

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 26.—OCTOBER, 1893.

---

I. ILLOGICAL METHODS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.<sup>1</sup>

I SHALL scarcely be expected, on an occasion like this, to speak on any other theme than Old Testament Criticism. When, eleven years ago, I was inducted into a similar chair in another institution, the discussion of this subject, in its present peculiar aspects, had just begun in this country; to-day it is the question of questions in the theological world. The movement, at once a sign and a fruit of the times, has passed far beyond its incipient stages. Its literature is already large. Even single phases of the subject have come to occupy no inconsiderable place in current thought. It is to one of these phases of the general theme that I shall invite your attention at this time. It especially concerns the style of reasoning adopted by those who advocate the newer views of the Bible. Is this reasoning in harmony with the accepted rules of logic? Can the critics of this class vindicate their often asserted claim to be scientific? On the answer to this question really depends the value of the conclusions reached.

Mr. Gladstone, not long since, speaking of modern criticism of the Bible, while confessing that he was no expert, gave this excellent advice. He said: "We must be on our guard against drawing warmth of affection into the field as having the force of argument. We should rather endeavor to defend the Scriptures upon the same principles of evidence and reasonableness governing our mental processes in other matters. When the arguments of specialists point to negative conclusions, we should beware of haste. We should reserve our judgment, even if yielding provisional as-

---

<sup>1</sup> Inaugural Address, May 3, 1893.

### III. SANCTIFICATION THE NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE OF JUSTIFICATION.

#### AN EXPOSITION OF ROMANS VI. 1-4.

THE doctrine of a free justification is the key-stone of the gospel. It has been rightly called the article of a standing or a falling church, for any system of theology which teaches it, even though it may contain doctrines inconsistent with it, is yet able to save; but any system which vitally corrupts this doctrine is an invention of the devil, and if consistently followed out in practice will lead to utter ruin. It is no wonder then that it has been the object of the most virulent attack on the part of Satan and his allies. No wonder that it has met the sternest opposition of the natural pride of man. Every trick of human ingenuity has been resorted to to make it appear monstrous or absurd. One of the favorite points of attack has been from the objection arising from the Antinomian abuse of the doctrine. "If," say they, "man be indeed justified by faith, where is the need of works at all on the part of the sinner? If Christ has truly furnished a perfect obedience, which has satisfied the law, both as to its penalty and precept, then why impose the obligations of the law upon the sinner to whom this righteousness is imputed? Why may he not give free rein to his lusts?" The objection is truly a plausible one. It may well puzzle a mere human intellect to answer such an objection. It has been urged with unwavering persistency for eighteen hundred years, and it is urged at this day with as much blatant effrontery as if no answer had ever been found to it. But as the doctrine came by revelation, so its guards and defences were revealed. The inspired apostle, in the sixth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, anticipates this great objection of the ages to the gospel which he had just been preaching, and gives an answer to it which mere human wisdom could never have discovered. But there is, perhaps, no one passage of Scripture which

has been more generally misunderstood and perverted from its true meaning than this one.

We ask careful attention to an exposition of this passage, which is not original, which is not new, but which, nevertheless, seems to have escaped the majority of expositors. The proper understanding of the sixth chapter of Romans will furnish the key to many other misunderstood passages of Scripture, will remove many difficulties from the believer's mind, and will afford consolation under many discouragements.

It will be necessary to take a review of the apostle's previous argument, as briefly as perspicuity will permit. After a short and appropriate introduction he lays down the main proposition of the epistle, namely, the gospel is the power of God unto the salvation of every one that believeth—that is, it is the only plan which enables God to save the sinner consistently with his own attributes. Now to prove this he must make good these two propositions: (1), No man can be saved by his own righteousness; (2), The elect are saved by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which the gospel reveals. He proves the first proposition, that no man can be saved by his own righteousness, in this way: To be saved by one's own righteousness, a perfect obedience to the law must be rendered. But all have sinned. He proves this latter in detail. He takes up first the case of the Gentiles, or the heathen. Now, all that was necessary to prove this charge against them was to mention notorious facts. He draws a picture of the corruptions then existing among the most polished of the heathen nations, which makes us sick with loathing as we look upon it. He then deprives them of the excuse of ignorance by showing them that although they had not the revealed law, yet they had the law written upon their hearts, and that even while they committed these abominations their consciences condemned them. Having thus proved his point in regard to the Gentiles, the apostle turns to the Jews. They flattered themselves that since they had possession of the law and the ordinances of circumcision, and were the seed of Abraham, therefore they could not but be saved. But the apostle startles them with the question, "Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through the breaking of

the law, dishonorest thou God?" He shows them that not the mere possession of the law, nor the hearing of it, but the doing of it, was necessary to justify them. But when this question was squarely put, the conscience of every man convicted him of breaking the very law in which he trusted, and so they were deprived of this stay. As to circumcision, that was a mere sign of the covenant. But if the covenant on their part was broken, of what use was the sign? As to their being children of Abraham, the apostle removes this stay by proving that Abraham was not justified by his works, nor by circumcision, but by faith. But if Abraham was justified by faith in imputed righteousness, then only those are his true children who are children by a like faith, and circumcision availed nothing except as it was a sign and seal of that faith. Thus the last stay of the Jews is taken away. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." All the world is become guilty before God. Tribulation is to come upon every soul, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. The apostle's conclusion is, that by the deeds of the law, that is, by his own righteousness, no man shall be justified.

