


1951

The Psychology of Holiness

Henry Orton Wiley

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_lectures

 Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wiley, Henry Orton, "The Psychology of Holiness" (1951). *Western Evangelical Seminary Lectures*. 1. https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_lectures/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Lectures by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

THE WESTERN SCHOOL OF EVANGELICAL RELIGION

Portland, Oregon

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF HOLINESS

H. Orton Wiley

April 30-May 4, 1951

RS

73

W676

PORTLAND CENTER LIBRARY
GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OREGON 97223

THE WESTERN SCHOOL OF EVANGELICAL RELIGION

Portland, Oregon

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF HOLINESS

H. Orton Wiley

April 30-May 4, 1951

LECTURE I. A PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF HOLINESS

"The most important intellectual circumstance with which theology has to reckon in our generation is the rapid progress and phenomenal popularity of the infant science of psychology."

With these words Dr. Walter Marshall Horton begins his interesting volume on "A Psychological Approach to Theology," in which he sets himself to the task of consolidating the gains and discounting the losses of the age of psychology, by digesting and assimilating all that is valid in this whole movement of thought, and putting it into its rightful place in the general body of human wisdom. For theology is the custodian of the general body of wisdom; and every advance in knowledge must result in theological adjustment. He appears to have been goaded on by a challenge found in the "Sermons of a Chemist" by the late Dr. Slosson, presented in these telling words,

"In the intellectual crisis of the present, which comes from the sudden influx of novel and unassimilated ideas, facts and theories from scientific research, we are not getting the help that we have a right to expect from those who now occupy our pulpits, and I fear that we shall get still less from their successors. For either from lack of taste or from defect of training the graduates from our best theological seminaries do not seem to be concerned with such questions...They seem to be smartly up to date and keenly alive on all topics but one, and that is theology. Most of them do not seem to have any, or any interest in any. By theology I do not mean a particular system of dogmatic doctrine, but rather the habit of thinking about the fundamentals of faith and reason, about the metaphysics that lie at the base of physics, the psychology that controls character and motivation, the personal philosophy that is the compass of conduct. It is the schools of science, not the schools of theology, that are turning out the thinkers in such fields.

81 2

Note: We are in the midst of the greatest revolution of thought that the world has ever seen, the EINSTEIN THEORY OF RELATIVITY, the Planck theory of quanta, the chromosome theory of heredity, the hormone theory of temperament, the new knowledge of the constitution of the universe and the workings of the human mind. These ideas will influence the philosophy, the theology, the religion, and morals of the future as much as the Copernican theory influenced those of the sixteenth century, and the Darwinian theory of the nineteenth. Such questions would have aroused the keenest interest in men like Edwards, Berkeley, Calvin, Wesley, Aquinas or Augustine.

"Since sermons have become sociological instead of philosophical, serious-minded people are going elsewhere to get their metaphysics and often getting a poor brand of it from unqualified dispensers. When a young preacher does touch upon such topics -which fortunately is seldom,-he is apt to reveal a materialistic conception of matter that sounds amusingly antiquated to his scientific hearers. Unless the preacher gets accustomed to deep diving while he is young, he is apt to swim shallower and shallower as he gets on in life. Unless he has once thought things through for himself he will be at the mercy of every passing fad that blows. Theological schools ought to teach theology. Eloquence of tongue will not compensate for want of thought. In time congregations will tire of a diet of exclusively boneless sermons stewed in cream."

It is not within the scope of these lectures however, to discuss the bearing of psychology on the field of theology in general, but merely to limit them to the field of Christian experience. More specifically, we shall give our attention to the subject of holiness as this doctrine and experience is held by Christians of the Wesleyan persuasion. We have fallen upon times when this great dispensational truth is being subjected to the criticism of psychology, as formerly it was attacked by certain forms of dogmatic theology. Students versed in the History of Christian Thought will recognize in these modern objections to holiness merely the age-old objections which the proponents of this great truth have met in some form in every generation. We now must meet these objects on the frontiers of the science of psychology. In order to bring immediately before us, the purpose of these lectures, we shall anticipate some of the problems drawn from the writings of Dr. William Newton Flew; Dr. W. E. Sangster, and Dr. E. H. Sugden.

Dr. William Newton Flew

Dr. William Newton Flew in his admirable and scholarly work entitled "The Idea of Perfection," makes the statement in his introduction that "in the following pages the idea of perfection is not regarded as sinlessness (p.xii); and in his chapter on Methodism, takes issue with several of the generally accepted Wesleyan positions.

