

SCRIPTURAL
WAY OF HOLINESS

W. McDONALD



GOULD LIBRARY
EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

SCRIPTURAL
WAY OF HOLINESS;

OR

THE PATH MADE PLAIN.

William

BY

W. McDONALD,

//

*Author of "New Testament Standard of Piety," "Saved to
the Uttermost," "Another Comforter," "Wesley
and His Doctrine," Etc. Etc.*

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS CO.

CHICAGO AND BOSTON

1907

Copyright 1893,
By W. McDONALD.

FOUR
ST
767

PREFACE.

IN giving to the friends of holiness this *revised* edition of the *Scriptural Way of Holiness*, we are not unmindful of the fact that many similar publications of great excellence have been written and are now in the hands of the people. But it is also true that the subject is an ocean too vast to be exhausted by taking a few bucketfuls to irrigate the river wastes which meet us on every hand. Many more volumes will be required to meet the growing demands.

The former edition has met with commendable favor on both sides of the Atlantic. There were in it some personal references which seemed necessary at the time, but as the parties have gone to their reward, and, we have no doubt, to the heaven of holiness, we judged it due that these personalities should be eliminated.

The present edition was prepared, mainly, for the English market, and has met with much favor there. We have made some farther changes and added a full table of contents, which will be valuable to the reader.

While this volume contains our mature thoughts

on the subject of holiness, they are not our views, but what we have learned from the Holy Scriptures, and have found confirmed by the experience of the saints of God.

We commend the book to God, before whom we shall soon stand to account for the purity of our motives, in explaining and defending what we profoundly believe to be His truth, and urging the church of God to its acceptance as their present inheritance. And if, in the providence of God, it shall be the means of helping a single soul into the full enjoyment of a pure heart, we will give all glory to Him whose "blood cleanseth from all unrighteousness."

W. McDONALD.

Boston, Mass., 1893.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
ERRORS RESPECTING HOLINESS	1
Confounding relative with absolute perfection.—Wesley.—Richard Hooker's definition of perfection.—Confounding purity with maturity.—Dr. Dempster.—Bishop Hamline.—Dr. Steele.—Confounding imparted with imputed holiness.—A dangerous error.—Dean Alford.—Scripture teaching.—Mr. Fletcher's answer.	

CHAPTER II.

HOLINESS DEFINED	15
Removal of all sinful desires and sinful tempers.—Perfect in the sense of complete.—Love with all the heart.—Lost image restored.—Richard Watson.—Dr. Upham.—Dr. Clarke.—Mr. Fletcher.—It is not subjugation.—Quarterly Review reviewed.—Mr. Wesley on justification and sanctification.—Richard Watson's definition.—Dr. Steele.	

CHAPTER III.

HOLINESS THE FAITH OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH	27
St. Ignatius.—Clement of Rome.—Irenæus.—Macarius.—Erasmus.—George Fox.—Isaac Pennington.—Robert Barclay.—Dr. Cudworth.—Walter Marshall.—Dr. Worthington.—Isaac Ambrose.—Bishop Hopkins.—Bishop J. Taylor.—John Wesley.—Richard Watson.—Mr. Fletcher.—Dr. Upham.	

CHAPTER IV.

- HOLINESS SCRIPTURAL 42
 Bishop Foster.—Parity.—Meaning of term.—Such a perfection commanded.—Divine ability pledged.—Dr. Mahan.—Dr. Clarke.—Prayer for perfection.—Whiter than snow.—Philosophical Magazine.—Scripture examples.—Mr. Barnes' account of Job examined.

CHAPTER V.

- OBJECTIONS TO HOLINESS. 62
 Eccles. 7: 2.—Scriptures must agree with themselves.—Dr. G. Peck.—Dr. Clarke.—Meaning of "sinneth."—An illiberal writer examined.—Mr. Barnes on absolute perfection.—Prov. 20: 9.—Rom. 7: 14, 25.—Paul's thorn in the flesh.—Phill. 3: 12.—Creamer.—Dr. Mahan.—Prof. Stuart.—Dr. Robinson.—Dr. Steele.—1 John 1: 8.—Meaning of passage.—Dr. Mahan.—Lord's prayer.—Sin offering.—Dr. Mahan's experience.

CHAPTER VI.

- HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION 91
 Distinction between conversion and entire sanctification.—Bishop Hedding.—William Arthur.—Bishop Foster.

CHAPTER VII.

- HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION.—THE FAITH OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH 98
 Dr. Steele.—Ninth article.—Zinzendorf.—Westminster Catechism.—Dr. Helffenstein.—Dr. Hovey.—Wesley.—Watson.—Dr. Upham.—Dr. Dempster.—Dr. Curry.—Dr. Hodge.—Bishop Thompson.

CHAPTER VIII.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION.—THE
 EXPERIENCE OF BELIEVERS 105
 Experience a question of fact.—Testimony of the witnesses.—William Bramwell.—H. A. Rogers.—Bishop Whatcoat.—Dr. Upham.—J. B. Taylor.—Objections to testimony answered.

CHAPTER IX.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION.—SCRIPTURAL 121
 Variety in experience explained.—Scripture illustrations.—Disciples before and after Pentecost.—Cornelius.—Mr. Fletcher — Richard Watson.—William Arthur.

CHAPTER X.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION. SCRIPTURAL.—THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH 138
 False views.—“Babes in Christ.”—A fallacious argument answered.—The Thessalonians.—An honored Church. And yet needing their love made perfect. The Apostles’ Prayer.—Meaning of “wholly.”

CHAPTER XI.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION.—SCRIPTURAL — OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE 149
 Represent’s God as doing His work partially — Disparages justification.—Objections answered.—Dr. Peck.—Dr. Upham.—Pastoral address.

CHAPTER XII.

HOLINESS—WHEN ATTAINED 160

Points of agreement between those who reject and those who accept the doctrine of higher life.— Dr. Hovey.— Saved to the uttermost.— Meaning of term.— Voice of experience.— Wesley's views.— Gradual and instantaneous.— Depravity not removed by growth.— Dr. Hodge.— Examples of failure.

CHAPTER XIII.

HOLINESS — HOW OBTAINED. 176

Clearly justified.— Know where the mark is.— Mr. Fletcher.— Do not seek the experience of another.— Consecration must be complete.— Difference in the two consecrations.— Frances Ridley Havergal's hymn.— Faith must be perfect.— Bishop Foster's views.— Mr. Fletcher.— Cause of failure.— Bishop Taylor.

CHAPTER XIV.

HOLINESS — EVIDENCES OF ITS ATTAINMENT 206

Consciousness of perfect trust.— Direct witness of the Spirit.— The operations hidden with God.— Objection to this witness answered.— The indirect witness.— Mr. Wesley's views.

CHAPTER XV.

HOLINESS — HOW RETAINED 228

Must be confessed.— Objections.— Bishop Hamline.— Dr. D. A. Whedon.— An incident by Bishop Taylor.— Mr. Wesley's cautions.— Mr. Wesley made the subject a specialty.— "Select societies."—"Bonds."— Mr. Wesley's helpers professed it.— Mr. Wesley professed it.— Mr. Fletcher.— A life of simple trust.— Abundant in good works.— Must not regard heart purity as a consummation.

SCRIPTURAL WAY OF HOLINESS.

CHAPTER I.

ERRORS RESPECTING HOLINESS.

IT may not be out of place in the opening of this treatise to notice a few errors, with reference to Christian holiness, into which many persons fall. Some of these errors take the form of objections to the doctrine, while others give a false idea of the real work accomplished in the experience.

1. *They confound relative with absolute perfection.* This is a common fault among those who oppose the possibility of such an experience in this life. They will have it that those who believe the doctrine we advocate, hold to absolute perfection, though the charge has been denied and the doctrine repudiated a thousand times.

Absolute perfection belongs to God alone, and is absolute because it is a perfection to which nothing can be added. It is complete in quality and quantity. Absolute perfection is underived, and exists independent of any cause. Such a perfection cannot be affirmed of the highest angel, or the brightest glorified being.

Christian perfection is relative ; it has reference to

the perfection of God, but differs from it, in that it is *derived*, and is entirely dependent upon the merit of Christ. While it is like God's perfection in *quality*, it is infinitely removed from it in *quantity*. As a drop of water may be like the ocean, and yet almost infinitely short of being the ocean; and as a ray of light may be like the sun, and yet almost infinitely short of being the sun; so the perfection of a Christian may be like God's, from whom it is derived, and yet be infinitely short of His. In one respect they are alike—in *quality*. A Christian may "be perfect even as his Father which is in heaven is perfect," and yet that perfection be infinitely short of God's absolute perfection.

Absolute perfection implies freedom from mistakes, errors, and infirmities. None of these can exist with such a perfection. But "the highest perfection to which man can attain, while the soul dwells in the body, does not exclude ignorance and error, and a thousand infirmities."—*Wesley*.

Ours is not an intellectual perfection; if it were, it might exclude ignorance and error. It is simply a moral perfection, having its seat in the heart, not in the intellect. Hence it may exist with a thousand mistakes and infirmities. Perfection in knowledge does not belong to angels, much less to ignorant man.

Why should the term *perfection* be objected to? Its use, in this connection, is not a human arrangement; it is in the Scriptures by Divine direction;

and he has more presumption than Christian modesty who would substitute some other term in its place, as in his judgment more expressive or pleasing to the ear. The term, when properly understood, has none of the objectionable characteristics which some imagine. They are more imaginary than real. Richard Hooker defines the term thus: "We count those things perfect which want nothing requisite for the end whereunto they were instituted." In other words, if a thing answer the end for which it was designed, it is perfect. The machine which propels a railroad train, and the machine which keeps in motion the thousands spindles of a cotton factory, are very unlike. In their places they are perfect, because they accomplish just what they were designed to accomplish. But change them, and you would at once witness the most imperfect arrangement. In like manner man, for the end for which God made him, may be perfect; but for any other object he is an imperfect arrangement. He could not, in his present state, be a perfect angel, nor a perfect God; but he can be a perfect, or complete lover of the Lord, for "herein is his love made perfect."

That is perfect which has what belongs to it, and nothing else. A perfect *lamb*, one suitable for sacrifice, according to the law, was one not lacking in any of its parts or members, and had no excrescences. "It might be fatter or leaner, younger or older, larger or smaller, but still the test of perfec-

tion was, that it had what belonged to it, and nothing else."

So with the Christian. If he is complete in Christ,—dead unto sin and alive unto God,—if he is one thing—a simple, and not a compound, he is, we repeat, not a perfect God, not a perfect angel, but a Christian "made perfect in love." He may not possess the same measure of grace which another enjoys, nor manifest the same external sanctity in word and look; yet if the one test of perfection is found in him—if his heart is emptied of sin, and filled with love, and love only; if he loves "God with all his heart, might, mind, and strength," he has "perfected holiness in the fear of the Lord."

2. *A second error is that of confounding purity with maturity.*

There can be no doubt but that the error of confounding purity of heart with a mature Christian life has been the fruitful cause of a long-standing and plausible objection to instantaneous and entire sanctification.

"Is it possible," it has been asked, "for a believer to pass from childhood to manhood experience instantly?" "Can we become full-grown in a day?" There can be but one answer to these inquiries, and that a negative one. No such doctrine is taught,—no such experience is looked for. Such misapprehension comes of confounding two things which the Scriptures and experience have always kept separate—purity and maturity.

By purity of heart we mean a heart in which all the graces exist in an unmixed state. Love exists without any hate, faith without any unbelief, humility without any pride, meekness without any anger. These graces exist without alloy. This is purity of heart.

By maturity we mean all this and much more. Mature has the sense of ripeness by time or natural growth; as a man of mature age, or wheat of mature growth. In this state, love is not more pure, but greatly intensified. Faith is not freer from doubt, but possesses greater compass. It does not doubt less, but believes more. Humility is not more free from pride, but more filled with a sense of the Divine worthiness and of its own unworthiness.

Purity implies something removed; maturity, something added. Depravity, from which anger, envy, and pride arise, is taken away; while the fullness of the graces, including love, joy, peace, faith, and patience, is indefinitely augmented.

In purity, the soul is restored to health; in maturity, it knows the blessing of well-developed manhood. The one expels all disease from the soul; the other builds up the soul in vigour and beauty.

Purity is a proper preparation for growth; maturity is the consummation of growth. The one is the field cleared of noxious weeds, the other is the ripe waving harvest.

Purity is instantaneous; maturity is gradual.

Purity is never obtained by growth, nor maturity, by simple cleansing.

Purity respects quality; maturity respects quantity. One drop of water is of the same quality as the ocean, but not the same quantity. One drop of grace may serve for our cleansing, but an ocean of power and blessedness is before us, and of its fulness we may be more and more the partakers.

A young fruit tree may bear as good fruit in quality as a tree of older and larger growth; but there is a marked difference in the quantity. The young tree may bear to the extent of its capacity, but enlarged capacity brings not larger and better fruit, but abundantly more of it. In like manner, a pure heart may bring forth all the fruit of the Spirit to perfection, but not in the same abundance as when age and long experience shall mature its faith and love, and strengthen all its redeemed powers. This doctrine is clearly taught by our best writers.

"Beyond sanctification," says Dr. Dempster, "there is no increase of purity, but increasing increase in expansion."

"The heart may be cleansed from all sin," says Bishop Hamline, "while our graces are immature, and the cleansing is a preparation for their unembarrassed and rapid growth."

"When inbred sin is destroyed there can be no increase of purity, but there may be an eternal increase in love, and in all the fruits of the Spirit.—*Theological Compend.*

A pure heart may be comparatively weak in all the graces. It may be ignorant of many things relating to duty. For want of proper instruction it may do many things very improper to be done, judged by enlightened Christian intelligence. Purity does not secure us from mistakes, and the less we know, the more mistakes we shall make. Purity does not store the mind with Bible knowledge ; that is to be secured by time and research. But purity will keep us loyal to God and His law. If errors have been committed, they have been errors of the head, not of the heart. We erred, not knowing but that we were doing right. And when the error was discovered, we were pained, not condemned : pained that we knew so little—justified freely, because we did the best we knew. Had we been more mature we might have done better ; had we been prompted in our acts by impurity, we should have done much worse. Purity has preserved us from wrong intention, maturity might have preserved us from improper acts. Let no one be deterred from seeking heart purity, fearing that it involves so much of maturity. Seek a clean heart first, and look for maturity in the order of the Divine appointment.

3. Another error is that of confounding imparted with imputed holiness.

One of the most dangerous errors promulgated in connection with the doctrine of heart purity is, that man may be **holy in Christ** without being **holy in himself**. There is a marked difference between

being holy *in* ourselves and being holy *of* ourselves. The inward holiness is *from* Christ, not *in* Christ: we mean, not *in* Christ in the sense of not being transferred to us.

It is claimed that we may be "complete in Christ, though in ourselves we are as full of sin as ever." A late writer describes it thus: "The flesh is still present in all its original sinfulness, and will remain unholy to the end. Sanctification is not the purifying of the flesh, but the outgrowth and development of the new man."—*Conflict of Faith*.

These writers contend that holiness, or sanctification, is simply the Christ-life in us, keeping under a perverse nature, ever present, and never to be removed in the present life. The "*old man*" is not dead, only "*reckoned*" so. Our defilement is not removed, only covered. Christ stands between our actual pollution and God, so that He sees only Christ. Perfect love is not to be understood as our love to God made perfect, but His love to us. And as Christ's love can never be other than perfect, whatever measure of it we possess must be perfect love. 1 John iv. 17: "Herein is our love made perfect," is said to be interpreted by the margin—"love with us," meaning, it is claimed, God's love to us, and not our love to Him. Dean Alford has the following note on the passage: "*This is love perfected with us*, not God's love to us; this is forbidden by the whole context. On the right interpretation, the confidence which we shall have

in that day, and which we have even now by anticipation of that day, is the perfection of our love."

A late writer gives us a most remarkable picture of what he is pleased to call "*the good man.*" "The good man," he says, "feels that when he is presenting to God his prayer and his praises and other holy things, that many vain and foolish thoughts often come unbidden, as the unclean fowls came down upon the sacrifice which Abraham had laid in order to be offered to God (Gen. xv. 11); and he feels that his sacrifice is sadly spoiled; and he asks, 'Can the pure God accept such impure sacrifices as I now bring and lay on His altar?' There is so much of self and sin in our holiest things that our very tears need washing, and our very repentance towards God needs to be repented of. In each of our hearts there is a fountain of black, filthy water; and when we think we are about to present a gift pure and clean to God, the stream bursts forth, and the gifts we thought would be so clean and pure are besmeared with vile effusions of our own corrupt heart. And we sometimes think that Satan empties much of the horrible filth of hell into our hearts, making each of them into a sewer for the foul waters of the abyss of despair to run through."

This is a description of a "good man." What more can be said of a bad one? He has nothing in him worse than the "horrible filth of hell." Nothing can be said of him more fully describing his de-

pravity than that he is a "sewer for the foul waters of the abyss of despair to run through." And yet, according to the doctrine of *imputed holiness*, this man, filled with the "horrible filth of hell," and a "sewer for the foul waters of the abyss to run through," is as pure as Christ is pure; is without a stain. This same writer says, "He who is our Great High Priest before God is pure, without a stain. God sees Him as such, and He stands for us who are His people, and we are accepted in Him. His holiness is ours by imputation. Standing *in Him* we are, in the sight of God, holy as Christ is holy, and pure as Christ is pure. God looks at our representative, and He sees us in Him. We are complete in Him who is our spotless and glorious Head."

It would seem that the bare statement of this dogma would be enough to turn "good men" from it as from the doctrines of devils. The idea that Christ's personal holiness is to so far hide the "horrible filth of hell" in us that God cannot see it, and that so long as Christ's personal purity remains we are pure in Him, no matter how impure we may be in ourselves, is a doctrine so abhorrent of sound reason and the teachings of the Word of God that we wonder any can accept it.

The Scriptures clearly teach that we may be cleansed from the evils of the *flesh*. 2 Cor. vii. 1: "Having, therefore, these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the *flesh* and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the

Lord." How does this accord with the statement that "the flesh is still present in all its original sinfulness, and will remain unholy to the end?" The old man is to be "crucified"—no longer to live. The body of sin "is destroyed"—no longer to exist. "He that is dead (to sin) is freed from sin." "Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow," which means—take away, not cover up, my filthiness. "Create in me a clean heart," not cover my old one from the Divine gaze by Christ's imputed holiness. "From all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you"—not throw over you the cloak of Christ's spotless righteousness, that your filthiness may not be seen.

On the subject of *imputed holiness*, we submit the substance of Mr. Fletcher's reply to the doctrine in his day. It was stated and answered as follows:—

"We do not assert that all perfection is imaginary. Our meaning is that all Christian perfection is in Christ—that we are perfect in His person, and not in our own."

To this Mr. Fletcher replied:—"If by being perfect only in Christ is meant that we can attain to Christian perfection in no other way than by being perfectly grafted in Him, the true Vine, and by deriving, like vigorous branches, the perfect sap of His perfect righteousness, to enable us to bring forth fruit unto perfection, we are perfectly agreed; but we perpetually assert that nothing but 'Christ in us the hope of glory,' nothing but 'Christ dwelling in

our hearts by faith,' or, which is all one, nothing but the 'law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' can make us free from the law of sin and death, and perfect us in love.

"But as we never advanced the idea that Christian perfection is held any other way than by faith that 'roots and grounds' us in Christ, we suspect that some hidden error lurks under these equivocal phrases: 'All our perfection is in Christ's person; we are perfect in Him, and not in ourselves.'

"If it is insinuated by such language that we need not, cannot be perfect by an inherent personal conformity to God's holiness, because Christ is thus perfect in us; or should it be meant that we are perfect in Him, just as the sick in a hospital are perfectly healthy in the physician who gives them his attendance—as the filthy leper was perfectly clean in the Lord, before he had felt the power of Christ's gracious words—'I will, be thou clean;' or as hungry Lazarus was perfectly fed in the person of the rich man, at whose gate he lay starving; if this be the meaning, we are in conscience bound to oppose it, for the following reasons:—

"1. If believers are perfect because Christ is perfect for them, why does the apostle exhort them to 'go on unto perfection?'

"2. If believers be perfect in Christ, they would all be equally perfect. But does not St. John talk of some who are perfected, and of others who are not yet 'made perfect in love?'

“3. The apostle exhorts us to be ‘perfect in every good work ;’ and does not common sense dictate that there is a difference between our good works and the person of Christ ?

“4. Does not our Lord Himself show that His personal righteousness will by no means be accepted instead of our personal perfection, where He says : ‘Every branch in Me which beareth not fruit,’—or whose fruit never comes to perfection (see Luke viii. 14)—‘My Father taketh it away ;’ far from imputing to it His perfect fruitfulness ?

“5. A believer’s perfection consists in such a high degree of ‘faith as works by perfect love.’ And does not this high degree of faith chiefly imply uninterrupted self-diffidence, self-denial, self-despair ? a heartfelt, ceaseless recourse to the blood, merits, and righteousness of Christ ? and grateful love to Him ‘because He first loved us,’ and fervent charity to all mankind for His sake ? These things, in the very nature of things, cannot be in Christ at all, or cannot possibly be in Him in the same manner in which they must be in believers.

“6. Is not this doctrine big with interest ? May not the impenitent sinner persuade himself to continue in sin, or the penitent Christian to return to it, by the persuasion that Christ’s perfection is imputed to him, and he, consequently, does not need intrinsic purity in himself ? But in this do we not see a direct tendency to set godliness aside, and to countenance gross Antinomianism ?

“7. Who can read these words of Christ, and not perceive that the perfection which He preached was a perfection of holy dispositions, productive of holy actions in His followers? and that it is, of consequence, a personal perfection, as much inherent in us, and yet as much derived from Him and dependent upon Him, as the perfection of our bodily health?—the chief difference consisting in this, that the perfection of our own health comes to us from God in Christ, as the God of *nature*; whereas our Christian perfection comes to us from God in Christ, as the God of *grace*.

“8. Imputed obedience rests on the same footing, and stands or falls by the same arguments. Besides those mentioned, we add the following:—(1.) The law speaks often of the vicarious suffering, but never of vicarious love or obedience. (2.) If we obey by proxy, we may sin as much as we please; for it is plain that if the obedience of another be accepted in lieu of our own, while we continue to indulge in a slight degree of sin, it may be thus accepted if we indulge a little more, and so on, until we have reached the depth of transgression.”

This argument of Mr. Fletcher's is clear, Scriptural, and conclusive. The doctrine which it seeks to overthrow is based upon the false and unscriptural assumption that the righteousness or perfection of Christ's life is the meritorious cause of our salvation; while the Scriptures everywhere teach that “we have redemption through His blood.”

CHAPTER II

HOLINESS DEFINED.

WHAT is the state of that believer who is "made perfect in love" (1 John iv. 17), who is "pure in heart" (Matt. v. 8), who is "cleansed from all unrighteousness" (1 John i. 9), "who is perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col. i. 28), "who is without spot" (Eph. v. 27, 1 Tim. vi. 14, 2 Pet. iii. 14), who is "sanctified wholly" (1 Thess. v. 23), who is "cleansed from all filthiness of flesh and spirit" (2 Cor. vi. 1), and who has thus "perfected holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. vii. 1)?

An answer to this question will relieve many honest inquiries after the way of holiness. Our answer will be brief, but sufficiently clear, we trust, for all who seek to know the truth.

Scriptural holiness includes the removal from our moral natures, through faith in Christ, of all sinful desires and tempers—all pride, anger, envy, unbelief, and love of the world; and (2) the establishment in these purified natures of the unmixed graces of faith, humility, resignation, patience, meekness, self-denial, and charity, or love. In other words, in entire holiness, there is wrought in the heart, through grace, the extirpation of all that is opposed

to grace, so that the moral man is delivered from all interior antagonisms, and possessed of the abiding Comforter.

A soul in such a state is "crucified with Christ." The law of sin no longer wars in his members, because the body of sin is destroyed.

In such a state faith exists without unbelief, love without enmity, humility without pride, patience without murmuring, and obedience without wilfulness. The soul has attained unto an unmixed moral state, and the undisturbed reign of Christ, as Messiah, is established there. The soul's action towards sin becomes spontaneous—an action without reasoning or deliberation, so that it shrinks from sin as naturally as the hand is withdrawn when, from any cause, it comes in contact with a serpent. Not that the soul does not feel the touch of sin, and is not profoundly moved by its presence, but feeling it, withdraws from it as instinctively as the hand is withdrawn from the touch of the viper.

In this state, the graces become perfect, in the sense of being complete. A faith which does not doubt God, but simply trusts Him in all things, is pure faith; humility which ascribes all glory to God, taking none to itself, is perfect humility; meekness which saves from all anger and irritability, is perfect meekness; self-denial which stands like the bullock between the plough and altar, ready for toil or sacrifice, however much opposed to natural inclination, is perfect self-denial; resignation which

says, either exalted or abased, "Not as I will, but as Thou wilt," is perfect resignation; love which expels all hatred and tormenting fear, is perfect love. These graces all meet and are complete in a pure heart. Not complete in the sense of being mature and not admitting of increase, but complete up to our present light and capacity. To love God with all the heart, and our neighbour as ourselves, is the substance of the Divine law, and the limit of the Divine claim upon us.

"Whatever may be the extent of powers possessed, it asks the whole, and no more. If those energies in a single being exceed all that the race of man ever shared, still no part can be reserved or left unemployed: the entire amount, up to the last jot and tittle, is demanded. And if we descend to the very lowest grade of responsible agents, where moral perception is scarcely distinguishable from mere animal instincts, the law claims no more than it finds. Whatever there is of mind, of vigour, of affection, it asks—it accepts. If the whole be but as the smallest dewdrop, it asks no more; if it expands into the vastness of an ocean, it must have it all, out to the farthest shore, and down to the lowest depths."

"The measure of our perfection is the perfection of God. The greatest perfection of God is *love*, and when all the soul, however expanded and however diminutive, is love,—love to God and love to man,—it has reached the measure of its capacity, even as God has reached the measure of His infinite capacity;

but such a soul has not reached the measure of its growth."

This state of holiness is simply the restoration of man, in the language of Richard Watson, "to the obliterated image of God in which he had been created."

It is claimed, we are aware, that Adamic perfection is an impossible attainment in this life. If by Adamic perfection is meant Adamic *purity*, we dissent. There is a marked difference between Adamic perfection and Adamic purity. The perfection of the first man was three-fold—physical, intellectual, and moral. We are not to look for physical perfection until our bodies are made like unto Christ's most glorious body, through the power of the resurrection. Nor need we look for intellectual perfection until we know as we are known. "Adam, it is true, did not possess omniscience, but within the range of his perceptive powers he was not subject to error. So far as God permitted him to know at all, he knew correctly. So that, relatively to the sphere of his ability and action, he was as perfect intellectually as he was corporeally and physically."—*Upham*.

But with regard to moral perfection or purity, we are unable to see why our loss by the fall is not met in the Gospel. Adam was required to love God with all his heart, and no more; and the Gospel claims nothing less of us. Dr. Adam Clarke says:—

"This perfection is the restoration of man to the

state of holiness from which he fell, by creating him anew in Christ Jesus, and restoring to him that image and likeness of God which he lost. A higher meaning it cannot have ; a lower meaning it must not have.")

Mr. Fletcher says :—("Christian perfection extends chiefly to the will, which is the capital moral power of the soul ; leaving the understanding ignorant of ten thousand things. Adamic perfection extends to the whole man," but not Adamic purity—as that belongs to the moral nature. or

This state of holiness does not exclude the liability to temptation, but aids in successfully resisting it. It does not place its possessor where he *cannot* fall, but, what is of equal advantage to him, where he *need not* fall. It does not make him infallible, but it places him in such relations to Divine wisdom that he will be much more likely to know the mind of the Spirit. It does not arrest spiritual growth, but, by removing all obstructions, greatly promotes it. Nor does it give to its possessor a faultless external life, while he is encompassed with mental and physical infirmities, but it imparts to him a pure heart, out of which flows perfect love, which is more acceptable to God "than whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." In a word, "sanctification," in the language of Mr. Wesley, "in the proper sense, is an instantaneous deliverance from all sin, and includes an instantaneous power, then given, always to cleave to God,")

This definition includes two important facts ; first, “instantaneous deliverance from all sin ;” which means that the heart is cleansed from all sin instantaneously ; and secondly, that with this heart cleansing comes a power from God by which we are kept in this state.

As the theory has been put forth with great vigour, that we are not cleansed from all sin, but that sin is simply *repressed*, or *subjugated*, this may be a proper place to briefly consider that dogma. It is expressed in the following language:—“Sanctification is such a measure of power over sin as holds us with more or less continuity in the same perfect fulness of Divine approbation as rested upon us when justification first pronounced us, through Christ, perfectly innocent of sin.” — *Methodist Quarterly Review*.

This remarkable language, translated into plain English, seems to be this: Sanctification is the continuance, with more or less interruption, of our full justification. If a believer succeeds in holding fast his first justification, with more or less interruption, he is sanctified. If this is not the meaning of the language employed, we cannot understand it. Our objections to this definition of entire sanctification are many ; a few of which we will briefly state:—

1. It reduces the standard of entire sanctification below uninterrupted justification ; for be it remembered that this full justification, which constitutes sanctification, is “with more or less continuity.”

This sanctification is not even uninterrupted justification.

2. It makes, strangely enough, the uninterrupted continuance of one thing, another thing—the uninterrupted continuance of justification—sanctification. But does not reason teach us that the power to maintain justification, equivalent to our first pardon, is not sanctification, but simply sustained justification, and nothing more?

3. This view of sanctification falls below the Wesleyan idea of justification. This is very plain.

At the Conference of 1744, according to Miles' *Chronological History*, page 20, they discussed and settled the following question:—

“What are the immediate fruits of *justifying faith*?” *Ans.*: “Peace, joy, love, *power over all outward sin*, and *power to keep down inward sin*.”

Speaking of the justified, Mr. Wesley says:—“He has *power, both over outward and inward sin*, even from the moment he is justified” (Vol. i., p. 109).

In his sermon on “The Marks of the New Birth,” he says:—“An immediate and constant fruit of this faith whereby we are *born of God* (not sanctified), fruit which can in no wise be separated from it, no, not for an hour, is *power over sin—power over outward sin of every kind; and power over inward sin*” (Vol. i., p. 155).

Mr. Wesley's view of entire sanctification is very different. It is not power to *repress* sin—to keep it in subjection—but it is “Death to sin” (Vol. vi.,

p. 505); "Entire deliverance from sin" (Vol. vii., p. 71); "Cleansed from all unrighteousness" (Vol. iv., p. 126). Speaking of being cleansed from all sin and all unrighteousness, he says:—"Neither let any sinner against his own soul say that this relates to justification only, or the cleansing us from the *guilt of sin*; first, because this is confounding together what the apostle clearly distinguishes, who mentions first, *to forgive us our sins*, and then *to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*" (Vol. i., p. 367).

The hymns of the Wesleys are full of the idea of *cleansing*, but nowhere do we find the idea of *repression* or *subjugation*.

"Purge me from every sinful blot;
My idols all be cast aside:
Cleanse me from every evil thought;
From all the filth of self and pride."

"Speak the second time, Be clean!
Take away my inbred sin."

"The hatred of my carnal mind
Out of my flesh at once remove."

"Come, O my Joshua, bring me in,
Cast out the foe, the inbred sin,
The carnal mind remove."

These citations are sufficient to show that the idea of *repression* found no place in Mr. Wesley's views of entire sanctification. It was "purge," "cleanse," "be clean," "remove," etc.

(Richard Watson defines entire sanctification as a "complete deliverance from all spiritual pollution, all inward depravation of the heart" (*Institutes*, Vol. ii., p. 450).)

CHECK THIS OUT

Here is **no repression**, but **extirpation**—deliverance from all pollution.

4. It is not in harmony with the word of God. (“It is a remarkable fact,” says Dr. Steele, “that while the Greek language richly abounds in words signifying repression, a half-score of which occur in the New Testament, yet none of them are used of inbred sin; but such verbs as signify *to cleanse, to purge, to purify, to mortify, and to crucify*. When St. Paul says that he keeps under his body and brings it into subjection, he makes no allusion to the *sarx, the flesh*, the carnal mind, but to his innocent bodily appetites. In Pauline usage, *body* is different from *flesh*. We have diligently sought, both in the Old Testament and the New, for exhortations to seek the repression of sin. The uniform command is to put away sin, to purify the heart, to purge out the old leaven, and to seek to be sanctified throughout soul, body, and spirit. Repressive power is nowhere ascribed to the blood of Christ, but rather purifying efficacy. Now, if these verbs which signify cleansing, washing, crucifying, mortifying, or making dead, are all used in a metaphorical sense, it is very evident that the literal truth signified is something far stronger than repression. It is eradication, extinction of being, destruction.”)

Nothing need be added to make this Scriptural argument more complete. It will be seen at a glance that repression is not the Divine method of dealing with sin, but extermination.

5. We are met with another objection to the repressive theory as difficult to explain as the one last named—it comes in direct conflict with the holiness of God. The same learned author last quoted says:—

“Holiness in man must mean precisely the same as holiness in God, who announces Himself as holy, and then founds human obligation to holiness upon this revealed attribute: ‘Be ye holy, for *I am holy.*’ Who dares say that God’s holiness is different in kind from man’s holiness, save that the one is original and the other is inwrought by the Holy Ghost? Now, if holiness in man is the same in kind as holiness in God—and it is perilous to deny it—what becomes of the repressive theory? Are there explosive elements in the Divine nature, and is there some outside power holding down sinful tendencies in His heart? Or, is He Himself holding them down? Let St. John answer: ‘In Him is no darkness’—moral evil—‘at all.’ His nature is unmingled purity. Thus must be the pattern of our holiness. ‘He that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, EVEN AS HE IS PURE.’ Hence, if any one should ask me to insure his admittance into a holy heaven, into the presence of a holy God, with inbred sin in his heart, though held down by the Holy Ghost Himself, I should decline the risk altogether.”)

6. The repressive theory confounds the distinction between *holiness* and *virtue*.

Quoting from the same writer, whose reasonings are cogent and clear, he says:—“We never call God

virtuous, nor angels, nor Jesus Christ, nor the spirits of the just made perfect, whether in the body or out of the body. We do not magnify, but rather belittle the Son of God, to ascribe to Him only virtue. He is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. What is the specific difference between virtue and holiness? Repression. Virtue is the triumph of right against strong inward tendencies toward the opposite. Jesus triumphed over outward temptations to sin, and was holy. Mary Magdalene, by Divine grace, triumphed over strong inward tendencies toward vice, and was virtuous. The repressive theory of holiness, involving as it must the co-working of the human soul with the Divine Represser, confounds the broad distinction between holiness and virtue, and banishes holiness from the earth, substituting virtue instead. In fact, we do not see any possibility, on this theory, for a fallen man ever to become holy in the sense of the entire extinction of inbred sin. If this is only repressed here, it may be only repressed for ever hereafter. If the Holy Spirit cannot eradicate original sin now, and here, through faith in the blood of Jesus, what assurance have we that He can ever entirely sanctify our souls? But if by repression is meant the right poisoning of the innocent passions of sanctified human nature after the extinction of ingratitude, unbelief, malice, self-will, and every other characteristic of depraved human nature which is sinful *per se*, we accept it as Scriptural."

