception of the facts and truths to be believed. How can anyone believe that which he does not understand? How many preach a faith of ignorance, a mystical something, given as a gift of God, a feeling which would work independently and even antagonistically to the reason, this so-called blind faith has been advanced as the true faith. Now is that possible? How can I believe that which I do not understand? Give to me a proposition in Russian and ask me, "Do you believe this?" What more could I answer than, "I don't even know what you said; how can I believe it?" Here is the reason for so much misunderstanding in so many who seek salvation. Man's order is: feelings, faith, then facts, but God's order is always: facts, faith, and then you get the feelings. To illustrate, a man comes to me bearing the facts, "You have inherited a million dollars." Now the question is, "Do I believe it?" If not, how can I have feelings? If he can convince me, convict my mind of its truth by evidence or facts, however, then, as soon as I believe, I have plenty of feelings. How can I have either faith or feelings without facts?

Paul states the truth of this order of facts first, then faith unto salvation in Romans 10:13-17: Faith cometh by the hearing of the facts or truth, and that truth cometh by the Word of God, hence the need of preaching to save men. Man must hear the truth; then the convincing or conviction of the Spirit begins to convince him of the truth of the facts of the Gospel that he might be saved. This intellectual perception of the truth is not saving faith but the grounds for faith or the beginning of saving faith. It will not save without the second element.

b. The voluntary trusting or yielding of the whole soul over to Christ for His salvation. The lack of this element is the cause of so much profession without possession. Too many have been asked, "Do you believe on Christ?" Their

answer is "Sure," "I know He lived and died; I know there was such a person." etc. That never saves; the devils believe and tremble, and never do they have that second element. The difference between the trust which knows and that which obeys and yields may be illustrated by the patient who not only believes in her doctor, but, also by obedience to his prescriptions, shows her belief. That is the proof of trust. Saving faith is the surrender of the sinful self to Him for His healing.

This surrender of self to Christ for salvation has the positive element of receiving and appropriating Christ for one's own need. The Scriptures call it "receiving Christ," John 1:12, "But as many as received Him to them gave He the right to become the sons of God;" and as having the Son, "He that hath the Son hath life." The illustration may be given to illustrate the difference in mental assent and true saving faith or the various elements of a saving faith in this manner:

A man crossed the Niagara Falls on a tight rope, pushing a wheelbarrow with a man in it. For a gag, when he reached the other side, he asked a man, "Do you believe that I could push you across in that wheelbarrow?" The man said, "Why, certainly, I believe it; I saw you push him a cross." That was mental assent or mental conviction of the reasonableness of the truth. Then the man asked him, "Well, get in then and I'll do it." At that the man said, "Oh, no," and hurried off. He lacked the last element of actual appropriation. Another example is that I might say of that chair, "Do you believe it will hold a man?" You study the strength, etc., of it, and then give intellectual assent. "Sure, I can see by its structure that it will." Then you ask, "Do you believe that it will hold you?" Here is a little more study, then, "Yes." Then I say, "Sit in it." When he does, then his faith is active and appropriating.

The truth is seen also in the three titles of Christ used in the New Testament: He is called "a Saviour," a general truth capable of wide application, but too broad for individual application. He is called "the Saviour," which is definite and exclusive; there is no other, this brings the truth closer home. Until the soul can say, however, "He is my Saviour," there is no appropriation.

In summary, saving faith is the perception and the reception of the saving truth of the gospel. It is the perception, then acceptance of Christ as the only Saviour. When Paul asked the Philippians' jailer to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and "thou shalt be saved," he was asking him to believe upon Christ as the only Saviour, and the fact that He would save him and to yield himself to Him for that salvation.

We might say in notes here the reason for the necessity for faith for salvation. There are two primary reasons: the first is that it is God-pleasing and makes God the truth. "He that cometh unto God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of those who diligently seek Him, for without faith it is impossible to please God. God decreed it because it sets the soul's seal upon the truth of God as true, even if it has to make all men liars. There is a logical

reason for the need of faith to salvation. Salvation is a gift and must be received as a gift, but being unseen and spiritual, except in its results, it must be received by faith. To illustrate: If I give you an estate in Kalamazoo, and you are here, all you get is a piece of paper, a deed; and the extent of your joy and assurance of its possession would rest upon my word as the facts and your faith in my word, having not seen the property. Paul says, in the only definition of faith in the Bible, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen," The original has it, "The title deed to things unseen." It puts into the hands of the recipient the evidences of the possession. The record of the transaction to your salvation is unseen; therefore, it is by faith. John said, "He that believes not, doth not believe the record that God has given eternal life, and this life is in His Son."

Faith receives the record God has given of His Son; and when that record of God's Son is received by faith, God gives the eternal life.

F. Regeneration

The word "regeneration" has been used in theology to mean almost everything the Spirit does for the individual. It has been mistakenly substituted for the workings of repentance, conviction, and saving faith. To many it is merely the influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion.

Foster says that it is the renewal or spiritual quickening wrought within by the Holy Spirit. It is first an illumination or spiritual enlightenment in the understanding and in the will, a spiritual renewal, the origination in the sinner of a new inclination, *Systematic Theology*, p. 666. To my mind this nowhere nearly approximates the full New Testament meaning of regeneration. It stops far short of finding the full meaning. These are certainly some of the results of regeneration, but not the thing itself.