But there is another righteousness by which the sinner may be justified. This is a righteousness which satisfies the law in every particular, which pays the penalty of sin, which furnishes a perfect obedience to the precept of the law, which makes it possible for God to be just and yet justify the sinner, which saves the sinner, not by lowering the demands of the law, and requiring an imperfect instead of a perfect righteousness, not by substituting instead of righteousness something that is not righteousness at all, but by giving the sinner a perfect righteousness, and making it as much his own as if he had wrought it out for himself. This is the satisfaction of Christ. Christ represented his seed in this work. He obeyed the law, and his obedience was imputed to his people; he suffered its penalty, and his suffering was imputed to them. The apostle concludes this argument in the fifth chapter of Romans, and closes it with the words, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Now this hydra-headed monster, the

Antinomian argument, erects itself. But the reply is one which severs and sears every one of its many heads. The objection takes various forms. "Surely it is right," say some, "to give full scope to grace; but, if where sin abounds grace does much more abound, then we ought to let sin abound; we ought to abide in sin that grace may abound." Again, it is sometimes put in this form: The fear of punishment and the hope of reward are the only motives to urge us to obey the law; but if Christ has satisfied the law for the believer so that he has no punishment to fear, and he is sure of heaven through Christ's work, then there are no incentives to exertion, and you have opened the flood-gates to sin. Now this is indeed true where the fear of punishment is taken away in other way than through union with Christ. This is illustrated by the facts accompanying the sale of indulgences.

Again, the objection is stated in this way: The law demands of the sinner but one perfect entire obedience; it cannot in justice require more; but if Christ has furnished that obedience for him, then the law has no claim whatever upon him, and he is entitled to gratify his lusts to the full. These are only specimens of the many ingenious ways in which this argument has been pressed. To consider each in detail, and to give each its appropriate answer, would require more space than we have at our disposal; but they are all fully answered in this great argument of the sixth chapter of Romans, and a clear understanding of this will put into the hands of every Christian a weapon with which to meet all such attacks.

Now this argument of the apostle's is no mere exhortation based upon the inconsistency of the Christian profession with a life of sin; nor a mere begging of the question by assuming that which is not true, that sin has no more attraction for the believer; but an invincible proof, showing that, from the very nature and purpose of the plan of salvation, justification and sanctification, faith and works, are just as inseparable as God and holiness; that where justification has taken place, sanctification must follow. His argument in proof of this may be summed up thus: The justification of the believer is effected by his union with Christ; but, (1), this union is of such a nature that it must result in sanctifi-

cation; (2), this union is wrought by the Holy Spirit; and, (3), it is the divine purpose to effect sanctification, as well as justification by means of this union. Bearing this outline in mind, let us examine the passage in detail.

“What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?” Paul in these words anticipates the objection which we have already stated in full. The word which is here translated “continue” is the same word which is elsewhere translated “to abide.” He repudiates this conclusion from his previous argument, with the earnest words translated “God forbid.” “How shall we who died for sin, live any longer therein?” This is the sum of his reply, which he expands in the following verses. This reply may be stated in two leading propositions, in the expansion and proof of which lies the proper exegesis of the whole passage. I. The believer is freely justified from sin, because he has died for sin in union with Christ, both federal and spiritual. II. It is impossible for those who have thus died for sin to abide in sin.

I. The believer is justified from sin because he has died for sin in union with Christ, both federal and spiritual. I have translated this passage “died for sin,” while in our English version it is “dead to sin.” It remains then for us to justify this translation and the exegesis which it involves, because upon this the whole argument turns. There have been almost as many interpretations of this expression as there have been interpreters. Three leading ones only claim our attention at this time. The first is, that it means “dead to sin” by profession of renunciation of it in baptism. “We who have made a public profession of our faith by baptism, did in that act renounce our sins, promising that we would forsake them, and thereby we became dead to sin.” This interpretation is worthless—1st. Because it entirely fails to answer the objection, “shall we continue in sin that grace might abound?” It only removes the objection one step back. It might be asked, why was it necessary to renounce sin? Should we not rather have continued in sin, that grace might have abounded? 2nd. It entirely fails to give any assurance that the believer will not abide in sin. It is a mere exhortation to consistency, but exhortation is not argument. 3rd. The inspired

original will not bear the translation, "dead to sin." The tense used is the aörist, or simple past tense, which can only be translated, "died." Other interpreters understand it in this way, that the believer is dead to sin in the sense that sin has no more power over him. When an anæsthetic is given to a patient, a severe operation may be performed without pain. He is as insensible to pain while under its influence as if he were dead; he is dead to pain. Now, in the same sense, say some, the Christian is dead to sin, and of course it would be folly to say that such a man could abide in sin. But this interpretation is no better than the other: 1st. It is a mere begging of the question. It is Paul's object to prove that sanctification is the necessary result of justification, but if this were his meaning he would be assuming without proof the very thing in dispute. 2nd. It is not true. Believers are not dead to the power of sin, as Paul so clearly testifies in his own case. 3rd. It is open to the same objection as the first interpretation, that the Greek original will not bear the translation, "dead to sin." The word means, "died."