First, he follows Dr. Sugden in holding that Wesley conceived of sin as a "thing" which must be taken out of a man like "a cancer or a sore tooth," and thus directly attacks the question of the eradication of inbred sin.

Secondly, this leads him to question the instantaneousness of entire sanctification as an act. He says, "But sin is not a mere thing." "From a mere bundle on the back, however burdensome, a man may be delivered in an instant. How can he be delivered in an instant from that which he himself is? The man himself must be changed; and we are changed by the companionship of the Indwelling Spirit of God." (p.355) This of course, puts the whole emphasis upon progressive sanctification.

Thirdly, he thinks another defect in Wesley's theology lies in the characteristic word "assurance." Wesley starts from the principle that in all matters affecting the Christian salvation, perfect faith is attended by its interior evidence. This consciousness is of the very essence of the new relationship. Just as every child was meant to know its father, so every man was meant to know God. "But if our criticism of Wesley's doctrine of sin is valid," he says, "the word assurance is inapplicable to the uprooting of indwelling sin. A man may bear testimony to his awareness of a God who is willing and able to 'destroy the last remains of sin,' he cannot know himself well enough to claim that God has already done it." (p.137) This of course, is a direct attack upon the "witness of the Spirit" which was a characteristic doctrine of Methodism.

"How do you know that you are sanctified, saved from your inbred corruption?" "I can know it no otherwise than I know I am justified. 'Hereby do we know 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 afterward 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."

"But what need is there of it, seeing sanctification is a real change, not a relative only, like justification?"

"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 should need none, that we are born of, or are, the children of God." (Wesley, Plain Account of Christian Perfection, p.75)

(Note: Mr. Wesley argues that we need the witness to sanctification as a real change, as well as to the New Birth, which is likewise a real change. Dr. Flew argues that because sanctification is a real change, we can have no witness of it. He therefore, makes a knowledge of ourselves the ground, or lack of it, for the witness of the Spirit; while Mr. Wesley makes the testimony of the Spirit the ground of assurance. On the same basis, Dr. Flew should argue against the witness of the Spirit to our New Birth, "because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father.")

Dr. W.E. Sangster

Dr. W.E. Sangster in his recent work entitled, "The Path to Perfection," takes essentially the same position. Holding that Mr. Wesley's conception of sin as a "thing" was in some sense materialistic, he thinks that under a changed psychology, the whole position is subject to attack. First of all, he calls in question the statement of Dr. Chadwick, that Mr. Wesley professed the blessing of entire sanctification. Then, he thinks that the emphasis should be placed upon supernatural love, not eradicated sin. He bases this of course, on his psychological position that "no man knows what is in him," that is, in the depths of the unconscious. Hence one can profess perfect love, for this fills his consciousness; but he cannot say "I am freed from sin." Dr. Sangster objects especially to any profession of freedom from sin. "There are deep, deep, reasons," he says, "why no man can say, with all respect to the saintly Fletcher, 'I am freed from all sin.' It is indeed, a thing not to say. It is gravely dangerous to such sentiments. If it costs any students of this teaching a pang to part with Wesley at this point, it must console them to remember that, if they have rejected his counsel, they have followed his example."

The above reference assumes that Mr. Wesley never professed the blessing of entire sanctification. The only reference Mr. Wesley makes to his justification is the experience at Aldersgate where he says his "heart was strangely warmed." It may be argued therefore, that Mr. Wesley never professed the experience of justification. Here are references that refer to his entire sanctification.

"You have over and over denied instantaneous sanctification to me; but I have known and taught it above these twenty years." (Works IV, p.140)

"In the evening, while I was reading prayers at Snowsfield, I found much 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 awaked 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.'" (Works, Volume III, p.323-324) (1744)

Nearly thirty years later (1771) he wrote: "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." (Works, Volume VII, p.38) (Quoted in Woods, -Perfect Love p.148)

Dr. Chadwick quotes the above, -"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." (Chadwick, -The Call to Christian Perfection, p.47)

Dr. E. H. Sugden

Dr. E.H.Sugden in "The Standard Sermons of John Wesley" has been cited by both Dr. Flew and Dr. Sangster, and it may be well to call attention to the original statements which they have quoted, together with other references pertinent to the subject in hand. It appears to us that Dr. Sugden is attempting to champion Mr. Wesley's teachings with one hand, and tear them down with the other. Here are some of his confused statements.