The term "regeneration" occurs but twice in the New Testament: Matthew 19:28, where the reference is not to any change in the individual, but to the new creation to come; and in Titus 3:5, "He saves us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Here the washing, which is regeneration, is the same in meaning as John 3:3, born of the Spirit and the water. Evidently the water is the Word of God, without which no conversion is possible. The sinner is born of the Word of God by the Spirit of God.

This is evident from I Peter 1:23, "Being "born again" not of corruptible seed (human) but of incorruptible (divine), by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever." That the water of regeneration is the Word of God is further shown in Ephesians 5:26, "That He might sanctify and cleanse it (the Church) with the washing of water by the Word." As the literal meaning of the word "regeneration," it means regenerated or re-born; hence the term in I Peter 1:23, "born again;" its mystery; for its necessity, one only needs to turn to John 3:1-9. There is the full meaning set in parallel position with natural birth. It is comparable in its realm to the natural birth, hence a re-birth, new birth, born again, born from a new seed.

Jesus emphatically states the impossibility of entrance or perception of the Kingdom of God without this new birth, "Except a man be born again he cannot enter, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Note the perplexity of Nicodemus, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Does he have to go through the process of being born all over again? Jesus then

shows him that the process is a mystery explicable to the Spirit alone. How could He say in plainer words the meaning of the word, "born again" or regeneration than when He said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." There is a likeness in the births, the difference being in the realms in which the person is born, born of corruptible seed, human, nothing but corrupt human; but born of incorruptible seed, the Divine, born of the Spirit, then Spirit, belonging then to the realm of heaven. You can worship God "in Spirit and in truth," and not until then, can you understand the things of God or "see" the kingdom of God, for they are spiritually discerned. The regenerated person belongs to the realm of the kingdom of God or the spiritual kingdom.

So far, then, we find the meaning of the word "born again" or "regeneration" means a new birth in a new realm, a birth as real as the natural or first birth by natural parents, one that is comparable to the natural birth, one which brings a "new creature" into existence, for "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature, or literally " a new creation," so radical that "Old things are passed away and all things are become new," II Corinthians 5:17.

Now as to the nature of this new birth, what constitutes it? What is this new nature which the sinner partakes in the new birth? Christ has intimated it, "born of the Spirit;" then it is spirit. Even as, when born of the flesh we partake of the flesh nature, so newly born of the Spirit, I partake of the Spirit's nature. To be born again, then, is to partake of the divine nature of God, to take the Spirit of God's nature, even as when born of human parents I partook of their human natures. That this is the truth concerning regeneration may be abundantly proven from the Scriptures.

- a. II Peter 1:4, Note the Word of God as the agent here, "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world."
- b. I Peter 1:23, "Being born again not of corruptible seed (human nature) but of incorruptible seed, by the Word of God;" seed is the basic word for nature.
- c. John 3:6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."
- d. John 1:13, "Which were born not of the blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."
- e. Ephesians 4:22-24, the two natures in the believer are set in contrast: the natural human nature called the "flesh" throughout the New Testament, and the new man. The believer is to put off the old man, reckoning him dead, etc., and to put on the new man, after (or like) God, created in righteousness and true holiness."
- f. Colossians 3:10, this new man is created "after the Image of Him that created him." It is in God's likeness, for it is a part of the divine nature, hence the child of God now is called the "son of God," children of God. The right to call God 'Father' is based upon this new birth, and is, by nature, an inherent right. God is the father of the believer in the same sense as the human son is a son of his father.

In summary, regeneration is the action of the Spirit of God in the soul of the sinner, breeding by supernatural birth the very nature and life of God into his soul, literally making him a child of God, imparting unto him a new nature created in God's own

likeness in righteousness and true holiness. This new nature, being the nature of God, and the residence of the Spirit of God in the soul, being the very life of God Himself, John says it cannot sin. He means not that the Christian cannot sin, but the seed of God in the soul cannot sin, I John 3:9, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for His seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." It is God's seed which remaineth in him and cannot sin. The new nature cannot; but the flesh, or old man, can and does sin unless he is kept crucified with Christ, This new nature is truly holy and patterned after the image of God, for it is the very life and nature of God; so, "Beloved, now are we the Sons of God."

Christ settles forever the question of the necessity of regeneration, He says the very emphatic 'must' to being born again without a doubt, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." The reasons are simple; he lacks the fundamental nature of God with all its faculties to perceive the kingdom of God. When man fell, he lost the image of God, with the spiritual faculties. I do not mean to assert that Adam, in his best estate, was ever as exalted in his position as the humblest sinner by the new birth, but he had the perfect image of God and could commune and perceive God. The natural, fallen, unregenerate man is not merely bent a little, needing only a little straightening; sick a little, and needing a little cure; bad a little and needing a little teaching; but he is dead in his sins, lacking the very first requisite to commune with God and enter God's heaven, that is the nature of God with all its spiritual faculties; God is Spirit. How can fleshy fallen man commune with Him or perceive Him? God is holy. How can fallen, depraved man enjoy His company? The new nature given by regeneration is both Spirit and holy; it can both commune with and enjoy God.