7. The testimony of consciousness is opposed to the repressive theory. Thousands have testified to a clear and most delightful sense of heart purity. It has not been the absence of malice, and envy, and pride, but the conscious presence of purity all through their natures. If these evils still exist within, only repressed by a superior force, keeping them under, "consciousness must attest to a falsehood when she bears witness to entire inward purity."

No amount of argument can convince the believer, who is conscious that the blood "cleanseth from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit," that the work is not done. He bears about in his heart daily the sweet assurance that he is "dead unto sin and alive unto God," through a purification wrought by the "precious blood of Christ." With him, the old man has been cast out and spoiled of his goods.

CHAPTER III.

HOLINESS THE FAITH OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE view of Christian holiness which we have presented in the previous chapter is not a new doctrine in the Christian Church. Though differing in terminology, it has been held by many of the ablest and best defenders of the Christian faith from the apostolic to the present time.

St. Ignatius, who was a disciple of St. John, and who for upwards of forty years was the pastor of the Church at Antioch, and who, during the third persecution of the Christians, suffered martyrdom at Rome, by being cast to the wild beasts, says:—
(“Nothing is better than peace, whereby all war is destroyed, both of things in heaven and things on earth. Nothing of this is hid from you if ye have perfect faith in Jesus Christ, and love, which are the beginning and end of life: faith is the beginning, love the end; and both being joined in one, are of God. All other things pertaining to perfect holiness follow. For no man that hath faith sinneth; and none that hath love hateth any man.”—*Epistle to the Ephesians*, A. D. 70.)

Clement, chosen Bishop of Rome, in the sixty-seventh year of the Christian era, hence called

Clement of Rome, whose name was in the "book of life" (Phil. iv. 3), wrote two epistles to the Church at Corinth, which were so highly prized by the early Christians that they caused them to be read in the churches. Irencus says of him: "He had seen the blessed apostles, and conversed with them; and the preaching of the apostles still sounded in his ears." In one of his epistles to the Corinthians, speaking of "perfect love," he says:—"The height to which love exalts us cannot be spoken. Love unites us to God. Love covereth a multitude of sins. Love is long-suffering; yea, beareth all things. There is nothing mean in love, there is nothing haughty. Love has no schism, is not seditious. Love does all things in unity. By love were all the elect of God made perfect. Without love nothing is acceptable to God. Ye see, beloved, how great and wonderful a **thing** love is, and that no words can declare its perfection. Who, then, is sufficient to be found therein? who but they to whom God vouchsafes to teach it? Let us, therefore, beseech Him that we may be worthy thereof, that we may live in love unblameable, without respect of persons. All the generations from Adam unto this day are passed away; but those who were made perfect in love are in the regions of the just, and shall appear in glory at the visitation of the Kingdom of Christ.")

Irencus, bishop of Lyons, a father of the second century, and disciple of Polycarp, says:—"The apostle, explaining himself in his 1st Epistle to the

Thessalonians, chap. v., exhibited the perfect and spiritual salvation of man, saying: 'But the God of peace sanctify you perfectly; that your soul, body, and spirit may be preserved without fault to the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.' How then, indeed, did he have the cause of these three (that is, to pray for the entire and perfect preservation of soul, body, and spirit to the coming of the Lord), unless he knew the common salvation of *these* was the renovation of the whole three? Wherefore he calls those *perfect* who present the three faultless to the Lord. Therefore those are *perfect* who have preserved their souls and bodies without fault.")

These holy men well understood the teachings of the apostles; and it is not likely that they would be at fault on so important a doctrine as the one with reference to which they have spoken.

Macarius, who lived in the fourth century, has left in his "Homilies" some clear statements on this subject. It is said of him, that "having served his Master faithfully for ninety years, he was received up into the reward of his labour." He died on the 5th January, A.D. 391. "Thus lived, and thus died, the great Macarius, of Egypt, if he can so properly be said to die, whose very life in the flesh was a constant death to this present evil world."—*Wesley's Christian Library*, vol. i., p. 70.

The "Homilies" of Macarius are beautiful illustrations of a holy life. He says:—"The soul that is thoroughly illuminated by the inexpressible beauty

of the glory of the light of the face of Christ, and partakes of the Holy Spirit in perfection, and is thought worthy to become the mansion and throne of God, becomes all eye, all light, and all face, and all glory, and all spirit."

"One that is rich in grace, at all times, by night and by day, continues in a perfect state, free and pure, ever captivated with love, and elevated to God."

"What, then, is that 'perfect will of God' to which the apostle calls and exhorts every one of us to attain? It is perfect purity from sin, freedom from all shameful passions, and the assumption of perfect virtue; that is, the purification of the heart by the plenary and experimental communion of the perfect and Divine Spirit. To those who say that it is impossible to attain to perfection, and the final and complete subjugation of the passions, or to acquire a full participation of the good Spirit, we must oppose the testimony of the Divine Scriptures; and prove to them that they are ignorant, and speak both falsely and presumptuously."

Who can question, after reading these extracts, but that heart-purity was taught and known in the Apostolic Church, and by the Fathers?

Thomas Erasmus (1550) speaks of pure and clean minds: "Blessed are they whose heart is pure and clean from all filthiness."

The Reformers composed a prayer, still in use:—
 "Cleanse Thou the thoughts of my heart by the

inspiration of the Holy Ghost, that I may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy holy name.”

In 1647, George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, said:—“I was come up in spirit through the flaming sword into the Paradise of God, and knew nothing but pureness, innocency, and righteousness; being renewed up into the image of God by Christ Jesus, into the state that Adam was before the fall.”

In 1670, Isaac Pennington, one of the best educated and most laborious followers of Fox, maintained the doctrine of Christian holiness. He inquires:—“Is it not the will of Christ that His disciples should be perfect, as their Heavenly Father is perfect? Does he not who hath the true, pure, living hope, purify himself, even as He is pure? Is not this the way to enjoy the promises of God’s presence, to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in God’s fear? Will God dwell in an unholy temple? He may indeed to such, when at any time they are tender and truly melted before Him, as the wayfaring man that tarries for a night; but He will not take up His abode there. . . . I verily believe many can witness to such a state, which the Spirit of God does not call less in them than a perfect state, a sound state, wherein Christ, the Heavenly Physician, has healed them perfectly, and made them witnesses of true soundness of soul and spirit in the sight of God. Oh, that all knew and enjoyed it!”

Robert Barclay, one of the most able and voluminous writers among the early Friends, in his *Apology for the True Christian Divinity, as held and preached by the people called in scorn Quakers*, published in 1675, makes an able defence of this proposition: “In whom this pure and holy birth is fully brought forth, the body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed, and their hearts united and subjected to the truth; so as not to obey any suggestions to temptations of the Evil One, but to be free from actual sinning and transgressings of the cause of God, and in that respect perfect; yet this perfection still admits of growth; and there remaineth always in some part a possibility of sinning, where the mind doth not diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord.”

Rev. Ralph Cudworth, D.D., who died in 1688, and who is said to have been “a man of extensive erudition, well skilled in the languages, an able philosopher, an acute mathematician, and a profound metaphysician,” in a sermon preached before the House of Commons, says: “I mean by holiness, nothing else but God stamped and printed upon my soul. True holiness is always breathing upward, and fluttering towards heaven, striving to embosom itself with God. We do but deceive ourselves with names; hell is nothing but the orb of sin and wickedness, or else that hemisphere of darkness in which all evil moves; and heaven is the opposite hemisphere of light, the bright orb of truth, holi-

ness, and goodness; and we actually in this life install ourselves in the possession of one or other of them. There be some that dishearten us in our spiritual warfare, and would make us let our weapons fall out of our hands, by working in us a despair of victory. There be some evil spies that weaken the hands and hearts of the children of Israel; and bring an ill report upon that land that we are to conquer, telling of nothing but strange giants, the sons of Anak there, that we shall never be able to overcome. The Amalekites, say they, dwell in the south; the Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites, in the mountains; and the Canaanites by the sea-coast, huge armies of tall, invincible lusts; we shall never be able to go against them, we shall never be able to prevail against our corruptions. Hearken not unto them, I beseech you, but hear what Caleb and Joshua say: 'Let us go up at once and possess it; for we are well able to overcome them:' not by our own strength, but by the power of the Lord of Hosts. There are indeed sons of Anak there; there are mighty giant-like lusts that we are to grapple with; nay, there are principalities and powers, too, that we are to oppose; but the great Michael, Captain of the Lord's host, is with us; He commands in chief for us, and we need not be dismayed. 'Understand, therefore, this day, that the Lord thy God is He which goeth before thee; as a consuming fire, He shall destroy these enemies, and bring them down before thy face.' If thou wilt be faithful to Him,

and put thy trust in Him, 'as the fire consumeth the stubble, and as the flame burneth up the chaff,' so will He destroy thy lusts in thee; their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as the dust.")

Rev. Walter Marshall, Fellow of New College, Oxford, and subsequently Fellow of Winchester; a Presbyterian, who for nonconformity was ejected from his living at Hursley, in 1662, was an able defender of the gospel of full salvation. He spent his last days in ministering to a little flock in Gosport, in Hampshire, "where he shined," it is said, "though he had not the public oil." "He had, by many mortifying methods, sought peace of conscience; but notwithstanding all, his troubles still increased." He wisely consulted Richard Baxter, who told him that he took his troubles "too legally." Another divine whom he consulted, and to whom he related his soul-troubles, told him plainly that he had forgotten to mention the greatest sin of all, the sin of unbelief, in not believing on the Lord Jesus for the remission of his sins and the sanctifying his nature." From this time he sought Christ by faith, and not only found Him as a pardoning, but sanctifying Saviour, and died "in the full persuasion of the truth, and in the comfort of that doctrine which he had preached."

Mr. Marshall wrote a book, which he entitled, *The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification Opened*, "the substance of which," says a writer of the times, "was

spun out of his own experience." The copy from which we quote is from the Edinburgh edition of 1644, the work having been written in the latter part of the former century.

Mr. Marshall says :—" Be sure to seek for holiness of heart and life only in its due order, where God hath placed it—after union with Christ, justification, and the gift of the Holy Ghost ; and in that order seek it earnestly, by faith, as a very necessary part of your salvation. But though salvation be often taken in Scripture by way of eminency, for its perfection in the state of heavenly glory, yet, according to its full and proper signification, we are to understand by it all that freedom from the evil of our natural corrupt state, and all those holy and happy enjoyments that we receive from Christ our Saviour, either in this world by faith, or in the world to come by glorification. Thus justification, the gift of the Spirit to dwell in us, the privileges of adoption, are parts of our salvation which we partake of in this life. Thus, also, the conformity of our hearts to the law of God, and the 'fruits of righteousness with which we are filled by Jesus Christ' in this life, are a necessary part of our salvation. God saveth us from our sinful uncleanness here by 'the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,' as well as from hell hereafter (Ezek. xxxvi. 22 ; Tit. iii. 5). 'Christ was called Jesus, that is, a *Saviour*, because He saved His people from their sins' (Matt. i. 21)." —Page 137.

Dr. Worthington, born the same year with John

Wesley, a worthy minister and able writer, in a work entitled *The Scheme and Conduct of Man's Redemption*, says:—"If we suppose that nature shall, by degrees, be so refined by grace, as at length to be fully recovered of its present disorders, then all difficulties immediately vanish, and we may easily apprehend what is meant by Christian perfection in its full extent; this being but another word for the recovery of the original perfection of our nature, to which, when it arrives at its full height, I conceive it will be in no respect inferior. That human nature shall in this life arrive at such a complete state of perfection as this, besides what has been already observed, may be further argued from the consequences of the opposite opinion. For I conceive that the doctrine of the impossibility of attaining perfection and freedom from sin is injurious to our Saviour, Christ, derogates from the power and virtue of His sacrifice, and renders His mission, as to the main end of it, in a great measure ineffectual."

Isaac Ambrose, who flourished about the middle of the 17th century, in a work edited by Mr. Wesley, describes the excellency of sanctification thus:—"The excellency of this privilege appears in this particular. This is our glory and beauty, even glorification begun. What greater glory than to be like unto God? We are changed from the same image, from glory to glory; every degree of grace is glory; and the perfection of glory in heaven con-

sists chiefly in the perfection of grace.”—*Ambrose, Works*, p. 87.

Bishop Hopkins, quoted by Mr. Fletcher, says:—
“Consider for your encouragement, that it is not so much the absolute and legal perfection of the work as the perfection of the worker, that is, the perfection of the heart, which is looked at and rewarded by God. It is not so much what our works are, as what our heart is, that God looks at and rewards.”

The same author quotes Archbishop Leighton as follows:—“By obedience, sanctification is here intimated. It signifies both habitual and actual obedience, renovation of the heart, and conformity to the Divine will. This obedience is universal three manner of ways: 1. In the subject. It is not in the tongue alone, or in the hand, etc., but has its root in the heart. 2. In the object. It embraces the whole law. 3. In its duration. The whole man is subjected to the whole law, and that continually.” Again he says:—“To be subject to God is truer happiness than to command the whole world. Pure love reckons thus, though no further reward were to follow, obedience to God (the perfection of His creatures, and its very happiness) carries its full recompense in its own bosom. Yea, love delights in the hardest services. It is love to Him, indeed, to love the labour of love, and the service of it; and that, not so much because it leads to rest, and ends in it, but because it is service to Him whom we love. According as love is, so is the soul; it is made like,

yea, it is made one with that which it loves. By the love of God it is made Divine, is one with Him.”
—*Commentary on St. Peter*, p. 15, etc.

Bishop Taylor, in speaking of “perfection,” or “loving God with all the heart,” says:—“That this is possible, is folly to deny. For he that saith he cannot do what he can do, knows not what he says; and yet to do this is the highest measure and sublimity of perfection, and of keeping the commandments.”

The Methodistic view of Christian holiness is generally very clearly defined. There is a reason for this. It was formulated amidst the fires of controversy, rendering it necessary to guard every point. The terms which they employ are mainly Scriptural, and for that reason less liable to be misunderstood.

(Mr. Wesley says:—“Scriptural holiness is the image of God; the mind that was in Christ; the love of God and man; lowliness, gentleness, temperance, patience, charity” (Vol. vi., p. 23). “Holiness is having the mind of Christ, and walking as He walked” (Vol. ii., p. 405).)

Richard Watson defines entire sanctification as a
(“Complete deliverance from all spiritual pollution, all inward depravation of the heart, as well as that which, expressing itself outwardly by the indulgence of the senses, is called filthiness of flesh and spirit” (*Institutes*, vol. ii., p. 450).) *Mc BISH'S*

(Mr. Fletcher says:—“We contend for a perfection in which the love of God is so ‘shed abroad in our

hearts' that it controls all the actions and feelings, and 'sin has no dominion over us.'"

"We frequently use, as St. John, the phrase 'perfect love,' instead of perfection; understanding by it the pure love of God shed abroad in the hearts of established believers by the Holy Ghost, which is abundantly given unto them under the fulness of the Christian dispensation."—*Christian Perfection,* p. 27.

(Dr. Upham, of the Congregational Church, gives the following as his view of the subject:—"What, then, is the nature of Christian perfection, or of that holiness which, as fallen and as physically and intellectually imperfect creatures, we are imperatively required and expected to exercise; and to exercise not merely in the 'article of death, but at the present moment, and during every succeeding moment of our lives?' It is on a question of this nature, if on any one which can possibly be proposed to the understanding, that we must go to the Bible; and must humbly receive, irrespective of human suggestions and human opinions, the answer which the Word of God gives. It is cause of great gratitude that a question so momentous is answered by the Saviour Himself; and in such a way as to leave the subject clear and satisfactory to humble and candid minds. When the Saviour was asked, 'Which is the great commandment in the law?' He answered, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy

mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. *On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets'* (Matt. xxii. 37—39). And it is in accordance with the truth involved in this remarkable passage that the apostle asserts (Rom. xiii. 20), '*Love is the fulfilling of the law.'*'

"He, therefore, who loves God with his whole heart, and his neighbour as himself, although his state may, in some incidental respects, be different from that of Adam, and especially from that of the angels in heaven, and although he may be the subject of involuntary imperfections and infirmities, which, in consequence of his relation to Adam, require confession and atonement, is nevertheless, in the Gospel sense of the term, a holy or sanctified person. He has that love which is the 'fulfilling of the law.' He bears the image of Christ. It is true he may not have that physical or intellectual perfection which the Saviour had; but he bears His moral image."—*Interior Life*, p. 23.)

We have seen that, with regard to the nature of entire sanctification, there is very great harmony of belief and expression among Christians of every age, and of different shades of religious belief. They all agree that it is (1) freedom from sin; (2) that it is through faith in the merits of Christ's death; (3) that it is a work to be accomplished in the hearts of those who are already believers; and (4) that it is to be enjoyed in this life. This is not, then, a new

doctrine, but as old as Christianity. It is not exclusively held and taught by one denomination, though it has been made more prominent by some than by others. It is the inheritance of God's universal Zion. The wonder is that any reject it, and the greater wonder that all do not enjoy it.

CHAPTER IV.

HOLINESS SCRIPTURAL.

IF the doctrine of Christian holiness is not clearly, explicitly taught in the Scriptures, we are under no obligations to accept it. But to the most spiritual, the Bible glows with the delightful theme. They see it on every page, and wonder that others have not the same vision. To them, "It breathes in the prophecy thunders in the law, murmurs in the narrative, whispers in the promises, supplicates in the prayers, sparkles in the poetry, resounds in the songs, speaks in the types, glows in the imagery, voices in the language, and burns in the spirit of its whole scheme, from its alpha to its omega, from its beginning to its end." ("Holiness! holiness needed! holiness required! holiness offered! holiness attainable! holiness a present duty,—a present privilege,—a present enjoyment,—is the progress and completeness of its wondrous theme! It is the truth glowing all over—webbing all through revelation; the glorious truth which sparkles, and whispers, and sings, and shouts in all its history, and biography, and poetry, and prophecy, and precept, and promise,

and prayer—the great central truth of the system.”
 —Bishop Foster. *EX. USF. HIS*

But this may seem a little too rhetorical for convincing argument. Let us, therefore, appeal directly to the Record.

The Scriptures describe this state as one of purity. They not only command us to be “pure in heart,” but they represent such a character as actually existing. “Blessed are the pure in heart” (Matt. v. 8). “To the pure all things are pure” (Tit. i. 15). “Keep thyself pure” (1 Tim. v. 22). “I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance” (2 Pet. iii. 1). “Purifieth himself, even as He is pure” (1 John iii. 3). “Who gave Himself for us that He might . . . purify unto Himself a peculiar people” (Titus ii. 14). “Purifying their hearts by faith” (Acts xv. 8). “Seeing ye have purified your hearts in obeying the truth” (1 Pet. i. 22). “Holding faith in a pure conscience” (1 Tim. iii. 9).

The term *pure* is defined, etymologically, as meaning “entire separation from all heterogeneous or extraneous matter; clear; free from mixture; as pure water, pure air, pure wine, pure silver or gold.”
 —Webster.

Its theological meaning, according to the same authority, is, “freedom from moral defilement; without spot; not sullied or tarnished; incorrupt; undefiled by moral turpitude; holy.”

Pure has the sense of “unmixed,” “unadulterated.” It is a *simple*—consisting of one thing; uncom-

pounded—a heart in which there is nothing but purity—nothing adverse to God, to Christ, to holiness.

That such a moral state is possible is proved from the language of Jesus: “Blessed are the pure in heart.” If such a character did not exist, the language of the *beatitude* would be meaningless. When Jesus says, “Blessed are the merciful;” “Blessed are the meek;” “Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness,” etc., He means to intimate that such characters exist. If there were none who were merciful—none meek—none who hungered and thirsted after righteousness, there would be no propriety in these utterances. When He says, “Blessed are the pure in heart,” He means to say that such characters exist, or His language is without meaning.

There is not only such a state described, but the promise that God will give such a heart. “I will turn My hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin” (Isa. i. 25). If all the dross and tin—meaning all depravity—is “purely purged away,” the unmixed gold of heart purity only remains.

“Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you . . . I will also save you from all your uncleanness” (Eze. xxxvi. 25—29). This makes the purity complete; and this God has promised to do. “And I will cleanse them from all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned against

Me" (Jer. xxxiii. 8). This is a promise made to men in this life, for this life. But how could such a result be secured if purity of heart is neither promised nor enjoyed in this life?

"Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried" (Dan. xii. 10). This does not have reference to the future, but to the present life. "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness" (Mal. iii. 3). That this refining, purifying, and purging is a work to be wrought upon the human soul in this life is clear from the fact that it is to be followed by an offering unto the Lord in righteousness.

"If the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?" (Heb. ix. 13—14). If the blood of beasts, offered in sacrifice, did make pure, ceremonially, or sanctify to the purifying of the flesh, shall not the blood of Christ, which is infinitely more efficacious in purging or making pure the conscience, complete the work of cleansing in the soul of the believer?

"If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin'

(1 John i. 7). "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John i. 9). If "the blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth* from all sin"—not *will* cleanse, but "*cleanseth*," which means *now*, at this time—this moment, then ample provision is made for our complete salvation from sin in this life; and to deny the possibility of such cleansing is not only to call in question the Divine ability, but to deny that the blood possesses the virtue which inspiration claims for it. Who is prepared to make such a denial without any Scriptural authority?

Believers are represented as being perfect. This is an offensive term, we are aware, and yet it is the term which inspiration has seen proper to employ with great frequency. We have defined what is meant by Christian perfection (see Chap. i.). The terms "perfect," "perfection," "perfect love," etc., are not terms of denominational invention, nor are they of human origin at all, as it regards their use in describing spiritual things. They are terms employed by the Holy Ghost to describe the experience of believers in this life. Who will affirm that He did not fully understand their import, and that they were not employed properly?

When God speaks of believers **being made perfect**, we are not to understand that He is speaking of a perfection which belongs to God, or angels, or Adam before his fall; but of man in his present state and relations.

“The meaning of words or terms in reference to any particular subject is to be found in their subjective relations. The lines defining the subject fix a limit to the meaning of words connected with it, and hence preclude an arbitrary or general meaning of the same terms, which is manifestly foreign to the subject in hand.

“Apply this common-sense rule to the term perfection, in its relation to human experience in this world, and you will see that St. Paul does not mean absolute perfection in any sense, for that belongs to God alone, and He is not the subject of discourse at all.

“He does not mean the perfection of angels, whatever that may be, for he is not writing about angels.

“He does not mean the pristine perfection of our first parents in Eden, whatever that may have been, for he is not talking about them, but about their unhappy children, who are, through the redemption of Jesus, recovering from the effects of their fall.

“He does not mean a perfection which will in this life exempt us from infirmities of mind—unavoidable errors of judgment—nor, hence, errors of practice; nor the bodily infirmities to which flesh in common is heir. The Saviour distinctly advertised His followers of the fact that ‘In the world ye shall have tribulation.’”—*Infancy and Manhood*, p. 21. OK USE HIS BOOK

1. *Such a perfection is commanded.*

God commanded Abraham,—“Walk before Me

and be thou perfect" (Gen. xvii. 1), which he could not have done had such a walk, or such a life, been impossible.

David counsels Solomon to serve God with a perfect heart and a willing mind (1 Chron. xxviii. 9). Was David so imperfectly versed in the service of God as to urge his son to so fruitless an endeavour as that of attempting to serve God "with a perfect heart?" He must have been, had such a service been impossible. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). "Be perfect by having a heart purified from all hate, and filled with all love. If thy vessel be filled with love, God can be no more than full. He is the perfect infinite, thou art the perfect finite. The shrine of a temple was a perfect image of the temple. The temple was a perfect temple, the shrine was a perfect shrine. They were different in magnitude, but they were alike perfect."—*Whedon*.

The Greek verb here rendered *be ye*, is properly rendered, *ye shall be*, amounting to a promise that they may or shall be perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect.

Alford remarks upon this text: "No countenance is given in this verse to perfectibility in this life." "Taking the word perfectibility in its evangelical sense," says Dr. Whedon, "we should like to know why? Our Saviour here distinctly affirms that it depends upon, or rather consists in, the indwelling reign of love in our hearts. Nor must any man

lower down to his own moral level the high promises of God's Word in this behalf. Against these promises of the complete reign of love in the heart, completing our Christian life, it is useless to quote those imperfections and failings which belong to men as men, arising from the limitations of the human mind. Neither St. Paul nor St. James expected that the Christians they addressed would be perfect like angels, or even ideally perfect men, nor perfect performers of God's absolute law. But they did expect that the law of love might possess a power in their hearts, and in that would consist the perfected character of their piety."

"'Be perfect' (2 Cor. xiii. 11), or, be *made perfect*, which more exactly expresses the original."—*Alford*.

"'Let us go on unto perfection' (Heb. vi. 1), not *towards* perfection, with no prospect of gaining it, as some would have it, but *to* or *unto* it. But why start for a point never to be reached in this life? The *preposition* has the sense of starting for a place with a view of reaching it as a limit, as an end; with the idea of subsequent rest there."—*Robinson*. It means, to start for the goal of perfection, and make it, and rejoice in it.

We have cited but a few of the Scriptures which command holiness or perfection. To deny the doctrine is to charge God with mocking us with commands which we are utterly unable to perform. God does not command us to be holy, to be perfect,

to love Him with all the heart, knowing at the same time that He is requiring an impossibility. If it be too great to be enjoyed, is it not too great to be commanded? Mark, we are not commanded to aspire after it, and approximate it as nearly as possible, but we are commanded to possess it. It is presented, not only as a present duty and privilege, but as a present enjoyment.

2. *God has not only commanded us to be perfect, but He has assured us of His ability to make us so.*

Human weakness, if supplemented by Divine power, is **no barrier** to the accomplishment of such a work.

“Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb. vii. 25). “The original word, *panteles*, rendered *uttermost*, is, as every Greek scholar knows, one of the strongest words that can be found in the Greek or any other language, being compounded of two words, *pan*, which means *all*, and *telos*, *the end*, uniformly translated in the New Testament *perfection*. That Christ, in the most absolute sense, is *able to save us from all sin, is undeniable.*”—*Dr. Mahan*. The term *uttermost* means, the extreme, the furthest, the greatest, the highest degree, fully. It is composed of two words, *utter*, meaning utmost, complete, total, absolute, perfect; and *most*, meaning the utmost extent, the greatest number, the greatest quantity. **Christ is able to save all that come**

unto God by Him, to the extent indicated by this word.

“Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us” (Eph. iii. 20). Paul had been asking for great and wonderful blessings. 1. That they might be strengthened with might in the inner man, and that it might be strength according to the riches of His glory. 2. That Christ might dwell in their hearts by faith. 3. That they might be rooted and grounded in love. 4. That they might be able to comprehend what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of the love of Christ. 5. That they might know Christ’s love, which passeth knowledge. 6. That they might be filled with all the fulness of God. A person who had received all this, it would seem, would need nothing more to make him complete in Christ. But that all doubt might be removed from the mind, as to the Divine ability, he asserts that God is able to do exceeding abundantly above all our asking or thinking. Can any doubt remain as to His ability to save us from all sin? “And His ability here is so necessarily connected with His willingness, that the one indisputably implies the other; for, of what consequence would it be to tell the Church of God that He had power to do so and so, if there were not implied an assurance that He will do what His power can, and what the soul of man needs to have done?”—*Dr. Clarke.*

3. *God has inspired prayers for this completeness, or perfection, which would never have been done if the prayers were not to be answered.*

As we consider these prayers, let the reader bear in mind what God has said with respect to prayer. "Ask and ye shall receive." "If ye shall ask anything in My name, I will do it." "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, I will do it." "What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." These Scriptures must mean that God answers prayer, especially those prayers which He inspires.

We select only two or three examples, confining ourselves chiefly to the New Testament.

"Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ" (Heb. xiii. 20-21).

Did Paul expect an answer to this prayer? If so, then they were to be perfect in this life, for it was to be done as a qualification for doing good works, which are confined to this life. Dr. A. Clarke has the following comment on this prayer:—"From the following terms we see what the apostle meant by the *perfection* for which he prayed. They were to do the will of God in every good work, from God working in them that which is well pleasing in His sight. (1) This necessarily implies a complete change

in the whole soul, that God may be *well pleased* with whatsoever He sees in it; and this supposes its being cleansed from all sin, for God's *sight* cannot be *pleased* with anything that is unholy. (2) This complete *inward purity* is to produce an outward conformity to God's will, so they were to be *perfect in every good work*. (3) The *perfection within* and the *perfection without* were to be produced by the *blood of the everlasting covenant*; for although God is love, yet it is not consistent with His justice or holiness to communicate any good to mankind but through His Son, and through Him as having died for the offences of the human race."

"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. v. 23).

Is such a prayer appropriate if such an experience is impossible? If entire sanctification is an impossible attainment, why does the apostle encourage the Thessalonians to expect it, by the assurance, "Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it?" If such a blessing is not for this life, how could the entirely, or wholly sanctified be "preserved blameless," or in this sanctified state, "unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ?" Does not this prove that it is an experience for this world? May not Christians pray with confidence, believing that whatsoever they ask in faith it shall be done?

"The original term, *holoteleis*, rendered *wholly* in

this prayer, is compounded of two words—*holos*, meaning *all*, and *telos*, meaning *perfection*. The promise before us presents to our faith sanctification in its utter fulness, or it authorizes us to expect nothing at all.”—*Mahan*.

That this full sanctification is to be enjoyed in this life is clear from the fact that the “whole spirit and soul and body” may “be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” “To limit such promises,” says Dr. Mahan, “is to ‘limit the Holy One of Israel’ in a form which does peril to our immortal interests.”

“This also we wish, even your perfection” (2 Cor. xiii. 9). Alford translates it, “We also pray for this, even your perfection.” Did Paul expect this prayer to be answered? If so, what would be an answer?

We select only one prayer from the Old Testament—David’s appeal to God for a clean, or pure, heart. “Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean; wash me and I shall be whiter than snow” (Psa. li. 7). “‘Purge me with hyssop.’ This refers to the process of symbolic cleansing, which represented sanctification. ‘And I shall be clean,’ means, then shall I be cleansed from moral pollution and sin.”—*Murphy*.

“Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.” This is not, as some have supposed, a highly-wrought figure of speech, but a simple petition for a pure heart, offered in perfect harmony with the Divine promise.

The expression—"whiter than snow," has not been so clear to most minds. It has been thought that nothing could be whiter than snow. But recent scientific investigations have revealed the fact that David was more exact in his praying than we were in our knowledge. We have learned that we may be "*whiter than snow.*"

We copy from the *Philosophical Magazine* an account of Professor Nordenskiöld's recent investigations of snow, which beautifully illustrate this prayer. "On the occasion of an extraordinary fall of snow which took place in Stockholm, in December, 1871, he was curious to know whether the snow, so pure in appearance, did or did not contain any solid extraneous particles. He accordingly collected a large quantity of snow on a sheet, and obtained a small residue after it had melted away. This remainder consisted of a black powder resembling coal; heated, it yielded a liquor by distillation; calcined, it was reduced to red brown ashes. Moreover, it contained a number of metallic particles attracted by the magnet, and giving all the reactions of iron.

"In a large city, however, such an experiment could not be considered conclusive. Professor Nordenskiöld, therefore, during his polar voyage in 1872, when he was blocked up by ice as early as the beginning of August, in about eighty degrees north latitude, before reaching Parry's Island, to the north-west of Spitzbergen, examined the snow which covered the icebergs, and which had come from still higher

latitudes. He found it strewn with a multitude of minute black particles, spread over the surface, or situated at the bottom of little pits, a great number of which were to be seen on the outward layer of snow. Many of such particles were also lodged in the interior strata. The dust, which became grey on drying, contained a large proportion of metallic particles attracted by the magnet, and capable of decomposing sulphate of copper. An observation made a little later upon other icebergs, proved the presence of similar dust in a layer of granular crystalline snow, situated beneath a stratum of light fresh, and another of hardened snow. Upon analysis this matter was composed of metallic iron, phosphorus, cobalt, and fragments of diatomaceæ. It bears the greatest analogy to the dust previously collected by the professor on the snows of Greenland, and described by him under the name of *Kvyokonite*."

Rev. L. R. Dunn, in speaking of these investigations, says:—"Now, if these investigations are correct, and we have no reason to doubt them, then the prayer of the psalmist was proper, as well as wonderful; and his figurative language is true according to the most modern scientific researches. These facts are of the deepest interest to the Christian when he re-utters this prayer, or sings of this purity. For the cleansing, the purity, realized by faith in the blood of the Lamb, makes the soul indeed 'whiter than snow.' There are not left in that soul

any of the remains of sin, any of the elements of iniquity—‘The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from *all* sin.’ All the language made use of in the Word of God to indicate the purity which Christ brings to the soul is of the strongest character, and the figures employed are eminently suggestive of its entireness.”

These are examples of the numerous prayers for heart purity. They are not offered for unpromised blessings, but for such as are provided and promised. He who prays as directed will receive the good he seeks, or God’s promise fails. If these prayers can be answered, the doctrine of entire sanctification is true; if they cannot be answered, the promise fails, and God’s Word is proved false.

To deny that such an experience is possible in this life is to charge God with inspiring prayers which He will not or cannot answer. It is also charging professedly inspired men with the duplicity, mockery, and guilt, of praying for what they knew never was and never could be realized. “Could such prayers be offered under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? If not, the inspiration of so much of the Scriptures is renounced. But did they believe that their prayers would be answered and holiness restored? Then it was so, or they were mistaken; if mistaken, and yet inspired, they were deluded by the Holy Ghost, and inspiration is not to be trusted. What fearful havoc the denial of this doctrine thus makes with the Word of God and the character and consistency of

our Lord and Master, and of those holy men who taught it! Whatever infidels may do, thus to dishonour the Word of God and the memory of His holiest servants, Christians will at least hesitate before they adopt a scheme so fraught with ruin."

—*Bishop Foster.*

4. *The Scriptural examples of this grace are numerous.*

These are found in the Old and the New Testament, and they answer the frequent demand for examples of holy living—of perfect Christians. It is not *their* testimony alone to their purity, but the testimony of God and His inspired Word.

Job "was perfect and upright" (Job i. 1).

"He was a man," says Mr. Barnes, "who was true, blameless, just, pious, abstaining from every evil deed. The Chaldees render it, *complete, finished, perfect.* The idea seems to be that His piety, or moral character, was *proportionate*, and was *complete in all its parts.* Such is properly the meaning of the word *tâm*, as derived from *tâmăn*, to *complete, to make full, perfect or entire, or to finish.* It denotes that in which there is no part lacking to complete the whole,—as in a watch in which no wheel is wanting."—*Notes in loco.*

If Job was such a man as this, will any one doubt that he was pure in heart?

"They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless" (Luke i. 6). "Both righteous," or

holy. This means more than a mere external conformity to the law ; it is an honourable testimony to their piety towards God. "*Blameless*, that is, no fault or deficiency could be found in them."—*Barnes*. If Zacharias and Elisabeth were blameless in *all the commands of God*, it must have included the "first great commandment"—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," etc., and no perfection among mortals exceeds this.

"I am pure from the blood of all men" (Acts xx. 26). "I serve God with a pure conscience" (2 Tim. i. 2). Here is external and internal purity. Paul was pure with respect to his duty to men ; he failed not at any point here. He was pure in his service to God. His conscience did not upbraid him, as it was pure. Such purity as this is all we mean by holiness, perfect love, perfection.

"Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded" (Phil. iii. 15). "Herein is our love made perfect" (1 John iv. 17). These Scriptures need no explanation. They teach, in the clearest language, that perfection had been attained, and was enjoyed.

There are numerous Scriptures which prove that persons were regarded as *perfect*, *pure*, and *holy*. They were addressed or spoken of as persons of whose experience there was no question. "Mark the perfect man" (Psa. xxxvii. 37). "Blessed are the pure in heart" (Matt. v. 8). "He that hath clean hands and a pure heart" (Psa. xxxiv. 4). "Unto the pure all things are pure" (Tit. i. 15). "We

“speak wisdom among them that are perfect” (1 Cor. ii. 6). “God will not cast away a perfect man” (Job viii. 20). “The wicked shout in secret at the perfect” (Psa. lxiv. 4). “Whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected” (1 John ii. 5). “If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us” (1 John iv. 12). “Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently” (1 Pet. i. 22). “Purifying their hearts by faith” (Acts xv. 9).

In a multitude of other Scriptures the experience is directly asserted or unequivocally implied. “Jesus said, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast” (Matt. xix. 21). “Perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love” (1 John iv. 18). “Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus” (Col. i. 28). “He gave some apostles, some prophets . . . for the perfecting of the saints . . . till we all come unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (Eph. iv. 11—13). “And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as He (God) is pure” (1 John iii. 3).

In view of these Scriptural representations, it does seem to us that to deny that any have ever attained unto this experience is to falsify the Word of God in its representations of character. There can be no

meaning in all these Divine utterances **if sin** must remain in us until death frees us from it.

Take the idea of Christian perfection, as a present experience, out of the Bible, and it would be much like sinking a city and leaving the guide-boards standing pointing to it for a thousand miles round.

CHAPTER V.

OBJECTIONS TO HOLINESS.

IN reply to the doctrine maintained in the previous chapter, it is urged that there are unanswerable Scriptural objections to it—that certain passages in the Bible assert a contrary doctrine, or cannot be reconciled with it by any fair construction.

We have no disposition to ignore this objection, but shall seek to meet it candidly and squarely. We shall confine ourselves exclusively to Scriptural objections. Of these we shall notice only the most prominent, believing that if the strongholds are taken the weaker positions will not be maintained. Let us, then, proceed candidly to examine those Scriptures which are supposed by many to inculcate an opposite doctrine.

“For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not” (Eccles vii. 2).

1. The Scriptures must agree with themselves. They do say, “He that is born of God sinneth not,”—“He that sinneth, hath not known God,”—“He that committeth sin is of the devil.” If, then, there be no one on earth that sinneth not, then there is no one on earth who is “born of God;” no one that “knoweth God;” and no one who is not “of the

devil ;" a conclusion which the most radical believer in the impossibility of living without sin would be unwilling to accept.

2. Cannot these Scriptures be so harmonized as not to disparage the blood that cleanseth from all sin, and at the same time rescue them from the charge of contradiction ?

This Scripture does not assert that freedom from sin is impossible. At most, it only asserts that it is not secured. This would not make against the doctrine, only against all men for neglecting their duty and privilege. It does not declare that a sinless state is unattainable—only, it is not attained. It is agreed by the best Biblical scholars that the verse should be translated, "There is not a righteous man upon earth who doeth good and *may not sin.*"

The Hebrew verb *to sin*, in this passage is in the *future tense*, and should be rendered *may not sin*. The meaning of which is, that there is no man who is not *liable to sin*.

"We are supported," says the Rev. G. Peck, D.D "by some of the best critics, Romish, Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Arminian. The Vulgate, or Jerome's version, has *non peccet, may not sin*. In the interlineal translations of the Antwerp, London, and Paris Polyglots; in Castalio's, Oliander's, and Francis Junius' versions, we have the same. And we have precisely the same rendering of the Syriac and Arabic in the London and Paris Polyglots. This result I have arrived at from personal inspec-

tion of the authorities I quote, and I need not say to the scholar, that they present a tide of evidence in favour of the version here given that it is not easy for the sturdiest spirits to resist. We see here what the best scholars of every age since the commencement of the Christian era have determined in relation to the proper rendering of the original Hebrew text, without any reference at all to the question at issue between us and our opponents, on the subject of the necessary continuance of sin in believers."

This rendering of the passage in dispute harmonizes the Scriptures with themselves, and makes it possible for all to be so free from sin that it may no longer have dominion over them.

(Dr. A. Clarke has the following sensible note on this passage:—"There is not a man upon earth, however just he may be, and habituated to do good, but is *peccable*—liable to commit sin—and therefore should continually watch and pray, and depend upon the Lord. But the text does not say, the *just man does commit sin*, but simply that he *may sin*.")

Mr. Fletcher says:—"If you take the original word *to sin*, in the lowest sense which it bears: if it mean in Eccles. vii. 20 what it does in Judges xx. 16, namely, *to miss a mark*, we shall not differ; for we maintain that, according to the standard of paradisiacal perfection, 'there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and misses not the perfection, *i.e.*, that does not lessen the good he does by some

involuntary, and therefore (evangelically speaking) sinless defect.' But it is bold to pretend to overthrow the glorious liberty of God's children, which is asserted in a hundred plain passages of the New Testament, by producing so vague a text as Eccles. vii. 20. And to measure the spiritual attainments of all believers, in all ages, by this obscure standard, appears to us ridiculous."—*Works*, vol. ii., p. 561.

If, then, Eccles. vii. 20 has been correctly rendered by us, and to assert the contrary is to set ourselves against an array of evidence which no intelligent person will care to encounter—then it offers no objection to the doctrine we seek to establish in these pages.

2. "If they shall sin against Thee (for there is no man that sinneth not)" (1 Kings viii. 46, and 2 Chron. vi. 36).

This, or these, texts, are to be understood as having the same significance as the last-named.

"No unprejudiced person, who, in reading this passage," says Mr. Fletcher, "takes the parenthesis ('for there is no man that sinneth not') in connection with the context, can, I think, help seeing that" those who quote this text against the doctrine of Christian perfection "mistake Solomon. . . The meaning is evidently, *There is no man who is not liable to sin*; and that a man actually sins when he actually departs from God. Now a *liability to sin*, is not indwelling sin; for angels, Adam and Eve, were all liable to sin, in their sinless state."

Our author says:—"The word translated *sinneth* is in the future tense, which is often used for an *indefinite* tense in the potential mood, because the Hebrew has no such mood or tense. Therefore, our translators would have done justice to the *original*, as well as to the context, if they had rendered the whole clause, '*There is no man that may not sin;*' instead of '*There is no man that sinneth not.*'"

But that there are some men who do not actually sin is unquestionable, for the following reasons:—

(1.) The hypothetical phrase, "If they shall sin," proves it; showing that their sinning is not unavoidable. There would be no sense in the "if," if sinning were a necessity.

(2.) God's anger against those that sin. "And Thou be angry with them." "God is angry with the wicked," but He delights in His saints. So certain, then, as God is not angry with all His people, so true is it that some do not sin in the sense of the wise man.

(3.) Solomon intimates that those who have sinned, by actually departing from God, may "be-think themselves, repent and turn to God with all their hearts, and with all their souls," and thus be so saved as not to sin.

The passage does not furnish the most distant intimation that all men *must*, though all men *have* sinned and *may* sin. But let them confess their sin, they can be **forgiven**, and cleansed "from all unrighteousness."

3. "If I say I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse" (Job ix. 20).

Some very uncharitable thrusts, based upon this text, have been made at those who profess to be saved from sin.

"It is common," says one writer, "to find those who profess to be perfect, to be men of really no religion at all; making good that word, 'If I should say I am perfect, that would prove me perverse.' We can have no surer certificate of the rottenness of one's character. If otherwise he seems to be a Christian, that pretence shows that he is far from it."—*Cook's Centuries*, vol. ii., p. 155.

He must be an illiberal and uncharitable writer who can say all this of such men as Wesley, Fletcher, Bramwell, James Brainard Taylor, Drs. Finney, Upham, and thousands more. These men, while they did not profess to be perfect, did profess to enjoy what is meant by Christian perfection.

Abraham was commanded, "Walk before Me and be thou perfect." Of Asa it is said that from a given time "His heart was perfect all his days." We are to "mark the perfect man," etc. "The righteousness of the perfect shall direct his ways." Paul says, "We speak wisdom among those who are perfect," "Be perfect," etc. Do these Scriptures inculcate the idea that the parties named are "*rotten-hearted*"—"have no religion at all?" This proves a little too much.

If Job did not believe himself to be perfect, it is

evident that the Lord differed from him in judgment, for He affirmed "that there is none like him in all the earth, a *perfect* and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil" (i. 8). It further appears that, whatever might have been Job's opinion of his own perfection, he believed that there were men who were perfect. In verse 10 he says, "He (God) destroyeth the *perfect* and the wicked." If the perfect, in Job's estimation, were "rotten-hearted," "perverse," had "no religion at all," he would not have distinguished them from the wicked, for in that case they would have been the same. And if a perfect man, after God's ideal, did not exist, it would be impossible for even God to destroy them.

Mr. Barnes has the following note on this verse:—"If I say I am *perfect*.' Should I attempt to maintain such an argument, the very attempt would prove that my heart is perverse and evil. And is not the claim to absolute perfection in this world always a proof that the heart is perverse? Does not the very setting up of such a claim, in fact, indicate a pride of heart, a self-satisfaction, and an ignorance of the true state of the soul, which is full demonstration that the heart is far from being perfect? It has come to a different conclusion from that of God. It sets up an argument against Him,—and there can be no more certain proof of a want of perfection than such an attempt."—*Barnes' Notes*.

Mr. Barnes denies perfection to Job, in direct opposition to God, who affirms that he was perfect. He

is careful, however, to call it "*absolute perfection*,"—a term never employed by any who hold the doctrine, but an idea which has been repudiated from the beginning. "Neither is there," says Mr. Wesley, "any *absolute* perfection on earth." But Mr. Barnes finally attributes to Job all the perfection which has ever been claimed for him, so far as we know. He says:—"And that man was perfect." The LXX. have greatly expanded this statement by giving a paraphrase instead of a translation. He was a man who was true, blameless, just, pious, abstaining from every evil deed. Jerome renders it, *simplex*,—*simple*, or *sincere*. The Chaldee, *complete*, *finished*, *perfect*. The idea seems to be that his piety or moral character was *proportionate*, and was *complete in all its parts*. He was a man of integrity in all the relations of life,—as an Emir, a father, a husband, a worshipper of God. Such is properly the meaning of the word *tām*, as derived from *tāmām*, to *complete*, to *make full*, *perfect* or *entire*, or to *finish*. It denotes that in which there is no part lacking to complete the whole,—as in a watch in which no wheel is wanting."—*Notes in loco*.

This is all we have claimed for Job or anybody else; and this is what God calls *perfection*, or being made *perfect*. Job was in this sense a perfect man,—not *absolutely* perfect, but *complete*. He loved God with all his heart. God gave this testimony concerning His servant, and we have no right to question it.

Should it be admitted that Job was not a perfect man in his own judgment, how would that bear against the doctrine, or against God's judgment in the case? It does not assert that others may not attain unto this state. It does not declare the attainment impossible. "To construe this language," says Bishop Foster, "as applicable to all Christians, at all times, is as unwarrantable as to apply all Job's words concerning himself to all other men. But most preposterous of all is it to attempt from this passage to infer that the Bible doctrine is that it is impossible for a man to be saved from all sin."

Canne, on this text, refers the reader to Prov. xxvii. : "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth ; a stranger, and not thine own lips."

4. "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" (Prov. xx. 9).

This language may be taken as the proud boasting of a Pharisee ; and if so, no man of that description can say with propriety, "I have made my heart clean." The law of faith excludes all boasting.

But we might answer Solomon's question thus : "the man in whom the prayer of thy father David is answered, 'Create in me a clean heart, O God ;' the man who has obeyed the Divine command, 'Wash thy heart from iniquity, that thou mayest be saved ;' the man who has followed the instructions of Paul, 'Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.'" The man who has the hope

in him of seeing God as He is, and “purifieth himself even as He (God) is pure,”—such a man may say, “I,—by the grace of God, by the blood of Jesus, not by any merit or work of my own,—have made my heart clean.” Is there any answer to be made to this?

We come now to the New Testament.

5. “I am carnal, sold under sin,” etc. (Rom. vii. 14—25).

This Scripture has been taken to teach that all believers must remain in bondage to sin until death; that there must be a life-long warfare between the flesh and spirit—between the old man and the new. We doubt if any Scripture has been more frequently wrested to the unspeakable injury of souls than this.

Whether the seventh of Romans refers to believers at all, is a question over which there has been very much controversy. We do not propose to enter into the merits of that controversy, as we have never been able to see the force of it.

The question is not whether the seventh of Romans describes the state of a believer, but—Is there no better state for him? Must he ever remain where his cry shall be, “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” Must this body of death ever cleave to him? or may the “law of the Spirit of life” make him “free from the law of sin and death?”

If this chapter describes Paul’s experience at any period of his Christian life, it surely does not de-

scribe that in which he says, "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? . . . Our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. . . . For he that is dead (dead to sin) is freed from sin."

Read the glowing victories of the opening verses of the eighth chapter, and tell us, can that be the same experience which we have seen in the seventh chapter? Before, he was in bonds, "sold under sin;" now, his bonds are broken and he is free, made so by the law of the Spirit of life. Before, he was carnal; now, he is spiritual. Before, the old man was alive and active; now, he is crucified and dead. It is to this latter experience we urge our readers. "Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." But having so many promises, "let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

6. *Paul's thorn in the flesh* (2 Cor. xii. 7).

The apostle could not refer in this text to moral, but physical disabilities. The early writers of the Church, such as Chrysostom and Tertullian, insist that Paul was afflicted with great bodily weaknesses, and to those he most probably alludes in this text. The Corinthians had said that "his bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible" (1 Cor. x, 10).

(To assert that this thorn in the flesh was indwel-

ling sin, and hence that the apostle was unholy, is the height of absurdity.

(1.) Paul says that this thorn was given to keep him humble, "lest he should be exalted above measure." But surely sin never made a man humble. The grace of God makes us humble, but sin—never.

(2.) The apostle calls these afflictions "infirmities." But "infirmities" are not indwelling sin.

(3.) Paul, speaking of these "infirmities," says, "most gladly, therefore, will I glory in my 'infirmities.'" But if these "infirmities" were indwelling sin, he must have been wicked beyond measure to have gloried in them. The wicked only do this.

(4.) The apostle goes further, and says, "Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities." If these had been indwelling sin, Satan could have done no worse than to have taken pleasure in them.

(5.) This thorn in the flesh was given to Paul after his revelations, to keep him humble. "Now as it is absurd to say that God *gave* him the thorn of indwelling sin after his 'revelation,' or that He gave it to him at all to keep him humble, it cannot be indwelling sin that is meant by the thorn and messenger."

(6.) It would seem that if sin were such a sovereign remedy against pride, that Paul would have mentioned its virtues, that his brethren might have availed themselves of the Satanic panacea; and further, that he would have informed them how much of it was needed to make them humble enough to

go to heaven. The very idea is shocking to contemplate.

7. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect" (Phil. iii. 12).

This is supposed to be a strong text against Christian perfection. But a careful examination of the text and its connections will lead us to a very different conclusion. The term *perfect*, in the 12th verse, is a *verb*, and in the 15th it is an *adjective*. In speaking of the 12th verse, Creamer, in his *Bible Lexicon*, says:—"This must be carefully distinguished from the adjective perfect in the 15th verse."

The context shows what the apostle had not attained, and in what sense he was not perfect.) "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I might win Christ. If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead" (verses 7, 8, 11).

(It is very clear from this, that what the apostle had not attained unto was the glory, immortality, and perfection of the saints at the resurrection. In this sense he was not perfect, nor is any man until "mortality is swallowed up of life." But surely this has nothing to do with Christian perfection? It refers to another state entirely.)

It is very remarkable that, immediately after the

apostle disclaims the perfection of the resurrection state, he professes the evangelical perfection for which we contend. "Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded" (verse 15).

Properly understood, there can be no contradiction here. A Christian may be perfect in love, and yet not a perfect glorified saint. The one is freed from depravity, the other from all the infirmities of our mortal state.

The saints will be more perfect in the resurrection state than they are here, all admit, as angels and archangels may be still more perfect than the "saints in light."

"On this passage," says Dr. Mahan, "I remark, first, from a comparison of this passage with the phrase in verse 15, 'Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect,' it is evident the apostle considered himself perfect in one sense, in another imperfect. Why, then, is the inference directly drawn, that in verse 12 he affirms his imperfection in holiness, when the opposite conclusion is fully sustained by verse 15? But, second, the apostle, it is perfectly evident from the context, is not here speaking of sanctification at all. There are three senses, somewhat differing the one from the other, in which the verb here rendered perfect, as well as the adjective from which it is derived, are used in the Bible:—

(1.) To designate moral perfection, or entire sanctification in holiness, as 'Be ye therefore perfect' (Matt. v. 48). (2.) Maturity in Christian knowledge

and virtue. 'We speak wisdom among them that are perfect' (1 Cor. ii. 6). (3.) Exaltation to a state of rewards, or happiness, in a future world, in consequence of a life of devotion to the Divine service in the present world: thus, Christ, as the Captain of our salvation, is said to have been made 'perfect;' that is, advanced to a state of glory, through, or on account of, suffering (Heb. ii. 10). 'Among the Greeks,' says Professor Stuart, speaking upon the passage last referred to, 'this verb was employed to designate the condition of those who, having run in the stadium, and proved to be victorious in the conquest, were proclaimed as successful combatants, and had the honours and rewards of victory bestowed upon them.' Such persons were said to be perfect, or to have been perfected. Now that the apostle used the term perfect in this last sense exclusively, in the verse under consideration, is demonstrably evident, from the fact that he was writing to Greeks, and used it with reference to the very custom in regard to which they had been accustomed to use the term in this one sense only. He represented himself as running a race, but not as being perfect; that is, not having been advanced to a state of glory, in consequence of having victoriously finished his course. It is, then, in reference to having finished his course and received the conqueror's reward, and not in reference to moral perfection, that the apostle uses the term 'perfect' in this passage. He uses the phrases, 'not as though I had already attained,

either were already perfect,' and 'I count not myself to have apprehended,' with exclusive respect to the 'resurrection of the dead,' and 'the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus'—that is, to the glory and blessedness consequent on having victoriously finished his Christian race. Hence Professor Robinson, in his *Lexicon on the New Testament*, thus explains the phrase:—"Either were already perfect." Not as though I had already completed my course and arrived at the goal, so as to receive the prize.' In respect to holiness, an individual who is running the Christian race is perfect, who puts forth his entire energies in that course. In respect to a state of glory and blessedness, he is perfect when, and only when, he has finished his course and received the consequent reward. It is with exclusive reference to the latter, and not to the former, that the apostle affirms that he had not 'attained, and was not perfect.'—*Christian Perfection*, pp. 58, 59, 60.

Nothing need be added to make this exposition more complete. It wrests this text from those who would employ it to prove Christian perfection impossible in the present life. Dr. Daniel Steele very properly says, "Paul was not perfect, or crowned as a victor, while he was perfect as a racer."

8. "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i. 8).

Those who employ this text to disprove the doctrine of heart-purity are careful not to give the

connection, as this would completely overthrow their whole scheme. If this text means what the opponents of Christian holiness claim, one point is gained by them; viz.: they have successfully demonstrated that the Bible contradicts itself; and that the same writers contradict themselves. While the apostle declares that "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," he also declares, that "if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Properly understood, there is no conflict between these Divinely-inspired utterances.

Does the phrase—"have no sin," relate to our present or past character? When the apostle employs the phrase, "If we say we have no sin," does he refer to our character, in view of what we now are, or of what we have been in the past? There can be no doubt of its reference to the latter. The following exposition of the chapter in which this verse occurs, by Rev. Asa Mahan, D.D., is so clear and strong, we give it in full:—

"That the apostle is here addressing real Christians is obvious. But the important question is—Of *whom*, and concerning *what*, is he here speaking? This question, all who cite verse 8 to prove the continued sinfulness of all believers in this life, wholly overlook, and for this reason lead their readers quite astray from the real meaning of the sacred writer. To this fundamental enquiry the apostle has himself

furnished us with a specific answer in chap. ii. 26. 'These things,' he says, 'have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you.' The apostle, let the reader bear distinctly in mind, is writing to real believers, about seducing teachers and their subverting errors, and is telling such Christians what they will be and become if they embrace the subverting errors of those ungodly men, 'who are swarming in the Churches, and corrupting the saints of God from the pure truth as it is in Jesus.' In accomplishing his purpose, the apostle proceeds in the wisest manner conceivable, setting in contrast before the believer what will be his experience and character provided he remains steadfast in the faith, walking in the light, on the one hand, and on the other, the inevitable consequences of embracing the errors and following the pernicious ways of those ungodly seducers of the Churches. To understand the apostle, we must, first of all, determine the specific character of the errors taught by these seducers. These errors are well known to the ecclesiastical historian, and may be specifically stated as follows:—

"(1.) Those 'ungodly men' denied the proper divinity and incarnation of Christ, affirming that He never dwelt in a real material body, but only *appeared* as man, as angels did. Thus, in the language of Jude, 'denied the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.'

"(2.) They professed to live and walk in full fellowship with God, while they led the most scandalous

lives, thus 'turning the grace of God into lasciviousness.'

"(3.) The soul, as they taught, is an emanation from God, and is, therefore, immaculate. To say that the soul sins, is, they affirmed, to say that God sins. Sin, they affirmed, belongs exclusively to the body, the flesh, and is to be got rid of, not by atonement and cleansing grace, but wholly by physical mortification, hence the origin of hermitage.

"(4.) They accordingly denied atonement, on the express ground that men have no sin to be atoned for and cleansed from. For the same reason they denied the doctrine of the forgiveness of sin, and the necessity and duty of confessing it and seeking forgiveness on its account, saying, 'We have not sinned, and therefore have no occasion to confess sin, or to seek forgiveness on account of it.' These were the seducers of the Church, against whom the apostle is warning believers, and these are the specific errors against which he was guarding them in the chapter and epistle before us. This is perfectly evident, as we shall now proceed to show from the language employed in the chapter itself.

"Why does the apostle affirm, in the first three verses, that himself and his fellow apostles had 'heard' Christ, had 'seen' Him, had 'looked' upon Him, and 'handled' Him with their hands? Simply to verify the fact which these seducers denied, namely, that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh, and had veritably dwelt in a real physical body. Such

language is adapted to no other end. This great central truth of the Gospel, namely, that 'the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us,' must be believed and embraced, as the apostle informs us, or 'fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ,' and fulness of joy, are impossible to us. Believing and embracing this truth, on the other hand, we enter into this fellowship and fulness both. Such is the doctrine taught, and the error refuted, in the first four verses of this chapter.

"In verses 4—7, the apostle refutes the second error of these seducers, setting before us at the same time, in contrast with that error, another great central feature and truth of the Gospel. And how wonderfully he reasons upon the subject. The great revelation which inspired apostles had heard of God and declared to men, is this: 'God is light,' absolute purity, and 'in Him is no darkness at all,' that is, nothing impure or unholy. Suppose, now, the apostle adds (verse 6), that 'we say,' as these seducing teachers do, 'that we have fellowship with Him,' a God of immaculate purity, and yet 'walk in darkness,' that is, do as these errorists do, lead scandalous lives. 'We,' in that case, 'lie and do not the truth.' In other words, we affirm that to be true of ourselves which we are conscious in ourselves is not true, the worst form of lying conceivable. Going to India, we find there the very class of errorists here referred to, the errorists from whom these seducers derived their subversive doctrines. The philoso-

phers there, the *Yoges*, are, in heathen regard, the most sacred persons living. They profess to be in direct and open fellowship with God; yet they lead the most scandalous lives conceivable. When expostulated with upon their vices, their scornful reply, as missionaries inform me, is, 'All that belongs only to the flesh; the soul, which is part of God, is as pure as He is.' So these seducers taught, and thus verified themselves a race of gross liars.

"If, on the other hand, instead of 'following the pernicious ways of such 'ungodly men,' we walk in the light, as God is in the light, this will be our Divine experience—we shall not only have fellowship with God, but with one another, and 'the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.' Christ will then 'sanctify and cleanse us with the washing of water by the Word, and present us unto Himself without spot or wrinkle or any such thing,' but render us 'holy and without blemish.'

"In verses 8 and 9, the apostle exposes the third error of these ungodly seducers of the Churches, by contrasting the consequences of embracing their error, that is, denying our need of atoning grace, by denying the fact that we are sinners, with those which will come upon us if we confess the fact that we are sinners, and trust in atoning grace. Suppose, the apostle says, that we, as these ungodly men do, 'say that we have no sin' to be atoned for, that is, deny the fact that we are sinners. In that case, we involve ourselves in the guilt of self-deception, de-

nying of ourselves what we cannot but be conscious of as true. We thus evince the fact, also, that 'the truth is not in us,' that is, that we are utterly void of real integrity. Every man is so distinctly conscious of the fact that he is a sinner and needs atoning grace, that he cannot reject that grace, and deny the fact that he is a sinner, without evincing palpable self-deception on the one hand, and an utter want of real integrity on the other.

"But if we confess our sins, and seek atoning grace, then God evinces His justice to His own Word of promise, by not only pardoning our sin, but by delivering us from its power, 'cleansing us from all unrighteousness.' When sin is confessed in the spirit of true faith in atoning grace, God not only 'has mercy and abundantly pardons,' but 'turns His hand' upon the humbled and trusting penitent and 'purely purges away his dross, and takes away ALL his tin.'

"But suppose, adds the apostle (verse 10), we embrace the last error of these deceivers, and deny our need of confessing sin, by denying the fact that we have sinned, that is, 'say we have not sinned.' In that case, we not only evince our own want of integrity, but 'make God a liar,' He having 'concluded all men under sin.'

"Such is the obvious meaning of the apostle throughout this chapter, which is, from beginning to end, one continued discourse, relating to one and the same class of seducers of the Churches, and to

the specific errors taught by those 'ungodly men.' To say that by atoning blood and cleansing grace we have been made 'free from sin,' is one thing, and is just what every believer is privileged, and in duty bound, to find grace to say. To deny our need of atoning and cleansing grace, and our duty to confess sin, on the ground that we are 'without sin,' 'have no sin,' and 'have not sinned,' what these errorists did say, is quite another. That this last is the real and exclusive meaning of the apostle in this chapter, I argue, from the following considerations:—

"(1.) This was the specific exposition given of this chapter by the entire primitive Church, during the first four centuries of the Christian era—the Church which received the chapter, and entire epistle, directly from the apostle himself. During this whole period, the doctrine of entire sanctification was the undisputed doctrine of that Church, and none imagined that any sacred writer, in any passage of Holy Writ, intended to deny or throw a shadow of doubt over the truth of that doctrine. All understood who these false teachers were to whom the apostle here refers, and what were the errors with which they were seducing believers. All understood him in the words, 'If we say we have no sin,' not intending to deny this doctrine, or cast a shade of reproach upon those who hold it, but to affirm that if we should 'reject atoning grace,' we should 'deceive ourselves,' and evince a want of integrity.

“(2.) As shown in a late number of the *Divine Life*, not a few of the ablest advocates of the opposite doctrine assert the correctness of the primitive exposition, and hold it as a great error to adduce this passage in disproof of the doctrine, and as casting imputations upon those who hold it. Individuals must be hardly pressed for proof texts who will force such a passage into their service.

“(3.) The language employed perfectly verifies the primitive exposition of this passage. No advocate of the doctrine of entire sanctification even, in any age, applied such language to himself as this:—‘I have no sin,’ (by nature) and ‘have not sinned.’ It is omnipresent in the heart and thought of every such believer, that by atoning grace and blood he was redeemed, was saved from sin, and is now kept from sin; and he always employs just such language to represent his thoughts upon the subject. On the other hand, this is the precise form of words even employed by those who reject atoning grace, and refuse to confess sin, on the affirmed ground that they have no sin, and never had any to be atoned for or to confess. It is a palpable violation of all known laws of interpretation to cite the words of the apostle for the purpose for which many of the opposers of the doctrine of entire sanctification do employ his words.”—*Divine Life*.

9. Such a state attained would render the Lord’s Prayer useless. “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors” (Matt. vi. 12).

It is argued that this prayer is for all, and to be used at all times ; and that, consequently, Christians will always have sins to confess, or will never arrive at a state of perfect holiness in this life.

If absolute holiness was insisted upon, then might this thing be ; but as no such thing is claimed, we are not able to see the force of this objection.

Man, while in the flesh, at least, will remain fallible ; consequently, liable to err ; and if liable to err, liable to sin through his mistakes. An act may be done ignorantly, which is, nevertheless, a violation of the perfect law of God. And there is nothing improper in asking God to forgive even such sins. Under the Mosaic economy there were acts denominated "errors" committed "unawares," "unwittingly," for which a "sin-offering" was provided (Lev. iv). This offering was provided for "the priests," "the whole congregation," for "the rulers," and for "one of the common people ;" showing that all classes were liable to commit such sins. These, be it remembered, were sins "unwittingly," or "ignorantly" committed ; things done "unawares." And yet they needed a "sin-offering"—an atonement.

We cannot do better than quote Dr. Daniel Steele's concluding notes on Leviticus, chapter iv. :—

"(1.) Ethical writers insist that the moral sense of mankind pronounces innocent the inadvertent doer of an act wrong in itself. They declare that there is a broad distinction between wrong and guilt on the one hand, and right and innocence on the

other; and that guilt always involves a knowledge of the wrong and an intention to commit it. Hence, in the light of moral philosophies filling our libraries and taught in our colleges, a sin of inadvertence or ignorance needs no expiation. The punishment of such sins by human judicatories, it is asserted, would be an outrage against which every good man would cry out. Nevertheless, so great are the interests intrusted to men in certain positions, that severe penalties are attached to carelessness, as in the handling of poisons by physicians and apothecaries, the involuntary sleep of a weary sentinel at his post, or in the case of the bridge-tender, who, through a misapprehension of the hour of the day, has the draw open when the express train arrives. These are inadvertent sins which men regard and punish as crimes. Now what the exigencies of human society require in a few cases, the perfect moral government of God demands in all cases—satisfaction for involuntary sins. But there is this difference: God always provides an atonement for such sins, and never executes sentence till the atonement has been rejected. Where the expiation cannot be known and applied, He forbears to inflict the penalty. The time of this ignorance God overlooked (Acts xvii. 30). Hence the law of God is more merciful than the law of man, which, in the cases specified, makes no provision for escaping the punishment of involuntary offences. The objection which some have raised against the Divine govern-

ment, for holding errors and inadvertences as culpable and penal, falls to the ground when we find the first announcement of this fact accompanied by the institution of the sin-offering.

“(2.) Though a well-meant mistake does not defile the conscience and bring the soul into condemnation, it nevertheless demands a penitent confession and a presentation of the great Sin-Offering unto a God of absolute holiness. The refusal to do this, since the Sin-Offering is provided, involves positive guilt. Says John Wesley, ‘Not only sin, *properly* so-called, that is, a *voluntary* transgression of a known law; but sin *improperly* so called, that is an *involuntary* transgression of a Divine law, known or unknown, needs the atoning blood. I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions, which I apprehend to be naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. Therefore *sinless perfection* is a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions.’ Hence Charles Wesley sings—

‘Every moment, Lord, I want
The merit of Thy death.’”

Such are the errors, the inadvertences, the mistakes of our lives, resulting from ignorance, intellectual weakness, and a thousand other causes aside from heart depravity, in regard to which we shall always have occasion to pray, “Forgive us our

debts." We have no sympathy with the idea that the Lord's Prayer is not intended for Christians, that its petitions are not made in the name of Jesus, etc. We believe it appropriate at all times, and for all men—saint and sinner—anywhere during probation.

We have now briefly noticed the main Scriptural objections urged against the doctrine of holiness. There are other Scriptures which are employed for this purpose, but these are the strongest. We have seen that, when properly understood, they teach no such doctrine, but in many cases just the reverse.

Dr. Mahan gives us his experience while searching for the truth on the subject, which we commend to all as worthy of imitation :—

"The question, what are our revealed privileges, is to be settled, not by an appeal to the conscious or visible attainments of any individual or class of individuals, but wholly and exclusively by reference 'to the law and to the testimony.' The Spirit of the Lord does know, and He only can know, what 'things are possible with God' on the one hand, and what 'things are possible to him that believeth' on the other. In determining the possibilities of faith, we must refer exclusively to what God, by His Spirit, has taught us on the subject.

"In my endeavours to find the true revealed answer to such inquiries, I judge that I may truly say that I proceeded with the greatest care and circumspection. I at once perceived that if God, as many suppose He has, has absolutely revealed the fact that

no believer in Christ ever had been, or ever will be, in this life, saved from all sin, that settles for ever the whole question. My first inquiry, therefore, was directed to all those passages which, as I had supposed, and many do suppose, do teach the doctrine of Christian imperfection—that is, of the continued sinfulness of all believers in Jesus. In my examination, I determined to take each passage by itself, and, in the clear light of the known and acknowledged laws of interpretation, determine its real meaning, and then its bearing upon the inquiry before us. This I did, and, to my surprise, found that not one of these passages possessed the remotest evidence in favour of the doctrine it had been supposed to teach.

“ I then turned to the inquiry, What do the Scriptures directly and positively teach in respect to the privileges of the ‘sons of God’ in this life? On this subject, as I found, the teachings of the Bible are of the plainest and most absolute character possible.”—*Out of Darkness into Light*, pp. 357-8.

Whoever adopts the same method, with a firm desire to know “the truth as it is in Jesus,” will come to a like conclusion. But if we first prejudge the question, and depend on passages we have never examined, and object because others have objected, we shall likely reach the opposite conclusion. Let us “**know the truth, and the truth shall make us free.**”

CHAPTER VI.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION.

THAT a distinction exists between conversion and entire sanctification is clear to those who know the experience. But while such are able to testify that a marked difference exists, they are not able to define it. In fact, there is no other way to explain Christian experience but to admit that such a distinction exists.

“If the idea should become prevalent,” says Dr. Upham, “that justification and sanctification are the same thing, it would involve the subject of sanctification, and perhaps, that of justification, in much confusion.”

What is the distinction between the two experiences—conversion and entire sanctification?

1. Conversion inquires—How can the sins which are past be forgiven, and I become a member of the household of faith? Entire sanctification inquires—How can I be cleansed from conscious impurity, and be made meet for the kingdom of glory? I have my title in conversion; I have my meetness in heart purity.

“Justification,” says Mr. Wesley, “is the forgiveness of all our sins, and, what is necessarily implied

PPS 109
IS DIFFERENT

therein, our acceptance with God." It "expels the love of the world, the love of pleasure, of ease, of honour, of money; together with pride, anger, self-will, and every other evil. . . . How naturally do those who experience such a change imagine that all sin is gone, that it is utterly rooted out of the heart, and has no more place therein. How easily do we draw that inference—I *feel* no sin, therefore I *have* none: it does not *stir*, therefore it does not *exist*: it has no *motion*, therefore it has no *being*!"