First, he says, "Wesley at this time was not quite free from the conception of entire sanctification as a step up from a permanently lower to a permanently higher level; an advance to a higher state; though as the Minute shows, he came to see the mischief of this view." Where he finds this, he does not state, and it appears to be merely a comment on a Minute that is entirely irrelevant. Dr. Sugden continues, "Hence his hesitation to say definitely that it is an instantaneous work. Of course it is, and must be an instantaneous work; a deliverance this moment from all sin; but it is not necessarily or usually the beginning of a state of entire sanctification from which there are no relapses. We ask, did Mr. Wesley ever teach that entire sanctification was a state from which one could not lapse, -especially in his nature statements of this

Mr. Wesley says, "As to the manner, I believe this perfection is always wrought by a simple act of faith; consequently in an instant."

Mr. Wesley's views are further stated as follows: "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 sin, - 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 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; 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." (Wesley, -Sermons, I,p.122)

In a letter to Hester Ann Rogers he says, "You may obtain a growing victory over sin from the moment you are justified. But this is not enough. The body of sin, the carnal mind, must be destroyed; the old man must be slain, or we cannot put on the new man, which is created after God (or which is the image of God) in righteousness and true holiness; and this is done in a moment. To talk of this work as being gradual, would be nonsense, as much as if we talked of gradual justification. (Journal of Hester Ann Rogers, p.174)

doctrine? Is Dr. Sugden trying to absolve Mr. Wesley from teaching "eternal security?" Hardly!

Secondly, Dr. Sugden states that Mr. Wesley "never quite shook off the fallacious notion that sin is a "thing" which has to be taken out of a man, like a cancer or a rotten tooth....But sin is not a thing; it is a condition of balance among motives. As long as by faith we realize the presence of Christ through the indwelling Spirit, the balance will always tip the right way; but if we once let our faith fail, the motives which though innocent in themselves, tend under circumstances to sin, will once more prevail. And as long as we are in the body, those motives will always be present. No one can expect that the grace of God will free him from the feeling of hunger, or thirst, or sex, or weariness, or from delight in beautiful sights and sounds, or the pleasures of a gratified curiosity; and all these may, and often are, motives to sin. But we may hope and be certain that the sense of God's indwelling presence will now, and now, and again now overbalance them, so that they have no power over us; and these nows will become as we grow in grace and faith, a practically continuous chain. Let us listen to Mr. Wesley's wise counsel: "Expect it by faith; expect it as you are, and expect it now. Why not?"(II,pp.459-460)

Thirdly, and closely related to the previous position, Dr. Sugden says that "Wesley was profoundly right when he taught that the only way by which such a result could be achieved was the complete domination of the love of God in the heart. Both he and many of his followers have been brought into some confusion of view by the idea that the carnal mind is something in man which can be removed, like an aching tooth or cancerous growth; or a sort of stain or defilement which can be washed away, like an ink blot, or a patch of filth on the body. Now the carnal mind is not a thing at all. It is really the absence of a sufficient inhibition upon the desires of the flesh and of the mind. Recent psychological investigations have shown that the strongest instincts can be completely inhibited by a dominating emotion, so that they are not even felt. (II,p.149)

Fourthly, and somewhat different from the foregoing, is Dr. Sugden's position concerning Wesley's idea of Justification. He says, "The question is whether we are to say that a justified person is to be described as having fallen from a state of justification whenever he commits sin. The previous paragraph assumes that every act of sin

is a relapse from the justified state; that the man who so sins needs to be converted over again. This was certainly Mr. Wesley's view; but he evidently felt its difficulty as time went on, and tried to escape by denying that there is such a thing as a justified state; there is only a succession of moments, at each of which a man is justified or not, according as he is at that moment free from actual sin, or committing it. But this is to ignore the supreme importance of conversion. This is an epoch making experience in a man's life, and from that point on he is a regenerate person, an adopted son of God; and he may be properly so described, in spite of occasional lapses into actual sin. His normal attitude is that of Faith in Christ and power over sin, though he may sometimes slip and fall. He has not lost his ideal because he sometimes fails to realize it. 'He that is bathed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean as a whole.'" (II,p.366)

It is rather interesting to note that Dr. Sugden accuses Mr. Wesley of denying a state of justification because a person may sometimes slip and fall; yet accuses him of believing in a state of entire sanctification, because it is, as he maintains, merely a succession of now, and now, and now. It is even more interesting to note that Dr. Sugden quotes a Scripture referring to sanctification, or a washing at the laver, to support his idea of justification which is a forensic act and completed at once.