What, then, is the meaning of the expression? Now, God says: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Die? For what? Die for his sins; die to pay the penalty of sin. We have all sinned; we must all, therefore, die. God's truth and justice require that this sentence be executed to the letter. Now there are two ways revealed in God's word in which this sentence may be executed: we must either die for our sins in our own persons, or in the person of some competent representative. Christ has died as the representative of his people. He was made a curse in their stead. Now the question arises, How did this death of Christ's become theirs? It must be made theirs in such a way that it may have the same effect subjectively upon themselves, and objectively upon their relations to God's law as if they had died for themselves. It must be theirs in such a way that it can be truly said that when he died they died. This is accomplished by their union with him. If we be legally and spiritually united to Christ, then it may be truly said that what he did we did. But we are so united to Christ; then when he died for sin, we died for sin, and this is what the apostle means when he says that we died for sin. That

this is the proper exegesis there is overwhelming evidence: 1st. In the first place notice the fact to which we have already referred, that the tense here used is the aorist, or simple past tense, which will not bear any other translation than "died." Our death to or for sin is represented, not as a present state, but as a past act in our lives. 2d. The translation, "died for sin, or on account of sin," is a perfectly legitimate use of the dative. 3d. The mistranslation in this verse has necessitated it in some of the succeeding passages, where the mistake is still more palpable. The seventh verse reads, "He that is dead, is freed from sin." Now the verb which is here translated "freed from" is never in the New Testament, and rarely in the Old, used in the sense "to be freed from." In the New Testament it always means "to be justified." But when we translate "he that died is justified from sin," we not only translate the Greek correctly, but the theological significance becomes clear. "He that died with Christ—representatively for sin, on account of sin, to the guilt of sin—is justified from sin." In the eighth verse again the aorist is again mistranslated: "If we be dead with him, we believe that we shall also live with him." It should be, "If we died with him, we shall also live with him." But when they came to the tenth verse it was impossible to keep up this mistranslation any longer, and they gave the proper translation for the tense, "For he who died, died unto sin once." But it is exactly the same expression, the same verb, the same tense, which has been hitherto translated "dead to sin." This verse, connected with what precedes, makes it certain that in whatever sense Christ died to sin, in the same sense those who had been baptized into union with Christ, and so into union with him in his death, died for sin. But Christ could not have died to sin by renunciation of it in baptism, because he never had any sin to renounce; he could not have died to the power of sin as the patient is dead to pain, because he was never alive to the power of sin in any such sense. There is but one way in which Christ could have died to sin, and that is to die for sin, to die for the imputed guilt of sin, to die to satisfy divine justice. And so there is but one way in which the sinner could have died with him, and that is to die for sin, on account of sin, to pay the penalty of sin, in order

that the sentence of death might be executed. 4th. That this is the proper translation is shown by the parallel passage in 2 Cor. v. 14, where the same verb and the same tense is used. Our version again has it, "For we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead." The Revised Version again has it correctly, "For we thus judge that if one died for all, then all died." On this passage, Dr. Hodge, who, in his *Commentary on Romans*, had opposed the exegesis we are advocating, concedes the point, apparently having reconsidered the subject. He says: "This is precisely the argument which he uses in Romans vi: 'Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?' Far from it," he says. "How shall we who have died on account of sin live any longer therein?" 5th. Again, this exegesis explains, and is confirmed by other passages in which our participation with Christ in his other representative acts is expressed by a similar usage. It is said that we were crucified with Christ, that we were raised with him, and that we live with him. "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye were raised with him. . . . If ye then were raised with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ is, sitting on the right hand of God. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear," etc. These passages can be understood in no other way than that we did these things in Christ our representative. Now it may not be amiss to quote some authorities for this exegesis:

It is the exegesis of Haldane, of Shedd, of Chalmers, of Brown; and, as we have said, Dr. Hodge, who opposes it in his commentary on Romans, adopts it in his later commentary on Corinthians. Ellicott thus paraphrases the parallel passage in Galatians ii. 19: "I, through the law, owing to sin, was brought under its curse, but having undergone this, with and in the person of Christ, I died to the law, in the fullest and deepest sense—being both free from its claims, and having satisfied its curse." Perhaps the clearest expression of this our union with Christ in all his representative acts for us, will be found in Pusey on Hosea. Commenting on the passage: "After two days he will revive us, and the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight,"

he says, "The resurrection of Christ and our resurrection in him could not be more clearly foretold. . . . The apostle, in speaking of our resurrection in Christ, uses these self-same words of the prophet: "God hath quickened us together with Christ, and raised us up, and made us sit together in heavenly places with Christ Jesus." The apostle, like the prophet, speaks of that which took place in Christ our head, as having already taken place in us his members." Pusey further quotes from one of the fathers: "If we unhesitatingly believe in our hearts what we profess with our mouths, then *we* were crucified in Christ, *we* died, *we* were buried, *we* were also raised again on that very third day." Pusey adds: "What Christ our head did, he did not for himself, but for his redeemed, that the benefits of his life, death, resurrection, and ascension might redound to all. He did it for them; they partake of what he did."

We think we have put it beyond all possibility of doubt that the apostle means to say that we have died in union with Christ to satisfy the claims of the law, and to free us from the guilt of sin.

Now this union with Christ, in his justifying death for sin, has two aspects, the federal, or representative, and the spiritual, or vital. We say "two aspects," to guard against the error which might arise that there are two unions. It is one and the same union, but the terms, "federal and spiritual," express different effects and relations of this union. Our federal or representative union with Christ is sovereignly constituted by God the Father in election. The vital union is wrought by the Holy Spirit in regeneration. The federal union gives us the legal title to the acts of Christ as our representative. The vital puts us in actual possession of them. The federal is the ground of virtual justification, the spiritual is the ground of actual justification. The federal union is objective in its nature and effects; the spiritual is subjective in both. The federal puts us in the same position before the eyes of God the Judge, as if we had died for sin ourselves; the spiritual works the same subjective effects in us as if we had died for sin ourselves. The representative frees us from the legal guilt of sin; the spiritual frees us from the consciousness of guilt. The federal satisfies the law; the spiritual satisfies conscience. The fed-

eral reconciles God to man; the spiritual reconciles man to God. The federal is a satisfaction to the divine ethical nature; the spiritual is a satisfaction to the human ethical nature.