The fact that the Spirit of God alone is able to regenerate the soul is clearly seen when the nature of regeneration is seen. The sinner can no more birth himself than can the little baby birth itself; Christ clearly defines it as "born not of man, nor the will of man, but of God, James 1:18, "Of His own will begat He us." It is not something we do, but something done for 'us as the work of God, after we accept the provisions of His grace; it is "born of the Spirit."

The Spirit is the direct agent breeding the nature and life of God into the soul, The Word of God is the instrumentality. The Roman Catholic Church gives to the sacraments the instrumentality of regeneration. The soul is saved by the baptism, and partakes of the nature of Christ through the mouth by the consecrated water in the mass. The Lutheran Church also holds the transubstantiation of the element of the wafer, and to baptismal regeneration. The Campbellites and most Disciples of Christ and Christian churches, hold to baptismal regeneration. They would make the symbol the effective agent, rather than the mere sign that something has occurred within. Baptism, or any literal ceremony or ordinance, is never in this dispensation an effective means of grace, but the outward testimony of inward grace. Paul says in I Corinthians 4:15, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel." He was the spiritual father of these Corinthians but he couldn't mean baptism for He says in 1 Corinthians 14:17, "I thank God I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius, for Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." Baptism cannot be the means to regeneration, but an outward symbol of it, not an effective means, but the sign that it is already accomplished. Thus we see the water is the Word of God, by which we are regenerated, I Peter 1:23, I Corinthians 4:15, through saving faith, Galatians 3:26. John 1:12-13.

G. Adoption

The meaning of the word adoption in the English is not altogether the same as in the original in the Word of God. Paul is the only New Testament writer who uses it, and he has a special reason for its usage. It occurs only in Romans 9:4, Romans 8:15, 23, Ephesians 1:15, and Galatians 4:5 and in no other places. The Greek word is "Huiethesia," and is the same word in each occurrence. It literally means to put or make a son, to legally declare sonship. We have no equivalent English word close enough to give the true meaning. It takes more than that to make one a son. Moses was adopted by Pharaoh but wasn't an Egyptian; he was still a Jew. To make the Greek word here equivalent to the English word adoption is misleading. Our relationship in the family of God is not one of cold legal sonship while aligned by blood. The word adoption is to give another meaning to our relationship. In regeneration, we receive the nature of God and hence become sons of God, but in adoption we receive the petition or inheritance of sons. Regeneration is a change of natures while adoption is a change of positions. The word adoption then is not taking out of legal papers to make someone else's child your own. God doesn't need that. We are by nature his children by the new birth. In the Old Latin usage, the word adoption meant to "Declare the son's majority, or maturity of full sonship."

To illustrate: When a young man attained the full legal age, the father brought him to the public forum, and, from the bema, or platform, the father said to all the gathered citizens, "This is my son; he has now come to full age; he inherits my name, my property, and my social position." Then he took off the toga praetozta, or boy coat, and put on him the toga virillia, or man coat. By this, he, in the presence of the citizens, invested his son with the sign of full manhood and publically acclaimed him as his son with full rights. This is Paul's meaning in Galatians 4:1-5. We were under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the father, but the fullness of time has come now we received the adoption of sons. Therefore, now, we are no longer a servant but a son, and an heir with Christ. Here also we see the meaning of Christ of "Confessing our names in heaven."

There is a future realization of our adoption. When before the forum of the universe we shall hear our names confessed, and Christ shall not be ashamed to call us, "Sons," saying, "This is my son, in Christ he is a joint-heir to my name; my throng," We shall then put off the toga of childhood, the body of humiliation, and put on the new victorious robe of full manhood, the new body from on high, then shall be declared our majority, or our full adoption. How like childhood our present condition; we speak as a child, understand as a child, think as a child, but, when I become a man, the childish things shall be done with, the partial knowledge gone, then to know as even also I am known,

The word adoption then is a complementary word to sonship. It tells us what we received in our sonship besides the divine nature of God. It shows that our sonship carries with it an inheritance. Peter links the two together, that is our sonship with our inheritance, I Peter 1:3-4, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you."

In our sonship, we are sons of God by nature, bearing His image. In our adoption we

are heirs of God possessing His possessions. See this in Ephesians 1:5, Predestinated unto the adoption of children, and verse 11, in whom we have also obtained an inheritance, receiving the seal of the Holy Spirit which is an earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession. See also Romans 8:15-23, the word adoption is linked with inheritance or heirship, for we have not received the spirit of fear but of adoption, if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. We may enter into more of the joys of sonship now, while we only receive an earnest of our inheritance of the saints in light, but our majority shall someday be declared.