Sanctification is "love, joy, peace, always abiding; but invariably long-suffering, patience, resignation; gentleness, triumphing over all provocation; goodness, mildness, sweetness, tenderness of spirit; fidelity, simplicity, godly sincerity; meekness, calmness, evenness of spirit; temperance, not only in food and sleep, but in all things natural and spiritual."

Then comes the emphatic question, "Have we not all this when we are justified?"

"What," he replies, "total resignation to the will of God without any mixture of self-will? gentleness, without any touch of anger, even the moment we are provoked? love to God, without the least love to the creature, but in and for God, excluding all pride? love to man, excluding all envy, all jealousy, and rash judging? meekness, keeping the whole soul inviolably calm? and temperance in all things? Deny that any ever came up to this, if you please, but do not say all who are justified do."

If any really come up to this experience who are

newly justified, "I will say," says Mr. Wesley, "they are sanctified, saved from sin in that moment. But certainly this is an exempt case. It is otherwise with the generality of those that are justified."

Some insist that Mr. Wesley's descriptions of regeneration involve those of entire sanctification. A careful examination of the language employed will convince any candid mind that it is not so.

Mr. Wesley speaks of justification expelling the love of the world, pleasure, ease, etc., but not *all* love of the world; *all* love of pleasure; *all* love of ease. When he speaks of sanctification, it is love to God without the *least love* of the creature; love to man, excluding *all* envy, etc. He believed that all the fruits of the Spirit existed in regeneration, but not as in entire sanctification. The one was the work begun, the other was the work completed. This distinction makes Mr. Wesley's descriptions clear and intelligible.

2. In conversion the soul rests from condemnation for all past sins. In entire sanctification the soul rests from all internal discordancies. "There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." The song of the heart is,—

"No condemnation now I dread,
Jesus, with all in Him, is mine;
Alive in Him, my living Head,
And clothed in righteousness divine,
Bold I approach th' eternal throne,
And claim the crown, through Christ my own."

While we may be well able to go up and possess

the land, there are, nevertheless, enemies to be expelled. And hence the cry,—

“Come, O my Joshua, bring me in ;
Cast out Thy foes, the inbred sin,
The carnal mind remove.”

These evils show themselves in many ways well known to an unsanctified heart. The affections clamour for forbidden objects—objects condemned by the conscience, and resisted by the will. The mind does not readily drop them, and turn away from them, in utter loathing, because they are offensive to God, and keep up a war in the soul.

But entire sanctification is soul-rest.

“A rest where all our soul’s desire
Is fixed on things above ;
Where fear, and sin, and grief expire,
Cast out by perfect love.”

There is rest from internal discord ; rest from anxious solicitude ; rest from fearful forebodings. “They have entered into rest.” Anger, pride, envy, and all irregular desires, which have been under control in conversion, and have not been allowed to reign, no longer exist, having been removed.

3. Conversion is deliverance from the voluntary commission of sin ; entire sanctification is deliverance from the *being* of sin.

This idea is very clearly presented by Bishop Hedding. He says:—“The difference between a justified soul who is not fully sanctified, and one fully sanctified, I understand to be this :—The first (if he do not backslide) is kept from voluntarily

committing known sin, which is what is commonly meant in the New Testament by *committing sin*. But he yet finds in himself the remains of inbred corruption, or original sin, such as pride, anger, envy, a feeling of hatred to an enemy, a rejoicing at a calamity which has fallen upon an enemy, etc. Now in all this the regenerate soul does not act voluntarily; his choice is against all these evils; God has given him a new heart, which hates all these evils, and resists and overcomes them as soon as the mind perceives them. Though the Christian does not feel guilty of depravity as he would do if he had voluntarily broken the law of God, yet he is often grieved and afflicted, and reprovèd at a sight of this sinfulness of his nature. Though the soul in this state enjoys a degree of religion, yet it is conscious it is not what it ought to be, nor what it must be to be fit for heaven.

“The second, or person fully sanctified, is cleansed from all these inward involuntary sins. He may be tempted by Satan, by men, and by his own bodily appetites to commit sin, but his heart is free from these inward foes, which, before his full sanctification, were ready to fall in with temptation and lead him into transgression. He may be tempted to be proud, to love the world, to be revengeful or angry, to hate an enemy, to wish him evil, or to rejoice at his calamity, but he feels none of these passions in his heart; the Holy Ghost has cleansed him from all these pollutions of his nature. Thus it is that,

being emptied of sin, the perfect Christian is filled with the love of God, even with that perfect love which casteth out fear.”—*Sermon preached before the New Jersey Conference, 1841, and published by vote of the Conference.*

This is so plain that the child may understand it, and so much in harmony with Christian experience that comment is unnecessary.

“Regeneration,” says Bishop Hamline, “is like breaking up the fallow ground and sowing it with wheat, in the growth of which there spring up tares. It is a mixed moral state. Sanctification is like weeding the soul, or gathering the tares and burning them, so that nothing remains to grow there but good seed. In regeneration a spiritual growth is like the slow progress of the wheat, choked and made sickly by the intermingling weeds. Entire sanctification removes them, roots them out of the heart, and leaves it a pure moral soil.”

Rev. William Arthur has some beautiful and striking illustrations of this distinction:—“A piece of iron is dark and cold; imbued with a certain degree of heat, it becomes almost burning without any change of appearance; imbued with a still greater degree, its very appearance changes to that of solid fire, and it sets fire to whatever it touches. A piece of water without heat is solid and brittle; gently warmed, it flows; further heated, it mounts to the sky. An organ, filled with the ordinary degree of air which exists everywhere, is dumb; the touch of

the player can elicit nothing but a clicking of the keys. Throw in, not another air, but an unsteady current of the same air, and sweet, but imperfect and uncertain notes immediately respond to the player's touch; increase the current to a full supply, and every pipe swells with music. Such is the soul without the Holy Ghost, and such are the changes which pass upon it when it receives the Holy Ghost, and when it is filled with the Holy Ghost."—*Tongue of Fire*, p. 61.

Bishop Foster says:—"When a soul is regenerated, all the elements of holiness are imparted to it, or the graces are implanted in it, in complete number, and the perfection of these graces is entire sanctification; and hence, we insist that entire sanctification does not take place in regeneration, for the graces are not then perfected. And again, though in regeneration all the elements of holiness are imparted, all the rudiments of inbred sin are not destroyed; and hence again the absence of complete sanctification, which, when it occurs, expels sin. Regeneration is incipient sanctification in this sense—it is of the same nature as sanctification, and, so far as it extends, is sanctification; it is included in entire sanctification, but is not so extensive; it is a degree, but not the whole of that work."—*Christian Purity*, p. 109.

CHAPTER VII.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION—

The Faith of the Christian Church.

THE doctrine that the work of entire holiness is wrought in the soul subsequent to conversion, has been, and, so far as we know, is, the faith of every Evangelical Church in Christendom.

“Every Reformed Church of Europe and America agree that there is an infection of nature remaining in them that are regenerated. Augustine and Calvin are not stronger in their assertion of this fact than are Arminius and Wesley. It is no small presumption in favour of the truth of a doctrine that it has remained unquestioned through all the fierce battles of polemical theologians, and all the reformers of the Church, and all the re-statements of Christian truth.”—*Dr. D. Steele.*

“The contrary opinion,” says Mr. Wesley, “is wholly new; never heard of in the Church of Christ, from the time of His coming into the world till the time of Count Zinzendorf; and it is attended with the most fatal consequences.”—*Works*, vol. i., p. 115.

He further states that “it is a doctrine so new, that it was never heard of for seventeen hundred years; never till it was discovered by Count Zinzen-

dorf. I do not remember to have seen the least intimation of it, either in any ancient or modern writer; unless, perhaps, in some of the wild, ranting Antinomians. . . . It is true that when the Germans were pressed upon this head, they soon allowed that sin did still remain in *the flesh*, but not in the *heart* of a believer; and after a time, when the absurdity of this was shown, they fairly gave up the point, allowing that sin did still remain, though it did not reign in him that is born of God. But the English, who had received it from the Germans, were not so easily prevailed upon to part with a favourite opinion; and even when the generality of them were convinced it was utterly indefensible, a few could not be persuaded to give it up, but maintain it to this day.”—*Works*, vol. i., p. 108.

In the Ninth of the “Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England,” it is declared that “Original sin . . . is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam. . . . And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated.”

This article has stood as a bulwark against the doctrine of Zinzendorf and those who follow him. It is in perfect accord with the experience of those who have been regenerated.

The Larger Westminster Catechism, the formulated faith of the Presbyterian Church, has the following statement of this doctrine:—“The imperfection of sanctification in believers ariseth from the remnants

of sin abiding in every part of them, and the perpetual lustings of the flesh against the spirit, whereby they are often foiled with temptations, and fall into many sins, and are hindered in all their spiritual services."

The Presbyterian Church in the United States, in her Confession of Faith, chap. xiii., says of sanctification—"They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are farther sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, by His Word and Spirit dwelling in them."

With regard to the faith of the German Reformed Church in the United States, we quote from Rev. Dr. Samuel Helffenstein's *Theology*, pp. 324-5 :—
"Sanctification is that act of God's free grace whereby believers are gradually cleansed from the remains of sin and indwelling corruption and renewed after the image of God. The work is commenced in regeneration; the principle of spiritual life is then implanted, and the man is renewed in knowledge after the image of God, and in true righteousness and holiness. This work, thus commenced in regeneration, is carried on in sanctification."

Rev. Alvah Hovey, D.D., of the Newton Theological School, has spoken the sentiments of the Baptist denomination on this subject. He says :—
"The experience of Christians, immediately after conversion, is not the highest which they should expect in this life. . . . The work of renewal is

only begun, not finished, by regeneration. . . . As He (the Spirit of God) regenerates the soul by imparting to it a holy disposition, so He carries on the work thus begun by increasing the power of that disposition and subduing the evil tendencies which oppose it.”—*Higher Christian Life*, pp. 11, 12.

These authorities show clearly that on one point there is harmony of faith among all the Churches. They hold that *regeneration* does not free the soul from *depravity*. This is a strong presumptive argument in favour of the doctrine.

“The sum of all is this,” says Mr. Wesley; “there is in every person, even after he is justified, two contrary principles—nature and grace, termed by St. Paul, the flesh and spirit. Hence, although even babes in Christ are *sanctified*, yet it is only in part. In a degree, according to the measure of their faith, they are spiritual; yet in a degree they are carnal. And to this agrees the constant experience of the children of God. While they feel this witness in themselves, they feel a will not wholly resigned to the will of God. They know they are in Him, yet find a heart ready to depart from Him; a proneness to evil in many instances, and a backwardness to that which is good.”—*Works*, vol. i., p. 115.

“That a distinction exists,” says Mr. Watson, “between a regenerate state and a state of entire and perfect holiness, will be generally allowed. Regeneration, we have seen, is concomitant with justification; but the apostles, in addressing the body of

believers in the Churches to whom they wrote their epistles, set before them, both in the prayers they offer in their behalf and in the exhortations they administer, a still higher degree of deliverance from sin, as well as a higher growth in Christian virtues."—*Institutes*, part ii., chap. 29.

"The distinction," says Dr. Upham, "is evidently made in the Scriptures. The passages of Scripture where it is clearly recognized are so numerous and so familiar to attentive readers of the Bible that it seems to be hardly necessary to quote them at any length. 'And the very God of peace,' says the apostle (1 Thess. v. 23), 'sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.' And again, 2 Cor. vii. 1: 'Having, therefore, these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.' It is very evident, from the general tenor of the apostle's communications to them, that these exhortations were addressed to those whom he regarded, and had reason to regard, as justified persons. He felt, nevertheless, although they were justified,—although their sins were blotted out,—that there was much remaining to be done in the matter of their present and prospective sanctification. Hence his exhortations to preserve their bodies blameless, to cleanse themselves, and to perfect holiness in the fear of God, which would have been unnecessary if he had con-

sidered the work of sanctification as absolutely and necessarily involved in that of justification.”—*Interior Life*, p. 173.

“The denial of it” (depravity in believers) “is a position,” says Rev. Dr. Dempster, “utterly novel. It is less than two centuries old. Till that modern date, no part of the Greek or Latin Churches was ever infested with it. And in the Reformed Churches it was never heard of only among a few raving Antinomians.”—*Sermon*.

Rev. Dr. Curry says:—“This carnal mind survives the work of regeneration, and is often actively rebellious in the hearts of real Christians.”

Rev. Dr. Hodge says:—“According to the Scriptures, and the undeniable evidence of history, regeneration does not remove all sin.”—*Systematic Theology*, vol. iii., p. 290.

Rev. Bishop Thompson says:—“The justified and regenerate discover in themselves the remains of the carnal mind.”—*Last Address, West Va. Conference*.

These citations prove that on the subject of a residue of depravity in the hearts of believers who have been justified only, there is no difference of opinion. It is a truth as universally accepted by all evangelical Christians as justification by faith. The contrary opinion, which has found a few advocates in modern times, arrays itself boldly against the faith of the united Christian Church. It says to every Church, and to all the great lights of Christendom, with here and there an insignificant exception in modern times,

you are all in error ; you have all misinterpreted the Scriptures and experience ; we know more than you all. If you claim that the doctrine is Scriptural, we deny it. We know more of their import than you all. If you claim that experience confirms your views, we deny it, claiming to know more of experience than the combined wisdom and piety of the ages. This is the position occupied by the advocates of the theory that the soul is wholly sanctified when converted. The modesty of the position is not enviable.

CHAPTER VIII.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION—

The Experience of Believers.

WHILE we rely mainly upon the voice of inspiration for proof of the possible attainment of heart-purity, we must not overlook, or in any sense ignore, the value of human testimony. If the witnesses are competent; if they are not influenced by motives of a personal character; if they have had ample time to test their experience; and if, amidst the awful realities of death, they have still adhered to their faith and experience; next to the Word of God, their testimony is the most valuable, because most reliable. On the subject of the two works, there are witnesses of unimpeachable integrity.

A late writer inquires:—"Tell us where any servant of God, walking in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless, ever became distressed on account of the residuary depravity left in him, sought deliverance from it by a new consecration and a special act of faith, succeeded and obtained a special witness of the Spirit that the work was done?"

This writer, as all must see, raises a *false issue*, as no one, so far as we know, claims that those who "walk in *all* the ordinances and commandments of the Lord *blameless*" are not fully saved. But the real issue is, do all "babes in Christ" walk in the manner here described?

It becomes a question of fact, attested by consciousness, and settled by an appeal to testimony. "To disbelieve all the professors," says Mr. Wesley, "amounts to a denial of the thing."

The witnesses are carefully selected, and are found to agree in three points covering the controversy.

1. They testify to a *conversion* of which there can be no doubt. It is as clear as light.

2. They further state that after a clear and satisfactory conversion, and with no consciousness of backsliding, or in any way losing their faith, but in the midst of active efforts to promote the cause of Christ, and to save men, to their great surprise and mortification, they found in their hearts evils, such as pride, anger, unbelief, envy, and other irregular desires, which greatly troubled them.

3. They further give evidence that, believing it to be their privilege to secure freedom from these manifest evidences of depravity, they earnestly sought and consciously found the freedom they so ardently desired.

This *second blessing*, as they call it, was as clearly marked as their conversion; and after they became conscious of its reception, the evils, which formerly

gave them so much trouble, were all **removed**, and for years they joyfully sang of

“A heart in every thought renewed,
And full of love divine ;
Perfect, and right, and pure, and good ;
A copy, Lord, of Thine.”

If the witnesses are clear on these points, the controversy, so far as human testimony is concerned, is at an end.

Lest denominational prejudices might be supposed to bias the witnesses, they are selected from different denominations.

REV. WILLIAM BRAMWELL.—Mr. B. speaks of his conversion thus:—“I had prepared myself with much prayer and self-examination for worthily partaking of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, and while in the act of receiving it from the hand of Rev. Mr. Wilson, a pious clergyman from Preston, I obtained a clear sense of pardon. My spirit rejoiced in God my Saviour. Darkness and gloom, guilt and condemnation, were at once removed in a manner incomprehensible to me, and utterly beyond all that I had ever been taught to expect or desire.”

There can be no doubt as to the genuineness of this conversion. It is one of those strongly marked and clearly defined changes which leave no doubt.

What transpired subsequent to his conversion is told in the following words:—“Being obedient to the teachings of the Spirit (*i.e.* he did not backslide as some claim), it was not long before he **was con-**

vinced of the necessity of a further work of grace upon his heart. He now saw that it was his privilege to be cleansed from all sin."

Mr. Bramwell says:—"I was for some time deeply convinced of my need of purity, and sought it carefully with tears, and entreaties, and sacrifices, thinking nothing too much to give up,—nothing too much to do or suffer,—if I might but obtain this pearl of great price."

Who can doubt but that there was depravity of heart remaining in Mr. B., which conversion had not wholly removed?

After describing the manner in which he sought heart-cleansing, viz., "by faith alone, without the deeds of the law," he says:—"The Lord, for whom I waited, came suddenly to the temple of my heart, and I had an immediate evidence that this was the blessing I had for some time been seeking. My soul was all wonder, love, and praise. It is now about twenty-six years ago: I have walked in this blessed liberty ever since. Glory be to God."—*Bramwell's Life.*

Such a testimony as this should settle the question, so far as experience can settle it, that heart-purity is a work wrought, by the power of the Spirit, subsequent to conversion.

HESTER ANN ROGERS.—This pious lady holds high rank among the witnesses of Jesus, for her spotless life and Christ-like devotion to the salvation of souls. Her experience clearly illustrates all the points in

this controversy. After a long and severe struggle, she was assured of her pardon and adoption. She thus describes the change:—"In that moment my fetters were broken, my bands were loosed, and my soul set at liberty. The love of God was shed abroad in my heart, and I rejoiced with joy unspeakable. Now, if I had possessed ten thousand souls I could have ventured them all with my Jesus. I would have given them all to Him! I was truly a new creature, and seemed to be in a new world. I could do nothing but love and praise my God, and could not refrain from continually repeating, 'Thou art my Father! O God, Thou art my God!' while tears of joy ran down my cheeks."

This was a clear conversion. She continued to praise the Lord, and rejoice in Him for some time. She performed every duty, bore every cross, and was constant in her devotions. But in the midst of labours more abundant, she says:—"The Lord began to reveal in my heart that sin was not all destroyed; for though I had constant victory over it, yet I felt the remains of anger, pride, self-will, and unbelief often rising, which occasioned a degree of heaviness and sorrow. At first I was amazed to feel such things, and often tempted to think I had lost a measure of grace" (just what some accuse such persons of); "yet when I looked to the Lord, or whenever I approached Him in secret, He shed His precious love abroad, and bore witness also with my Spirit that I was still His child. Yea, and at this

time I received many remarkable answers to prayers—many proofs of His undoubted love and goodwill to my soul, and I ever felt I would rather die than offend Him.”

No one can question, with any reason, the presence of depravity here, and that, too, while the soul was conscious of communion with Jesus, being justified freely by His grace.

In this state of mind, Mrs. Rogers made earnest supplication to God, with strong crying and tears, and ceased not her efforts until Jesus “spoke the second time, *Be clean.*” In her own language, “I come empty to be filled; deny me not. I have no plea but Thy mercy, the blood of Jesus, the promise, and my own great need. O, save me fully by an act of free grace. I now take Thee at Thy word; I do by faith cast myself on Thy promise. I venture my soul on Thy veracity; *Thou canst not deny!*” At last she exclaimed, “Lord I do believe; this moment Thou dost save. Yea, Lord, my soul is delivered from her burden, I am emptied of all; I am at Thy feet, a helpless, worthless worm; but I take hold of Thee as my *fulness!* I am conquered and subdued by love. Thy love sinks me into nothing; it overflows my soul. O my Jesus, Thou art all in all! In Thee I behold and feel all the fulness of the Godhead mine. I am now one with God; the intercourse is open; sin, inbred sin, no longer hinders the close communion, and God is all my own.”

Mrs. Rogers bore witness in life and in death that

this was the work of heart-cleansing which she did not receive at the time of her conversion. We cannot see how such testimony can be resisted, except by denying all testimony based on experience.

BISHOP WHATCOAT.—Of this man's consecration to the Episcopacy, Bishop Simpson remarks that "holy hands were never laid on a holier head." Of his conversion, Bishop W. gives the following account:—"I was reading the Scriptures, and when I came to these words, 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God,' as I fixed my eyes upon them, in a moment my darkness was removed, and the Spirit did bear witness with my spirit that I was a child of God. In the same instant I was filled with unspeakable peace and joy in believing; all fear of death, judgment, and hell suddenly vanished. Before this, I was kept awake by anguish and fear, so that I could not get an hour's sound sleep in a night. Now I wanted no sleep, being abundantly refreshed by contemplating the rich display of God's mercy in adopting so unworthy a creature as me to be an heir of the kingdom of heaven."

As clear as was this conversion, he soon found that sin, though subdued, was not destroyed. Though converted, he was not "cleansed from all unrighteousness." Of his subsequent experience he says:—"My faith and love grew stronger and stronger" (he did not backslide, as some claim); "still," he says, "I soon found that though I was justified freely, yet I

was not wholly sanctified. This brought me into a deep concern, and confirmed my resolution to admit of no peace or truce with *the evils which I still found* in my heart. I was sensible that they both hindered me at present in my holy exercises, and that I could not enter into the joys of my Lord unless they were all rooted out."

The freedom which he so ardently sought, to the unspeakable joy of his heart, he found. "After many sharp and painful conflicts, and many gracious visitations, also, on the 28th of March, 1761, my soul was drawn out and engaged in a manner it never was before. Suddenly I was stripped of all but love. And in this happy state, rejoicing evermore, and in everything giving thanks, I continued for some years with little intermission or abatement, wanting nothing for soul or body more than I received from day to day."—*Wesley's Missionaries to America.*

No testimony could be clearer or more satisfactory than this. It covers each point fully, and the only way to break its force is to deny all testimony, which Christian men will be slow to do.

PROF. THOMAS C. UPHAM.—Mr. Upham was well and favourably known as a minister of the Congregational Church. Of his conversion he says:—"God had given me great blessings, such as a new sense of forgiveness, increased love, a clear evidence of adoption and sonship, close and deeper communion with Himself."

It appears from this statement that when Mr. U.

commenced seeking the blessing of entire sanctification, he was not in a backslidden state, but possessed a "clear evidence of adoption and sonship." But with this "close and deeper communion with" God, he found evils within, which this change, clear as it was, had not removed. Hence he says:—"I do not know that I was ever more troubled. The remains of every form of internal opposition to God appeared to be centred in one point—*selfishness*." But he cried unto the strong for strength. His faith triumphed, and from the midst of this conflict he exclaims, "Thou hast given me the victory." "I was never able before that time to say, with sincerity and confidence, that I loved my Heavenly Father with all my strength. But, aided by Divine grace, I have been enabled to use this language, which involves, as I understand it, the true idea of Christian perfection, or holiness, both then and ever since. There was no intellectual excitement, no very marked joy, when I reached this great rock of practical salvation. But I was distinctly conscious when I reached it."

Could this keen, philosophical mind have been so much deceived as to have mistaken this grand experience for conversion, or restoration from a backslidden state? The insinuation would be repelled as an insult to ordinary intelligence.

JAMES BRAINARD TAYLOR.—Mr. Taylor was one of the brightest examples of holiness who have ever adorned the Presbyterian Church. He professed faith in Christ at the age of fifteen. His biographer

says :—“As soon as he felt the transforming power of truth, he manifested a decided disposition to active benevolence.” His whole heart seemed bent on loving and serving Christ, and yet he was constantly hindered by the evils of his unsanctified nature. He says :—“Notwithstanding my profession that I had crucified the world, the flesh, and the devil, I had keener sorrows for indwelling sin than I ever experienced before conversion. Oh ! the distress which I have felt on account of pride, envy, love of the world, and other evil passions which have risen up and disturbed my peace, and separated between God and my soul!”

One is struck with the similarity of this experience with that of Hester Ann Rogers. At this time he says :—“I felt I needed something which I did not possess. There was a void within which must be filled, or I could not be happy. My earnest desire then was, as it had been ever since I professed religion, six years before, that all the love of the world might be destroyed, all selfishness extirpated, pride banished, unbelief removed, all idols dethroned, everything hostile to holiness and opposed to the Divine will crucified ; that holiness to the Lord might be engraved on my heart, and evermore characterise my conversation. At this very juncture (April 23, P.M., 1822) I was most delightfully conscious of giving up *all* to God. I was enabled in my heart to say, Here, Lord, take me, my whole soul, and seal me Thine,—Thine now and Thine for ever. Then

there ensued such emotions as I never before experienced: all was calm and tranquil, silent and solemn, and a heaven of love pervaded my whole soul. I had a *witness* of God's love to me, and mine to Him. Shortly after I was dissolved in tears of love and gratitude to our blessed Lord. The name of Jesus was precious to me. He came like a king and took full possession of my heart, and I was enabled to say, 'I am crucified with Christ.'" Writing to a friend, he says:—"My soul has drank from the fulness of God. The Lord has given me power over the adversary, so that when he comes he finds nothing in me." "I have enjoyed, and do still feel a *fulness*, which the Lord has bestowed upon me. Yes, perfect love appears to be the ruling principle in my soul, so that I enjoy a little heaven to go to heaven in. . . . I have concluded, and do still believe, that my soul enjoys the blessing of *full redemption*. . . . My mind loves to dwell upon this delightful theme—holiness. It is a blessed doctrine. Ah! why did I not come to possess it before? Why? Because, like many other professors of religion, I looked for a death purgatory, not believing that *the blood of Christ*, and not *purgatory*, cleanseth from *all sin*. This is the present tense. It is efficacious *now*, and the Lord has proved to me a full, a complete Saviour."—*Letter*, June 21, 1822.

We could multiply these witnesses, but **their testimony** would only confirm those already given. These must be taken as examples of a great multitude.

With such testimonies ringing through the Church, what becomes of the inquiry of the writer quoted in the opening of this chapter? These testimonies meet fully every point, and demonstrate, so far as testimony can do it, the doctrine which he denies. The Church may, and doubtless will, abandon theories on this subject, but we trust she will never ignore such testimonies as these.

“If the whole number of Christians were consulted, at or near the time of their conversion,” says Dr. L. Lee, “few, if any, would be found to believe themselves to have been wholly sanctified at the time of their conversion, or to have been freed from all depravity; yet they feel confident that their sins have been forgiven, and that they love God. Whatever may be their creed, whatever may be their philosophy of regeneration and sanctification, if they are real Christians, experience has but one language; they feel, they are conscious, that they love God and enjoy His favour, yet that they have not attained all that is implied in entire sanctification as taught in the Scriptures, and as it has been explained above. If the experience of those who have obtained this great blessing of entire sanctification were consulted, it would doubtless be found to accord with the explanation above given.”—*Theology*, p. 215.

It has been objected,

1. That nothing can be proved by experience. We admit that experience is not sufficient to prove a doctrine unsupported by Scripture. But we insist,

with Mr. Wesley, that "experience is sufficient to confirm a doctrine which is grounded on Scripture." We have shown that the doctrine has a Scriptural foundation, and the argument from experience confirms the doctrine.

It may be true that persons are liable to be misled by their emotions. The men of 1843 claimed to have a witness that the world would end on a given day of that year. But shall we, on that account, give up the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit? Are we prepared to deny the witness of the Spirit because some have been mistaken in their experience? Is this the logic—The Adventists professed to have the witness of the Spirit that the world would end in 1843, and were mistaken, therefore no man can know that his sins are forgiven, or his heart cleansed from all unrighteousness? If this is the conclusion, let us no longer sing

"The Spirit answers to the blood,
And tells me I am born of God."

And let us no longer repeat the Scripture, "We have received . . . the Spirit which is of God, that we may know the things that are freely given us of God" (1 Cor. ii. 12).

There is a marked difference between the witness of the Spirit to an abstract dogma, and its witness to a work wrought in the soul by the power of that Spirit, or the Spirit witnessing to His own work. God gives us no warrant for the former, but abundant assurance for the latter.

Suppose I should affirm that I had the witness of the Spirit that the *identity* of the resurrection body will consist of the same kind of elementary matter, combined in the same proportions, and having the same form and structure; and it should be found that its *identity* consisted in a *sameness of particles*, and I am mistaken; would my mistake be a justifiable pretext for denying the fact that the Spirit may witness with my spirit that I am a child of God?

Those who claimed to have the witness of the Spirit that the world would end on a given year or day, claimed such witness to an occurrence, with regard to which God had declared they should not know. It had reference to an abstract dogma, which had no connection with consciousness; hence the absurdity of supposing that a man could be conscious of it. But God has declared that we may be conscious of our personal salvation. It is an inward change, wrought by the Holy Spirit, and as such, may be known. So we teach, and so we believe.

The time was when the witness of the Spirit to our *adoption* was stoutly denied. It was claimed that we could not know our sins forgiven in this life, although the Bible seemed to teach another sentiment. But tens of thousands sought the witness of their adoption, and found it; which fact has shed so much light on the teaching of the Bible, that very few are found among evangelical Christians who have any doubt on the subject. Ought not our experience in entire sanctification to have as much

weight? Is not a denial of the latter a virtual denial of the former? No stronger evidence can be produced from the Bible or experience for the one than the other.

2. It is objected to this doctrine, that those professing entire sanctification are only reclaimed from a backslidden state.

The man who asserts, for the sake of sustaining a pet dogma, that Fletcher, Carvosso, Bramwell, Hester Ann Rogers, Whatcoat, Professor Upham, and others, were in a backslidden state at the time they sought and professed to find the blessing of entire sanctification, should cover his face for very shame.

The reader must have seen how fully this objection has been refuted in the testimonies of Bramwell, who assures us that he was "obedient to the teachings of the Spirit;" and Mrs. Rogers, who declares that she "had constant victory over sin;" and Bishop Whatcoat, who tells us that his "faith and love grew stronger and stronger."

While it may be, and doubtless is, true, that many professing entire sanctification, are simply reclaimed, and hence the short-lived duration of the work, it is still true that this cannot be said of thousands whose whole lives refute the charge. Whatever may be said of some who have professed this grace, the witnesses whom we have introduced were not in a backslidden state when they commenced seeking the fullness of the Spirit.

("Others have thought," says Rev. Mr. Boardman,

“to solve the problem by calling the second experience simply a return from backsliding. But in each of the cases given we have the testimony of the witnesses themselves that it was more than this—a *deeper work of grace*, a fuller apprehension of Christ, a more complete and abiding union with Him than at first. The witnesses themselves being judges in their own case, this solution is not the true one. We must go deeper for it. Thousands in every age since the primitive have backslidden and returned again, without any such great and permanent advancement in the Divine life as that set forth in the examples before us. . . . There is vastly more in such an experience than return from backsliding! Then, too, above and beyond all this, it is never the returning backslider who comes into the fulness of this experience. Indeed, if backsliding and returning would really bring men into this Gospel fulness, pity but the whole Church would backslide and return. It would be a grand thing for the cause of Christ, and for their own comfort and joy. The backslider returns only to the point attained when he turned back at most, and hard struggling for that! But the work in question is a higher height, and a deeper depth, in the comprehension both of the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, and of the way of salvation by faith.”—*The Higher Christian Life*.)

CHECK THIS

CHAPTER IX.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION,
SCRIPTURAL.

DO the Scriptures teach that believers are wholly sanctified at, or subsequent to, conversion? Is the soul entirely delivered from depravity at the moment of its justification, or is its entire cleansing a subsequent work? We admit that if the Scriptures furnish no evidence of such a change, a belief in the doctrine is not obligatory upon any. But if there be evidence from the Scriptures of such an experience, it should be accepted.

It must be remembered that the Bible, in prescribing rules for all, adapts its teachings to the great variety in human nature, resulting from education and natural temperament, through which experience works out its richest gems.

No two experiences are exactly alike. No two persons reach the same point by the same process. One encounters a variety of difficulties to which another is a comparative stranger. One is endowed with a measure of the Spirit, and joys in God to a degree which well-nigh staggers the faith of another. One enters into the land of rest, rapturously exclaiming,

“O, for a thousand tongues to sing
My great Redeemer’s praise !”

while another reaches the same point with feelings best expressed by

“ A speechless awe that dares not move,
And all the silent heaven of love.”

This variety in Christian experience, on the subject of heart-purity, as well as conversion, is marked. One says, “ I felt it, not only outwardly, but inwardly. It seemed to press upon my whole being, and to diffuse all through and through it, a holy, sin-consuming energy. For a few minutes, the deep of God’s love swallowed me up ; all its waves and its billows rolled over me.” Another says, “ ’Twas no ecstatic flight, no height of rapture ; but, O, the depth ! the fathomless depth ! The ocean of love.” Another says, “ My heart melted and flowed out like water.” Another says, “ For a week the mortal powers could scarcely sustain the weight of love.” Another says, “ I now looked around for my sins,—they had long been my companions,—but they were nowhere to be found. Jesus had borne them all away.” Another says, “ Wave after wave rolled over me, until I could only cry out, Glory ! Glory ! It seemed like light, and its essence love.” Another says, “ There was no intellectual excitement, no very marked joy, when I reached the great rock of practical salvation. But I was distinctly conscious when I reached it.” Another says, “ Here were wonders ! This was like a God. But why attempt to describe it with words ? The brightness of His glory has oft-times been so great

as almost to extinguish the lamp of this mortal life." Another says, "I now believed for the first time that my soul had entered the Canaan of perfect love."

These testimonies are selected from the most intelligent believers in the Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopal Churches. They are samples of what might be extended almost indefinitely both in number and variety. One has *raptures* which no tongue can express; another, *love*, in its fathomless depths and heavenly sweetness! One shouts "*Glory*;" another whispers "*Peace*." One has *visions* and *revelations*, another sweetly trusts the Word.

This variety in Christian experience is generally conceded to result mainly from natural temperament. (It is not the province of Christianity to annihilate our natural temperaments, but to give direction and tone to them. It modifies, but never destroys them. Mr. A. is *sanguine*,—warm, ardent, confident. Mr. B. is *phlegmatic*,—cold, dull, sluggish, heavy. One is quickly and powerfully stirred and excited, while another is seldom, if ever, excited or profoundly moved. Mr. C. is confident, trustful—can believe on slight evidence; while Mr. D. is distrustful, unbelieving, and can scarcely believe after his judgment is convinced. Mr. E. is hopeful, while Mr. F. is desponding. They were always thus, and always will be. Grace has not changed them in this respect.)

From this variety in natural temperament comes the great variety in Christian experience.

Now, for a book claiming to treat on matters of experience, to be perfectly adapted to all this temperamental or constitutional variety, so clearly developed in Christian experience, and not conflict with any who may be seeking the heavenly way, it must, in the very nature of things, be somewhat general on those points which enter so largely into the experience of all. It can do little more than present the main facts, without attempting to explain them in all their minuteness. It fixes the outline, but leaves the filling up to individual experience. It maps out the beginning and end of the voyage, with all the prominent dangers of the passage; but it does not attempt to describe every head-wind and counter-current to be met with. It tells us what winds will sweep us into harbour, but it does not attempt to describe the force of the gale which wafts us into port.