Now, that this union with Christ was not merely federal, or representative, but also spiritual, or vital, the apostle shows in these words, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death." In other words, "Know ye not that so many of us as were united to Christ by his Holy Spirit, were, by that same Spirit, united to him in his death? Therefore, we were buried with him, by that act of the Holy Spirit which united us to him in his death."

That the primary reference of the apostle is to the act of the Holy Spirit by which we became united to Christ, in other words, regeneration, and not to the external rite of baptism, remains to be proved. It is generally admitted that water baptism is the symbol of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The words of John the Baptist settle this beyond dispute, "I indeed baptize you with water, . . . but there cometh one after me, . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." This is supported by numerous passages, one of which we shall presently quote. But granting that there is a baptism of the Holy Ghost, of which water baptism is but the sign, it may yet be questioned whether Paul's primary reference in this passage is to the Holy Ghost, and not to water baptism.

Now it is a very common figure of speech to put the sign for the thing signified. It is particularly so where two things are so closely connected that they are seldom, or never, spoken of separately. Where a visible ordinance invariably signifies a spiritual act, the name of the ordinance may be transferred to the act without danger of ambiguity. This is frequently the case in the scriptural use of the word "circumcised," both in the Old and the New Testaments. In Deut. xxx. 6, it is said, "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayst live." This is paralleled by Deut. x. 16; Jer. iv. 4, etc. In this passage, clearly the primary reference is to the spiritual act signi-

fied by circumcision. Paul says in Col. ii. 11, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." And, again in Rom. ii. 28, 29, "Neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; . . . but circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter." And other parallel passages. Now since we not only find this usage of the word circumcision for the spiritual act which it signifies, but that Paul almost always uses it in this metonymic or spiritual sense, it is natural that we should expect him to use the word "baptism" in the same way. A few quotations will show that he does so use the word and, with few exceptions, in no other sense. The meaning of the word as he ordinarily uses it is the spiritual act of the Holy Ghost in regeneration, and only in one or two passages, where the context leaves no room for ambiguity, does he use it for the water rite. In Gal. iii. 27, he says: "For as many as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." He had been proving by one of the most profound and masterly arguments to be found in his writings, that the "seed," to whom the blessings of Abraham were promised, was not a distributive noun referring to individuals, but a collective noun referring to Christ, as the head of a spiritual body. To be of that seed then, and heirs of the promise, it was necessary to be one with Christ, to whom the promise referred. He sums up his argument in these words: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Greek nor Jew, . . . for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. But if of Christ, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." It is plain that the union here spoken of is a spiritual union, consequently the act by which that union was constituted must have been a spiritual act; but that act was baptism, therefore the baptism spoken of must be the baptism of the Holy Ghost. To make it mean anything else would break an essential link in the chain of the apostle's argument.

Again, compare the parallel passage in Col. ii. 12, 13: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye were raised with him, through the faith of the operation of God." This is immediately con-

nected with the passage already quoted, in which he had used the word circumcision in the metonymic sense, and in which he affirms the identity in spiritual meaning of baptism and circumcision. Therefore the word baptism must also be used in the metonymic sense. This is further shown thus: Faith is a spiritual thing, therefore the being raised through faith must have been a spiritual operation, or a spiritual union with Christ in his resurrection; but if spiritual union with him in his resurrection is meant, then the burial with him in baptism must be spiritual union with him in his burial; but if the burial is spiritual, then the baptism by which they became partakers of that burial must be spiritual. The meaning is that faith is the bond of that union wrought by the Holy Ghost in baptism or regeneration, by which we become partakers of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection.

If any doubt could remain as to what kind of baptism Paul refers to, it would be set at rest by the passage in 1 Cor. xii. 13: "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." The body, of course, is Christ. The body then to which we become united is a spiritual body, the act by which we are so united is a spiritual act, that act is called baptism, and the Holy Ghost is the agent by whom that act is wrought. Now, if the rule to interpret Scripture by Scripture has any force at all, it has in this case to show in the parallel passages that the baptism to which Paul refers is, primarily, not the rite of water baptism, but the baptism of the Holy Ghost or regeneration.

This clearly, then, is the meaning of Paul in the sixth chapter of Romans: that we died with Christ, not only in the sense of being federally united to him in his death, but that by that act of the Holy Spirit, which is expressed by the word baptism, or, in other words, regeneration, we became also spiritually united to Christ in all his acts for our redemption. We died with Christ, we were buried with him, we were raised with him, not only legally, but spiritually; not only objectively, but subjectively. Not only are the *legal* effects of the death of Christ *imputed* to us, but the *subjective* effects of it are *inwrought* in us by the Holy Spirit. Precisely the same kind of experience is wrought in the soul of the believer by his spiritual union with Christ, as if he

had died for sin himself, had paid the entire penalty of the law, and had been discharged, forever free from its claims. This subjective effect of union with Christ in his atoning death may not necessarily be completed at the moment of regeneration, but we understand the Apostle Paul in this and other passages, to teach that, sooner or later, the Spirit, in his dealings with the soul he is sanctifying, will work into him an experience analogous to that through which Christ passed when he died for sin on the cross. Bear this in mind, for it will have an important part in the discussion of the apostle's second proposition, namely:

II. That it is impossible for those who have thus died for sin, that is, by their federal and spiritual union with Christ in his atoning death, to abide in sin.

Now, he does not say that it is impossible for the justified believer to *sin*, but to *abide in sin*. The word he uses denotes continuance or abiding in, entire surrender to sin, in contrast with that constant warfare with sin which marks the true Christian. It is such an abiding as is denoted by the objector, "Let us abide in sin, *in order that* grace may abound," that is, a deliberate, intentional abiding. He intends to show that such a state of mind and heart is simply impossible for those who have died for sin; that it is utterly inconsistent with the legal and spiritual effects of union with Christ in his death, and that the ultimate result of justification must be entire sanctification.