H. Justification

The meaning of a word in the Scriptures is not to be determined by the usage of theology, nor merely from the etymological significance of the word, but from its usage in the Word of God. In no secular writing will you find the richness nor accuracy of meaning attached to the word as in the Scriptures. God attaches new meaning to old words in the Bible, so that the etymology is not always accurate; neither are the theological interpretations through the ages always reliable guides to the real meaning of words. Theology, being a man-made science, goes astray many times and loses the meaning rather than expounds it. We saw this in the study of the word regeneration, and many theologians are amiss in their interpretation of the word justification. Many have made the word justification to mean the act of making one righteous, while the true meaning from the Scriptural usage is to "declare or reckon righteous." Justification is not an act upon the sinner, but one done for him, a purely objective act of God in declaring the sinner righteous. That this is the true meaning of the word justification may be determined by examining the places where the word occurs. Some of these passages are Deuteronomy 25:1, "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous and condemn the wicked." Others passages are Exodus 23:7, Isaiah 5:23, Luke 16:15 etc. See also Romans 4:2-8, RV, "For if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God, for what saith the Scriptures? And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt, but to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justified the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness." The Biblical meaning of the word justification, therefore, is not to make righteous, but to reckon, declare, or show righteousness. To be justified before God then is to be declared righteous by God.

The need of justification is apparent. The sinner is a criminal with many charges against him before God the great judge. He has been regenerated, brought into the household as a Son, but what of His record; what of the condemnation of past sins? Forgiveness is not enough. Forgiveness is negative. Can one be thus changed and brought into God's family and still be a condemned criminal? There is a need, therefore, of justification, the judicial legal declaration by God freeing man from his condemnation, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that be in Christ Jesus." He has "Passed from judgment unto life" and his method of release is by justification, and yet justification is more than a mere technical release from penalty or condemnation, or blotting out of the record against us, nailing it to His cross. There is a positive aspect of justification, which is lost by many theologians who would make it negative as only a release.

The negative side is the "Blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances which were against us, taking it away, nailing it to His cross," but the positive side of justification in the resurrection of Christ is "He was raised for our justification." By our identification with Him in His death the condemnation is removed, and by His resurrection and our continuance of identification with Him in His resurrection, I am brought into new relationship, and in Christ am as holy as Christ is. His obedience, His holiness, His righteousness, is mine, so that I am declared to be righteous, and as perfect as God demands me to be in Christ. As God reckoned Christ to be sin for me, in my stead and place, so He now reckons me to be holy in Christ. The double reckoning is a blessed reality which brings peace to the saint's heart. God reckoned my sin unto Christ, and He reckons Christ's holiness unto me. It is so much more than a mere legal technicality of releasing from the condemnation of the law. It means that all that Christ is before God, so am I. Is He spotless? Then so am I! Is He holy before God? Then so am I! Is He innocent, guileless, acceptable, loving, pure, and immaculate? Then, as I am in Him, so am I! Justification is God seeing me in Christ, as sinless, innocent, harmless, undefiled, and holy as He is.

Justification sees me as more than a released sinner from the law's condemnation, but it sees me as though I had never committed a sin. This certainly is the declaration of II Corinthians 5:21, "For He made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." By no other method could the sinner be declared righteousness, the guilty innocent, the condemned free, the vile holy, etc., but since I am in Christ, identified with Him all that He is before God, I am also. It is an interesting study to note all the times and things that Paul says we have "in Christ."

The grounds and basis of our justification does not reside in ourselves, in works which we can do, but upon the works of another, the death and resurrection of Christ.

Some things to note about justification:

1. There is no justification by the works of the law, Romans 3:20; Galatians 2:16.
2. Justification is a free gift of God's grace, Romans 3:24
3. Justification is by faith in Christ, Galatians 3:24; Romans 3:26; 4:5; Acts 13:39.
4. Justification is grounded in the Atonement of Christ, II Corinthians 5:31; Romans 5:9.
5. The extent of justification, Acts 13:39; Romans 8:1, 33-34.
6. The results of justification:
 - a. Peace with God, Romans 5:1
 - b. Freedom from any charge, Romans 8:33-34
 - c. Saved from wrath, Romans 5:9
 - d. No judgment for sin, only works, whom God justifies He will glorify, Romans 8:30

In summary, justification is the reckoning or declaring by God of the sinner as righteous in Christ. It constitutes the releasing from condemnation, the necessity for punishment, and the blotting out of the record of past sins; but more, it declares the sinner as being in Christ as righteous as He, as obedient as He, as pure and innocent as He. Justification has to do with his state, the righteousness declared by God of Him, the Holy

Spirit is sanctification works out in Him, the holiness of God which he imputes he wishes to impart.

I. Sanctification.

There is much confusion surrounding the word sanctification. There is the confusion of terms. Some have called the deeper experience of the saints through the years, a baptism of love, some a clean heart, some a victorious walk, or life, others holiness, some a second blessing, others the baptism with the Holy Spirit. While speaking of the same experience the terms have varied, and many have denied that anyone else had the same experience because they failed to call it by the same name. The variety of names is a natural outcome of stressing various phases of the same operation of the Holy Spirit in the individual's life. The New Testament abounds in a great variety of expressions for the same Spirit's workings, and under a number of figures it depicts the various sides to the same truth, such as entire dedication, or yieldedness, crucifixion, death to the old man, putting off the old man and putting on the new man, being filled with the Holy Spirit, or the infilling of the Spirit, sanctification, holiness of life, etc. There is to be expected, then, the stressing of one phase, many times, to the exclusion of the others. Some theologians make sanctification a sovereign activity of God wrought out independent of our cooperation or wills: That our sanctification is a substitutionary sanctification apart from any holiness of living, or heart purity. There are others who would make sanctification synonymous with sinless perfection, as making the one who is sanctified perfect and sinless.