If we understand the Scriptures, they tell us that we may be "*forgiven*," and, then "*cleansed from all unrighteousness*" (1 John i. 9). We may be the "*sons of God*," and then "*purified even as He is pure*" (1 John iii. 2, 3). We may be "*babes in Christ*," and yet so "*carnal*" as to need "*cleansing from all filthiness of flesh and spirit*" (2 Cor. vii. 1). We may know "*the principles of the doctrine of Christ*," embracing *repentance* and *faith*, the prerequisite and condition of pardon—and then "*go on unto*," not *towards*, "*perfection*" (Heb. vi. 1, 2).

Here are the facts. They are simple, and can be

understood by all. They leave a wide margin for individual experience to have its full scope.

While the Bible clearly recognizes a distinction between conversion and entire sanctification, as a matter of experience, it does not pretend to describe all the nice points of difference which exist. These are left to individual experience, by which they are more or less affected, proving true that word, "If any man will do His will" (or "willeth to do His will"—*R. V.*) "he shall know of the doctrine."

The following Scriptural illustrations of this doctrine must convince the candid reader that it is not without Divine authority.

Before and after Pentecost.

A careful examination of the spiritual state of the disciples before the Pentecost must convince the unprejudiced reader that, whatever else they may have possessed, they were not "purified from all filthiness of flesh and spirit." The baptism of the Holy Ghost wrought wonderful changes in them. That they were Christians, notwithstanding their imperfections, is evident from several considerations.

1. They had been chosen out of the world.

Christ announces the fact that they were not of the world, even as He was not of the world. It was because of this choice, already consummated, that the world hated them.

2. *They had become preachers of the Word.*

"They went out and preached that men should repent." "When I sent you out," inquires the Master, "without purse and scrip, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing." "Go thou and preach the kingdom of God," was the commission to which they responded.

Does any one suppose that Christ would have chosen and sent men out to preach who had not been converted? They could not have preached "repentance" properly had they not repented.

3. *They had received a measure of the Spirit.*

Jesus "breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The Holy Ghost had not yet been given in His fulness. They had not been filled with the Holy Ghost, but He had come to them, in a measure, from the breath of Jesus.

4. *They had been cleansed, at least, in part.*

"Now," says Jesus, "ye are clean, through the word which I have spoken unto you." There are many things in their lives which go to show that this cleansing, though real, was not complete.

5. *They had become members of the family of God.*

When great power attended their word, and demons departed at their bidding, and they reported their wonderful success to the Master, He said: "Rejoice not that the devils are subject to you through My name, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven." "That your names are written;" indi-

cating that the work was done. They were already registered in the family record on high.

These facts, with many others which might be mentioned, must convince all candid minds that the disciples were the children of God, the friends of Jesus, the commissioned heralds of the Gospel of our salvation, with the Spirit in their hearts, and the love of Jesus cheering them in their work. And yet, with all these facts before them, some will have it that the disciples were not converted before the Pentecost. But this idea does not prevail, we are glad to say, to any considerable extent. There are also the clearest proofs that whilst the disciples were Christians, they were not fully sanctified before the Pentecost. As conclusive evidence of this, we note several facts in their history:—

1. *Christ chides them for their unbelief.*

To Peter He said, "Wherefore didst thou doubt?" (Matt. xiv. 31.) Between the resurrection and the Pentecost, doubt was added to doubt. Thomas said, "I will not believe, unless," etc. Others had quite given up, exclaiming, "We trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel." Christ says, "O slow of heart to believe," etc. He "upbraided them because of their unbelief," and even "hardness of heart."

Such manifest unbelief as this cannot be consonant with purity of heart. Unbelief is sin, and entire sanctification, if it does anything, expels this fiend from the heart. Nothing of this was witnessed after

the Pentecost. The fires of that day consumed the last vestige of doubt.

2. *Christ reproves them for their wordly, secular spirit.*

Up to the Pentecost they were, to some extent, place-seekers. "Who should be the greatest?" who should "sit on the right hand" and who "on the left?" were questions which more than once called forth the sharpest reproof from the Master.

3. *He reprimands them for their spirit of retaliation.*

Upon the Samaritans they would call down the consuming fire, giving evidence that they knew not what spirit possessed them. One of them would smite with the sword, to the cutting off the right ear of a servant of the high priest, only to receive a rebuke from Him whose kingdom is not of this world, and does not need to be established by carnal weapons.

4. *Christ prays for their sanctification, and for their oneness with Him and His Father.*

That prayer was answered on the day of Pentecost, when they were "all filled with the Holy Ghost."

That the Pentecost secured to them purity of heart, there is the clearest evidence.

At the Council in Jerusalem (Acts xv. 8, 9), Peter, in giving an account of his visit to Cornelius, and the work of God upon the hearts of the company assembled, says: "And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy

Ghost, even as He did unto us ; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." Two facts are here stated :—

(1.) Whatever was imparted to the disciples at Pentecost, was imparted to Cornelius: "Giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us." This must refer to Pentecost. The Holy Ghost fell on both companies alike—not in outward symbolism, but in essential power and effect.

(2.) The work wrought was the "purifying their hearts by faith." "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." If Cornelius' heart was "purified by faith," then the apostles received the same blessing at Pentecost, for God put no difference between them. This fixes the character of the work at Pentecost—the purification of the heart by faith.

We are aware of an objection to this reasoning. It is said that our argument proves too much ; it proves either that Cornelius was a Christian before Peter visited him, or that purity of heart takes place at conversion.

There are many, to us, unanswerable arguments in favour of the idea that Cornelius was a servant of God, a believer, before Peter visited him. Take the following facts :—

(1.) *Cornelius was a devout man* (Acts x. 2). The meaning of the word *eusebes*, is *pious, reverent, devout, religious*.—*Robinson*. The same word occurs in 2 Peter ii. 9 : "The Lord knoweth how to deliver

the *godly* out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." This term fixes the character of Cornelius. He must have been a justified man.

(2.) *He was one that feared God.*

The wicked have "no fear of God before their eyes." To fear God is to depart from evil. The members of the early Church "walked in the fear of the Lord," and following this was the "comfort of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ix. 31). Paul exhorts the Hebrews, "Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and *godly fear*" (Heb. xii. 28). Such was the spirit of Cornelius.

(3.) *He gave much alms to the people.*

Works are not recognized in the Scriptures as good and acceptable to God, which do not spring from faith. That these works were the fruit of faith seems clear from the fact that

(4.) *He prayed to God alway.*

"He that cometh to God," in the manner here described, "must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of such as diligently seek Him."

(5.) *The prayers and alms of this good man "came up for a memorial before God."*

Did ever the prayers of an unbeliever thus come up before God? Cornelius was accepted, not because of his prayers and alms, but because he believed God. He was a believer in the same sense that Zacharias and Elisabeth, Simeon and Anna, were believers.

(6.) *God assured him that his prayer was heard.*

He had, no doubt, been praying about the Messiah, and his prayer being answered, he had become a believer. He was familiar with the Jews and their religion, and had, without doubt, heard of Jesus. In fact Peter addresses him and his company as if they were perfectly familiar with John's baptism, and with Jesus of Nazareth.

(7.) *Cornelius is called "a just man."*

The same is said of Abel, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Simeon, Joseph, John the Baptist, and Joseph of Arimathea. Shall all these be regarded as saints, and Cornelius alone be cast out?

We are glad to be sustained in these views by so able and orthodox a writer as Rev. Israel Chamberlayne, D.D. In his work entitled *Saving Faith*, he says:—"The striking case of Cornelius stands in Acts x. ; in which we have the *character* of the man, and God's gracious *acceptance* of him. . . . Inwardly and towards God, his was a life of *earnest piety* ; he 'feared God,' and—with *fasting*—'prayed to God always.' Outwardly and towards men, it was marked by a sacred regard for the rights of person, property, and character ; for, fearing God, he wrought '*righteousness*.' And it was a life of diffusive *benevolence*: he 'gave much alms to the people.'"

God's gracious *acceptance* of him is variously attested:—

By the *angel*: "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God."

By *vision and voice* from heaven: "What God hath cleansed," etc.

By Peter—that voice still in his ears—when he "opened his mouth" to preach the Gospel, by saying, "Of a truth I perceive," by God's signal acceptance of this upright Gentile, "that in every nation," Gentile, Jewish, or Christian, "he that," like him, "feareth God and worketh righteousness, is," in like manner, "accepted of Him."

By *God Himself*; for "while Peter was yet speaking these words," God added His own indubitable attestation to their truth—"the Holy Ghost fell"—upon Cornelius and the whole assembly.

"While such is the effect of the above testimony on the issue before us, it also establishes this:—That it is the law of the government of the blessed God—a law of universal application—*now* to accept, for Christ's sake, all who *now* heartily believe and sincerely obey, according to the light they have, as in the case of Cornelius; the *time* and *manner* of making them *acquainted* with His acceptance of them being 'left in His own power.'"

Speaking of the Church of the living God, he says:—"Its every real member, whether a God-fearing Gentile, like Cornelius, a devout Jew, like John the Baptist, or a hesitating Christian, like Thomas of the Twelve—each is His, and therefore a *living member*" (pp. 33, 34, 35, 39).

Such a believer as Cornelius was in the best possible state to receive purity of heart. It must be

admitted that the objection, that Cornelius was not a believer, and consequently was not justified before God, is without reason.

Our argument is, that the disciples at Pentecost, as well as Cornelius at Cæsarea, were made partakers of heart-purity.

Before Pentecost they had great fear, which perfect love should have cast out, had they possessed it; but after the Pentecost they had no fear. Ruler and rabble, mob and Satan, had no power to stay their faith in the crucified.

The outward manifestation—the miraculous gift of tongues—was but the symbol of a mightier work within. They did not then shout, says Mr. Fletcher, “Then hath God given unto the Gentiles power to speak Arabic,” but “Then hath God granted the gift of the Holy Ghost, according to the fulness of the Christian dispensation.”

Mr. Fletcher contends that an uncommon degree of sanctifying grace was then imparted; that the gift of tongues was merely an appendage, and by no means an essential part of the baptism. He says:—“That this dispensation of the Holy Ghost, this coming of Christ’s spiritual kingdom with power, is attended with an uncommon degree of sanctifying grace, is acknowledged by all; and that the gift of tongues, etc., which at first on some occasions, and in some persons, accompanied the baptism of the Spirit, for a sign to the bigoted Jews, or to stupid heathens; that such a gift, I say, was a temporary appendage,

and by no means an essential part of Christ's spiritual baptism, is evident from the merely spiritual effects which the receiving of the Holy Ghost had upon the penitent Jews, who, being 'born of water and the Spirit,' pressed after the apostles into the kingdom on the day of Pentecost. It is very remarkable that, although three thousand converts 'received the gift of the Holy Ghost' on the memorable day in which Christ opened the dispensation of His Spirit, no mention is made of so much as one of them working a single miracle or speaking with one new tongue. But the greatest and most beneficial of miracles was wrought upon them all; for 'all that believed,' says St. Luke, 'were together, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, breaking bread from house to house, eating their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people,' by their humble, affectionate, angelical behaviour. Or, as the same historian expresses it (Acts iv. 32), 'The multitude of them that believed'—spoke Greek and Latin? No; but—'were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common;' having been made perfect in one, agreeably to our Lord's deep prayer, recorded by St. John: 'Neither pray I for these (My disciples) alone, but for them also who shall believe on Me through their word, that they all may be one; I in them (by My Spirit), and Thou in Me, that they may

may be made perfect in one.'"—*Works*, vol. i, pp. 593, 594.

Rev. Richard Watson regarded the Pentecostal baptism, not a miraculous gift of tongues merely, but the purification of the heart, and the filling it with the Holy Ghost. Speaking of the manifestations of God to man, he says:—"The first grand administration of Him was after Christ ascended and went within the veil, and then poured out from heaven that glorious and visible influence which was made manifest on the day of Pentecost. But then we should greatly narrow our view of the subject if we confined the effects of these operations of the Holy Spirit merely to His miraculous gifts. That which the apostles received in addition was infinitely more valuable than these gifts, however important they were to the success of their public ministry. The visible tongues of fire were only emblems of what had passed within. It was, indeed, a baptism of fire to them. What new creatures did they now become! They were raised from earthliness to spirituality. Their gross conceptions of the kingdom of Christ were purged away. The bright flame irradiated their dim eyes to perceive the true and full meaning of the sacred Scriptures, kindled the ardour of an unquenchable love to Christ, and transformed them into bright reflections of His own purity. They came together the sincere, but timid and partially enlightened followers of Christ; and they departed full of light, and power, and love. . . .

Christ now baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire. There is to be a constant, though secret, Pentecost, as to every Christian. The sacred baptisms are inexhaustible to all who fix their faith and hope in the office and power of Christ to administer them, and the gracious condescensions and readiness of the Spirit to be thus administered. He that thus comes to God shall receive this mighty influence; it is our fault that we do not live in a richer experience of it.

“Yes, brethren, the celestial gift is yours. You are called to receive the heavenly element which spreads an intensity of spiritual life through the understanding and conscience; kindles and feeds the secret fire of devotion; converts, like the warmth of summer, the dark and sterile soul into life, and verdure, and fruitfulness; animates every affection; invigorates for every service; gives vital pulses to the courage, and strengthens in all its conflicts; *nor terminates its sacred operations till it has purged from the heart of man all its stains of sin, all its debasing alloy of earthliness, and rendered it to God, meet for high fellowship and intercourse with Him for ever and ever.*”—*Sermons*, vol. ii., pp. 363, 364.)

Rev. W. Arthur says:—“The apostles had doubtless received the Spirit in some measure before the day of Pentecost; for our Lord had breathed upon them immediately after His resurrection, and said, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’ Yet in the time which intervened between that and Pentecost, whatever

might have been the advancement of their spiritual condition beyond what it was before, it rested far behind that which immediately followed upon the baptism of fire. It was only then that they were '*filled* with the Holy Ghost.' We find, however, that even the expression, '*be filled*,' is applied broadly to ordinary believers; and that, too, not merely as describing the actual enjoyment of some individuals, but a precept applicable to all: 'Be not drunken with wine, wherein is excess, but be *filled with the Spirit*.' Whatever is meant by being *filled* with the Holy Ghost is, by these plain words, laid upon us as our duty."—*Tongue of Fire*, p. 46.

CHAPTER X.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION,
SCRIPTURAL.*The Corinthian Church.*

THE apostolic counsel to this Church settles the question involved in this controversy, if it can be settled by the Word of God.

A recent writer says of this Church:—"Paul declares that he wrote to the Church at Corinth *with anguish of heart and many tears*, to rebuke them for their many open sins against God. He calls them carnal, and tells them the reason why. There were *envy, strife, and divisions among them*. Having fallen into open sin, their spiritual state was far below the privileges of those who are born of God."—*Birthright, etc.*, p. 74.

The natural inference from this statement is, that the Corinthian Church were not born again, and consequently were not entitled to be known or recognised as Christians at all. Let us examine, candidly, the apostle's treatment of this Church, and see if he regarded them in the same light.

1. These epistles were addressed to the *whole Church*. The apostle addresses himself "unto the Church of God which is at Corinth;" not to a class of persons "far below those who are born of God."

“To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus;” *i.e.*, separated to God, but not “*wholly* sanctified.”

2. Addressing the whole body of believers, he says: “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” Here “the Church of God,”—“all” of them, are addressed as “brethren,” which would hardly be suitable to a class of persons who were not even “born of God;” and to exhort such persons to “be perfectly joined together in the same mind,” would not be in keeping with the apostle’s purpose, if that purpose was to call them back from entire apostacy, which must have been their state if they were not “born of God.”

There is not the most distant intimation that the apostle was addressing a class of Church members, so far backslidden as to have lost their justification. It is only necessary to note the words of commendation bestowed upon this Church by the apostle, to make this clear.

1. He says: “I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ.” These are not words to be addressed to persons who are “far below the privileges of those who are born of God.” He does not address them as persons who had been converted and had backslidden, but thanks God “for the grace of God which *is given*” them.

2. He farther says: "In every thing ye are enriched in Him!" and "the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you;" and "ye are in Christ." Can these things be affirmed of backsliders, or those who are not "born of God?" He further declares that they had "received the Spirit which is of God." Wherever this Spirit is received, it "witnesseth with our spirit that we are the children of God." A Church of which these things could be affirmed must be a true Church.

3. Another significant fact here stated is, that the members of this "Church of God" were "babes in Christ." To be "in Christ," is to be "a new creature." To be a "babe in Christ" is to be a "child of God;" "and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ." Can such persons be other than Christians?

Now, what were the "open sins" of this Church which the apostle condemned? Were they evils uncommon among ordinary Church members of that day, or even of these times?

It is alleged that some of those to whom Paul wrote were guilty of the worse type of sin—that of a man having his father's wife (1 Cor. v. 1). But whoever reads this epistle carefully, will observe that the apostle does not address these wicked persons; but he exhorts the "Church of God," as "dearly beloved brethren," to put away from them these persons, lest they be found guilty of keeping company with such offenders, and become contami-

nated by their influence. These counsels and exhortations were not addressed to this class of sinners, but to the Church, setting forth her duty in regard to such; making a marked distinction between the "dearly beloved brethren" addressed, and the wicked persons who were to be put away.

But what were the faults of this Church? Much the same as those we find in nearly every Church in the land.

1. They had not conquered their *selfishness*. They entertained and freely expressed their likes and dislikes of their ministers. Such free expressions were, at times, evidently unbecoming, and to a pure mind gave evidence of an unsanctified heart. But it was only what is repeated in these times in nearly all our Churches. One saith, "I am of Paul," another, "I am of Apollos," and another, "I am of Cephas." They seemed quite unwilling to cordially receive their ministers, and at times not a little "strife" arose on account of it.

But suppose that every Church or Church member who should freely express their likes and dislikes, as is here indicated, should be set down as backslidden, and far below those who are born of God. Would not the imputation be regarded as harsh and uncharitable? And yet this is one of the chief sins of this Church. The apostle does charge that such conduct gives evidence of depravity or carnality; but he does not intimate that they were not the children of God, but affirms, on the contrary, that

they were "babes in Christ." In this respect they did much the same as men of the world do when they wish to carry their point.

Who has not seen "strife,"—sometimes even "envy," not to say "divisions," in Churches, growing out of the "calling" and "dismission" of ministers? But who ever thought of turning all these Churches over to Satan, as though they had "blasphemed," or representing them as "far below those who are born of God?"

2. This Church gave evidence of being unsanctified, in that its members were "still carnal."

Just what is meant by "carnal," in this connection, may not be so clear. But that it does not refer to that carnality which characterizes the unconverted sinner, in its broadest and most unrestricted sense, is very clear. The apostle represents that "babes in Christ" and "carnal," are the same. Not that it is the same thing, but that "carnality" belongs to a "babe in Christ." If they are no farther advanced than *childhood*, they are still, to a certain extent, "carnal;" depravity is not all removed.

The apostle says: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ." They were, like children, irritable, fretful, petulant—marked evidences of an unsanctified nature. This the apostle calls "carnal;" and so far as it existed, it gave evidence that the old man had not been "cast out and spoiled of his goods."

The evils which are found in this Corinthian

Church are just such as we find in every unsanctified Church the world over. For all such carnality the apostle proposes this all-potent remedy: "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. vii. 1).

This text proves, beyond all successful controversy, that there may be "babes in Christ," and "dearly beloved brethren," who are not cleansed from all moral defilement—that they are not perfectly holy, but may be made pure.

The members of this Church, though acknowledged to be Christians, were not cleansed; they were to some extent "carnal and walked as men." And yet they were earnestly pressed to seek the cleansing provided for them, and thus "perfect holiness in the fear of God."

The writer last named seeks to break the force of this text by arguments, in our judgment, the most fallacious. He insists that the apostle is not referring to the actual condition of the Corinthians when he urges them to "cleanse themselves," etc., for then would "Paul include himself in this very exhortation;" "*let us cleanse ourselves, etc.*" "Does *Paul the aged*, now in the twenty-sixth year of his ministry, and only six years before his martyrdom, confess that he himself is not yet cleansed from the things of which he warns others?"—*Birthright*, p. 77.

No one knows better than this writer that it is not only a common mode of address among teachers to include themselves with their hearers, but that is very common in the epistles. James says: "In many things *we* offend all." Did he mean to say this of himself, or of those whom he addressed?

"*We* put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us." Does James mean to say that he was a *horse-breaker*? or did he speak of or to those who practised these things?

"So is the tongue among *our* members." Does he mean to have it understood that his tongue is "set on fire of hell?" or did he mean to say that it was true of unregenerate men?

"Therewith curse *we* men." Was it true that James did this cursing, or was it the practice of sinners? No man, without having some special theory to sustain, could imagine that the apostle intended to include himself in these references.

The same writer says: "Paul's *babes in Christ* must not be confounded with John's *little children*. John's epithet is one of endearment, Paul's is a term of reproach."

That "babes in Christ" is a term of reproach, we do not believe. The term means, "*an infant, child, babe.*"—*Robinson*.

In 1 Cor. xiii. 11, the word occurs, "when I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things." Was it any "*reproach*" to

be a child, before he became a man? It is true that they were children when they should have been maturing into manhood; but the term is not necessarily one of reproach, for all must be babes before they are men. And here is seen the need of their entire sanctification.

The view which we have taken of the character of this Church is in exact accord with Mr. Wesley. He says:—"When St. Paul writes to the believers at Corinth, to those who were *sanctified* in Christ Jesus, he says: 'I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. Ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife, are ye not carnal?' Now here the apostle speaks unto those who were unquestionably believers,—whom in the same breath he styles his brethren in Christ,—as being still in a measure carnal. He affirms there was envying (an evil temper), occasioning strife among them, and yet does not give the least intimation that they had lost their faith. Nay, he manifestly declares they had not; for then they would not be babes in Christ. And, what is most remarkable of all, he speaks of being carnal, and babes in Christ, as one and the same thing; plainly showing that every believer is, in a degree, carnal, while he is only a babe in Christ."—*Works*, vol. i., pp. 109, 110.

The Thessalonian Believers.

Of all the Churches addressed by the apostle, so

far as we have any information, this is the most faultless. He makes no complaints, prefers no charges against them, but commends them for their devotion to God. Their "work of faith and labour of love, and patience of hope," are occasions of devout and continued thankfulness to God. They had received the Gospel, not in word only, but "in power and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance." They had become followers of the apostles and of the Lord, and although they had received the Word in much affliction, they had received it "with joy of the Holy Ghost." They were "ensamples of all that believed," and from them the Word of God sounded out in every place, and their faith was spread abroad. They had "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God." And in this delightful state they were waiting "for the Son of Man from heaven." With all these evidences of a sound conversion, the apostle prayed "exceedingly," that he might see them, and that he might "perfect that which was lacking in their faith," which lack was "unblamable holiness" (1 Thess. iii. 10—13).

In the 5th chapter of this epistle is a prayer for this devout Church: "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and I pray God that your whole soul and body and spirit be preserved blameless," etc. They are assured that God is able to do it, and "will do it."

The original word rendered *wholly*, as we have before remarked, is one of remarkable strength—none

stronger in any language. It is from *olos* which signifies *all*, and *telos* which signifies *perfection*. It means, "The very God of peace Himself sanctify you entirely, or in all respects to perfection. And may your whole person—the spirit, and the soul, and the body, be preserved blameless."

The Thessalonians were assured that they could be wholly sanctified, and could be preserved blameless in all their moral activities. This is set before them as a blessing, not yet received, but within the grasp of simple faith.

The objection urged to this view of the text is that the apostle prays, not that each shall be sanctified wholly, but that all of them shall be sanctified. The objector would read the text thus: "The very God of peace sanctify all of you;" making it apply to the Church as a whole, and not to the extent of the work in each individual heart. In order to give the full sense of the word *wholly*, the objector should add to *all of you*, the other sense, *perfectly*, which he must admit exists. Then his *all of you* would make nothing against our view, as what belongs to one belongs to *all*, viz., perfection.

Then the conclusion of the verse must for ever overthrow the objector's view. The whole spirit and soul and body is to be preserved blameless, etc. The whole man being thus preserved, shows that the apostle had in view a personal sanctification. This proves that even converted people need to be "wholly sanctified," and may be, for the "very God

of peace" is faithful, and "will do it." Partial sanctification is the state of all believers who are only born again, but not "made perfect in love."

The dogma, so earnestly pressed by some, that the work of heart-purity is complete in conversion, does not harmonize with the prayer of the apostle. He prays for a people whom he regarded as sanctified, but not *wholly* sanctified. He believed, however, that God, the God of peace, could do even this for them, and for this grace he earnestly prays.

Notwithstanding the clearness with which this truth is taught, there are to be found those who make objections to it. To these we call the reader's attention in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XI.

HOLINESS SUBSEQUENT TO CONVERSION,
SCRIPTURAL.*Objections to the Doctrine.*

“THE distinction which is made in the Scriptures between the two, justification and entire sanctification, is regarded so obvious and incontrovertible by most writers, that it has naturally passed as an established truth into treatises on theology. It is also recognized almost constantly in sermons and in religious exhortations and conversation. There is, perhaps, as much unanimity among religious men on this subject as on almost any subject of theological inquiry. And the attempt to confound justification and sanctification, which has been made from time to time, would necessarily tend, if it were successful, to perplex and confuse the established forms of speech among men, as well as the authorized and Scriptural modes of religious thought.”—*Interior Life*, p. 174.

1. *It is objected that this doctrine represents God as doing His work imperfectly.*

The sinner, it is claimed, when seeking God, asks to be saved; and if God does not, in answer to his prayer, fully save him, He does His work imperfectly. And if He does save him fully, a second work is not

only unnecessary, but unscriptural. This is a very plausible objection, but unsound.

That God does His work perfectly, there can be no doubt. But what is a perfect work of God in justification? God's work is always in harmony with man's faith. Whatever the intelligence perceives as the need of the soul, and faith humbly grasps, God bestows.

What is the chief, the all-pervading desire of the sinner? Is it that his heart may be made pure? What does he know or believe about a clean heart? He is under sentence of death, and condemnation rests heavily upon his soul. He is guilty and must have pardon. An offended God is seen all around him, and he pleads for reconciliation. His cry is not "*Cleanse,*" but "*Forgive!*" "God be merciful to me a sinner." "Turn away Thine anger from me." He sees nothing beyond this. Every other thought is swallowed up in this one—"I must be reconciled to my offended God."

This is the prayer of the penitent which God hears and answers. The culprit is forgiven, fully forgiven for Christ's sake; and a new life springs up in his soul; and he finds himself joyfully repeating, "Though Thou wast angry with me, Thine anger is turned away, and Thou comfortest me." He sings,

"My God is reconciled ;
 His pardoning voice I hear :
 He owns me for His child ;
 I can no longer fear :
 With confidence I now draw nigh,
 And Father, Abba, Father, cry."

He receives according to his faith. He knows little of the deep depravity of his heart, and it is well he does not at first, for such a discovery would paralyse his faith and quite extinguish his hope.

Sin has a two-fold character, or exists in the soul after two modes or forms. The one is called *actual sin*, from which comes our guilt. The other is *original* or *birth sin*, from which comes original depravity. We are guilty for what we *do*; but we were depraved before we were responsible for our doing. Guilt and condemnation come of what we do, while depravity lies back of our doing, in original sin.

The existence of original and actual sin has always been accepted by the Christian Church as a Scriptural doctrine.

Salvation has a two-fold character, or is applied in two forms. For guilt there is forgiveness; for pollution there is cleansing. Forgiveness can only extend to actual transgression, and never to original depravity. We can only be forgiven for what we have done. We were not responsible for original depravity.

Original depravity must be removed, and as it cannot be forgiven, it must be cleansed. This is in perfect harmony with the Scriptures. "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." "Our sins," must be understood as sins which we have committed, which have brought guilt upon the soul, and must be forgiven. "All unrighteousness,"

or the absence of holiness, must be understood as depravity, which is not reached by forgiveness, but must be cleansed from the soul.

Here is the need for the two works—forgiveness and cleansing. When the soul is converted, all *its* sins—the sin it has committed, are taken away. There is nothing left of what *we* have done. The forgiveness has extended to “all things,” and the new life is a “new creation.” “Old things,” all that we have done, “have passed away, and all things are become new,” and we are placed in the same relation to God which we should have sustained had we never sinned. In conversion God does what He undertakes to do—places us back where we were before we committed sin. Such an act does not necessarily touch original depravity, as we should have needed cleansing from that if we had never been guilty of personal transgression; as that was upon us before we began to commit sin.

In this view of the subject, we see the great and mighty work wrought in conversion—a work, complete, and in no respect imperfect in itself; and at the same time we see the need of a further work, which shall remove original depravity, which work is accomplished by “cleansing us from all unrighteousness.”

These views are common, and in harmony with the best minds of the Church.

Bishop Foster says:—“Believers are not, by virtue of the new birth, entirely free from sin, either as it

respects the inward taint or outward occasional act."

"I need scarcely insist upon this, it is so universally the faith of the Church."

"But it is asked with earnestness, Is not the work of God perfect in regeneration? If you mean, Is not the soul regenerated? we answer, Certainly it is; but if you mean, Is it not therefore perfectly holy? we must answer, It does not so seem to us. Both penitence and regeneration are parts of entire sanctification, but they are not the whole. But is not a person regenerated a perfect child, and is sanctification anything more than development? When a soul is regenerated, all the elements of holiness are imparted to it, or the graces are implanted in it, in complete number, and the perfection of these graces is entire sanctification; and hence, we insist that entire sanctification does not take place in regeneration, for the graces are not perfect. And again; though in regeneration all the elements of holiness are imparted, all the rudiments of inbred sin are not destroyed; and hence, again, the absence of complete sanctification, which, when it occurs, expels all sin." *Christian Purity*, pp. 107, 108, 109.

"It is not the first cry of the sinner," says Dr. Upham, "that he may be sanctified, but that he may be forgiven. It is his past sins which stare him in the face. It is his past sins which must be washed away. And until this is done, and at the feet of Jesus he has received the remission of his transgressions, he has no other desire, no other thought.

But when he has experienced a release from the bitter memory of the past, and has felt the rising hope of forgiveness, and not till then, is his mind occupied with the distinct subject of the reality, the obligation, and the blessedness of a holy heart in all time to come."—*Interior Life*, p. 171.

"The awakened sinner," says Rev. L. Lee, "has his mind mainly directed to the guilt of his sin, and his inability to save himself without God; and he cries to God for pardon and a new heart. Faith is limited by the view his intelligence takes of his necessity; and the work wrought, and the blessing obtained, are in accordance to the faith exercised. With most persons it may be presumed that their view of the whole subject, at the time of their conversion, may be expressed in these words: 'I am a sinner lost; Christ is a Saviour who died to save me, able and willing to save now. Lord, for Christ's sake, save me this moment.' Subsequently, the necessity of a deeper work is seen and felt. At any time when the intelligence comprehends what is wanting to constitute a state of entire sanctification, and faith is exercised, the work will be finished."—*Theology*, p. 214.

If regeneration and entire sanctification are always wrought at the same time, what disposition is to be made of the tens of thousands in the Church who profess to be justified freely, but are conscious of not being sanctified wholly? They are among the most active and worthy members of our Churches. If the

doctrine which we oppose be true, these are all children of the wicked one. We could not consent thus to curse whom God owns and blesses; but we should be obliged to do so if we believed this dogma.

“There are multitudes in all the Christian Churches,” says Dr. Geo. Peck, “who exhibit the fruits and have the inward testimony of a state of justification, but who do not enjoy the great blessing of perfect love. What shall we say of those upon the hypothesis here opposed? We must, so far as I can see, come to one of the following conclusions concerning them:—Either they were never really justified; or they have lost their entire sanctification without losing their justification; or they have lost both one and the other, and are, consequently, in a backslidden state.

“Can we, consistently with charity, come to the first conclusion, viz., that all those Christians who are conscious of the absence of entire sanctification, or perfect love, in question, were never really born of the Spirit, or justified? Perhaps none would, for a moment, embrace such a conclusion. And will any who hold the identity of the new birth and entire sanctification fall upon the second supposition, viz., that these persons have lost the blessing of perfect love, and yet retain that of regeneration? This conclusion seems incongruous and even absurd. For if these two things are identical, how can they be separate? If there is any reason which goes to identify regeneration and entire sanctification in

their commencement, does not the same reason identify them in their progress? If they are one and the same, how can they be separated under any circumstances or at any time?

Well, who will embrace the third supposition, viz., that all who were ever justified, and do not now enjoy the blessing of entire sanctification, have fallen away from the favour of God? I think few will hazard such a conclusion as this. The result, then, to which I come, is, that the theory which asserts that entire sanctification invariably takes place when justification and regeneration take place, is inconsistent with fact and experience."—*Christian Perfection*, p. 366.

We think we have shown that to reject the doctrine that regeneration and entire sanctification are experienced at one and the same time is not to represent God as doing his work imperfectly. The absurdity of the dogma is of itself sufficient to convince every candid mind that it has no foundation in truth.

2. Another objection urged against the doctrine of entire sanctification is, that its presentation as a distinct work is calculated to disparage justification.

We are not able to see how the faithful presentation of entire sanctification disparages justification, any more than a faithful presentation of justification disparages sanctification. They are both of God, and are great Bible truths, and attested by experience.

Does the teacher disparage his mathematical axioms in urging the student to leave them and proceed to his demonstrations? Does he disparage the alphabet, by urging the pupil to leave it and proceed to combine letters into syllables, and syllables into words, and words into sentences, and sentences into discourses? Does the architect disparage his foundation by leaving it to erect a beautiful superstructure thereon?

It is no disparagement to the alphabet that the finished discourse is more highly prized than the letters of which it is composed. Still, without the letters, there could have been no discourse. The axioms are not disparaged because the demonstrations are regarded with greater interest; especially it is understood that no such results could be reached without their aid. It is no disparagement of a foundation that the superstructure derives its permanency from the foundation on which it rests.

In like manner, it is no disparagement of justification that entire sanctification occupies an advanced position in Christian experience which God never assigned to justification. Sanctification completes what justification so gloriously begins, as the superstructure completes what was so well begun with the foundation.

To cease presenting the subject of sanctification, fearing that justification might suffer thereby, is much like stopping with the foundation, fearing that it might be disparaged by a beautiful superstructure.

We believe that justification is glorious, but we believe that entire sanctification excels in glory. The one is the foundation, the other is the top-stone.

Mr. Wesley did not believe that justification would suffer by urging the people to the experience of sanctification. He urged his preachers and members to seek it, profess it, and urge it upon the people. In writing to one of his preachers, he says:—"Dear Brother,—Where Christian perfection is not strongly and explicitly preached, there is seldom any remarkable blessing from God, and consequently little addition to the society, and little life in the members of it. Therefore, if Jacob Rowell is grown faint, and says but little about it, do *you* supply his lack of service. Speak, and spare not. Let not regard for any man induce you to betray the truth of God. Till you press the believers to expect full salvation *now*, you must not look for any revival."—*Works*, vol. vi., p. 761.

The General Conference of 1832, in the Pastoral Address, held similar views. They say:—"Is it not time for us, in this matter at least, to return to first principles? Is it not time that we throw off the reproach of inconsistency with which we are charged in regard to this matter? Only let all who have been born of the Spirit, and have tasted of the good Word of God, seek with the same ardour to be made perfect in love as they sought for the pardon of their sins, and soon will our class-meetings and love-feasts be cheered by the relation of experiences

of this high character, as they now are with those which tell of justification and the new birth. And when this shall come to be the case, we may expect a corresponding increase in the amount of our Christian enjoyments, and in the force of the religious influence we shall exert over others.”—*Journals.*

There is no disparagement of justification here; no fear expressed that it would be underrated; but an urgent appeal to all to go on unto the actual possession of this experience, and then proclaim it to the glory of God and the salvation of men.