In presenting these applications of the depth-psychology to the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification, there is no thought of controversy. It is only done that we may have a brief pre-view of the influence of a false psychology, or at least the false application of psychology to Christian experience. In the former days, our fathers defended this experience of heart purity against the attacks of opposing systems of dogmatic theology; now we must fight the battle again on a new frontier,-that of the young and growing science of psychology. The points of attack are much the same, but are presented, if not disguised under a new terminology. We must now turn our attention to a consideration of the so-called "depth psychology" which underlies,-not only the above mentioned positions but other grave errors as well.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TRENDS IN MODERN THEOLOGY

"I cannot but think," says William James, "that the most important step forward that has occurred in psychology since I have been a student of that science in the discovery, first made in 1886, that, in certain subjects at least, there is not only the consciousness of the ordinary field, but an addition thereto in the shape of a set of memories, thoughts and feelings which are extra-marginal and outside the primary consciousness altogether, but yet must be classified as conscious facts of some sort, able to reveal their presence by unmistakable signs. I call this the most important step forward, because, unlike the other advances which psychology has made, this discovery has revealed to us an entirely unsuspected peculiarity in the constitution of human nature. No other step forward which psychology has made can proffer any such claim as this." (William James, -Varieties of Religious Experience, p.223)

Following this discovery, there arose the so-called school of medical psychologists led by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). Freud was greatly influenced by Josef Breuer (1842-1925) but worked along until, about 1906 when he was joined by Adler, Jung, Ernest Jones and others. Out of the Freudian psychology has come modern psychoanalysis which occupies no small place in medical therapeutics, and has exerted an influence in academic circles as well. At about this time or earlier, F.W.H. Myers (1843-1901) advanced the idea of a "subliminal self" in an attempt to explain such phenomena as telepathy, and also as an apologetic for the immortality of the soul. Hudson in his "Law of Psychic Phenomena" (1892) popularized the idea of the subconscious mind as an explanation of hypnosis, glossolalia (or tongues), crystal-gazing, automatic writing, catalepsy and kindred phenomena. Levi White in his "Borderland of the Supernatural" (1904) attempts to show the relation of psychic phenomena to spiritism; while Cutten in his "Psychological Phenomena of Christianity" (1909) applies the same principles to social and religious life. We pass over these rapidly, only mentioning them as links in the application of psychology to religious experience. We have not referred to the more general works on the psychology of religion, such as those of Starbuck, Coe, James, Norborg and others. Freud published his "Introduction to Psycho-Analysis" in 1920, and it is to this that we now turn our attention as furnishing the basic principles of the depth-psychology.

The Freudian Psychology

Freud compares the unconscious to a large ante-room, in which the various mental excitations are crowding upon one another like individual beings. Adjoining this is a second, but smaller room or apartment, which serves as a sort of reception room, where consciousness resides. But on the threshold there stands a personage with the office of door-keeper, who examines the various mental excitations, censors them, and denies them admittance to the reception room when he disapproves of them. However, it makes little actual difference whether the door-keeper refuses an impulse, or whether he drives it out once it has entered,-this is merely a matter of his vigilance and promptness in recognition. This metaphor Freud uses to widen his terminology. The excitations in the unconscious, that is, in the ante-chamber, are not visible to consciousness, which is of course, in the other room. Being unconscious to begin with, they remain unconscious. When they have pressed forward to the threshold and been turned back by the door-keeper, they then become incapable of consciousness, and are said to be "repressed." But even those excitations which are allowed over the threshold do not of necessity become conscious,-it is only when they succeed in attracting the eye of consciousness that they themselves become conscious. This second chamber in which they await the eye of consciousness is known as the pre-conscious system. The door-keeper Freud calls "resistance" which occurs in any attempt to loosen repressions. (Freud, -Introduction to Psychoanalysis, p.260)

Before coming directly to the psychology of holiness, it may be well to notice the application of this form of psychology to other important fields, -first, to Christology; secondly, to Original Sin. Both of these subjects are vitally related to the psychology of holiness.