We have come to designate all the works of the Holy Spirit in the believer's life by the one term sanctification, and have, more or less, made the word to mean a deeper experience of the child of God; hence the birth of the term second work of grace, as differentiating it from the salvation of the sinner as the first work of grace, hence the term, second blessing. It has been the experience as well as the conviction of the average believer that there is a higher plane of Christian experience for him than that which he has entered. There is not the complete victory he feels he needs and God has for him. He knows he is coming short of the promises, these precious promises, such as "Sin shall not have dominion over you," and the "rest for the Child of God," and the promises of present power and victory. There is bred a hunger for more of God than present possession. Happy is the saint who then learns the blessing of the deeper life, the wholehearted yielding to the infilling sanctifying Holy Spirit.

The conviction then of a deeper experience, a victorious life, a fullness of joy, and deeper richer communion with God must be true, as the hunger is true, and the promises the Word of God are true; God must have such an experience for the child of God. The promises for salvation were true and God honored them and kept them when we believed and He saved us. What of those, which promise the fullness of the Holy Spirit and victory?

We shall try in an orderly fashion to determine just what is promised and what the present working of the Holy Spirit in the believer is, and what more He wants to do in us, what are the meanings of the terms used? It is well to inquire into these questions. Does God have more for the child of God than salvation from the penalty of sin and its consequence? Is there victory over the dominion of sin? Does the child of God have to live in sin? Is it possible to live above sin? Is it possible to be filled with the Holy Spirit and have divine, spiritual power? If so, then millions of saints are living in a substrata sphere of

spiritual malnutrition; far below their privilege and falling far short of the promises. More than that, they are sinning in disobeying God in refusing to permit the greater working of God in their lives. One of the sins of Israel according to Psalm 78:41 was that they "limited" the Lord God of Israel. They circumscribed Him, drew a circle, said, "This far can God work and no farther." I greatly fear that is the case with modern theological systems and creeds. Modern churches have fitted their creed to their experience rather than their experiences to the biblical truth. They counted the cost of doing the complete and whole will of God; therefore, they denied its attainability. It is human nature to excuse its own devilment even upon "Scriptural grounds." How much better it is to believe God, even if it involves a seeming impossibility! God majors in the impossible. We need the injunction of Paul, "Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us entering into his rest, any of you would scorn to come short of it." Let us not so much fear fanaticism or going too far, but fear more of coming short; the fear of shortcoming is of entering God's promised rest. Not in heaven, but here and now.

1. Definition of terms

There are no less than eight distinct terms used to designate the work of the Holy Spirit in the believer apart from regeneration. They give His mission and ministry.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit - By the gift of the Holy Spirit, is meant the promise of the Father to send the Holy Spirit upon the waiting believers and to abide with the believer forever is accomplished. Christ promised the Holy Spirit as a gift, and, ten days after His ascension, the Holy Spirit came as the gift of the Father. We are never asked afterward to pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit; as a gift, He was once and for all given and indwells and abides with them forever, both sanctified and unsanctified. We have received the Spirit of Adoption. When a person is saved or born of the Spirit, he is made a partaker of the one gift of the Holy Spirit. In other words, the Holy Spirit takes up His residence in the soul of the believer never to depart, making that soul a "Temple of the Holy Spirit." It is erroneous then to pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit, or to entreat His coming. He is already within the believer.

The sealing of the Holy Spirit - Ephesians 1:13, "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." This is the seal of ownership, such as a buyer who goes through a forest putting the seal of the owner upon timber, making it his even though not yet delivered. "The foundation of God standeth sure having this seal, the Lord knoweth these that are His." The presence of the Holy Spirit in the believer is the seal and earnest of the future inheritance. His abiding presence is the seal of God's divine ownership; to possess Him to have the evidence of belonging to God.

The sanctification of the Spirit - II Thessalonians 2:13, "Through sanctification of the Spirit," etc. There are two primary meanings to the word sanctification as it is used in the Scriptures.

- a.) The first meaning is to set apart, or separate unto God, Leviticus 27:14-16, "And when a man shall sanctify his house to be holy unto the Lord, then the priest shall estimate it, whether it be good or bad: as the priest shall esteem it, so shall it stand, and, if a man shall sanctify unto the Lord some part of the field of his possession;" also of the temple, II Chronicles 7:16, "For now have I chosen and sanctified this house that my

name may be there forever; Matthew 23:17 "Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gold or the temple that sanctifieth the gold;" so also when Christ is said to "Sanctify Himself." The word is thus used concerning the church as sanctified unto God, set apart for God.

b.) The second meaning is to separate from ceremonial or moral defilement, to cleanse, Leviticus 11:44, "For I am the Lord your God; ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy; neither shall ye defile yourselves." The two meanings go together and are inseparable. To dedicate unto God is to dedicate unto holiness. The altar sanctifieth the gift. It is dedicated or sanctified unto holy usage. This separation is both negative and positive, separated from the world and sin and self unto God and holiness.