CHAPTER XII.

HOLINESS—WHEN ATTAINED.

IF we are required to “go on unto perfection,” to “purify ourselves even as He is pure,” to “cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit,” when may we look to have the work accomplished? How long subsequent to conversion may we expect to be sanctified wholly? There are differences of opinion on this subject.

There is substantial agreement among the friends and opponents of holiness on several points. Dr. Hovey, in his *Doctrine of the Higher Life*, submits the following points of agreement:—

“1. The piety of many persons who must be esteemed Christians is mournfully defective. Their faith in the promise of God is weak, their hope of eternal life faint, and their love to the souls of men inoperative. They make no visible progress in the Divine life. They give no evidence, by word or deed, that ‘the joy of the Lord is their strength,’ and that the kingdom of God, as known by them, ‘is righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.’ After years of connection with the Church, they remain babes in Christ, having little more strength than when they tasted the good Word of God and the powers of the world to come.

“2. This course of thought anticipates a *second* point of agreement; namely, that the experience of Christians, immediately after conversion, is not the highest which they should expect in this life. However sweet and joyous it may be, this experience is the sparkling brook rather than the mighty river; and every affluent from the hills of Providence on the one hand, or of grace on the other, should increase its volume and power. The work of renewal is only begun, not finished, by regeneration, yet many live as if they supposed the work of sanctification to be carried as far, at the moment of the new birth, as it will ever be carried on the shores of time. Such a view, it is almost needless to repeat, has no support in the Word of God, and no analogy in the constitution and course of nature. It cannot, therefore, be depreciated and opposed too heartily.

“3. A *third* point of agreement may be found in the belief that sanctification is wrought by the Spirit of God. Turning away, then, from the question of means and modes, it is important to observe that those who accept the doctrine of ‘the higher life’ agree with those who reject it, in ascribing the work of sanctification to the Holy Ghost.

“4. A *fourth* point of agreement may be discovered in the belief that sanctification is complete before the soul enters Paradise. No relish for evil, no selfish or sinful desire, will pollute the spirit when it bids adieu to the present state, and enters into rest.”—
Pp. 10—12.

With these points of agreement, acknowledged by an able opponent of the experience, we are led to inquire—When is this work, so important, and so much neglected, and so necessary to fit us for heaven, to be wrought? It must be done before death liberates the spirit, for there is no moral change beyond.

We are utterly unable to comprehend how God can save us a moment before death, and not be able to do it an hour, a day, a week, a month, a year, or many years before. It must be either that He is *unable* or *unwilling*. We are assured that “He is *able* to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him.” Here is clearly revealed the Divine ability to save from all sin. One would think that the object in revealing this stupendous fact would be to induce all to trust in Christ to thus save them. Is it true that His revealed power to save is unlimited, while His grace and love are limited? The apostle assures the Thessalonians that, “faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it.” The thing to be done was—“The very God of peace sanctify you wholly.” The term “wholly” has about the same sense as the term “uttermost.” Compounded of two words—*olos*, meaning *all*, and *telos*, meaning *perfection*. And that this is to be accomplished before death, and not at death, is proved from the declaration, “I pray God that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” They were **not**

only to be "sanctified wholly," but were to be preserved wholly sanctified until the coming of Jesus. How such language sweeps away the notion of death cleansing, or death salvation!

If God be both *able* and *trustworthy* to save us now, the reason why the work is not wrought is found in our personal neglect, or refusal to perform the condition—"believe on the Lord Jesus Christ."

It is admitted by many, that while it is possible for a soul to be sanctified wholly some time before death, it is nevertheless true that it is not an instantaneous work. It must be wrought by a gradual process.

1. *What is the voice of experience on this subject?*

The testimony of experience should go far in settling questions of experience. As God has nowhere said that a soul cannot be wholly sanctified instantaneously or immediately, but has rather urged all to seek, with the promise that "according to your faith, so shall it be unto you," an appeal to experience is in place. Has God thus wholly saved any soul?

Mr. Wesley, in the early part of his ministry, believed that entire sanctification was almost always a gradual work, to be received at, or near, death. He could not believe that a newly converted child of God, except in rare cases, could be fully saved until some time had elapsed. But so numerous were the examples of such a salvation, and so greatly did they multiply around him, the genuineness of whose experience he saw no reason to doubt, that he fully

accepted the doctrine of instantaneous sanctification—the privilege of believers at any time after conversion.

Hester Ann Rogers speaks of an interesting interview which she had with Mr. Wesley, following a most delightful love-feast at Macclesfield. She said: “Ah, sir, there are some who cannot receive all the testimonies that were borne last night; they think those who were justified only a few weeks or months ago, are deceived when they pretend to know anything of sanctification.”

“Well,” said Mr. Wesley, “but you and I do not limit God; and indeed the time has now come when a fuller dispensation of the Spirit is given than has ever been known before. Fifty years ago, and indeed before that time, there was *here* and *there* an instance of the power of God, but it was rarely the case. We seldom heard of instantaneous sanctification by faith. The Moravian brethren seemed, for a time, the most clear; but now there is no people in the world that speak so clear and distinct as the Methodists; and *we* now see more clearly than at first; there are more living witnesses of the power of God.”

Just at parting, Mr. Wesley said, “I never before saw the nature of instantaneous sanctification as I do now.”

In 1764, after an extensive revival of holiness, he writes to a friend as follows:—“Now, with God one day is as a thousand years. It plainly follows that

the quantity of time is nothing to Him; centuries, years, months, days, hours, and moments are exactly the same. Consequently, He can as well sanctify in a day after we are justified as a hundred years. There is no difference at all, unless we suppose Him to be such a one as ourselves. Accordingly, we see, in fact, that some of the most unquestionable witnesses of sanctifying grace were sanctified within a few days after they were justified. I have seldom known so devoted a soul as S—— H——, at Macclesfield, who was sanctified within nine days after she was convinced of sin. She was then twelve years old, and I believe was never afterwards heard to speak an improper word, or known to do an improper thing. Her look struck an awe into all that saw her.

“Although, therefore, it usually pleases God to interpose some time between justification and sanctification, yet we must not fancy this to be an invariable rule. All who think this must think we are sanctified by works, or, which comes to the same, by suffering; for, otherwise, what is time necessary for? It must be either to do, or to suffer. Whereas, if nothing be required but simple faith, a moment is as good as an age.

“The fact is, we are continually forming general rules from our own particular experience. Thus S—— H——, having gone about and about herself, which took up a considerable time, might very naturally suppose all who are sanctified must stay for it near as long a time as she did.”—*Works*, vol. vii., p. 14.

In the year 1770, he writes to one of the members of his society as follows:—"It is, therefore, undoubtedly our duty to pray and look for full salvation every day, every hour, every moment, without waiting till we have either done or suffered more. Why should not this be the accepted time?"—*Works*, vol. vii., p. 764.

In 1762 the flame of holiness broke out at Bolton. In speaking of those who were sanctified, Mr. Wesley says:—"Two of these were, I think, justified and sanctified in less than three days."

At Macclesfield he found forty who had professed heart-purity. Of these he says:—"I spoke to them (forty in all) one by one. Some of them said that they had received that blessing ten days, some seven, some four, some three days after they had found peace with God; and two of them the next day. What marvel, since one day is with God as a thousand years?"—*Works*, vol. iv., p. 135.

It has been insisted that Mr. Wesley taught both a *gradual* and *instantaneous* work. No passage is more commonly cited than the following:—"A man may be dying for a long time, yet he does not, properly speaking, die till the instant the soul is separated from the body; and in that instant he lives the life of eternity. In like manner, he may be dying to sin for some time, yet he is not dead to sin till sin is separated from his soul, and in that instant he lives the full life of love."—*Plain Account*, p. 80.

The meaning of Mr. Wesley is, not that entire

sanctification is gradual in some and instantaneous in others, but that it is instantaneous in all, even in those who approach it by gradual steps. If he did intend to convey the idea, at this time, that the work was gradual in all cases, he certainly subsequently changed his views.

The foregoing illustration was first published in 1758, some two years before the great revival of holiness began, such a revival as had never before attended the preaching of these holy men. Mr. Wesley says:—"In the years 1759, '60, '61, and '62, their numbers multiplied exceedingly, not only in London and Bristol, but in various parts of Ireland as well as England. Not trusting to the testimony of others, I carefully examined most of these myself; and in London alone I found six hundred and fifty-two members of our society, who were exceedingly clear in their experience, and of whose testimony I could see no reason to doubt. I believe no year has passed since that time wherein God has not wrought the same work in many others; but sometimes in one part of England or Ireland, sometimes in another;—as the wind bloweth where it listeth; and every one of these (after the most careful inquiry, I have not found one exception either in Great Britain or Ireland) has declared that his deliverance from sin was *instantaneous*; that the change was wrought in a moment. Had half of these, or one-third, or one in twenty, declared it was *gradually* wrought in *them*, I should have believed this with regard to

them, and thought that *some* were gradually sanctified, and some instantaneously. But as I have not found, in so long a space of time, a single person speaking thus, as all who believe they are sanctified declare with one voice that the change was wrought in a moment, I cannot but believe that sanctification is commonly, if not always, an instantaneous work."—Vol. ii., p. 223.

Whatever might have been the views of Mr. Wesley in 1758, when he employed the illustration referred to, there can be no doubt with regard to his views when he gave utterance to the foregoing sentiment. In the first case, it was both "gradual and instantaneous;" in the latter, it was "commonly, if not always, an instantaneous work." His mature views on this subject cannot be misunderstood. Experience, which was very widely extended during the great revival, from 1759 to 1763, did much to modify and correct his views on the subject.

"To expect it" (Christian perfection) "at death, or some time hence, is much the same as not expecting it at all."—Vol. iv., p. 138.

"Inquiring how it was that in all these parts we have scarce one living witness of it" (full salvation), "I constantly received, from every person, one and the same answer: 'We see now, we sought it by our works; we thought it was to come gradually; we never expected to receive it in a moment, by faith, as we did justification.' What wonder is it, then, that we have been fighting all these

years as one that beateth the air?"—*Journal*, May 25, 1761.

Here is a clear statement as to what were the views of the Methodists prior to 1760, and the reasons for those views, viz.: want of witnesses. There was only here and there a clear witness of full salvation, until the great revival commenced in 1759, and then they became so numerous that the question of instantaneous sanctification was no longer a doubtful one, but became the constant theme of Mr. Wesley and his followers.

2. *This experience is not exclusively Wesleyan.*

We could summon hundreds of men and women, from all the Evangelical Churches, who would testify with one voice, that the work, which they variously name—the "higher life," "rest of faith," "complete trust," etc.—was wrought in them instantaneously.

The late Dr. Upham's testimony was:—"There was no intellectual excitement, no very marked joy, when I reached this great rock of practical salvation. But I was distinctly conscious when I reached it."

Dr. Mahan, while in conversation with some friends, looking for deliverance from "the corruptions of his heart," says:—"While thus employed, my heart leaped up in ecstasy indescribable, with the exclamation, 'I have found it.'"

We need not multiply examples; we could fill many volumes with them. Such testimony, on a question of experience, must be accepted.

3. *Depravity can never be removed by growth in grace.*

It has been well said that "It does not belong, except in a very limited degree, to the laws of growth to correct malformations and deep-seated organic or vital irregularities. Growth is an increase or development of some living force; not a destroyer or transformer of any living force. A child with an organic disease may grow; but that will not cure the disease. A tree with a worm at the heart may grow. The worm may not prevent the tree from growing, nor does the growth of the tree either kill or remove the worm. So, no degree of spiritual growth can remove the fixed malformation, the deep-seated organic disease of sin, from the human heart. As in the former cases, there must be a special or specific remedy. So in this case there must be a special miracle of grace—the power of God, invoked by faith, for this particular end; consequently, instantaneously received."

Growth is but the accumulation of the same kind of particles of which the animal or plant was possessed at its beginning. Growth never changes a tree or animal into one of another kind. It never changes a horse into an ox, nor an eagle into a dove, nor a fox into a lamb, nor a crab-apple into a bell-flower. It makes the horse a larger horse, but he is a horse still; the eagle a larger eagle, but it is an eagle still; the fox a larger fox, but a fox still; and the crab-apple only becomes a larger crab-apple. In

like manner, a sinner does not grow out of sin into justification, nor out of justification into sanctification. As the river does not grow by simply running, but by the inflowing of other streams or rivers, so the growth of a believer does not consist in what is removed, but in what is added. Holiness is the gift of God.

You cannot grow sin out of your heart by the expansion of what is there. You may as well attempt to grow weeds out of your garden, or grow vermin from vegetation.

There is only one way to get rid of weeds, and that is to pull them up. The only way to remove sin is to seek by faith for the "blood of Jesus Christ, which cleanseth from all sin."

It is claimed that this view of entire sanctification undervalues the old-fashioned doctrine of growing in grace.

One writer affirms that "growth in grace for a time is an indispensable condition of entire sanctification." Persons who neglect this, it is said, "seem not to understand that praying for immediate and entire sanctification, before they have so grown in grace as to be able to abstain from all outward sin, is downright enthusiasm—expecting and praying for an end without using the appropriate means. I doubt if repentance is more necessary to justification than is a growth in grace to entire sanctification."

To assert that growth in grace is a condition of

sanctification, is the same as saying that entire sanctification is by works, a doctrine repudiated by all.

Dr. Hodge says of sanctification, that it is not a "mere process of moral culture by moral means ; it is as truly supernatural in its methods as in its nature."—*Systematic Theology*, vol. iii., p. 220.

Dr. George Smith, F.S.A., says (*Lectures on Theology*):—"As we obtained pardon by simple faith in Jesus, so must we obtain purity. We are no more able to work out the latter in our hearts than the former. We must come, then, to the great and precious promises, and exercise a faith precisely analogous to that by which we were justified."

Mr. Wesley says:—"Exactly as we are justified by faith, so are we sanctified by faith. Faith is the condition of sanctification, exactly as it is of justification. It is the condition: none are sanctified but he that believes; every one that believes is sanctified, whatever else he has or has not. In other words, no man is sanctified till he believes; every man when he believes is sanctified."—Vol. i., p. 388.

To say that we are not to pray for entire sanctification until we are "able to abstain from all outward sins," is to ignore the fact that our "outward sins" are but the cropping out of heart depravity, which entire sanctification can alone remove. One of the chief needs of entire sanctification is to root out heart corruption, which is ever leading us into sin. Does growth in grace save us from one class of sins, and faith in Christ's blood from another ?

It is frequently said, and with great propriety, that "growing *in* grace" is not growing *into* grace. To grow in grace we must first have the grace in which to grow. "Growing *into* grace is much like swimming *into* the water." We can understand how a person can swim *in* the water, but not how he can swim *into* it.

4. *No one has ever obtained the grace of heart-purity gradually.*

The very idea of *gradual*, removes from the whole process the *now*. Gradual does not mean now, and never can mean now. No gradualist can bring his faith to the now. Long and earnest have been the struggles for heart-purity on the gradual line, but no one has yet confessed to having attained unto the object of pursuit.

"I believe in a gradual work," said an aged servant of the Lord, as he arose and testified in a meeting for holiness. "I am expecting it gradually."

"How long have you been seeking?" we inquired.

"About seventy years," responded the old pilgrim.

"Have you received it yet?"

"No, I cannot say that I have, but I am seeking, and trust God will give it to me before I die. This is my faith."

"Seventy years! and not received it yet. How much longer do you think it will require to gain this prize of perfect love?"

"I do not know. I am looking that God may give it to me."

"How much nearer does the blessing seem to you now than when you commenced, seventy years ago?"

"I cannot say that it appears any nearer; but I am hoping and trusting that God will yet fully save me."

"Now, beloved, if I had been seventy years getting nowhere, on the gradual line, by the grace of God I would try the instantaneous, and see if I could not get somewhere."

He came to the altar as a seeker of heart-purity, and within twenty-four hours, arising from the altar, he said: "As far as the east is from the west, so far has God removed my transgressions from me." The Lord had saved him by faith alone.

A congregation of believers were invited to come to the altar as seekers of instantaneous sanctification. A leading member of the Church said, at the close of the meeting, "Had you invited those who were seeking the blessing gradually, I would have come. I believe in seeking it gradually."

The next time the invitation was extended, those who were seeking the blessing of heart-purity gradually were invited to come. The gentleman before-named came, and knelt with the company of seekers.

A little time elapsed, and he beckoned to the minister to come to him. As he approached, the seeker said, "I cannot get this blessing now."

"Why?" inquired the minister.

“I am seeking it gradually, and that fact, I **and**, prevents my faith claiming it *now*.”

Gradual does not mean now, and never can mean now. But if by faith, then it is *now*.

We will close this chapter with a quotation from Mr. Wesley, which must strike all as exceedingly pertinent:—

{ “Indeed, this is so evident a truth, that well-nigh all the children of God scattered abroad, however they differ in other points, yet generally agree in this: that although we may, ‘by the Spirit, mortify the deeds of the body;’ resist and conquer both outward and inward sins; although we may *weaken* our enemies day by day, yet we cannot *drive them out*. By all the grace which is given at justification, we cannot extirpate them; though we watch and pray ever so much, we cannot wholly cleanse either our hearts or hands. Most sure we cannot till it shall please our Lord to speak to our hearts again, to speak the *second time, Be clean*; and then only the leprosy is cleansed. Then only, the evil root, the carnal mind, is destroyed; and inbred sin subsists no more. But if there be no such second change; if there be no instantaneous deliverance after justification; if there be none but a gradual work of God (that there is a gradual work none denies), then we must be **content**, as well as we can, to remain full of sin till death.”—Vol. i., p. 122. }

CHAPTER XIII.

HOLINESS—HOW OBTAINED.

AFTER all we have said, the most important question connected with this whole subject is, "How may I secure the blessing of a pure heart?"

Much has been spoken and written upon this subject, and yet it is dark to him who has no light. It is very difficult to make clear experimental truths to the mind of him who has no experience. It is quite as difficult to explain the way of faith to a seeker of entire sanctification, as to a seeker of pardon. Experimental matters, to be understood, must be experienced.

Then there is such a marked variety in Christian experience, that what is adapted to one, is not fully adapted to another. Our method will be to lay down general directions, and leave the seeker with the Spirit of God and his own heart.

1. In order to make the work certain, we must have the assurance that we are justified freely.

We need not dwell upon the importance of such an experience as a starting point in the pursuit of full salvation. Some have, no doubt, made a very great mistake here, and, consequently, have taken for entire sanctification what was only conversion.

Their rejoicing in the light has only been short-lived, and their profession has done more harm than good.

2. (“If you would hit a mark,” says Mr. Fletcher, “you must know where it is. Some people aim at Christian perfection; but, missing it for angelic perfection, they shoot above the mark, miss it, and then peevishly give up their hopes. Others place the mark as much too low; hence it is that you hear them profess to have attained Christian perfection, when they have not so much as attained the mental serenity of a philosopher, or the candour of a good-natured conscientious heathen.”—*Works*, vol. ii., p. 634.)

It is not to be supposed that we can understand all the adjuncts, antecedents, and consequents of this subject before we have had an experience; yet we may possess such a knowledge of it as to be able to seek it with a firm confidence that it shall be received.

“If we must know,” says Dr. G. Peck, “the whole way with the clearness of intuition, or of present consciousness, before we will take a step, God will doubtless leave us in our present ignorance with regard to the whole matter. If I wish to visit a distant point, concerning which I know nothing excepting from report of travellers, it would be an extravagant demand for me to require perfect information with regard to all the various appearances of the way, and all the fortunes of the journey, before I would venture to set off. It would be quite enough for me to have satisfactory evidence that the desired

point was accessible—that the way was feasible—and that the exercise of my natural powers of body and mind would, in due time, bring me there. With this evidence before me, would it be rational for me to sit still and speculate upon circumstances which I never can fully understand until they come under my own observation?”

3. We should not aim at the experience of another. No error among seekers of heart-purity is more common than this, and few more fatal. Such an experience as you seek might be ill-suited to your temperament. He who saves, knows best what we need, and will adapt His gifts to us with infinite wisdom.

4. (The work of consecration must be complete. We use the word *consecration*, not because it is the best word, but because it is the word in most common use, and will be more likely to be understood.

Entire consecration is giving ourselves a complete sacrifice to God. The work of entire sanctification is frequently called, “*Entire consecration.*” But surely this does not describe the state known as heart-purity?

There is this difference between entire consecration and entire sanctification—the one is what we do, by Divine help; the other is what God does in us. Consecration is a devotement of ourselves to God, while heart-purity is a work wrought in us by the Holy Ghost. There may be entire consecration without entire sanctification, but there cannot be the

latter without the former. It is not to be supposed that the former can long exist without the latter, but still it may exist.

The consecration of ourselves to God must be entire—including body, soul, life, talents, reputation—everything.) These are to be used when, where, and as God demands, and only thus. It includes *being, doing, and suffering*. The soul in this state of abandonment, cries—

“ Here I give my all to Thee,
Friends, and time, and earthly store ;
Soul and body Thine to be,—
Wholly Thine—for evermore.”

The poet has further described the universality of this devotement—

“ Write on our garnered treasures,
Write on our choicest pleasures,
Upon things new and old,
The precious stone and gold ;
On wife, husband, children, friends,—
On all that goodness lends ;—
Go write on your good name,
Upon your cherished fame,—
On every pleasant thing,—
On stores that Heaven doth fling
Into your basket,—write !
Upon the smiles of God,
Upon His scourging rod,—
Write on your inmost heart,
Write upon every part,—
To Him who claims the whole,
Time, talent, body, soul,
'Holiness unto the Lord.'”)

But just at this point some one will inquire for the difference between the consecration we made of ourselves at the time of our conversion and the con-

secration that our entire sanctification calls for. This is an interesting question. The distinction, as we think, will develop in *four particulars*:—

“ FIRST DIFFERENCE.

“ When we came to God for pardon, we brought and offered powers that were *dead*, and only dead, in trespasses and in sins ; but when we would realize the experience of entire sanctification, we consecrate powers that are permeated *with the new life of regeneration*. Hence, says an apostle, ‘ Yield yourselves unto God as those who are alive from the dead ;’ and again, ‘ I beseech you, brethren ’ (he is addressing Christians), ‘ that ye present your bodies,’ *i.e.* your souls and bodies, a part being put for the whole, yourselves, ‘ *a living sacrifice.*’ This is the first distinction.

“ SECOND DIFFERENCE.

“ When we dedicated ourselves to the Divine service at conversion, we seemed to *mass our offering*, and said, very sincerely and earnestly,—

‘ Here, Lord, I give myself away :
’Tis all that I can do.’

But when we would sanctify ourselves unto God, with a view to this richer and deeper experience, then, with the illumination received at conversion and characterizing our regenerated life, our consecration becomes more *intelligent, specific, and careful*. It is not merely myself, as before. It is now these

hands, these feet, these senses, this body, with all its members and powers; it is now my soul, with all its ennobling faculties,—its understanding, judgment, memory, imagination, conscience, will, and affections. It is now all my talents of time, influence, energy, reputation, home, kindred, friends, worldly substance,—everything. Upon all we have and are we specifically and honestly inscribe, ‘Sacred to Jesus;’ covenanting to use all in harmony with the Divine will. Some at this point have been careful to write upon paper the several items that were included, as well as the several obligations that were assumed, in this fuller consecration of themselves to God. This was the case with the celebrated Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of the Presbyterian Church.

“THIRD DIFFERENCE.

“When we would thus specifically sanctify ourselves unto God, there is likely to rise up in the mind, or before the conscience, *some peculiarly trying test of obedience*. This is varied in different experiences. It may be a little thing, *a very little thing*, but it is not on that account any the less formidable. Eating an apple amid Paraisaical scenes would seem, from a human standpoint, to have been a very little thing; and then observe, it was a test required of one who was living before God. Adam failed in the test; a failure ‘that brought death into the world, and all our woe.’ So the test that infinite holiness may lay upon the regenerated may be

a little thing, perhaps something connected with our appetites, or with our adornments, or with our associations, or with our services. The question may be,—Will you give up that doubtful indulgence, a something in which you regard your own inclinations rather than your soul's good and God's glory? Will you lay aside the *last weight*, and the sin that doth so easily beset you? Will you take your place with the entirely devoted, and consent that those around shall say reproachfully, '*He is one of the sanctified?*' Oh! it is hesitation or reluctance upon just such points that will explain very much of the feeble, halting, sickly, religious experience and Christian life that characterizes too many of the professed disciples of the Lord Jesus.

“FOURTH DIFFERENCE.

“This will appear in the *object or end* of the two consecrations. When we came offering ourselves to God in the first instance, it was that we might obtain *pardon*: now we specifically yield all, including the doubtful indulgence, with a view to *heart-purity*. Then, groaning under a sense of our guiltiness, we said, ‘O wretched man that I am!’ We wanted to be lifted into the relationship, and admitted to the privileges of dear children. Now we come as children, having the Spirit of Adoption; not for pardon or peace,—these are not our conscious need,—but we come for a more perfect submission to the Divine will; a more satisfactory sense of heart-

purity; an increased ability to do or suffer all the will of our Father in heaven, and a deeper and a more blessed rest in Christ.

“Observe, then, these *four features*, as belonging more especially to the consecration required of the regenerated.”—*Rev. Alfred Cookman.*)

When such a consecration is made, the soul joyfully exclaims:—

“To do, or not to do; to have,
Or not to have, I leave to Thee;
To be, or not to be, I leave:
Thy only will be done in me!
All my requests are lost in one,—
‘Father, Thy only will be done!’”

“Welcome alike the crown or cross,
Trouble I cannot ask, nor peace,
Nor toil, nor rest, nor gain, nor loss,
Nor joy, nor grief, nor pain, nor ease,
Nor life, nor death; but ever groan,
‘Father, Thy only will be done!’”

(“A consecration thus deliberately made,” says Dr. Upham, “including all our acts, powers, and possessions of body, mind, and estate, made without any reserve either in objects, time, or place; embracing trial and suffering as well as action; never to be modified and never to be withdrawn; and which contemplates its fulfilment in Divine and not in human strength,—necessarily brings one into a new relationship with God, of the most intimate, interesting, and effective nature.”)

Consecration is simply consenting that Christ shall have all; it is the consent of the will to the unobstructed reign of grace. If the will consents, the

whole man goes Godward without resistance; if the will refuses to yield, all effort is fruitless.

The seeker may find that the greatest obstruction to faith is the smallest object of desire. Many a soul has been kept out of the kingdom by a mere trifle—an ornament on their person, a practice, the wrong of which they are not able to fully discover. But it must be remembered that it is the *doubtful* thing that keeps us back. If we believe a practice to be sinful, we must yield it at once, or give up all hope of being saved. But if a practice be a doubtful one, it is the *doubt* that blocks our wheels. The doubtful practice must be abandoned, because it is doubtful. He that doubts the propriety of a given practice, and yet indulges in it, is guilty of doing what he is assured may be wrong; and no wonder the apostle says, "He that doubteth," the rightfulness of the act, "is damned," or condemned. "Whatsoever is not of faith," is not fully accredited as right, "is sin."

Rev. D. W. C. Huntington, D.D., in writing on the subject of consecration, inquires:—"Have you been hindered by the devil's lions? (1) 'You cannot keep such high vows. Better promise a little and see if you can keep that.' It would be easier to make a world with God to help, than to do the simplest thing without Him. A war against all sin is the least thing a Christian can undertake. (2) 'I do not know what God may ask of me.' And you need not to know; you know He is God, that is enough

(3) 'But I shall be singular.' So you will. The majority of the world is still unchristian. Such singularity, which is not mechanical, nor put on to cover spiritual pride, but the result of loving and serving God in an ungodly world, we must all accept. The quicker the better."—*Northern Christian Advocate*.

We conclude our remarks on the subject of consecration with the following beautiful lines, by Frances Ridley Havergal:—

“Take my life and let it be
Consecrated, Lord, to Thee ;
Take my hands and let them move
At the impulse of Thy love.

Take my feet and let them be
Swift and beautiful for Thee ;
Take my voice and let me sing
Always, ever, for my King.

Take my silver and my gold—
Not a mite would I withhold ;
Take my moments and my days,
Let them flow in ceaseless praise.

Take my will and make it Thine—
It shall be no longer mine ;
Take my heart, it is Thine own,
It shall be Thy royal throne.

Take my love, my Lord, I pour
At Thy feet its treasure store ;
Take myself, and I will be
Ever, only, all for Thee.

Wash me in the Saviour's precious blood,
Cleanse me in its purifying flood,
Lord, I give to Thee my life, and all, to be
Thine, henceforth, eternally.”

5. Implicit, momentary trust in the merits of

Christ. All our devotement, or consecration, is as nothing if implicit faith is wanting. Faith alone is the condition of entire sanctification, and the only condition. "Every man when he believes is sanctified," says Mr. Wesley.

What am I to believe?

(1.) I must believe that entire sanctification is a blessing promised in the Holy Scriptures, and to be enjoyed in this life.

It is not enough that I believe the doctrine taught in the Scriptures, and promised to mortals some time, it may be at death; but I must believe it is for me, *here and now*. Unless this is a settled conviction of the soul, all my efforts are fruitless.

(2.) I must believe that God, for Christ's sake, is willing, able, and ready to save us now. On His part all is done. The atonement is complete, the provisions ample, and He only waits for a heart willing to receive. He is more anxious to save us than we are to be saved.

Let us pause at this point and ask ourselves the questions:—

(1.) Have I a tolerably clear understanding of the holiness I now seek?

(2.) Do I *feel* my need of holiness of heart, to rid me of my felt and mourned depravity, or do I seek it that I may be more happy?

(3.) Am I *anxious* to obtain this blessing; and does my desire for it exceed my desire for **any** earthly good?

(4.) Do I believe that God is *able* to give me a pure heart now; or am I looking for it at some future time?

(5.) Do I believe that God is *willing* to sanctify me wholly, and to do it now?

(6.) Do I now commit my soul into His hands to be saved; and to be saved *this moment*?

We know of no directions more simple and more wise than those given by Mr. Wesley:—

“But what is that faith whereby we are sanctified, saved from sin, and perfected in love? This faith is a Divine evidence or conviction—

“1. That God hath *promised* this sanctification in the Holy Scriptures.

“2. It is a Divine evidence or conviction that what God hath promised He is *able* to perform.

“3. It is a Divine evidence and conviction that He is *able* and *willing* to do it *now*.

“4. To this confidence that God is *able* and *willing* to sanctify us *now*, there needs to be added one thing more—a Divine evidence and conviction that He *doeth* it.)*

“In that hour it is done; God says to the inmost soul, ‘According to thy faith be it done unto thee.’ Then the soul is pure from every spot of sin; is clean from all unrighteousness.”

It is contended that we are not required to believe that He *doeth* it, but only that He *will* do it. It must not be a faith that we *receive*, but that we *shall receive*.

* Cf WOOD'S PERFECT LOVE
PAGE 80, 81

Just at this point, we are convinced that Bishop Foster, while he would guard against an error on the one hand, does not avoid an equally fatal error on the other. He says:—“It is well, nay, it is indispensable, to make an entire surrender of all to God; and when this is done, God will acknowledge it by sending the witness of His acceptance; but let no one, at his peril, *conclude that he has made this surrender*, and is consequently sanctified, without the requisite witness; he will only deceive himself, and receive no benefit. His faith, however strong, being false, will do him no good.”—*Christian Purity*, p. 206. *OK USE HIS*

The error here is in the item we have italicized. No man can believe for full salvation, until he has made a full surrender of himself to God. This full surrender is *consecration*—which the bishop says “is not sanctification, it is a part of it. Consecration is your work, God giving the requisite grace” (p. 204). Now, if I cannot “conclude that I have made this surrender,” I cannot believe for the accomplishment of the work. Any uncertainty as to the full surrender of the soul, blocks faith at every step.

There are three steps in this process, at only one of which can faith rest,—*has been*,—*is*,—*will be*. We are not to believe it *has been* done, as a condition of its being done. Nor are we to believe it *will be* done, without determining when, as a condition of its being done. But we are to believe it *is* done,

not as a completed work, for that would throw it back antecedent to faith; nor as a work to be subsequently wrought, for that would separate it from faith upon which it is conditioned; but that it *is* done, when, and in the instant, I believe, and consequently, inseparable from my faith.

We insist that a soul may believe that he has "made the surrender," before he receives the witness of the Spirit that he is sanctified. If he does not believe that he has made the surrender, he cannot believe that God accepts him fully.

We insist, further, that a soul does not "deceive himself," who believes the work is wrought in him before he has the witness of the Spirit that the work is done. Faith is the condition on which the blessing is received, while the witness of the Spirit is the knowledge which God conveys to the mind that the work has been wrought. The error here is in confounding faith with knowledge. We *may believe* the work done, without *knowing* it done.

There is no doctrine more clearly taught by Mr. Wesley, than that a soul must constantly believe the work of sanctification complete, though he may not always have the witness of the Spirit. Speaking of the hour of temptation, he says: "At such times there is absolute need of that witness, without which the work of sanctification not only could not be discerned, but could not longer subsist." But, says one, "I have no witness that I am saved from sin; and yet I have no doubt of it." "Very well," responds

Mr. Wesley, "as long as you have no doubt, it is enough; when you have, you will need that witness." —*Works*, vol. vi., p. 516.

But Bishop Foster would say to all such, "Until the witness comes, we will not say we are entirely sanctified; we will not even believe we are; we will look to be, and wait in expectation until we are, and then we will rest in God" (p. 206).

We might with propriety say, "Until the witness comes, we will not say we *know* we are sanctified;" but to say, "we will not believe we are," is to shoot wide of the mark.

"As when you reckon with your creditor, or with your host," says Mr. Fletcher, "and as when you have paid all you reckon yourself free, so now reckon with God. Jesus has paid all; and He hath paid for thee—hath purchased thy pardon and holiness. Therefore it is now God's command, 'Reckon thyself dead unto sin,' and *thou art alive unto God from this hour*. O begin, begin to reckon *now*, fear not; *believe, believe, believe*, and continue to believe every moment. So shalt thou continue free; for it is retained, as it is received, by faith alone."

How different is this from saying, "We will not even believe we are saved, until the witness comes," when the witness comes as the result of *receiving*, and the receiving comes as the result of *believing*.

The language of Jesus is, "What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them" (Mark xi. 24).

The word translated in this verse, "ye receive," is in the present tense, and the rendering of our English version is precisely correct. Numerous efforts have been made to change the tense of this verb, but it stands as the word of Jesus, who knew whereof He affirmed. Let others attempt to mend the theology of Jesus if they will, but we choose to abide by it as it stands in the Divine Record.

Mr. Fletcher, in referring to this verse, says:—"The 'Credo quod habes et habes'—believe you have it, and you have it—is not very different from those words of Christ, 'What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them and ye shall have them.' The humble reason of the believer and the irrational presumption of the enthusiast draw this doctrine to the right hand or to the left. But to split the hair—here lies the difficulty."—*Works*, vol. iv., p. 317.

