

baptism, I wish now to say on what grounds I utterly dissent from such an interpretation.

*First : If water be explained here as being the literal water of baptism, all mention of the Redeemer's work in the regeneration of man is excluded from a sentence in which Christ is teaching what is the VERY NATURE of regeneration.*

Our Lord is speaking of the regeneration of man ; He mentions two agents, water and the Spirit. Of these, one, the latter, we know to be the Holy Ghost, without whom man cannot possibly be regenerated ; the other is water. Now, if this be interpreted as literal water, it would teach that man is regenerated by the Holy Ghost and the simple element of water, without any mention of the work of Christ. Irreconcilable with this is the fact that the Bible teems with statements to the effect that we have LIFE only from the Lord Jesus Christ. He Himself says : " I am the life." St. John adds : " He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." For this reason, as well as that already adduced, namely, that Christians are directly stated to be begotten through the Gospel, I deem it wholly improb-