Sanctification of the spirit then carries the meaning of being separated by the Holy Spirit from sin unto Holiness, from defilement unto righteousness, from self and sin unto God. What the Spirit accepts and fills, He makes holy, for He is the Holy Spirit. Where He has complete control there will be holiness. To speak of any sanctification, apart from any change of nature, or the impartation of His holiness is foolishness. He does not separate from sin to avoid it. There is not only putting off of the old man with its corrupt works, but the putting on the new man, which is created after God in righteousness and true holiness. This putting on is the complete domination of the new spirit-created nature.

2. The Gifts of the Holy Spirit. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are His best to all upon Spirit-filled saints for specific service; they are what their name signifies, a special gift or talents for the edification of the church, the building up of the church into maturity to the fullness of Christ. The enumeration of these gifts is found in I Corinthians 12. There are nine of them corresponding to the fruits of the Spirit, recorded in Galatians 5:22-23. They cover the needs of the church for leadership, guidance, administration, and spiritual power. The Spirit gives some the gift of wisdom, and others knowledge to know the right thing to do for the church, to some faith and healing and miracles to empower the church, to others prophecy, to exhort, preach and evangelize, to others discernment of spirits, tongues, interpretation for personal edification, and is the One to determine which gifts are needed in each local church; and to give as He wills, to set the anointed gifted saints in the body as He wills, some apostles, some prophets, some teachers, supporters, and counselors." All won't have the same gift. How powerless is the church, which is devoid of these gifts, of the Holy Spirit, because of the lack of Spirit-filled membership!

3. We might add here another term, the fruits of the Holy Spirit. These fruits of the Holy Spirit are an out-flowing or manifestation of the indwelling Holy Spirit. They are enumerated in Galatians 5:22-23. Each Spirit-filled saint will manifest all the fruits of the Spirit. They are set in contrast to the fruits or works of the flesh. If we walk in the Spirit, these fruits of the Spirit will be manifested; but if we walk in the flesh, it is not strange to see fruits of the flesh - of pride, ambition, malice, deceit, anger, envy, covetousness, and sins of passion, or lusts.

These fruits of the Spirit are all forms of love, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit: love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness,

faith meekness, and temperance," and Paul adds that, they that are Christ's, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts, "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit."

The Spirit-filled life is a beautiful life, exemplifying the life of Christ, for it is the life of Christ; self is crucified, and only Christ now lives in you.

4. By the indwelling is meant that mystically our bodies are the temples of the Holy Spirit who indwells every believer. The church of Jesus Christ, made up of all true believers, is the only temple or abiding place of the Holy Spirit in this dispensation, I Corinthians 3:16; 6:19-20. It was thus that Jesus spoke of His body as a temple, which John said He spoke of His body.

5. By the earnest of the Spirit is meant that He is the pledge and a part of the complete inheritance we shall yet receive. In law, an earnest of the inheritance is a small part of the whole inheritance, which is yet to be received. It is a real part for the heir to live on until he can receive the fullness. If the working of the Holy Spirit in the believer's life is but the earnest, what shall the complete inheritance be? He is called the earnest in Ephesians 1:14.

6. By the anointing of the Spirit is meant a special grace for social service. It is the peculiar unction of the Holy Spirit to preach, teach, lead, guide, pray, or any other commission of God. It is akin to the gifts of the Holy Spirit, as in II Corinthians 1:21, where it is used with the earnest and the sealing. Its usage may be determined as used of Christ's anointing in Isaiah 61:1-4

7. By the communion of the Holy Spirit as given in the apostolic benediction in II Corinthians 13:14, it has more in its meaning than the fellowship of the Godhead with the saint. "Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with Jesus Christ." There is more to the "communion of the Holy Spirit" than can be comprised in the word "fellowship." I believe the word "communicates" would be more synonymous. Spirit communicates the mind of God to the saint, and more to the Spirit-filled saint; He communicates the things of Christ to the saint; He communicates the riches of God to the saint; and the fullness of all God has for him; He brings into present possession the things God has promised.

There remain two other words or terms which need defining: The baptism of the Holy Spirit and the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Some students of the Word of God make these two as interchangeable or synonymous; others make them two separate blessings for the child of God; and others consider them as two different operations of the Spirit, in conversion and sanctification.

8. I do not believe them to be synonymous, nor two more separate works of grace for the Christian; but the baptism of the Holy Spirit is a dispensational activity of the Spirit, while the infilling is a separate work of grace in the Child of God; giving him a richer, deeper, more powerful spiritual life filled with the presence and sweetness of Jesus Christ, through the complete filling of his whole being with the Spirit of God. Let us consider these terms to see if this conforms to the Scriptural truths. It is interesting to note that there is a definite exhortation to the Christian in Ephesians 5:18, "Be filled with the Holy Spirit," but nowhere after Pentecost is there such an exhortation to be "baptized with the Holy Spirit. We may first draw from this that there is an experience subsequent to salvation which a believer may or may not enter into, but which he is commanded to enter into of an infilling with the Holy Spirit, but

that he is nowhere asked after Pentecost to be baptized with the Holy Spirit. There must be a distinction between these terms. What then is the baptism with the Holy Spirit'?