Believe you *have* it and you have it, is one extreme. Believe you *will* receive, and you shall have, is another extreme. And yet both are not very far from the truth, which is—believe that ye *receive*, and ye shall have. But this difference, small as it is, is great enough to produce a failure at every step. The first asks us to believe a falsehood,—believe we *have* what we have not. The second leaves our faith perfectly indefinite,—believe we *shall* receive some time in the future. There is a vast difference between believing we have a thing, and believing that we receive it. The one is believing in the blessing

as an *accomplished fact*. The other is believing it as being accomplished now. To believe you *will* receive, is to make a chasm between the act of faith and the bestowment of the blessing; as though we must make a full consecration, and believe that God will accept the sacrifice, the acceptance being indefinitely future to the act of faith.

Now, according to the experience of thousands, the process seems to be this: The Christian seeking entire sanctification believes intellectually that entire conformity to the will of God, as to conduct and words, as to thoughts and affections, is his privilege and duty. He believes intellectually in the adaptation of the provisions which God has made, and in the truth of God's promise in this regard. Conscious of impurity within, he earnestly desires to be cleansed from its least remains. Considering the prayer of the apostle, "the very God of peace sanctify you wholly;" and the assurance, "who also will do it;" and, "the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth from all sin;" and assured in his consciousness that he has brought his sacrifice to the altar and bound it there; that he has made a full surrender, an unreserved consecration, with faith exercised through Divinely-given power (which power is requisite to the exercise of faith), he says: "I now give all. Thou hast promised to receive the gift. Thou dost now receive. The blood of Christ cleanses now." And in that moment, in view of the condition fulfilled, viz., his implicit faith in the promise and the atone-

ment, the Holy Spirit does the work, and he is in that moment sanctified in soul, and body, and spirit. His faith then rests on the truth of God, and is not a belief that we *receive* that we may receive, but, as Mr. Wesley expresses it, “a Divine evidence and conviction that He *doeth it* ;” it being always understood—and this is the point to be guarded—that it is faith for a present blessing ; but the blessing is conditioned on faith, and is conferred at the very instant the faith is exercised.

We are not saved because we have consecrated all to God ; but having made such a consecration, we are to believe that it is accepted, and we are received for Christ's sake. I know not what else faith has to do. It is not enough that the gift touch the altar, it must be placed there in faith that “*the altar sanctifieth the gift.*” Unbelief may cut off the virtue of the altar, and the sacrifice may remain untouched by fire. Having placed our gift on the altar, we are authorised to believe that God receives us according to His promise. We then receive through that very faith we are graciously assisted to exercise.

“But can I believe before I have the witness that the work is accomplished ?”

We have always found it difficult to understand how a soul could believe for full salvation after it is conscious that the work is done. We have always believed that entire sanctification is a blessing conditioned on faith ; and that the faith upon which it

is conditioned must be exercised before the blessing is received. But according to the fallacy which we are exposing, the blessing is first received, and the faith, upon which it is conditioned, is exercised afterwards.

If I cannot believe for entire sanctification until I am conscious of its presence in my heart, I can never believe for it; for the evidence of its possession must be subsequent to its reception, unless the evidence comes first and the blessing afterward.

The Divine order is, first believe, then receive, then know. But if the dogma we oppose be correct, it is, the evidence first, the blessing next, and the faith, upon which it is conditioned, last. This entirely upsets the Divine order, and no fruit is brought to perfection.

With these explanations, we are prepared to say to all seeking the grace of perfect love—

1. Do not trust in feelings. Nothing is more uncertain. Feeling is not faith, nor is it salvation, nor yet the condition of salvation. It is only the fruit of salvation, or what comes of salvation. Faith may be exercised and salvation secured in the absence of any remarkable feeling.

We do not ignore feeling. We shall have it; but we should not be troubled if it does not come at the moment.

2. Let us fix our faith on the promise of the everlasting God—

“Faith, mighty faith, the promise sees
 And looks to that alone ;
 Laughs at impossibilities,
 And cries, ‘It shall be done !’”

Let us not doubt God in the absence of great emotion, but let us trust Him, until He “opens in our hearts a little heaven.”

3. Does the reader desire entire sanctification, at whatever cost? You have long desired it, and often prayed for it, and done all you knew to obtain it.

This is all well. You may have put forth as much physical effort as is needful, for “bodily exercise profiteth little.” You have doubtless prayed as much and as earnestly as is necessary. Praying will not save you. Your salvation is not conditioned on prayer, or “bodily exercise.” Do you fully believe in full salvation attainable in this life? Do you believe it is your duty and your privilege to enjoy it now, just as you are? See that these points are all well settled; for this being saved *now*, and *as you are*, are points not so easily gained.

Are you willing to do all the will of God, to the end of life? Are you willing, if God calls you to it, to be singular, to be sneered at as one professing holiness? These are tests which crucify nature.

Have you made a full and entire consecration of all to God—the *body* with all its members, the *soul* with all its powers—*property*, to be used for God’s glory and as He requires?

In fine, are family, worldly interests, health, life, ~~talent~~, time, and voice,” all a free-will offering to

God—not for a day, but for the whole of life? Are you assured that it has been done? If so, you are not far from the kingdom of God.

If you have given all to God, a “living sacrifice,” it is your right to claim the promise—“I will receive you.” You have the right to believe that the promise is now fulfilled in you, and that He now saves you. Christ, remember, is your *altar*; and if your sacrifice is complete, “the altar sanctifieth the gift.” Whatsoever thus “toucheth the altar is holy.” We repeat—If your gift is perfect, if your sacrifice is complete, if your consecration is not wanting at any point, the grace of entire sanctification must be given, here and now. We are not able to see how it can be otherwise. God cannot deny Himself. He has promised, and must fulfil it.

But you have no *feeling*. “By grace are ye saved through *faith*,” not *feeling*. But you have feeling. You may not have as much as you desire, or as you have been expecting; but you will not deny that you have feeling.

Which is the more reliable, the immutable promise of God, or your uncertain emotions? Feeling may mislead you, but God’s promise never. In due time you will have all the feeling you need, but for the present, believe the promise.

Will you, then, at this moment, just as you are, without regard to your emotions, in child-like simplicity, reckon yourself dead unto sin and alive unto God? Can you not say, with your faith resting

upon the promise—"All is the Lord's! I am His, now and for ever?" Saying this in faith, you have the right to look up to Him who is mighty to save, and say, "Thou hast washed away all my sins; I am Thine for ever. I am dead! but it is unto sin. I am alive! but it is unto God. I glory! but it is in the Cross."

Oh! cast yourself into this sea of infinite love; you need not, you will not sink. Jesus comes walking on the water to lift up your sinking soul. He is near thee; *believe* it! He saves *now*; only *believe* it. Believe *as you are*. Believe *now*, and yours is the bliss of *perfect love*.

In the promises I trust;
In the cleansing blood confide;
I am prostrate in the dust,
I with Christ am crucified.

Jesus comes! He fills my soul!
Perfected in love I am;
I am every whit made whole,
Glory, glory to the Lamb.

CAUSES OF FAILURE.

We have read and re-read the following remarks of Rev. Wm. Taylor, as found in that excellent work, *Infancy and Manhood*, and cannot resist the conviction that they should have the widest circulation possible, that they may help the thousands who are contending with the same difficulties. He very justly represents these struggling, defeated ones, as "going about to establish their own righteousness," not having "submitted themselves unto the righteousness

of God," or God's righteous method of saving them by faith alone, and not by the works of the law. We have considerably abridged the remarks, but have retained the substance:—

“How often have you approached the altar of consecration with a determination to be holy! You wept at the mercy-seat of God, confessed your need of heart-purity, mourned over your past unfaithfulness, presented your sacrifice to God, and renewed your covenant. You arranged in your own mind a beautiful programme for holy living—To pray in your family morning and evening, to pray in your closet three times a day, to attend all the stated means of grace, visit the sick, give liberally to charitable objects, and, in short, discharge every duty of Christian life; and you felt a considerable degree of comfort in having renewed your covenant—quite an inflation of hope, anticipating the good time coming, when you shall have performed all these good things. You retired with buoyant hope and sincere desire to carry out your pious purposes to perfection, and you did the praying and all the other good things you promised, so far as the outward acts were concerned; but as for the development and perfection of the spiritual life within, you just missed it. One fortnight proved to you that in regard to the inner life—the essential thing in your experience—you had not been any better, nor done any better, than before your special consecration. Hope was deferred, **your heart became very sick, and you**

scarcely knew what next to do. But upon a careful examination, you thought you found out the ground of your failure—‘Not sufficiently watchful; have not carefully guarded those weak points in my experience—those peculiar besetments which I suffer at every unguarded gap.’ With this discovery your flagging hopes revived, and you were encouraged to try it again. Then you approached the altar of God with greater solemnity and self-abasement. You mourned, and wept, and confessed your repeated failures, submitted your helpless soul to God, and again renewed your covenant, and bound yourself most solemnly in a vow, for God to live and for God to die. Some write out their vows and put them into their Bibles, as reminders of their solemn engagements with God. Thus many sincere persons spend years in earnest struggling, and remain but dwarfs in religion. They have a great deal of motion without progression, like a door on its hinges.

“Now, what is the matter? There is something wrong.

“It cannot be that you are not sincere, for I am specially addressing sincere persons.

“Not because of any defect in the genuineness of your conversion to God, in the first place, for I am addressing such as were truly pardoned and adopted into the family of God.

“Not that you have wilfully departed from the Lord, for I am not addressing such. I have been describing the experience of persons who were ‘justi-

fied by faith, and obtained peace with God,' and who still have a measure of saving faith, and some degree of spiritual development, but whose faith is sadly trammelled in its exercise, and defeated in its grand end of full salvation from all sin, including specially the sin of unbelief, and the 'purging of the conscience from dead works.'

"Now, my dear friend, it cannot be the will of our Heavenly Father that any sincere soul should struggle so hard, and so long, as many have done, with so little to show for it:

"How shall we be able to detect the error which thus trammels our faith, and defeats its grand purposes? I can give you, my dear reader, the *theory* of truth necessary for its detection, but God, the Holy Sanctifier, alone, can give you the light, by which you may come to Jesus and have it removed. That He will gladly do, provided you consent to be holy without any 'ifs or buts,' or stipulations of your own.

"Well, just at the altar of consecration, where you so often prayed, confessed, consecrated yourself, and renewed your covenant, stood your almighty Saviour, waiting to impart salvation, free and full, to your aching heart; but at the moment of your entire submission, when you should have believed, what did you do? Why, you renewed your covenant, which directed your longing eyes away from Jesus to a future fulfilment of your vows; and it **was** implied in your mind, 'Then I will be brought **into**

the sweet union with God I so much desire.' You substituted a renewed covenant for present believing, nay, for a present Saviour; you arose and went away, and left Jesus 'standing there at the door knocking' for admission. Instead of opening the door to admit Him in all the fulness of His saving power, without which it was impossible for you to do better, with a pious vow in your mouth you retired through a back way, to your own dreary work, as weak as before. How could you do any better, when you missed connection with the source of light and life? If you wish to irrigate an orchard of fruit trees, your beautiful ditches of good works will do no good unless you lift the flood-gate and turn on the water. At that important point of submission, to be sure, you ignored the record of your past works, pronounced them filthy rags, and threw them away; but what then did you do? You gravely promised the Lord some more of the same sort, or, as you believed, an improved article. You told the Lord you certainly would do better next time; but a fortnight's experience proved to you that they were of the same sort precisely, and not a bit better than the old stock. Then the old 'accuser of the brethren' came in upon you like a flood, and you said to yourself, 'Dear me, what shall I do? I thought I had gotten such a start in the way of holiness that I never would get back here again! But here I am in the same old formal track, subject to the same petty annoyances, doubts, and fears.'

“Oh! how glad I was when the Lord, in mercy, revealed to my heart this insidious practical error of ‘going about.’ It is the more difficult of detection because everything embraced in these vows and covenants is a good thing, and how such a good thing, or combination of good things, can involve such a radical error, sapping the very foundations of our religious experience, is the problem to be solved. The desire that led to these vows is all right, for God the Spirit wrought it in your heart; and vows and covenants are right, in so far as they are a means of bringing you to a present perfect surrender to God, and a present acceptance of Jesus, as your present perfect Saviour. But as you are running on the Gospel track, under the pressure of this heaven-wrought desire, into the depôt of full salvation, look out there! Just at the entrance of the depôt, Satan adjusts a very ingenious ‘switch,’ and if you are not careful, you will be caught on it, and carried off the direct and only track leading into this glorious depôt, on to the old circuitous Jewish track of going ‘about to establish your own righteousness, instead of submitting yourself to the righteousness of God;’ and round and round you will go, and wonder why you do not get in. ‘Almost in,’ you say to yourself. ‘I can see in. Surely I will get in soon.’ Surely you never will get in on that track. It don’t lead in at all. It is the wrong road. I spent several years on that road, and have thoroughly threaded upon my knees this dark

labyrinth of legal complications, and am, hence, from experience, somewhat prepared to give advice to my young friends, and profoundly to sympathize with them in their struggles.

“When I got light on this subject, I changed the order of the arrangement at once.

“I said, ‘O Lord, I have been very unfaithful, and I am very sorry’—not that I had yielded to known sin. I had been struggling to be holy from the night I was converted to God, and had been preserved from any wilful departures from God,—‘I have tried a hundred times to be holy, and failed every time. I am very sorry, but, O God, I have no confidence in the flesh, or in any efforts of my own. I have tried, and tried, till my heart is sick. I know I will never be any better, nor do any better, unless my heart is made better. However much I may desire it, and however sincerely I may try, I am sure I can never be any better than I have been, or do any better than I have done, unless renewed in the spirit of my mind.’ I was indeed stripped of all hope from anything I had done, or could do. Not a peg in all the future of my life, no more than the past, on which to hang a hope, or furnish ground for a postponement. Then the crucifixion of the flesh, with its fallacious hopes and plans of reformation, dressed up in the most pious phraseology as they are, was fully accomplished. My conscience was purged of dead works, and I was let down into the vale of self-abasement and self-despair, and down

in that vale of self-conscious impotency my feet rested firmly on the 'Rock of Ages, cleft for me,' and Jesus 'was made of God unto me wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification.' Then I learned practically what I had all through believed as a theory, that as in justification by faith, so in the entire sanctification of the heart, it was 'not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.' If so, why not now, or the very moment the Holy Spirit reveals the inherent and accumulated corruptions of our nature, and the plague of unbelief in the heart?

"In this experience of full salvation from sin, unbelief, and dead works, I did not attain to the beatific altitude of Mount Nebo, and exult in visions of heavenly glory, but received a new baptism of legal fire, that consumed those dead works and fallacious hopes; and in utter self-conscious helplessness I learned to cling to Jesus in all the simplicity of a child; no longer saying, with self-confident Peter, 'Though all deny Thee, yet will not I. Though I die with Thee, yet I will not deny Thee;' but rather, 'Every moment, Lord, I need the merit of Thy death. If left to myself for one moment, that very moment I will sin against Thee.' Not that I have any sympathy with sin. I abhor it more than death; but self-confidence is abnegated. I know that such

is the helplessness of human nature in this struggle, and such the number and potency of the evil influences that surround me, that nothing short of the almighty power of Jesus can keep my heart from sinning.

“ When I was crucified with Christ in the full and final destruction of self-dependence, I learned the happy art of living by faith in the Son of God ; and then the good things embraced in my oft-repeated vows and covenants, I secure, of course, as the legitimate fruit of a present entire consecration to God, steadily maintained as a fact, and my perfect confidence in God’s provisions and promises as immutable facts, and my present acceptance of Christ for all that He hath engaged to do for me ; never for a moment to question whether He will do this or that, which is embraced in His covenant engagement, but gratefully accepting His facts with unwavering confidence, momentarily ‘ live by faith in the Son of God.’ He that ‘ thus believeth shall never be confounded.’ I have thus been enabled, through extraordinary vicissitudes and trials, to walk by faith for over twenty years. Never since I was thus ‘ crucified ’ and ‘ purged from dead works ’ have I made any vows pertaining to the inner life, and looking to **a future fulfilment.**”

CHAPTER XIV.

HOLINESS—EVIDENCES OF ITS ATTAINMENT.

HOW may we know that we are entirely sanctified, and made perfect in love ?

In view of the great variety in Christian experience, it is very difficult to so present the subject as to meet every case. Many are clearly conscious of having reached the great rock of perfect salvation, but they have no marked joy, no special intellectual excitement. Others are filled with rapture—are swallowed up in the ocean of God's love, and enjoy the luxury of having all its waves and billows roll over them. While others take the blessing by faith. They give themselves to God, and feel they are safe in His hands. Summer has come to the soul ; and the evidence of the accomplished work is learned by contrasting their feelings with what they were before. Others are so filled with the brightness of the Divine glory, that language utterly fails to describe it.

There are some evidences which are common to all, and are enjoyed by all who enter into this rest of faith.

1. *There is a consciousness of perfect trust.*

This trust is for heart-purity. It is not a matter

to be explained, but to be done and known. It is not a trust that the work has been finished, but a trust in Christ that He does the work now. There is the consciousness that we do believe—or what we call the “assurance of faith.”

Before this change was wrought, it was very difficult to believe. We staggered at the magnitude of the promises, and were not “strong in the faith, giving glory to God.” But now we feel no disposition to doubt. It seems a great sin to doubt a single promise. There may be no overwhelming emotion, but faith is all-conquering, and rests on Jesus Christ the Lord. If asked, “how we feel,” the response is, “I am trusting.” “Trusting what?” “Trusting that He *doeth* it.”

It is asked, “May I not doubt as to whether I do believe? May I not be deceived?”

To doubt whether we believe, is not to believe. We cannot doubt and believe at the same time for a blessing conditioned solely on faith. We may believe in the absence of great emotion, but we cannot believe and doubt that we believe at the same time.

Faith rests on the promise alone, and sees nothing but the promise; and the sanctified heart is conscious of the exercise of such faith.

It is not, “I am trying to believe,” or, “I hope I believe,” but, “I believe. I cannot tell how or why, only I am commanded to do it, and I do it. I am conscious that I do it. I walk about assured that I believe.”

2. *There is the direct witness of the Spirit.*

It is generally conceded that it is very difficult to explain the mode of the Spirit's witness, either in justification, or sanctification. While He utters no audible words, and the ear hears no sound, He does give a clear, unmistakable testimony, addressed to human consciousness, that the work is complete—that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin."

"The method of the Divine operation," says Dr. Upham, "appears to be one of the secret things which are hidden with God. Accordingly, the Holy Spirit, so far as the method or manner of His influence is concerned, operates differently in different cases."

It is a clear testimony, or witness, to a fact which has transpired within the human soul. It is a truthful statement, for He is "the Spirit of Truth."

"When this testimony is given, the clearness and strength of Divine light so fully and powerfully penetrates every channel of the heart, as to lay open to the mental vision the entire moral aspect, and impress the whole inner man with the invincible persuasion that the reign of grace is complete. And though it is possible for one who has never had this testimony to substitute for it some strong, rapturous emotion, or some sudden and overwhelming influence of the Spirit, yet when this Divine witness is received, it will be found to be unlike anything else; whether transports of joy, flights of imagination, or

suspensions of physical and animal powers. Nor can any agency, human, angelic, or infernal, fabricate a counterfeit that can escape instant detection by one who has known this witness of the Spirit.

“But how shall one discriminate between the witness of the Spirit in justification and entire sanctification? The Spirit is given when we are justified; what more may we expect when we fully attain purity of heart—when holiness is brought in? This is a plain case. The difference of the Spirit’s witness in the work of justification and entire sanctification is not in the manner so much as the thing which is witnessed *to*. It is the same Spirit; the phenomena are the same, but the testimony is to different facts, and consequently differs. When one is pardoned, the testimony is to precisely that fact, that he is pardoned, made alive to God; but it is not that he is entirely sanctified. The Spirit, indeed, along with His witness to pardon, clearly indicates to the soul—remaining sin. In the immediate joy of its first testimony this may not be so, but it is so, permanently, afterwards, when that excitement subsides. Not only does the believer know his remaining sin, by his own consciousness of it, but he is likewise conscious of the reproofing of the Divine Spirit on account of it, and of His urgings and promptings to a more complete salvation. Its witness of pardon co-exists with its reproofs and urgings, and co-exists consciously in the really Christian soul. It is thus a witness of the precise condition of the soul—both

of its attainment and want. When he is entirely sanctified, the same Spirit bears witness again, just as He did before; but now it is to another fact, not that he is pardoned, but that he is entirely sanctified. And if the former change was known to his own consciousness, so also will this latter be. Thus the Spirit witnesses with our spirit to our religious state, whatever it may be, whether of justification merely or entire sanctification.

“We can see no more difficulty in supposing the Divine Spirit to give a discriminating testimony, than in conceiving of it as witnessing at all. If He may convey the attestation of pardon, He may also of purification. If of one experience, certainly of the other. Nor can it be shown that His witness in the one case is either more comprehensible or more important than in the other.”—*Christian Purity*, pp. 229, 230.) *OK USE HIS*

An objection to this doctrine has been interposed here. It is claimed that purity of heart is a *quiescent* state—a state of rest, of repose, and consequently cannot be known, as neither consciousness nor the Divine Spirit can witness to any but to an *active* state.

This is regarded as one of the strongest objections to the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit; and, in fact, by many, is regarded as settling the question beyond all controversy. Notwithstanding this, thousands aver that they have the witness of the Spirit that they have been made pure.

This objection is based upon two assumptions: First, that entire sanctification is purely a *quiescent state*; and secondly, that consciousness never bears witness to a quiescent, but always to an *active state*. If both these assumptions could be proved, the objection would have some weight; but as both are merely assumptions, we shall pause a while before we abandon our faith in the Word of God and human experience.

1. We object to this assumption because it confounds what should be kept separate, viz.: Human consciousness and the witness of the Divine Spirit.

Consciousness is the knowledge of what passes in one's own mind. The witness of the Spirit is what is communicated to the mind by an agent outside of itself. It is what is told it by another Spirit.

We could conceive how consciousness might be unable, of its own knowledge, to reveal all the deep workings of God in the soul, but that seeming impossibility is removed when it is remembered that such knowledge is conveyed to our spirit by Him who "searcheth all things, even the deep things of God." If my spirit is ignorant of the work wrought, God's Spirit is not. If I cannot see the bottom, He can.

Consciousness cognizes the fact of *remaining depravity*, which, up to a given time, gave me much trouble. I am no longer conscious of that trouble.

Consciousness testified to the presence of *unbelief*, which prevented sweet communion with the Spirit

of Grace. There is now a consciousness that this barrier does not interpose to hinder such communion.

Consciousness testified that carnal love existed, which prevented me from loving God with all my heart. I am equally conscious that it does not at present check the flowing of my love—"pure, warm, and changeless"—to Him "who merits all my love."

Of these facts I am conscious. I may not, of myself, fully understand their deep import; nor need I, for just here the Divine Spirit speaks to my spirit—to my consciousness, and enables me to say,

"Tis done, the great transaction's done,
I am my Lord's, and He is mine."

Without this distinction, neither the Scriptures nor human experience can be interpreted. Who has the right to decide what the Divine Spirit shall tell me of the hidden work of God in my heart?

2. Our second objection to this assumption is, that it does not state correctly the character of the change wrought in entire sanctification.

The assumption that it is a quiescent state, and that only, is altogether gratuitous.

Entire sanctification is made up of purity, perfect love, and power. The state is as properly denominated "perfect love," as "heart-purity." If there were nothing but purity, the objection might have more force, but it would not meet the case then. But it is "perfect love." There is no "perfect love," where there is depravity in the soul; for

an impure fountain cannot send forth pure water; nor can a pure fountain send forth impure water. If my heart loves God perfectly, it is proof positive that it is pure. So that perfect love and heart-purity are identical. If I have the one, I have the other. Love is an excited state of the affections; hence active, and not quiescent. Of perfect love, consciousness can take cognizance; and as perfect love is all we mean by perfect holiness, or heart-purity, what becomes of the objection based on consciousness?

3. We object to this notion further, because it is in direct conflict with the Scriptures. "We know that He abideth in us by the Spirit which He hath given us" (1 John iii. 24). This abiding in Him is the same as that which Christ taught, and which John recorded (John xiv. 23): "If any man love Me, he will keep My words, and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him;" "which implies," says Mr. Wesley, in his note on the text, "such a large manifestation of the Divine presence and love, that the former, in justification, is as nothing in comparison of it." To this abiding, the Spirit testifies, and His testimony constitutes our knowledge. If there were not another text in the Bible on the subject, this would be conclusive.

"We have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God" (1 Cor. ii. 12).

One or two things here deserve attention. Believers—all believers—“receive the Spirit of God.” No Christian is, or need be, without it.

The work of the Spirit is, to make known to us the things which God freely gives us: to make known the fact of the bestowment, the nature of the gift, and the extent of the blessing. Nothing short of this will meet the case.

The expression, “*things* that are freely given us of God,” shows that He witnesses to more than *one thing*. If the Spirit only witnesses to our “adoption,” it would be *one thing*, and not “*things*.” He does witness to the one, but He also witnesses to the other.

A new and clean heart is one of God’s own gifts. “A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you” (Ezek. xxxvi. 26). “Create in me a clean heart,” was the cry of David (Psa. li. 10). The apostle assures us that we receive the Spirit for the express purpose of making known to us these gifts when bestowed. Shall we say that God has made a mistake? that it is not the province of the Spirit to give us such information? “Who art thou that repliest against God?”

“He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself” (1 John v. 10). This text does not assert that he who believeth unto “*adoption*,” “hath the witness in himself;” but “he that believeth,” whether it be for “*adoption*,” “*entire sanctification*,” or a “*pure heart*;” for the heart is “purified by faith.”

“The enemies of the doctrine of entire sanctification as a present attainable experience,” says Dr. Steele, “are not content with befogging the nature of this distinct work of the Holy Spirit, they boldly deny its subjective proofs, and assert that no man can ever know that his heart is thoroughly cleansed. Their assertions are two: First, that consciousness cannot bear witness to perfect inward purity, for that is a quiescent state, while consciousness cognizes only activities. The second declaration is, that the Holy Spirit, because He is the appointed witness of adoption, cannot disclose to the soul the cleansing which He has wrought through faith in Jesus’ blood. Let us examine the first assertion and see whether it does not prove altogether too much. Is human free agency a quiescent state, or an activity? If it is answered that it is an activity, because the mind is always active in its choices, we reply that the will is active in the choices which it actually makes. But how is it with the counter choice of good and evil, which it does not make at all? Could the will have made this alternate choice? If so, how do you know? Are you conscious of a potency? Are you conscious of something which never comes forth into actuality? Then you must be conscious of a quiescent state, the ability to choose between two opposite courses. Hence consciousness is the fundamental proof of freedom against the theory of necessity. Says sturdy Dr. Samuel Johnson, ‘I know that I am free, and that’s the end of it.’ Are those who

are eager to tear down the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification, willing to employ an instrument which inevitably subverts the whole structure of the Arminian theology, when in the hands of a predestinarian? That this is no mere bugbear, see what a damaging use the arch-materialist, J. Stuart Mill, made of a precisely similar assumption of Sir W. Hamilton. Hamilton had declared that consciousness cognizes only the actual, and not the possible. In another lecture he shows that the regulative faculty, or the pure reason, rejects the freedom of the will as utterly unthinkable, in accordance with his 'philosophy of the conditioned,' which is, that reason can admit neither the absolute nor the infinite. If the will is free, its acts are absolute, *i.e.*, uncaused; and on the other hand, if its acts are caused, there must be an endless chain of causation running beyond God's volitions into the infinite. Hamilton thus avers that the philosophy of the conditioned rejects alike freedom and fate, or the absolute and infinite.

"But Hamilton, nevertheless, endeavours to cling to freedom, because it is a *dictum* of consciousness. After arraying reason and consciousness in a deadlock on the question of free agency, he announces his belief in liberty on the ground of consciousness. But the faulty limitation of consciousness to the actual, excluding potency, did not escape the keen eye of the logical Mill. His spear finds this joint in Hamilton's coat of mail, and his philosophy is pushed into fatalism. For if Hamilton should tell a wilful

lie, he never could prove from consciousness that he might have told the truth, because that ability to speak the truth was a quiescent potency, beyond the sphere of consciousness. It would be well for those who talk so carelessly about consciousness failing to cognize a quiescent state, to remember that though Mill is dead, he has plenty of followers, who wish no better fun than the easy task of overturning human freedom and responsibility with the lever that the opponents of entire sanctification are now putting into their hands.

“Again, let us see what becomes of the doctrine of original, or birth sin, if we admit the theory that consciousness cognizes only activities. Can it be proved that the nature of man is corrupt by any appeal to consciousness? How on earth then did Paul, or his convicted legalist, in the seventh chapter of Romans, come to have such a piece of information as this—‘I am carnal,’ not merely do I *do* wicked deeds, but ‘I am carnal’ in my quiescent state, the fountain of all action? The law could not have been his informant, for it prescribes acts, saying, ‘*do this and live.*’ But by some means he becomes possessed of the painful fact that there is a *being* of sin back of the *doing*. Can anyone tell us how a man becomes convinced that his nature in its quiescent state is sinful? Here is a dilemma—for this fact is either revealed by consciousness or by the Holy Ghost. If by the former, then consciousness grasps a quiescent state; but if by the Holy

Ghost, then He has testimonies other than the fact of adoption and pardon. Which horn do you prefer to be gored by? Or will you abandon the doctrine of inborn sin and become Pelagian, and say that Adam's sin consists in doing as Adam did? I for my part advertise the public that I prefer this doctrine to the doctrine of innate depravity, so deeply ingrained in my nature, below the gaze of consciousness, that I may never, with all the light of the Holy Spirit promised in the Bible, certainly know that I am not a knave at the bottom of my nature. My intelligence revolts at the thought that a wise and holy God should allow beings to be born under His moral government, and amenable to His law, with no knowledge, and no means of knowledge anywhere in the universe, of their real character as discerned by the all-seeing eye. I am shocked at such a conception of God as represents Him as holy and hating all the traces and stains of sin, yet withholding from man that knowledge of his own depravity which is necessary to secure his co-operation in its complete purification. I must either take this view of God, or admit that He has made eyes in my soul by which, under the illumination of the Spirit, I may gaze to the very depths of my sinful nature. If this be true, then it follows that consciousness may attest a quiescent state, and a believer's intuitions may know by the light of the Holy Ghost that he is cleansed **from** all inbred sin.

“But the worst of this fallacious philosophy of

consciousness limited to the sphere of activities remains to be shown. It renders it impossible for a man certainly to know that he is in a regenerate state. For this is either a quiescent or an active state. If it is the former, then it can never be cognized by consciousness, and the witness of our own spirit, so much talked about by Wesley, is mere nonsense. But if the opponent says that the regenerate state is active since it is the awakening of love within the dead soul, then it follows that entire sanctification is an intensely active state, in which the soul loves God to the full extent of its powers. In the Wesleyan theology, perfect love is equivalent to perfect purity. If a soul can know that all its forces are moving Godward, it can know that self is crucified and sin is entirely destroyed.

“Let us now examine the assertion that the Holy Spirit is not the witness of complete holiness. The first corollary from this doctrine is this—there is no such experience in this life. For it is the office of the Holy Spirit to hold up the mirror of truth to every soul, that he may see his moral visage. Now if, under the illumination of the Spirit, no one on earth, looking into the Gospel glass, discovers that he is a sinner, then it follows that we cannot prove that a sinner exists on the footstool of God. If no one perceive that he is partially sanctified, then there is no proof that there is a regenerate soul on earth. If no one in Christendom sees himself in the Gospel glass complete in Christ Jesus, then it cannot

be proved that there is a soul entirely sanctified, that is now in the body. It is evident that a denial of the subjective proofs amounts to a flat denial of the experience. How can a thing be known to exist without its proofs?

“2. Who is he that knows so much about the Holy Ghost, that he can confidently set metes and bounds to His activities? How does he come by this amazing wisdom? The Bible does not set limits to the agency of the Spirit. So that if nothing were said in the Book of Books of a positive character on this subject, so broad an inference as the denial of the Spirit’s testimony to entire sanctification would be wholly unwarranted.”

This is not the witness of God’s Spirit to an abstract dogma, but to His own work in the heart of a believer.

This witness is accompanied by a keen sense of corruption, or wrong; and it prays most earnestly “The first approach of sin to feel.” Faith becomes settled and sees no reason for doubting one of the promises. A small doubt to such a heart is a great sin.

Joy is frequently present, but not always; while peace is ever abiding. There is a sweet sense of the Divine presence and favour, an unwavering assurance of a complete salvation, and a consciousness of a oneness with God. There is a complete victory over sin, the soul resting firmly upon the Rock of Ages, fully armed against any assault. Love is the

element of the soul—flowing into some hearts in a steady current, while into others it rushes like a burning fire. Christ becomes altogether lovely, and every thought is “brought into captivity to His obedience.” The human will is in subjection to the Divine, so that whatever be the call, whether to labour, suffer, or die, the heart joyfully responds, “Thy will be done.”

We have not only the *direct* witness, but we have what we denominate the *indirect* witness. By this we mean, the *fruit* of the Spirit, “love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, temperance, faith.”

These fruits come as the result of the completed work. The *direct* witness is instantaneous; the *indirect* is not. A witness is immediate; a fruit is gradual. The one is something said: the other is something developed. Words are instantaneous; fruit-growing is gradual.

Those who reject the direct witness of the Spirit, reject instantaneous sanctification.

The fruit of holiness is not put on; it grows. It does not require great labour to produce holy fruit, if the work is really complete. The fruit comes of what has transpired within, and not from what is put on from without. No urging will induce holy living. Nothing will produce that but holiness. If they retain the grace, they will live well; if they do not live well, it is a clear evidence that they have not the grace.

We may judge of the character of the work, by noting how the heart behaves itself in the presence of temptation. If "Satan cometh" to us, as he did to Jesus, "and hath nothing in us;" if he finds "no part dark" for a lurking place; if the light of God shines through every apartment of the soul; if, when he urges his temptations, he finds that we are "dead indeed unto sin;" it is very clear inferential evidence that the strong man has been cast out, and his goods have been spoiled.

There has been no little controversy on the subject of temptation, and especially the temptation of a sanctified Christian.

It is argued by one class, that all Christians are conscious of remaining impurity after conversion. They feel the motions of sin, though they are not dominant. Evil emotions and desires exist, to which they do not yield or consent, but in view of which they are greatly humbled.

It is insisted by others that these emotions and desires, in themselves, are not sins, but infirmities, or temptations; and that sin, proper, exists when the will consents. This is true, if by sin is meant an act only. But if we admit that depravity is sin, then it may exist before the act. Infirmities are inseparable from human nature. No matter what the degree of grace, they still abide with us, and go with us to the last. But infirmities are not sins, though it has been somewhat difficult for many minds to distinguish between them.

Infirmities are *without remedy* so long as we are in the body. Sins, by the keeping power of Christ, are avoidable through every hour of our regenerate life.

A thousand infirmities are consistent with perfect love, but not one sin.

With regard to the subject of temptation; it is insisted that sin, as an act, begins at the point of consent; but sin, in a proper sense, and in one of its Scriptural senses, may exist in the instinctive form of desire, and even back of that, in the emotions.