Jung of Zurich separated from Freud because of the latter's "pan-sexualism," but later differed from in other particulars also. He believes that the unconscious is the storehouse not only of repressed wishes, but of all memories, instincts, inherited and acquired capacities, together with the psychic energy which gives them expression. He divides the content of the unconscious into the personal unconscious, or that which had its birth in the life of the individual, and the collective unconscious, that which is a part of the heritage of the race. That remnant of ancient humanity, and that centuries old part in all people, namely, the common property left behind from all development, which is given to all men like the sunshine and the air. (Jung, -Psychology of the Unconscious) (Cf. also, Barbour, -Sin and the New Psychology, pp.44-45)

Christology

Dr. Sanday in his "Christologies: Ancient and Modern," attempts to relate this depth psychology, first, to the relation existing between God and the human soul; and secondly, to the seat or locus of the Deity in the Incarnate Christ. He uses the idea of a subliminal consciousness, such as that advanced by F.W.H.Myers; and while somewhat less metaphorical than Freud, there is a definite relation between the two psychological positions. According to Dr. Sanday, the subliminal region is divided into zones, and in proportion as we go down deeper through these zones, the power of describing them diminishes. Between the upper strata of the subconscious and the lower of the conscious, the paths are numerous, broad and easy. In the upper regions are stored the simple impressions of outward objects, the record of remembered facts. These may be recalled with more or less vividness, but always in the guise in which they vanished below the consciousness. There is however, a wide difference between these surface impressions and the more permanent constituents of motive and character. Impulses toward good and evil come flickering up from below. These are but the index of the real basement. They are like the needle on the face of a dial. The really important thing is not the index but the weight or pressure that moves the index. That in the case of religious motive is out of sight -down in the lowest depths of personality. Now it is in these subterranean regions, and by the same vitally reciprocating action, that whatever there is of the Divine in the soul of man passes into the roots of his being.

Of this psychology, Dr. Sanday attempts a twofold application: the first, which he calls a retrospective proposition is, that the primary seat, the locus of all Divine indwelling, or divine action upon the soul, is the subliminal consciousness. The second, which is his chief interest, makes this subliminal consciousness the proper seat or locus of the Deity of the Incarnate Christ. This in general is his explanation of Christology.

On either of the foregoing propositions, Dr. Sanday is close to the border-line of mysticism. In fact, Dr. Norborg insists that these psychologists, including William James, take the same position as the mystics. This may be summed up in the formula "experience-God-experience." He does assert however, that William James as a philosopher would quickly deny the transcendental problem, that the reality of God could be

proven or disproven by human experience. This break-down made James bewildered, for even as a psychologist he admits the possibility of the direct presence of the Deity. He says, "If there be higher powers able to impress us, they may get access to us only through the subliminal door." "But" asks Dr. Nörborg, "What if God wanted to enter the front door of day-conscious personality-life? Psychology could not stop Him; for after all, Psychology is merely a post-experiential analysis and evaluation of experience, i.e. an analysis of what happened in human life." (Nörborg, Varieties of Christian Experience, pp.188-191)

Original Sin.

Another application of this depth-psychology to theological thought, is that of N.P. Williams in his "Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin." Here there is an attempt to explain the soul after the general pattern of material organisms. In the soul therefore, a distinction must be drawn between its structure, and the vital energy that informs it, and is in turn determined by it as to its modes and channels of discharge. In the structure of the soul, there is the conscious, the fore-or preconscious, and the unconscious. It is usual and convenient, he says, to speak of these areas as if they were vertically superimposed one upon another, like the stories of a building.

1. The Conscious. Beginning with the top story which he calls the conscious self, the most important fact to note is, that it is furnished with certain wide and spacious windows, which are the senses, and which are never completely closed, even during sleep. Through these windows there "beats a perpetual blizzard of sense-impressions, mainly from the outside world, but also those which originate in the body. These are sorted out and built up into percepts by means of the categories of the understanding."

2. The Pre-Conscious. The important fact here is, that there is a perpetual drain of impressions, images, percepts and concepts, after they have played their part in the diorama of consciousness. Keeping to our metaphor, he says, they drain through a series of cracks or holes in the floor, into the story immediately below, the area of the pre-conscious which is the domain of memory. These are caught and held suspended, and by the force of the vital energy, organized more or less into conglomerates.

3. The Unconscious. The lowest room of all is the region of the unconscious. This is almost entirely unexplored, and only reveals its contents by vague and uncertain

glimpses in the dream. All that we can know about it may be summed up in this,—that its obscure recesses contain the fountain of that mysterious energy or life-force which penetrates and vitalizes the superincumbent structure; that it houses the uneasy and rebellious prisoners known as "repressed complexes," and that the exit is guarded against any possibility of escape by a kind of Cerberus known as the "censorship" whose lair is on the landing between the unconscious and the preconscious. This is a metaphorical personification of the intellectual, social and moral distinctions, dispositions and conventions which forbid the emergence into consciousness of ideas and impulses felt to be inconsistent with the dominant organization. (Note here, the idea of an organization which we call the nature)

4. The Vertical Elements. The horizontal elements however, which form the structure of the soul, are only a part of it as a totality. There are highly important vertical elements which pierce the floors at right angles; or, if one prefers the metaphor of a woven fabric, what we have considered so far, constitutes merely the warp of human personality, consisting of the various grades of consciousness; and we now have to consider the woof (or weft) consisting of the cross-threads of Instinct running up from the selvedge of the unconscious, through the pre-conscious, the ends of which are gathered ravelled and matted together, in a manifold and bewildering intricacy, in the sentiments or complexes.