1. The first argument for this position, drawn from the passage before us, may be thus stated: The root of the power of sin is the guilt of sin; but he who has died for sin is justified, or free from the guilt of sin. The power of sin is, therefore, broken, and it becomes impossible for the believer to abide in sin. Guilt once removed, the "body of sin" is wounded unto death, and must soon be destroyed.

The root of sin is its guilt. Sin, of course, is an abstract term, by which we signify a certain state of the soul, and the actions and habits by which that state manifests itself. The psychology of sin then is the psychology of a sinful soul. The subject therefore has not only the difficulties of ordinary metaphysics, but is complicated with those painful, as well as perplexing features

which sin introduces. What pathology is to physiology, psychology of sin is to pure metaphysics. But sin has its laws, and they may be learned and reduced to science, by observation and induction as well as those of any other part of the psychical or physical nature. There are two sources from which the necessary facts may be drawn. From the experiences of the redeemed sinners who have passed through all the stages of indifference, conviction, remorse, repentance, and peace of conscience regained through the subjective effects of the atoning work of Christ; and from divine revelation of the facts of redemption. In the sixth and seventh chapters of Romans we have at once the facts from one of the most remarkable religious experiences in the history of redemption, showing the effect upon conscience of sin, of law, and the gospel; and an inspired exposition of those facts. From the study of these two chapters, and parallel passages of the word of God, comparing them with our own experience, and our observation of others, we can see why it is that it is impossible for those who have died under the curse of the law to atone for the guilt of sin, to abide in the power of it.

Now when we say that the guilt of sin is the root of its power, we do not mean to confound the two things, or to deny the distinction between guilt and power, but the word of God gives us the best of reasons for saying that the guilt of sin is the root from which has sprung the tree of its power which bears such deadly fruit. Such passages as the following would indicate that there is this relation between the guilt and the power of sin, even if they explain nothing of the nature of this connection: "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. . . . I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law said, Thou shalt not covet." "Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead, . . . but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was to life, I found to be unto death." (Rom. vii. 5-10.) "The strength of sin is the law." (1 Cor. xv. 56.) Says Thornwell, "It is guilt which seals the soul in impotence." Now the word

guilt has two meanings which we must distinguish here: the one objective, the other subjective; the first is the actual ill-desert of sin, the second is the consciousness of that ill-desert. Guilt in both these senses enslaves the sinner.

(1.) Guilt in its objective sense of actual ill-desert enslaves by breaking the soul's communion with God, the source of all spiritual life. Dr Thornwell leaves nothing to be said on this subject: "Personal holiness, according to the uniform teaching of the Scriptures, results from union with God; and union with God necessarily implies possession of his favor. Good works, proceeding as they do, from the love of God as their source, governed by his law as their rule, and directed to his glory as their end, cannot be conceived to exist among outcasts and aliens. Union with him is the only source of strength, purity, and peace. This is what the Scripture denominates *life*. Now what is the condition of an unpardoned sinner? His first transgression, upon the necessary principles of retributive justice, has doomed him to the curse. But to be under the curse, and at the same time enjoy the favor of God, are contradictory states. The curse implies something inconceivably stronger than the bare negation of favor. It fixes an illimitable chasm between the sinner and his judge. It effects that awful separation from God, that banishment from his presence, that aggregate of all that is terrible, which the Bible compendiously expresses by *death*. In this condition of wretchedness and of exile the dominion of sin must be unbroken and complete. Corruption riots on its victim. The curse which banishes from God, banishes from holiness. The unpardoned sinner, consequently, from the very nature of his state, is as incapable of aspiring to holiness as a corpse is incapable of the functions of life. It is his doom, like the serpent, to crawl upon his belly and lick the dust. The condemnation which sends him out, like Cain, from the presence of the Almighty, forever precludes the possibility of repentance, places him beyond the pale of communion with his Maker, beyond the reach of spiritual impulses, and leaves him to wither in the atmosphere of death. Such is the strength of the law to crush the victims of its penalty. All that are under the curse are dead—cut off from the fountain of life. The only

works they are competent to perform are *dead* works.”<sup>1</sup> A single sin, then, is enough to break this union of the soul with its God. As, if a telegraph wire is broken or cut in but one place, the whole circuit is broken, so one sin by its guilt cuts off the soul from its union with God, the source of all spiritual life, and the soul becomes *dead*.

(2.) But this is not all that is meant by the enslaving power of guilt. Just as soon as the actual guilt of sin condemns the soul to banishment from the presence of God, the consciousness of that ill-desert, and of that hopeless banishment, will begin to work disastrous consequences in breaking down those natural restraints upon sin which remain to the sinner from the wreck of his fall. It will inevitably destroy self-respect. Self-respect is that within a man which deters him from committing a base act by the feeling that it is beneath him. It is something remaining of that sublime self-consciousness of the soul that it was created in the image of God. This feeling, though wounded, was not slain by the fall. It yet remains in the hearts of those who have not deliberately destroyed it, and repels the suggestion of an evil thing with the question, Am I a dog, that I should do this thing? But the consciousness of guilt will murder self-respect. When once a man has committed a base act, in spite of the protesting voice of his self-respect, it will never again protest against that same degree of guilt. It will never again say to a man, Thou art too noble for such a deed, for the consciousness of guilt will reply, Thou hast lowered thyself to the level of that deed by once committing it.