It is mentioned but a few times in the New Testament, with an important distinction each time it is used; in the gospel records it is always future. John the Baptist first indicates it in Matthew 3:11, "I baptize with water. He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire." In the first chapter of Acts again we meet the term, v. 5, "But ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." It is still future; and not many days off. It is referring to Pentecost. It is mentioned one other time in Acts 11:16, but there it merely is a calling to remembrance the words of John. For the church it is mentioned only twice again. It is mentioned next in I Corinthians 2:13 with an interesting note; it is in the past tense, "For by one Spirit are ye all baptized into one body and further by that have been made to drink into one Spirit." Here is the meaning also of the baptism of the Spirit; it is the activity of the Spirit of God on the day of Pentecost, baptizing the believers into one body. There was only one baptism of the Holy Spirit, on Pentecost, and now every sinner who is born again partakes of that one baptism and becomes united to Jesus Christ in His mystical body. Note that the Gospels are prophetic, whereas I Corinthians is historic; they meet at Pentecost, the "note many days hence" of Acts 1.

Note how this is used in I Corinthians 10:1 by Paul to symbolize or exemplify us, "All our fathers passed under the cloud, and all passed through the sea and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Their passing through the Red Sea was baptism unto Moses or into Moses, signifying their identification with him and union with him, so were all by the inner work of conversion or identification with Christ in His death, symbolized by the outward rite of baptism, baptized by the Holy Spirit into Christ, into His body a living vital part of Him.

Note also Ephesians 4:5, "One Lord, one faith, and one baptism." This is the one baptism; while there can be many symbolic or ritualistic baptisms. The external rite of baptism symbolizes the inner work of the Holy Spirit of uniting the soul in vital union with Christ.

9. What then is the infilling of the Holy Spirit? It is exactly what it says: it is being filled with a Person, and an august person, the third Person of the Trinity, filled with the Holy Spirit. It is the Spirit of God not only abiding, indwelling, a guest in the temple, but now possessing the temple, yes, filling the temple. Every room is His; He occupies it all; self has no room; it is crucified. The soul has a funeral service for it; and now every emotion, desire, choice, and activity of the' soul is controlled by the Holy Spirit. When He fills, there is no longer room for the world, the flesh, or the devil. This is a simple axiom of physics: no two substances can fill the some space at the same time; to be filled with the Spirit precludes all else; and, contrariwise, if ought of sin or self is still there, He is not filling the temple. It would be a contradiction of the terms to speak of being filled with the Spirit and self. Here is the need of wholesale delivery unto Him for His filling. It isn't necessarily making the temple clean for His entrance; you cannot do that. You can deliver it to Him, however, and He will sweep out each room and garnish it, making it a fit habitation of God through the Spirit.

Summary: It seems to me that nothing is plainer in the Scriptures than that of a subsequent work of the Spirit of God for the believer after salvation. Every exhortation to holiness of life and deeper experience speaks of it, besides the direct command, "Be filled with the Spirit;" and "This is the will of God, even your sanctification;" and "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly," and all like verses. It would seem the very plan of Pentecost speaks of it. The disciples were all believers and saved before Pentecost, for Christ said, "Ye are all clean through the Word I have spoken unto you;" and He breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit." They were to tarry until the reception of power from on high, the power of the Holy Spirit coming upon them. This was an addition to their salvation, and "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit."

There are two aspects of the infilling of the Holy Spirit or sanctification. It is both a crisis and a progression.

a. It is a crisis; we appropriate the infilling of the Holy Spirit by faith as Sons of God, even as we appropriated Christ for our Saviour by faith as sinners. In Galatians 3:2 Paul says that we "received the Spirit by faith." This may be seen in the 8th chapter of Acts; here is a baptized, believing group of believers, who believed the preaching of Philip, but they had not received the "Holy Spirit falling upon them" or a fullness, until the disciples came up from Jerusalem and when they had prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, "For as yet He had fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." The conditions for the infilling may be deduced from various portions of the Word. They are first, and naturally, a deep hunger for God and a thirsting after righteousness. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled," In Acts 2:38 Peter shows that it is only for the child of God, "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Evidently there must be a full, frank reckoning with sin, Many times it is the desire to retain some small sin, some cherished personal selfish ambition, saying no to God on something and excusing ourselves about it as harmless, not wrong, perfectly all right, etc. There is never any filling with the Holy Spirit until the soul says a universal "yes" to God on all subjects, whether of sins or habits to give up, or of some service to which He has called us. Acts 5:32 distinctly says, "The Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him;" that is absolute surrender. This is the failing point in all too many saints; it robs them of all God's best. Paul states it in Romans 12:1 as a presenting of our bodies as living sacrifices, holy, acceptable unto God, to prove the perfect will of God; that is for us.

The last step is appropriating faith. How natural this is, as in salvation we could not save ourselves, by faith we saw one who could and would and, by faith, we gave ourselves to Him to do it; so it is with the infilling. We read that the disciples prayed for the believers to receive the Holy Spirit. We realize the conflict of our two natures: the Christ nature and self-nature. We find that there is more for us; there is victory, perfect cleansing, sweeter communion and deeper spirituality, but a sin principle within which defeats and robs. We come to see our inability to fill ourselves with the Holy Spirit or to crucify the flesh with its lusts;

and we, by faith, come to the Holy Spirit to let Him do for us what we could not do; and, as by faith, we turn ourselves over to Him, He fills us.