5. Instinct. It will be seen from this that an Instinct is not an energy; it is rather an arrangement of the psychic structure which determines the course which Energy takes upon a given occasion in order to discharge itself. If we now relapse into an inevitable metaphor, we may say that an instinct is a path, a channel, a pipe, or a wire, into which fundamental energy is attracted by the impact of a given stimulus. Strictly therefore, it is inaccurate to speak of the Instincts as being efficient causes of action; the efficient cause of action is psychic energy, or what the medical psychologists call libido. While the instincts have been classified in various ways, Dr. Williams follows the medical classification which reduces the number of channel-ways or instincts through which the life-energy passes, to three, which he calls the Ego instinct, the Sex instinct, and the Herd instinct. All the so-called instincts, however numerous,

are thus reducible to three,-the individual, the reproductive and the social instincts. (N.P. Williams, -Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin, p.471ff.)

"Having now before our eyes," says Dr. Williams, "What may be described as a cross-section of the self, we naturally inquire if in this structure, the main outlines of which are given solely by heredity, we can recognize any lacuna, any misfit or dislocation corresponding to the inherited infirmity alleged by theology to inhere in human nature." There is, this author thinks, and he finds it in the weakness of the herd instinct in proportion to the other two dominant instincts. "The ultimate psychological fact therefore, he says, 'is the weakness or shallowness of the herd-instinct relatively to the other two primary instincts of human nature. And this unsatisfactory proportion which the three cardinal instincts bear to each other is, it must be remembered, nothing acquired or artificially constructed; it is simply given by heredity, in the total make-up of human personality with which we are born. It would seem therefore, that we need search no further, and at this deep level in the structure of the soul beneath the area of the pre-conscious, and lying in the obscure recesses of the Unconscious, we have unearthed that precise weakness or interior dislocation of man's being which historical Christianity affirmed to exist, and which forms the presupposition of its redemptive and sacramental scheme.'" (p.480)

It is interesting to note also, that while Dr. Williams is classified as a theologian of the modernistic type, he reaches conclusions which characterize the Arminian position concerning depravity as a "depravation arising from a deprivation." And furthermore, he sums up his position in a statement which has ever been held as fundamental among evangelical Christians. He says, "In the light of this identification of the inherited infirmity with congenital weakness or shallowness of the herd-instinct, it is easy to understand the psychological rationale of the traditional language employed by Christian ascetic theology in regard to the forms assumed by 'innate sin' as it gradually grows with the growing soul. In this traditional language it is often said that all actual sins spring from one or the other of two roots,-namely, Pride and Sensuality; and that these again run back into Self-love as their ultimate source. And self-love is nothing but a positive manner of describing the same fact which psychology

in agreement with the most primitive Christian modes of thought, conceives as a negation, an ellepsis (ἔλλειψις) or a deprivation, as a deficiency in that herd-complex, that sympathy or love, that corporate or social feeling which all men do possess to some degree (for otherwise they would not be moral beings at all), but which in normal human nature, as transmitted to us by birth and as it stands prior to moral and religious educative influences, is strong enough only to hamper and not to master the tendency of the life-force to rush impetuously down the channels of the self-asserting and race-perpetuating instincts. Pride is merely the name for the exaggeration of the ego-complex, and sensuality for the hypertrophy of the cluster of ideas and images connected with sex."

Further still, this same author affirms the position of evangelical Christianity when he says, "If this be so, we have in the treasure-house of Christian tradition that true conception of human nature, its power and its weakness, which contains the key to the world-old problem of social regeneration and reform. No readjustment of governmental or economic machinery, no perfection of scientific or hygienic efficiency, will in itself avail to bring the Kingdom of God upon earth one step nearer, apart from a change of heart in the individual member of society. The essential condition of such a change, which is the cooperation of human freedom and Divine grace, stands written for all time in the great saying of the Apostle, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling,' recognizing and using to the full the God-given endowment of self-consciousness, self-determination, and individual autonomy, yet remembering, in humble acknowledgement of the connatural flaw of human nature, that it is God, who alone can order unruly wills and affections of sinful men, 'that worketh in you to will and to do of His good pleasure'" (Phil.2:12-13) (Williams, -The Idea of the Fall and Original Sin, pp.480ff.)