But even after self-respect has been long dead, there is another feeling strong within man's bosom, which may yet restrain him from excesses in sin—it is shame, or fear of public opinion. Though we may have ceased to think well of ourselves, we would have others to think well of us. Even though in the secrecy of our own hearts we may know that we have debased ourselves, we yet would hide the guilty secret from our friends and companions. Though we may not be able to meet our own eyes in the mirrors of our secret chambers, we would yet look into the eyes of our fellow-men with all the bearing of conscious innocence. There-

---

<sup>1</sup> Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. III., pp. 364-'65.

fore, men are restrained at least from committing their sins in public, and confine their shameful deeds to the dark. But as the sense of guilt destroyed self-respect, so it will destroy shame. The process is the same. A man may become hardened to the contempt expressed in the eyes of his fellow-men, as he has already grown hardened to self-contempt. He will cease to care what men think of his actions, as he has ceased to care what his own conscience says.

Again, the sense of guilt enslaves by the two-fold effect which it has upon conscience. The effect of sin upon the conscience seems to be analogous to that of a morbid appetite on the body. When a man first begins to acquire these habits, nature makes vehement protests in the pain and loathing which at first follows the indulgence. But as this protest of nature is repeatedly disregarded, she seems to acquiesce, and those things which once were poisons to the body it now seems to need and enjoy even more than the actual necessities of life. But this silence of nature is deceptive. The time will come when she will call the transgressor to strict account. For every such indulgence, for every such violation of her laws, she will demand satisfaction to the full, in feeble health, in a shattered frame, in tortured nerves, and in a horrible death. So with the conscience. After that first keen pain which the wound of guilt causes, a numbness seems to ensue, and with successive blows upon this most sensitive part of man's nature, at last it seems to become utterly dead. Then the sinner may gratify his depraved appetites and enjoy his pleasures unalloyed by any warning pains. As long as he can keep conscience in this insensible condition, he can sin with delight. He almost realizes his idea of happiness while in this condition. He is a slave, but his slavery is one from which he has no longing to escape. He is willing to have his ears bored with an awl in sign of his eternal allegiance to this master. Like Anthony, in the lap of Cleopatra, he forgets honor, fame, ambition, his country, and his God. But conscience is not dead. It cannot be destroyed by any amount of guilt. The time will come in the history of every sinner when conscience will be fully aroused, and will take fearful vengeance. The time will come when the sinner's obli-

vion in the arms of lust will end, and thenceforward there remains for him nothing but an eternity of hopeless remorse. This remorse, so far from checking sin, will be a goad to the sinner. While conscience sleeps the sinner may sin with all the energy of delight, but when it awakens to a hopeless remorse, he sins with all the energy of despair. Thus it is as Paul says in Romans vii. 5, "The passions of sin, which are by the law stirred up, work in the soul to bring forth fruit unto death." It is a strange thing, and escapes our analysis, but it is nevertheless true, as our observation and experience will testify, that when the guilty soul comes in contact with the law in any way, it is aroused to a very frenzy of opposition. To a soul in such a condition, love of God is, of course, impossible, and a fierce hatred of him takes its place. Says Dr. Thornwell: "The dread of God's justice, arising from a sense of guilt, is the great ground of the sinner's hatred to God, and can only be removed by appeasing that justice, and assuring the sinner that he can be pardoned. . . . It is idle to talk of his loving God while the weight of unpardoned guilt hangs over him. The terrors of the Lord encompass him about, and the horrors of the grave seize hold upon him. In the nature of things a vindictive deity cannot be the subject of delight to the fallen object of his vengeance. Terror and dread are not the native elements of love. We may quail beneath the fiery justice and uplifted arm of a menacing deity; we may tremble and shake at the awful exhibitions of an angry God when the heavens grow black with his wrath, and the firmament smokes with his displeasure. . . . But exhibitions like this will only steel our hearts to deeper defiance and sterner hate. They cannot unbar the doors of our love. They may make us muster the energies of dark despair, and clinch our fists and nerve our souls to do battle with Omnipotence."<sup>1</sup> In the climax of this despair the soul will exclaim in the language which Milton attributes to Satan, "All good to me is lost; evil! be thou my good." Such are some of the effects of the sense of guilt upon the soul of the sinner. The analysis is, of course, incomplete. There is something in the sense of guilt which cannot be resolved or explained, but which acts as a goad

<sup>1</sup> Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. II., pp. 376-377.

and loosens every restraint to a lost soul. But enough has been adduced to justify the assertion that the root of the power of sin is its guilt, and that if guilt can only be removed in some way sin will be wounded in its very vitals, and must sooner or later die.

Now suppose that this can be done? Suppose that the actual guilt of sin can be taken away, and the soul's union with God can be restored? This is precisely what is done by the believer's federal union with Christ in his atoning death. He has died for sin, he has paid its entire penalty, just as if he had suffered it himself. There is now no condemnation to him. The ground upon which an infinitely holy and just God was compelled to break his union with him is removed. The severed nerve is united again, the broken circuit is complete once more. By his federal union with Christ in his whole work, the believer becomes entitled to that grace of the Holy Spirit by which he may be restored to the image of God. Thus we see that the federal union of the believer with Christ in the objective features of his work, releases him from the guilt of sin in its objective sense, and to that extent he is freed from its slavery.