Here is the only part of sanctification that we can do; see Romans 6:11-19, a reckoning or counting and a yielding. The first is active; the second is passive; a positive faith, and a surrendered faith for His working.

The very terms used show it to be a crisis: "crucified with Christ," putting off the old man and putting on the new man," "death to self," "Filled with the Holy Spirit," "Yield yourselves unto God," "present your bodies a living sacrifice." These are instantaneous acts. There may be high spots leading to the crisis and growth leading up to it, but the experience of the Spirit taking over and filling would have to be instantaneous,

b. It is a progression, a life to live. Paul gives the two aspects in one verse in Galatians 2:20, "I am crucified with Christ (that is when all the exhortations he gave about "mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth" and "putting off the old man." etc. were fulfilled), "Nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God;" a crisis of crucifixion and then a life of faith, which is the life of Christ Himself in Him. There is great danger in the teachings of many who make the infilling instantaneous only; "You get it all at once and once for all;" you got such entire sanctification and sinless perfection and eradication of the Old man as to need nothing else and to expect nothing else and to get nothing else. This is not the teaching of Paul. Even as the disciples after Pentecost were again filled with the Holy Spirit in 4:31, and we read that again and again they had new experiences in the Holy Spirit, so we need the new workings of the Spirit in our lives constantly.

Paul in Philippians 3:12-14, after 30 years, was still pressing untoward the goal, without the feeling a lot of folks have today after three months of a full attainment, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect, I count not myself to have apprehended, but I press toward the mark of the prize." He gives the idea again in II Corinthians 3:18, "But we all with open (unveiled) faces, beholding as in a glass (reflecting as in a mirror) the glory (the character) of God (or the nature of God)" - note not a cheap imitation, but a true reflection - "are changed or transformed into the same image from the glory to glory (or character);" How, you may ask, "as by the Spirit of God. Here is growth and progression in the image of God in us: Christ living in us, and His image becoming more discernible as we are walking in the Spirit. That is the reason why a sanctified saint of three years doesn't or can have the fullness and beauty of the image of Christ in his life as the mature sweet saint of 30 years. The image hasn't been fully transferred. The image is made by exposure to Christ's character and person.

There is much more than this that could be said on the doctrine of sanctification, but we shall close with this thought: the results of the infilling or of the sanctification of the Spirit.

- a. The primary result is in our witnessing, Acts 1:8. He was given primarily to give power to our witnessing, for service, and not for feeling, though his fruit will bring feelings.
- b. The revelation of the beauty and loveliness of Christ to the believer and through Him to others. "He will show the things of Christ to him;" this is illustrated by the servant Eleazar, who went after Rebekah to bring her as a bride to Isaac.
- c. The purifying, sanctifying influence will make holy, as His name implies; He is the Spirit of Holiness. He will give victory over sin, will mortify the old man with his affections and lusts, and will bring to fullness the new man which is created after God in righteousness and true holiness. He will bring the purity of heart which alone can see God,
- d. He will bring to full fruition in our lives all the nine fruits of the Holy Spirit. There will be the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, the joy overflowing, the peace that passeth understanding, the faith without which no man can please God, the gentleness or sweet moderation, which is a sweet reasonableness; there will be the active goodness pouring itself out in self-sacrificing service for others which "though the more it loves the less it be loved;" it is willing "both to spend and be spent;" there will be the meekness or sweet abandonment unto the whole will of God whatever it is; and, very importantly, there will be a wonderful temperance of nature which keeps it on an even keel. There won't be excesses either in the flesh or in doctrine.
- e. There will be manifested at least one or more of the gifts of the Spirit, for He gives "to every man, severally as He wills." He will be gifted to serve. All in all, the Spirit-filled saint will be the Christ-centered Saint. Everything will be Christ, and Christ will be everything. It will no longer be he that liveth, but Christ that liveth in him.

J. Glorification.

Definition: the exalted state of the believer in his future new body, whether by way of resurrection or transformation, as in I Corinthians 15:50-51, "We shall all be changed," "mortal (living) put on immortality, corruptible (dead) put on incorruption." This is the meaning of "glorify" as used in New Testament. Note: it is used of Jesus in John 7:39, "Jesus was not yet glorified," also John 12:16, He wasn't yet resurrected with His immortal, glorified body. Peter says in Acts 3:13, "God hath glorified His Son Jesus." Glorification for Jesus could bring a change in Him primarily in His body, hence we call it a "glorified body." For us, glorification must include a glorified change in spirit, soul, and body. The church shall be presented someday unto Christ a glorious or glorified church, not having spot or wrinkle, but it should be holy and without blemish, Ephesians 5:27, thus shall Christ be glorified in His saints in that day of glorification, II Thessalonians 1:10, when they "awake with His likeness."

1. Glorified in spirit: the act of this is already accomplished in the believer; "The spirits of just men made perfect," Hebrews 12:18-23.

2. Glorified in soul: The human nature, flesh, old man, is gone forever. All its passion, propensities, faculties, ties, desires, or lusts are now gone forever, and a new man after God's own image is the whole, I Corinthians 5:50.
3. Glorified in body, I John 3:1-3; Philippians 3:21; II Corinthians 5. This is a new body like Christ's in His resurrection; Hebrews 9:28, it is the completion of our salvation.