But much as we appreciate the findings of this psychologist concerning the fault in human nature, nevertheless the sin lies deeper down and further back than unbalanced instincts; it is that which causes the weakness of the social instincts and brings about a warp in human nature which theology denominates original sin or inherited depravity. Unbalanced motives are the consequences of sin, not the sin itself.

Having briefly reviewed the depth psychology and some of its applications in theological science, we are better prepared to understand the positions of Doctors Flew, Sangster and Sugden concerning the teachings of Mr. Wesley. They are grounded in a psychology which is fundamentally opposed to the teachings of the proponents of entire sanctification. We must reserve for later consideration, some of the false positions previously mentioned, and give attention to one only at this time.

It will be evident to all, that Dr. Sangster's teaching that "No man knows what is in him" is but a reference to the unconscious as found in the diagrammatic representation of personality as previously discussed. We have seen that according to this depth psychology, impulses good and bad spring into the consciousness from the depths below. It is impossible for any one to know what might possibly spring up from below, and hence he says, "It is improper to say 'I am freed from all sin!'" Here are the reasons which he gives for this statement, and we leave every true Wesleyan to note, not only the misunderstanding, but also the falsity of the reasons advanced.

1. The words are being used in a limited meaning. What is meant is this, 'I am not conscious of committing sin.' (But the subject under consideration is not the committing of actual sins, but inward sin or the carnal mind, -the disposition or temper of the soul.)

2. A claim of this tremendous character is hard to harmonize with a moment-by-moment life. (This "moment-by-moment" life is a reference to Dr. Sugden's criticism of Mr. Wesley's idea of entire sanctification as a state of grace. But Mr. Wesley held, as have all holiness people, that there is an act of cleansing, and then a continuous cleansing, so that we live in a vital relation to the cleansing blood of Jesus Christ at all times.)

3. It is a witness shaped in ignorance because no man knows what is in him. Here is his comment. "God may free a soul from sin while in the body. Who dare put a limit to the grace of God? The glorious possibility beckons every aspiring soul. But He will not tell him that it is done (It is rather presumptuous for him to say what God will or will not do) but is designed to oppose Mr. Wesley's doctrine of the witness of the Spirit) Continuing he says, "The angels may whisper it to one another. Other men may feel sure that a saint is in their midst. But he himself will not say, 'I am free from all sin.' Rather he will say with Paul, 'I judge not mine own self...he that judged me is the Lord.'"

Summary

In summing up the main points of difference between Mr. Wesley's teaching, and that of the writers just mentioned, we may say, First, sin does not originate in a lack of balance in the common, ordinary instincts of life; it is sin that brings about this lack of balance. Here the result is suggested as the cause. Secondly, Love is indeed a supreme factor in Christian Perfection as taught by Mr. Wesley, but he does not teach that love crowds out sin, he teaches that entire sanctification is an act of cleansing, and that the heart thus purified from sin is filled with pure or perfect love. Sanctification is always an act, and is always by blood through faith; love is said to be by the Spirit that dwells within us. Here again, the result is substituted for the cause. Thirdly, sanctification is denied as a state of grace. To be sure, it is a continuous cleansing and may be regarded as a state in the same sense as justification. The blood cleanses and continues to cleanse, as we walk in the light and in fellowship with Jesus Christ. The moment by moment position of these writers we regard as a total misapprehension of Mr. Wesley's teaching. To an objector who said, "Every moment Lord I need the merit of thy blood," Mr. Wesley replied, "Every moment Lord I have the merit of thy blood." Lastly, the position that Mr. Wesley regarded sin as a thing to be removed like a cancerous growth or a sore tooth, is a fundamental misapprehension of Mr. Wesley's teaching. Mr. Wesley maintained that sin was a condition, a state, or a disease of the soul. Hence Charles Wesley wrote,

Seed of sin's disease,
Spirit of health remove,
Spirit of finished holiness,
Spirit of perfect love.

Mr. Wesley's own definition of the carnal mind as given in his Plain Account is this: "By sin, I here understand inward sin; any sinful temper, passion, or affection; such as pride, self-will, love of the world, in any kind or degree; such as lust, anger, peevishness; any disposition contrary to the mind which was in Christ. The question concerning outward sin; whether a child or God commit sin or no. We all agree and earnestly maintain, 'He that committeth sin is of the devil.'"