Now suppose that the sinner can be freed from sin in its subjective sense also, from his own fearful consciousness of ill-desert? Suppose that not only by a legal decision he is exempted from all future punishment of sin, but that he no longer deserves punishment? Suppose that not only is God satisfied, but that his own conscience is put at rest? Suppose that not only are his outward relations changed, but that there can be wrought into his soul the experience of one who has died for sin? Let us suppose, as Dr. Chalmers does, in his commentary on this passage, that the punishment of sin, while retaining all its terrible nature, was limited, and that the sinner can be conceived of as having only a limited amount of sin to atone for, so that we could imagine him as having paid the entire penalty of the law. All the vials of God's wrath are poured out upon him and he dies, dies for sin to satisfy divine justice. Now suppose that he could be brought back to life again, freed from all the claims of the law, and looked upon by the whole universe as one who has sinned indeed, but who has amply suffered for his sins. What sort of experience would that man

bring back with him from his grave? What effect would such an experience have upon his future life? Would he not come back with a realization of all the horror of the guilt of sin, of its enslaving power, of God's hatred of it, such as he could never have acquired in any other conceivable way? Would he not henceforth dread sin, hate it, shun it? Would not the thought of it bring back all the memories of the bitterness of death? Could he be deceived again by the specious disguises which it might assume, and the fair promises it might make? Now, why cannot such a thing be conceived of as taking place in the sinner himself, and thus all punishment be remedial in its nature? Simply because no sin can be conceived of as having a limited ill-desert, and because no sinner can be conceived of as having a limited amount of sin to atone for. No creature can be conceived as committing a certain amount of sin, and thenceforth being perfectly righteous. Even if single sins could be supposed to be limited in their desert of ill, before he could atone for one sin, he would have committed a thousand others. But suppose the sovereign wisdom of God should devise some plan by which the same effects might be brought about as we have above described? Now God has devised such a plan, and its effect upon the soul of the sinner transcends what we could suppose would be the effect of his own death for sin.

We have seen that the believer's union with Christ is not only federal, but spiritual; not only objective, but subjective. Now it seems to us that Paul, speaking from the profoundest depths of his own experience, and being divinely inspired to interpret that experience in explanation of the method of salvation, teaches, not only that the believer is federally united to Christ, so that his relations to the law become the same as if he had died himself; but also that, in this spiritual union, the Holy Spirit works into the soul of the believer some analogy of the experience of Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection. I am fully persuaded that, in a deeper sense than we ordinarily think, we are made partakers of his death, burial, and resurrection. As the human voice sets the diaphragm of the telephone to vibrating, and those vibrations excite an electric current, and this current in turn excites corres-

ponding vibrations in another instrument, reproducing with wonderful exactness the very tones of the far distant voice, so, in some mysterious way, which we can but faintly conceive of, the Spirit creates a vital union between the believer and Christ, through which the sufferings of Christ for sin seem to reproduce themselves in his soul. To illustrate my meaning further, let us make a supposition, which, of course, is not true of the physical body, but which may have some analogy in the spiritual sphere. Let us suppose that, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the communicant really fed upon the flesh and blood of Christ, and that the particles of Christ's body gradually replaced the corrupt particles of the sinner's body, until the one became the counterpart of the other, so that the very scars of the hands and feet and side of the one might be reproduced in the other. This, we know, is not true. But suppose that this outward feeding upon the elements were the type and means of a spiritual feeding of the believer upon the once suffering, but now risen, soul of Christ, until his soul became the counterpart of the nature of Christ, until, so to speak, the very scars of Christ's soul were reproduced in that of the believer. But this is no mere supposition; it is the very truth of God. We do not mean to say that it is this analogy to the death of Christ wrought into the soul that atones for sin. Let that be marked, lest a wrong inference be drawn. The death of Christ, as an objective fact, is that which atones for guilt in its objective sense. But we do mean to say that it is the subjective effects of union with Christ in his death which counteract the subjective effects of guilt.

What, then, are the effects of spiritual union with Christ in his death? First, he has acquired an apprehension of the justice of God and the guilt of sin, such as he could never have acquired in any other way, not even if he had suffered all the wrath of God for sin in his own person. For he has lain prone upon the earth with Jesus in the Garden, already tasting of the bitterness of the cup of wrath, and has cried in his agony, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me." He has *felt* the vials of that wrath poured out, not upon himself, but upon the Son of God. With what amazement has he realized that the guilt of his sin is such that God could

not spare his only begotten Son, when it was laid upon him! The memory of that experience can never be effaced from his mind through all his life, or through eternity to come. He can never again sin as blindly as he once did.

“ I saw one hanging on a tree,  
In agonies and blood,  
Who fixed his languid eyes on me,  
As near his cross I stood.

“ Sure, never till my latest breath  
Can I forget that look ;  
It seemed to charge me with his death,  
Though not a word he spoke.”

Again, he has acquired such an apprehension of the holiness of God and the pollution of sin, as not even his own death for sin could have wrought in him. He has seen all his secret sins set in the light of God's countenance. He has seen all their pollution laid bare, and the pure light of God's holiness streaming down upon them. Oh, the withering agony of such an experience! Who can describe it? Who can tell of the groans of shame and self-contempt that rise from his breast as he sees that the holiness of God has compelled him to desert his Son for the guilt that was laid on him? Who can tell how that cry has pierced his soul, “ My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!”

Can the man who has passed through such an experience ever look upon sin again as he once did? Can he ever be deceived as to its true nature? His conscience is now awakened. He can never enjoy sin again. The memory of that scene on the cross will haunt him in the wildest revelry. The sweetness of the lust is gone forever. His once welcome slavery is now a hateful bondage, from which he longs to escape. He awakes from his oblivion in the arms of the enchantress, and now his whole soul regards her with loathing. But that is not all. Looking upon that cross he realizes the love which devised the plan by which he might thus die, and the love which has borne that awful load of guilt for him, and consented even to be abandoned of God for him; and as he realizes this, there comes upon him the spirit of grace and of supplications, and he looks upon him whom he has pierced, and

mourns for him as one that mourneth for his only son, and is in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born. At last his heart is broken.