Temptation is first addressed to the intellect. In the case of Eve, it was first a suggestion to unbelief—to doubt God's word. The moment she yielded intellectually to the suggestion to doubt, in that moment and in that doubt she fell

Temptation is addressed secondly to the emotions, which have, by doubt, become depraved. So soon as Eve yielded to the intellectual doubt, in that moment she lusted after the forbidden fruit.

Consent comes after this. Eve's duty was, in the instant that Satan said, "Ye shall not surely die," to have repelled the temptation. Neglecting to do it, she fell. Then her own depravity suggested the temptation which led immediately to disobedience.

If the heart is unsanctified, the temptation when presented finds a favourable response in the emotions, and to some extent in the desires. The judgment proclaims the indulgence unlawful; the will refuses to yield, but the affections cling to the object pre-

sented. The mind does not readily disconnect itself from the contemplation of the subject. It comes up again and again, and each time it seems more attractive, while the enlightened judgment warns us of the peril of indulgence.

Not so with the heart wholly sanctified. The same object may be presented; but instead of the emotions becoming favourably excited, and desire felt for the object, or any delight experienced in its contemplation, there is at once a universal rebellion throughout the whole soul. There is nothing which gives a favourable response to such presentations. The judgment proclaims the indulgence a great sin, and the whole emotional nature takes up arms to fight the base intruder. This I conceive to be the difference between the temptation of a sanctified and an unsanctified soul.

The temptation may be strong; the whole house may be shaken by the foe, and yet it may all be from without. If there be no response from within, except to oppose; if there be no delight in the contemplation of the object, but utter and eternal rejection, loathing the evil, then may the heart conclude it has secured the purity promised.

Mr. Wesley makes some practical remarks upon this subject which we commend, as possessing great value:—

Question. How do you know that you are sanctified,—saved from your inbred corruption?

Answer. I can know it no otherwise than I

know that I am justified. 'Hereby know we that we are of God,' in either sense, 'by the Spirit that He hath given us.'

"We know it by the witness and by the fruit of the Spirit. And, first, by the witness. As when we were justified the Spirit bore witness with our spirit that our sins were forgiven, so when we were sanctified He bore witness that they were taken away. Indeed, the witness of sanctification is not always clear at first; (as neither is that of justification); neither is it afterwards always the same, but, like that of justification, sometimes stronger and sometimes fainter. Yea, and sometimes it is withdrawn. Yet, in general, the latter testimony of the Spirit is both as clear and as steady as the former.

"Q. But what need is there of it—seeing sanctification is a real change, not relative only, like justification?

"A. But is the new birth a relative change only? Is not this a real change? Therefore, if we need no witness of our sanctification, because it is a real change, for the same reason we need none that we are born of, or are the children of, God.

"Q. But does not sanctification shine by its own light?

"A. And does not the new birth too? Sometimes it does; and so does sanctification; at others it does not. In the hour of temptation, Satan clouds the work of God, and injects various doubts and reasonings, especially in those who have either very

weak or very strong understandings. At such times there is absolute need of that witness, without which the work of sanctification not only could not be discerned, but could no longer subsist. Were it not for this, the soul could not abide in the love of God; much less could it rejoice evermore, and in every thing give thanks. In these circumstances, therefore, a direct testimony that we **are** sanctified is necessary in the highest degree.

“But I have no witness that I am saved from sin. And yet I have no doubt of it.

“Very well; as long as you have no doubt, it is enough; when you have, you will need that witness.

“There may be intermissions of the direct testimony that they are born of God; but some have the testimony both of justification and sanctification without any intermission at all; which I presume more might have, did they walk humbly and closely with God.”—*Works*, vol. vi., pp. 515, 516, 517.

In seeking the witness of the Spirit, do not look for too much. Do not look to be smitten to the earth by the power of God, or to be overwhelmed with the Divine glory. Do not look for supernatural utterances—to have your tongue so unloosed that you shall be able to speak with great correctness and power, especially without thought and without preparation. Look simply to be saved from all sin, and filled with pure love to God. It may come “with observation,” and it may not. You may be wafted to heaven on a tempest-tossed ocean, or your

soul may be swept as with a "rushing mighty wind." But it will be just as likely to come in a "still small voice," and you be borne upon a sea with scarcely a ripple, sped by winds soft as the balmy air of Eden. But He will notify you of His presence, and that He has come to stay. The evidence of His coming may be delayed for a season, to test your faith, but you need not fear, as God cannot deny Himself. Faith will become victorious, and the soul will find permanent, satisfactory rest in Christ.

"Come as Thou wilt, I that resign,
But O, my Jesus, Come!"

CHAPTER XV

HOLINESS—HOW RETAINED.

THE question—How may the blessing of holiness, or entire sanctification, be retained? is one of great practical importance. It is not to be retained without special effort, as there is no point of absolute safety until “mortality is swallowed up of life.” Our enemies are numerous, powerful, and subtle; ready at any moment to sow tares when the soul fails to watch or trust.

Taking it for granted that the heart is pure—that the Spirit attests to the completeness of the work, we shall proceed to point out the method by which such a blessing may be retained. May God direct our mind and pen, that we make no mistake.

1. *Confession; by which we mean, a humble, prudent, but frank acknowledgment of the work wrought in the soul by the power of the Holy Ghost.*

One writer urges us “not to attach too much importance to profession.” We are not to “fall into the delusion that profession should be confidently and often made.” “It will savour more of pride than grace; it will influence backward more than forward.”

Another writer urges, that “it is as well **not to**

make such profession, but to live out all the grace we can get, be the same more or less."

We are thankful for any counsel on a subject so important; but as it is a question of experience—a question upon which men should speak from experience, if they would speak wisely, it would be well to inquire whether the persons who volunteer such counsel to the professors of holiness have themselves proved the value of such instruction? Have they retained the blessed experience by keeping silent on the subject? If a person recommends a professedly valuable remedy to me, I am anxious to know whether it has healed him. If it proves in the end that he has faithfully applied it to himself, and it has neither cured him nor prevented a relapse of the disease, he should not urge it upon me. These counsellors should be able to show that once they had a clear experience of Christian purity; that they have retained it in all its blessedness, and in doing so, have very seldom confessed it; and that they know it can be done. Unless this is their experience, what right have they to counsel others? If such a case is on record, we have not heard of it.

The testimony of the life is not sufficient. We are to give a "reason of the hope that is within us." Our lives, if well ordered, may testify to the purity of our morals and the innocence of our social dispositions. "It may prove you honest, industrious, and neighbourly; but with all these you may be without regeneration or the love of God. How shall

it be known *why* you are honest—whether grace or nature, the love of Christ, or the love of praise, makes you so? Your life testify! Absurd! As well might the blameless conduct of a witness at the bar be offered in reply to fifty cross-questions.

“The mode is fixed by God’s authority. ‘With the mouth confession is made unto salvation.’ This has been the usual mode from the beginning. The psalmist wished to ‘declare’ what God had done for his soul. He prays, ‘O Lord, open thou my *lips*, and my *mouth* shall show forth Thy praise.’ In harmony with the text which connects faith and confession, he says, ‘I believed, and therefore have I spoken.’ The New Testament saints followed this example; for the apostle says: ‘We also believe, and therefore *speak*.’ Stephen testified with his expiring breath, and Paul records his experience in its remarkable details—visions, power and all—not leaving out his call to preach, nor even his visit to the third heaven. It seems he was wont to relate all in his sermons, and that before kings; not standing on his own apostolic dignity, nor anxious about the violations of courtly etiquette.”—*Bishop Hamline.*

“It is to be feared that special danger lies hid in the idea that we are not to openly profess this grace, but to show it forth in the life. It is just the idea which the devil, the greatest foe of vital godliness, would have prevail; it is the point at which some of his fiercest temptations are directed, and at which

scores stumble and fall. This was the point, it will be remembered, at which the devoted Fletcher fell; and surely, if man could have maintained it and kept silence, he, so full of prayer and faith, must have been the one. But why should not the same rule hold here as in the case of the justified person? How often have we seen such backslide from not obeying the call to acknowledge the pardoning love of God! Do they not, as a general thing, lose ground, and finally turn back to the world and sin?

“Many who have been justified, profess it only by the life, which is a practical denial, if confession is to be made with the mouth; and so, if Christ sanctify a soul, and it is confessed not with the mouth, but with the *life only*, it is in fact a denial of the Lord Jesus. That is, just so far as He has saved us, He must be openly confessed, or He is denied. The rule, that ‘silence gives consent,’ holds good only on the side of the devil.

“Experience shows that the simple neglect of this duty is the point at which loss commences; and if the neglect be continued, the results are most disastrous to the soul concerned. The living it out before the Church and the world is a thing of course; but while this is done, the other must not be left undone. We have yet to find the person who, for any length of time, maintained the witness of the Spirit to his entire sanctification, who did **not** *talk* holiness as well as *live* it.

“These are facts; and we may consent to live it

out, and not publicly profess it (which is, to our apprehension, equivalent to proposing to let our light shine by putting it under a bushel), when they are satisfactorily explained on any principles which will not, at the same time, overthrow the entire work of the Holy Spirit in the human heart."—*D. A. Whedon, D.D.*

These are very sensible words, from a very sensible man. What makes them more important is the fact that they are true—true in the experience of all who have either retained or lost this grace.

(1.) *It is objected that definite and repeated confession of heart-purity is not authorized by the Scriptures.*

The apostles and early Christians, it is claimed, made no such profession. What did they declare? Paul professes, that "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus had made him free from the law of sin and death." Again he says, "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God."

To the Thessalonians he says, "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily, and justly, and unblamably we have behaved ourselves among you." To the Philippians he says, "Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded."

If St. Paul does not profess full salvation in these confessions, it would be quite impossible to profess it in any language which might be employed.

St. John says, "Herein is our love made perfect." Mr. Fletcher insists that St. John "professed what our opponents called sinless perfection, and what we call Christian perfection," and that Paul "professed his having attained a perfection of Christian faith working love."

God requires a confession of all which He has done for us and in us. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Here faith and confession are to correspond. All the former claims and receives, the latter must confess or proclaim. "That the communication of thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus" (Philemon, 6). Here, acknowledgment of every good thing done in us is to be made. "They overcame him (Satan) by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death" (Rev. xii. 11). Here the great foe of God and man is overcome by the holy lives and faithful testimony of those who knew the cleansing power of the "blood of the Lamb."

We are commanded, not only to "hold fast the confidence and rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end," but to "hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering."

"Ye shall be witnesses unto Me," says Christ, "both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth"

(Acts i. 8). This was to be their work, "after that the Holy Ghost" had come upon them.

We are impressed that the Scriptures clearly and explicitly inculcate, not only the duty, but the great value of humble and definite confession of what Divine grace has wrought in the human heart.

(2.) *It is objected that those who profess entire sanctification, or holiness, are no better, if as good, as those who make no such profession.*

It is true, doubtless, that many who profess to believe in the doctrine of heart-purity, are no nearer it, practically, than many who have no faith in the doctrine. It may be, and doubtless is, true, that some who profess to enjoy the experience, give no more satisfactory evidence of possessing it than some who make no such profession. But we cannot see how these facts can make against the doctrine or experience. It is equally true that many who profess to be justified give no more satisfactory evidence of a change of heart than those do who make no such profession. But shall we reject justification on that account? The argument proves too much.

We are not to determine whether a doctrine is true or false by the lives of its professors, but by the teaching of its author. What do the Scriptures teach on the subject?

This objection comes with an ill grace, especially from those who claim that entire sanctification is identical with justification. They profess to believe that every person who is converted is entirely

sanctified; and that unless they are sanctified wholly they are not converted at all. That persons holding such views should complain of a profession of holiness is very remarkable. If their profession be in harmony with their theory, they are the loudest professors of holiness. But when pressed on the subject, they shrink from a confession in harmony with their faith.

Rev. W. Taylor relates an incident which occurred under his early ministry in Baltimore, illustrating this point. He says:—"A venerable steward of the society in my charge said to me, 'Bro. Taylor, I don't believe in this doctrine of entire sanctification as a specific attainment subsequent to conversion. When God converted my soul, He did it well, and I then received all the sanctification I ever expect to get, except a gradual growing in grace.'

"I was then a very unobtrusive, timid young man, and would not have had confidence sufficient to have advanced any opinion in this venerable man's presence adverse to his mind, except in a clear case of duty. The good Spirit, perfectly knowing my embarrassment, at once gave me 'a mouth and wisdom' which he was 'not able to gainsay nor resist.'

"'Bro. T——,' said I, 'Mr. Wesley admits the possibility of a person being justified freely and sanctified wholly in the same moment of time. In all his extensive acquaintance he had never met with such a case, but, as a theory, thought it possible. Now, probably I have the pleasure of meeting in

you, my brother, one of those rare cases that Mr. Wesley never knew; and if you were, indeed, "sanctified wholly" in the moment of your conversion to God, and you have been preserved blameless in that state, thank the Lord, you are all right. But if, after thirty years of such gradual growing as you talk about, you are not sanctified wholly now, then you are not right, in so far as you fall short of that experience. It reduces itself to a simple question of fact—are you wholly sanctified to God, or are you not? I will have no discussion with you as to the time—the earlier the better. If in the same moment of your conversion, as you say, better still.'

"I did not press the question, but he at once began to confess his unfaithfulness, and was sorry to say that he did not enjoy the experience of 'entire sanctification.'"—*Infancy and Manhood*, pp. 134, 135.

And this would be the honest testimony of every such professor who had an intelligent idea of the doctrine and no special dogma to sustain.

The following facts must be admitted by all; even by those who hold that believers are wholly sanctified at conversion:—

1. Every man *believes* in Christian perfection who believes in conversion, if the two works are one in point of time. The difference between the one and the other is simply a question of *when* the work is finished.

2. Every man *enjoys* entire sanctification who is

converted, if God finishes the work at one and the same time. It cannot be said by one class of another —“These holiness people” are so and so; for they themselves are as fully identified with holiness as others, and more so, for they profess to have attained it earlier in their experience.

3. Every man *professes* entire sanctification who professes to be converted, if the two works occur at one and the same time.

Every time such an one professes to have passed “from death unto life,” he makes the fullest profession of heart-purity, or perfect love. He is the last man to complain of profession.

4. If entire sanctification is not distinct from conversion, then no one should complain of a profession of the former blessing, for in so doing they complain of a profession of regeneration. No Christian can be truthful, if such a doctrine be true, who does not make a confession of entire sanctification.

5. If entire sanctification is complete in conversion, then Christians are never to be urged to “cleanse themselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit;” to “go on unto perfection,” and to be made “perfect in love.” There is no pride, no anger, no impatience, no unbelief, no love of the world remaining, to be cleansed from. And yet the newly-justified are known to experience all these evidences of depravity in a greater or less degree.

6. If entire sanctification and conversion are inseparable, then all who are conscious of not being

fully cleansed are to infer that they are not converted, and are to begin the work of repentance anew, having been utterly deceived in their former experience.

These simple facts must make it plain to every candid mind that seeking and professing entire sanctification is both reasonable and safe; and that the contrary doctrine is unreasonable and perilous, and should be discarded as a "damnable heresy" (2 Peter ii. 1).

(3.) *It is objected that Mr. Wesley counsels great caution in the matter of confession, insisting that the blessing should not be confessed, except on very special occasions.*

It must not be forgotten that the circumstances attending the labours of Mr. Wesley differed widely from those surrounding us. The doctrine of justification by faith and the witness of the Spirit were not only stoutly denied by the foremost men in the Church, but those who preached and professed the experience were held as ranting fanatics. Mr. Wesley boldly withstood these, and urged his people to declare the grace received, though in doing so they were subjected to the most violent opposition.

Mr. Wesley felt that to make prominent the experience of full salvation, or Christian perfection, among a people who could not even understand or appreciate justification, would be casting pearls before swine; it would only cause them to blaspheme the more. He therefore urged his people, especially in the earlier years of his ministry, not to make a

public profession before the unconverted, unless the fire was so hot they could not resist it, but to confine their professions to believers. He nowhere urges them not to profess the experience, only not to do it in the presence of those who could not understand it, and would not be benefitted by it. Hence he inquires:—

“Suppose one had attained to this, would you advise him to speak of it?”

“*Answer.* At first, perhaps, he would scarce be able to refrain, the fire would be so hot within him; his desire to declare the loving-kindness of the Lord carrying him away like a torrent. But afterwards he might; and then it would be advisable not to speak of it to them that know not God (it is most likely it would only provoke them to contradict and blaspheme); nor to others without some particular reason, without some good in view.”

This was very judicious counsel under the circumstances. It was written some time before the *great revival of holiness*, which seems to have materially modified his views on the subject. As the doctrine and experience became more generally known and appreciated, the profession became more general; and the duty to confess the experience is more and more urged upon ministers and people by Mr. Wesley.

In 1782, he writes to Mr. Benson:—“I doubt we are not explicit enough, in speaking on full sanctification, either in public or private.”—*Works*, vol. vii., p. 81.

Four years later, he urges Mrs. Crosby to "encourage Richard Blackwell and Mr. Colly to speak plainly, and to press believers to the constant pursuit and earnest expectation of Christian perfection;" saying that "a general faintness in this respect is fallen upon the whole kingdom."

In 1787, he writes to John King, one of his preachers:—"It requires a great degree of watchfulness to retain the perfect love of God; and one great means of retaining it is, frankly to declare what God has given you, and earnestly to exhort all the believers you meet with to follow after full salvation."—Vol. vii., p. 13.

To Miss Briggs he writes:—"Undoubtedly it would be a cross to declare what God has done for your soul; nay, and afterward Satan would accuse you on the account, telling you 'you did it out of pride.' Yea, and some of your sisters (not to say brothers) would blame you, and perhaps put the same construction upon it (as many are doing). Nevertheless, if you do it with a single eye, it will be pleasing to God."—Vol. vii., p. 103.

Writing to a member of the society on the subject of a profession of entire sanctification, he says:—"I am glad you have at length broken through those evil reasonings which so long held you down, and prevented you from acknowledging the things which are freely given you of God."

Do these counsels indicate that Mr. Wesley was anxious to suppress such testimony? He seems

most anxious that his people should make known this great salvation.

(4.) *It is objected that Mr. Wesley did not profess entire sanctification, which he would have done had it been proper.*

1. Mr. Wesley insisted on his preachers preaching the doctrine with great clearness and power. Writing of one place, he says:—"They sadly want more searching preachers; and those that would help them forward by explaining the deep things of God."—Vol. vii., p. 776.

To Mr. Merryweather he writes as follows:—"My dear Brother,—Where Christian perfection is not strongly and explicitly preached, there is seldom any remarkable blessing from God; and, consequently, little addition to the society, and little life in the members of it. Therefore, if Jacob Rowell is grown faint, and says but little about it, do *you* supply his lack of service. Speak, and spare not. Let not regard for any man induce you to betray the truth of God. Till you press believers to expect full salvation *now*, you must not look for any revival."—*Works*, vol. vi., p. 761.

Mr. Wesley writes to his brother Charles as follows:—"I find almost all our preachers, in every circuit, have done with Christian perfection. They say they believe it, but they never preach it; or not once in a quarter. What shall be done? Shall we let it drop, or make a point of it?" On examining one society he says:—"I was surprised to find fifty

members fewer than I left in it in October last. One reason is, Christian perfection has been little insisted on; and where this is not done, be the preachers ever so eloquent, there is little increase either in the number or grace of the hearers." Of another place he says:—"Here I found the work of God had gained no ground in this circuit all the year. The preachers have given up the Methodist testimony. Either they did not speak of perfection at all (the peculiar doctrine committed to our trust), or they speak of it only in general terms, without urging believers to go on unto perfection. And where this is not earnestly done, the work of God does not prosper."

2. Mr. Wesley made the subject a specialty in his preaching, and in the establishment of meetings for its promotion.

It is claimed that *all* religious meetings are for the promotion of holiness, and hence special ones are unnecessary. This is true in part only. We do not propose to discuss the question of the propriety of such meetings, but simply present the historic fact with respect to Mr. Wesley's practice. With regard to his preaching on the subject, he says, January 20, 1767:—"At five in the morning I again began a course of sermons on Christian perfection; if haply that thirst after it might return which was so general a few years ago. Since that time, how deeply have we grieved the Holy Spirit of God!" This, it seems, was not a new and un-

tried method with him. "I *again* began a course of sermons," showing that he had done the same thing before. He seemed anxious that the days of 1759, '60, '61, '62 and '63 should return, though fraught as they were with the George Bell errors and disasters.

In an "address" to the readers of the *Arminian Magazine*, for 1780, twenty years after that blessed work commenced, he says:—"I have still abundant letters in my hands, equal to any that have yet been published. Indeed, there is a peculiar energy of thought and language in many of those which were written in the year 1759 and a few of the following years, suitable to that unusual outpouring of the Spirit with which both London and many parts of England and Ireland were favoured during that happy period. Happy I cannot but call it, notwithstanding the tares which Satan found means of sowing among the wheat. And I cannot but adopt the prayer of a pious man in Scotland upon a similar occasion: 'Lord, if it please Thee, work the same work again, without the blemishes; but if that cannot be, though it be with all the blemishes, work the same work.'"

Mr. Wesley established special meetings for the promotion of holiness in believers. "The Methodists were divided into four Societies; namely, the United Societies, the Bands, the Select Societies and the Penitents. The *United Societies*, who were the most numerous, consisted of awakened persons.

The *Bands* were selected from these, and consisted of those who were supposed to have remission of sins. The *Select Societies* were taken from the *Bands*, and were composed of those who seemed to walk in the light of God's countenance. The *Penitents* were those who, for the present, were fallen from grace."—*Tyerman*, vol. i., pp. 444, 445.

Of the *Select Societies*, Dr. A. Stevens says (*History of Methodism*, vol. ii., p. 458):—"Mr. Wesley established meetings for penitents and backsliders, and *Select Societies* for persons who were especially interested in the subject of Christian perfection."

Mr. Wesley gives the following account of the origin of these *Select Societies*:—"I desired a small number of such as appeared to be in this state (viz., continually walking in the light of God, and having fellowship with the Father and with the Son Jesus Christ) to spend an hour with me every Monday morning. My design was, not only to *direct them how to press after perfection*, but also to have a select company, to whom I might unbosom myself on all occasions without reserve; and whom I could propose to all their brethren as a pattern of love, of holiness, and of good works."—Vol. v., pp. 184, 185.

These *Select Societies*, it will be observed, were **exclusively** meetings for the promotion of holiness among those who were already in fellowship with God.

None but believers were allowed to attend the

Band Meetings; and the questions propounded to each member on his admission show that their justification was not doubtful. Some of these questions were as follows:—

“ 1. Have you forgiveness of sins ?

“ 2. Have you peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ ?

“ 3. Have you the witness of God’s Spirit with your spirit that you are a child of God ?

“ 4. Is the love of God shed abroad in your heart.

“ 5. Has no sin, inward or outward, dominion over you ? ”

If they could answer these questions affirmatively, they were admitted to membership in these *Bands*, as seekers of holiness. These are the persons whom Mr. Wesley was ever urging to go on unto perfection, and to expect it at any moment.

Those who hold special meetings for the promotion of holiness, it would seem, follow in the footsteps of Mr. Wesley.

3. Mr. Wesley’s helpers made a clear and direct profession of entire sanctification, with his full approval, and often by his special request. As examples, take Rev. Alexander Mather. Mr. Mather was one of Mr. Wesley’s most honoured and successful ministers. He requested him to write an account of his Christian experience for publication in the *Arminian Magazine*. He did so, so far as it related to his conversion; but he did not make

mention of the work of entire sanctification. Mr. Wesley published this account in April, 1780. Of Mr. Mather's omission, he says:—"After reading and considering the foregoing account, I observed to Mr. Mather that he had wholly omitted one considerable branch of his experience, touching what is properly termed 'The great salvation.' He wrote me a full and particular answer, the substance of which I here subjoin." Then follows a clear statement of the work of heart-purity. Mr. Wesley closes the account with these words:—"I earnestly desire that all our preachers would seriously consider the preceding account. And let them not be content never to speak against *the great salvation*, either in public or private; and never to discourage, either by word or deed, any that think they have attained it. No; but prudently encourage them to *hold fast whereunto they have attained*. And strongly and explicitly exhort all believers to *go on unto perfection*; yea, to expect full salvation from sin every moment, by mere grace, through grace."

If Mr. Wesley was opposed to a public confession, why was he constantly calling out these experiences and publishing them to the world? This he never would have done had he been opposed to such public profession.

John Fletcher, a man held in high esteem by Mr. Wesley, had a clear experience of heart-purity, and relates it with an earnestness of spirit worthy of universal imitation.

Hester Ann Rogers records the meeting and the experience. After confessing that he had lost it four or five times by refusing to confess it, he says:—"I declare unto you, in the presence of God, the *Holy Trinity*, I am 'now dead indeed unto sin.' I do not say 'I am crucified with Christ,' because some of our well-meaning brethren say by this can only be meant a gradual dying; but I profess unto you, I am dead unto sin and alive unto God! And remember, all this is 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' He is my *Prophet, Priest, and King*; my indwelling holiness; my *all in all*."—*Hester Ann Rogers*, p. 135.

This is the kind of testimony which Mr. Wesley is ever urging his people to give.

He commends Dr. Clarke for "insisting upon full and present salvation," telling him that he "need not wonder" that "it is opposed, not only by formalists, but by half Methodists."—Vol. vii., p. 203.

Four years later, and within one year of his triumphant death, he says to Dr. Clarke that he "doubts whether a local preacher or leader" who speaks "directly or indirectly" against "Christian perfection" "should continue in the society. Because he that can speak thus in our congregations cannot be an honest man."—Vol. vii., p. 206.

4. Mr. Wesley's own confession.

It is claimed that Mr. Wesley did not confess the experience. One thing is very clear—if a minister in these times should speak of entire sanctification

as Mr. Wesley did, he would be classed among the loudest professors of holiness. Hear him :—

“I dislike the saying, that this was not known or taught among us till within two or three years. I grant you did not know it. You have over and over denied instantaneous sanctification to me ; but I have known and taught it above these twenty years.”—Vol. iv., p. 140.

“Many years since I saw that ‘without holiness no man shall see the Lord.’ I began by following after it and inciting all with whom I had any intercourse to do the same. Ten years after, God gave me a clearer view than I had before of the way how to attain it, namely, by faith in the Son of God. And immediately I declared to all, ‘We are saved from sin, we are made holy by faith.’ This I testified in private, in public, in print ; and God confirmed it by a thousand witnesses. I have continued to declare this for above thirty years ; and God has continued to confirm the word of grace.”—Vol. vii., p. 38.

This was written in 1771. In 1744, nearly thirty years before, he writes :—“In the evening, while I was reading prayers at Snowsfields, I found such light and strength as I never remember to have had before. I saw every thought, as well as action or word, just as it was rising in my heart, and whether it was right before God, or tainted with pride or selfishness. I never knew before—I mean not at this time—what it was to be still before God.

"I waked the next morning by the grace of God in the same spirit; and about eight, being with two or three that believed in Jesus, I felt such an awe and tender sense of the presence of God, as greatly confirmed me therein; so that God was before me all the day long. I sought and found Him in every place; and could truly say, when I lay down at night, 'now I have lived a day.'"—Vol. iii., p. 324.

Who can say, in the light of these utterances, that Mr. Wesley did not confess the experience of heart-purity?

We have dwelt thus long on the subject of confession because it is considered by many unnecessary, if not harmful. Let all who would retain the perfect love of God, hold fast their profession. "The devil," says Mr. Bramwell, "told me that I had better not profess it. But in preaching that night the temptation was removed, and my soul was again filled with glory and with God. I then declared to the people what God had done for my soul; and I have done so on every proper occasion since that time, believing it to be a duty incumbent upon me. I think such a blessing cannot be retained without professing it at every fit opportunity; for thus we glorify God, and with the mouth make confession unto salvation,"—*Life*, pp. 37, 38.

2. *To retain the perfect love of God, there must be a life of simple trust.*

Nothing in the Christian life is a substitute for faith. Feelings are not to be ignored. They exist

as the result, or effect, of faith. A religion without feeling is formalism: a religion exclusively of feeling is fanaticism. But a religion of faith, working by love, fires formalism, and imparts common sense to fanaticism.

The Christian life should be uniform—not ebbing and flowing, now up and now down. If we walk by faith, ours will be a uniform life; if by feeling, then it will be as changing as the winds or tides. Health, education, and natural temperament combine to modify our feelings. Influenced by these, we are ever changing. But faith, while it rests upon the promise, knows no change.

We are prone to measure our piety by our emotions. If we are full of religious emotion, we fancy ourselves full of faith; if we are destitute of such emotions, we judge ourselves to be void of faith. Such a life is, of necessity, most unsatisfactory, as we are never able to determine our exact spiritual latitude and longitude.

Mr. Fletcher, a man of an intensely emotional nature, exhorts believers to “exercise faith, independent of all feeling, in a naked promise, bringing with you but a distracted heart.”

“Storms may gather over the heads of the fully sanctified,” says Dr. G. Peck, “dangers may threaten them, tempests of adversity may actually break upon them—they may see no way of escape; but though not able to walk by *sight*, they can walk by *faith*, and so they are not moved.”

"The Lord has taught me," says Lady Maxwell, "that it is by faith, and not joy, that I must live. He has, in a measure, often enabled me strongly to act faith in Jesus for sanctification, even in the absence of all comfort. This has diffused a heaven of sweetness through my soul, and brought with it the powerful witness of purity."

The holy Fenelon, whose whole life was one of perfect trust, says:—"Naked faith, alone, is a sure guard against illusion. When we rest upon God only in pure and naked faith, in the simplicity of the Gospel, receiving the consolations which He sends, but dwelling in none, following the light of the faith of the present moment, then we are indeed in a way that is but little subject to illusion."

To walk by faith is to hear God when we cannot see Him, and to know God when we cannot feel Him. Faith can hear the Divine whispers in the hush of the soul as satisfactorily as when He thunders by in the storm of emotion. Faith may know the presence of the Comforter, though no chord consciously vibrates in the soul.

"Faith lends its realizing light,
The clouds disperse, the shadows fly;
The Invisible appears in sight,
And God is seen by mortal eye."

Faith is "*substance*,"—faith is "*evidence*."

It is just along here that faith gives out, if at all; for it is just here that God tests the strength of our trust. To love God for Christ's sake; to serve Him for the love we bear to Him, and not for the pleasure

of the service, the intoxication of delight which we experience, is not an ordinary experience. To do this we must be lifted far above the common plane of Christian life.

We would not be understood as speaking against *feeling*—only against trusting to so uncertain an evidence. Trials will come; temptations will assail you; dark clouds of adversity will envelope you; your soul, like the Master's, may be "sorrowful," and "very heavy." Satan may suggest that you are not as clear in your experience as formerly; that you have slipped somewhere, though you are unable to see where; that you had better give it up and commence again. Hark! that is from beneath. Keep looking up, though there be not a star visible in the whole heavens. Continue saying while you look, "Thy will be done;" and He who is "mighty to save" will reveal Himself to you.

It has been said that the heart sometimes experiences a state it is not easy to describe. There is no emotion of any kind, no active desire, no joy, no conscious peace, no misery, no guilt. A desert is not more destitute of flowers than is the spirit of emotions. The soul is like the clear blue vault of heaven on a winter day, when no cloud is seen, and no winds are abroad. At this absence of emotion we are often alarmed, just as a traveller on a lonely mountain summit sometimes is terrified at the very silence which there reigns. It seems more dreadful to him than the loudest thunder. If we set our-

selves to enjoy the highest results of Christian experience, and to be wholly the Lord's, the question must soon be settled, whether we love God as a means to our happiness, or for His own sake. Alas, how many stumble and fall when the Divine Shepherd leads them into the desert, to wean them from themselves and the world, and purge from the soul all its sensuous and earthly images! This is the crisis in the experience of the hidden life. It is a spiritual Rubicon. If we cross it, victory and glory await us in the future.

3. *To retain the perfect love of God, we must be abundant in good works.*

The world judge of our piety more by what we do than by what we profess. We may be abundant in good works without piety, but we cannot be pious without being abundant in good works.

We must be diligent in our efforts to save the perishing. We must go beyond the circle of those who are in sympathy with us, to those who hate us and scorn our message. We should enter heartily into all the plans of the Church to save souls, if they do not fully accord with our views of what is best, and thus give evidence that our hearts beat in sympathy with the work of God in all its departments, though it may not be conducted according to our plans.

We should not fail to give of our means for the support of the ministry of the Word. No man can withhold his money, when it is needed to relieve

suffering humanity or carry the Gospel to the perishing, and retain the blessing of entire sanctification. He who is reluctant to part with his gold has reason to fear that he has not parted with all his sins. A stingy man had better not profess holiness, as no one will believe that he possesses it. He who takes pleasure in hoarding wealth finds little pleasure in going on unto perfection.

4. *To retain the blessing of heart-purity, we must avoid the appearance of evil.*

That which has the *appearance* of evil, though not intended, is evil to those who judge by appearance. Undue devotion to business may gain for us the reputation of being worldly-minded. Extreme rigour in pressing our claims may gain for us the reputation of being hard-faced and unmerciful. A boisterous manner may cause some to set us down as fanatics. Our dress may be of so fashionable a character as to induce others to regard it as the fruit of pride. Our motives may be good, but pure motives will not neutralize the influence of such appearances upon the minds of those who cannot see the motive.

Great damage has come to the cause of Christ by making prominent that which is non-essential. Such as power to heal the sick. We are not infidel enough to deny that God heals the sick in answer to prayer. But when this is made prominent, and put forth as a miracle-working power equal to saving souls from death, it is then that God is dis-

honoured. Healing the sick is a small matter in comparison with saving a soul. If any have this power, let them exercise it in all humility, but let them remember that in comparison with soul-saving it is as the burning taper to the brightness of the king of day.

Do not run after new theories, or engage in new and unheard-of practices. They will cripple you in your work, and in time utterly destroy your usefulness. Be content with having a clean heart filled with the Spirit. This is all you need. This will fit you for usefulness.

5. *Finally, if you would retain the perfect love of God, do not consider heart-purity a consummation.*

A soul may be holy without being established in holiness. There is childhood in sanctification. He who ceases to grow in holiness, ceases to enjoy heart-purity. Purity of heart is a stepping-stone to religious development. Nearly the whole of growth is beyond heart-purity, as growth in grace belongs pre-eminently to the sanctified state. All obstructions to growth being removed, there is no reason why the pure in heart should not make more rapid progress than when in a lower state of grace.

Unless the soul pants for more of God, more of that fulness of which it has been made the partaker, in being made pure; unless faith seeks and secures enlargement, and love increases in intensity, the grace already given will not only not be retained, but there will be absolute loss. We shall have

missed the connection, and immediately retrograde on the downward plane until we have passed the point of beginning. Let us, then, not only "stand fast in the liberty wherewith God has made us free," but "add to our faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren (idle—*margin*) nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Peter i. 5—8).

"Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end." And "the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

THE END.

NEASE LIBRARY EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE
BT767 .M397 1907X GOULD
McDonald, William/Scriptural way of holi



3 2999 00024 6103

*GOULD LIBRARY
EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE*

Gould BT 767 M~~2~~397 1907x 553
McDonald, W.
Scriptural way of holiness.

DATE	ISSUED TO

Gould BT 767 M397 1907x 553
McDonald, W.
Scriptural way of holiness.