But if the believer died with Christ, he was also raised with him. "If we be planted together in the likeness of his death, . . . also in that of his resurrection." Just as there are spiritual effects answering to the legal effects of Christ's death, so there are spiritual, answering to the legal, effects of his resurrection; and in the same manner as we were baptized into the one, so were we baptized into the other. In other words, the Holy Spirit has wrought into the believer the subjective likeness of the resurrection of Christ. He realizes now what it is to have paid the full penalty of his sin, and to stand vindicated before the world. His peace of conscience is restored. It is one of the strange, but undeniable effects of the gospel, that it not only releases from the fear of punishment, but gives peace to the conscience. This the mere legal transfer of penalty could not have done. But when the soul rises from its death for sin in union with Christ, and looks upon his scars brought back from that grave, he is delivered not only from fear, but from that debasing sense of guilt, with all its consequences. Though his conscience is made tender by this experience, it is healed of its wounds. It is faithful in its warnings, but its sting is gone. Self-respect and regard for the opinion of the good is restored. He realizes that not even the immaculate angels of heaven would spurn his presence now. Henceforth he knows that he has a new character to sustain, not his own, but the honor of him who has redeemed him, and given him his new life.

Now it is not meant to be said that these experiences are all wrought at once in the act of baptism or regeneration, nor that they are reproduced with the same distinctness in every case, nor that they are the same in degree; but that before the Spirit of God completes the sanctification of the sinner, he stamps upon his soul this likeness of his sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection. The union with Christ is completed at once in the act of baptism or regeneration, but not all the effects of that union are immediately manifest. In the new-born infant few can detect the likeness to the parent which becomes plain to the eyes of the most

careless observer as he develops into manhood; so, though the believer contains in himself potentially this likeness to Christ from his new birth, yet it only develops with his growth in sanctification. As the photographer's plate receives the exact image, which yet must be developed with chemicals before it becomes visible, so must this spiritual conformity to Christ in his work be developed by the subsequent dealings of the Holy Spirit. All the means of grace are instruments made use of by him for this purpose, but especially the Lord's Supper. As in that sacrament the believer feeds with his mouth upon the elements which are incorporated into his body and become a part of it, so he spiritually partakes of the human nature of Christ present in that sacrament, conveyed by the Holy Spirit. Thus in a sense he incorporates and is incorporated into that nature, not in the sense that he becomes one with Christ in essence, but in a sense far transcending all human conceptions and analogies, even that of the vine and its branches, of the head and its body or the body and its members, of the husband and the wife. Thus the communicant becomes partaker of the body that was broken and the blood that was shed for sin, and its likeness is reproduced in his own soul.

This seems to me to throw much light on the design of afflictions to the saint. Not that these afflictions are the likeness of the sufferings of Christ for us, or that they could have any beneficial effect of themselves; but that they are simply the means in the hands of the Holy Spirit of producing conformity to the sufferings of Christ. "He has chastened us that we might become partakers of his holiness." "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." "Forasmuch, then, as Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God."

Much of what has just been said is tentative in its character, but enough has been established on grounds of reason and Scripture, to sustain the first argument in favor of the apostle's declaration that it is impossible for those who have died in union with

Christ for sin, to live in it, viz.: That as the root of sin is its guilt, and as guilt both in its objective and subjective sense, with all its consequences, is removed by the federal and spiritual union with Christ in his death, burial and resurrection; therefore the tree of sin must die with all its deadly fruits. The "body of sin" is wounded in a vital part, and must be destroyed. It may seem to us a long time in dying. If the root of a plant be dug up when it is small, it will soon die, but when it is grown to a strong tree, even though we may destroy the root, there will be enough sap left in the body to give it the appearance of life for a long time. But it must die.

2. The apostle's second argument for the assertion that it is impossible for those who have died for sin in union with Christ to abide in it is, that the union with Christ in his death and resurrection which is necessary to justification implies a union with him in his risen life, wrought by the same agent, in the same act, namely, the Holy Spirit, in the act of baptism or regeneration, which must result ultimately in sanctification. Not only has the believer been baptized into the death of Christ, but into his life also. "If we die with him, we shall also live with him." "As many as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ." The believer's life henceforth is Christ's risen life. They have not only been quickened together with him, and raised up together with him, but also made to sit together with him in heavenly places. "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, for the life that I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." But if the believer be united to Christ in life in such a way that Christ's life is said to be his life, then his life must partake of the character of Christ's life. But Christ liveth unto God. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to have died unto sin in union with Christ, but to be alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." The members must become partakers of the nature of the body. The wife must bring forth children which partake of the nature of the husband to whom she is united. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by

the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." The argument is irrefragable, if the believer be united to Christ in his death, he must be united to him in his life; since the same Holy Spirit who made him conformable to Christ in his death, spiritually as well as legally, is able also to make him conformable to Christ in his life, and since that life is a pure life, no more subject to death for sin, and consecrated to God, so must the believer's life be.

3. Now, last of all, it is the *divine purpose* in constituting this union with Christ, that it shall result not only in the justification, but the sanctification of the believer as well. "Therefore, we were buried with him by baptism into death, *in order that* like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, *in order that* the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" "We thus judge, that if One died for all, then all died; and he died for all *in order that* they which live (in him) should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again."

Now since it was the divine purpose in constituting this federal and spiritual union with Christ in death, burial, resurrection, and risen life, that it should result in the sanctification as well as the justification of the believer; and since the agent who wrought the union is almighty to carry out this purpose, and since the nature of this union is such as that it must destroy both the guilt and power of sin, with all its effects, both legal and spiritual, both subjective and objective, and create and nourish in the believer a life of holiness like that of Christ; the conclusion is irresistible, that it is impossible for those who have died for sin to abide in sin. Sanctification, therefore, must be the final result of justification. The Antinomian objection is thus completely answered, in whatever form it may present itself.