But what progress has been made over the thought of the ancient Greek philosophers: Socrates taught that "Ignorance is the root of evil; knowledge is virtue." Plato regarded evil as the "lack of harmony in the individual and in society." Aristotle sought for a balance between extremes, maintaining that extremes beget controversy. There must be "moderation in all things." Freud held that to make the unconscious conscious would rid the individual of psychological evil. Jung sought for an "adaptation of self-knowledge to reality." Adler maintained that "psychic evil grows out of the antagonisms between what we are, and what we would like to be." McDougal's idea was that of "an integrated personality." When therefore, modern psychology finds original sin merely in the unbalanced condition of the instincts, it has gained little if any, over the teachings of the ancient philosophers.

LECTURE II. A STUDY IN BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY

We have examined some of the modern psychological theories which have influenced recent works on Christian Perfection, especially noting their criticisms of the doctrine as taught by Mr. Wesley and his coadjutors. We turn now to an examination of the psychological terminology of the sacred Scriptures as furnishing a substantial basis for our dogmatic and experiential belief in entire sanctification.

1. A Brief History of Biblical Psychology. During the latter part of the eighteenth and the earlier part of the nineteenth centuries, there was a renewed interest in Biblical psychology due to the growing philosophical language of the times. One of the earliest treatises on this subject was that of Roos, written in Latin about 1769 and generally characterized as mechanical and dictionary like. About this time also, Dr. J.T. Beck published his Outlines of Biblical Psychology,--a series of lectures given to a semi-academic audience. This was followed by a more elaborate treatment of the subject entitled A System of Biblical Psychology by Franz Delitzsch, first published in 1855. Goschel was a follower of Beck and Delitzsch. He maintained that the soul took its rise from both body and spirit, earth and breath. It was therefore, that which became personality, the synthesis of both thesis and antithesis. G.F. Oehler's Theology of the Old Testament (1874) and J.H.A. Ebrard's Christian Dogmatics, both give special attention to the "Elements of Human Nature",--their positions being similar. J.B. Heard in The Tripartite Nature of Man (1875) regards man as a union of three natures instead of two, and with this simple key, he proposes to unlock the main positions as to Original Sin, the Fall, Regeneration, the Intermediate State and Future Glory. John Laidlaw in his Bible Doctrine of Man (The Cunningham Lectures of 1879) gives by far the best treatment of this subject and is well worthy of careful study on the part of students interested in this phase of Biblical truth. In more recent times, Dr. Weidner has summarized the positions of Beck and Delitzsch and given us a succinct statement of that which appears in an involved form in the original treatises.

2. The Fundamental Principles of Biblical Psychology. In our consideration of Biblical terminology, we must keep clearly in mind, the principles on which all psychological terms of Scripture are to be construed. "I take it for my guiding rule," says Roos, the pioneer in this field of study, "that everywhere in Scripture there reigns an accuracy and validity worthy of God." Believing as we do in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, we can have no hesitancy in accepting this as our primary position. The Word of God, we are told, "pierces even to the dividing asunder" of the constituent elements of man's nature (Heb.4:12), and indicates thereby that it gives attention to the minutest shades of expression. But we must consider also, that Biblical statements are not cast in scientific form, but are given in the common language of the people. Yet even on this ground, the exact meaning and consistent usage of psychological terms demands our closest attention.

3. The Development of Psychological Terms in the Scripture. Laidlaw points out also, that we must be prepared to find growth in the use of psychological terms, and that from several causes. First, acquaintance with culture outside the Hebrew nation left its evident impress, especially upon the New Testament writers, and even upon the later writers of the Old Testament as compared with the earlier. Secondly, there is the normal growth from the simpler and more popular use of terms to the more complex and philosophical view of man's nature. Thirdly, and most important is the fact that there has been a progress of revelation itself as set forth in the Scriptures. Rothe points out in this connection, that "we may appropriately speak of a 'language of the Holy Ghost.' For in the Bible it is evident that the Divine Spirit at work in revelation has always fashioned for Himself, out of the languages of those nationalities in which revelation had its chosen sphere, an entirely peculiar dialect, moulding linguistics which he found to hand, as well as the already existing conceptions, into a form specially suited to His purpose. "Without a consideration of this element of progress in revelation, it is impossible to construct an adequate Biblical psychology. This alone explains the transition from the terms of the earlier Scriptures that appear rather physical than psychical, to those of the later Scriptures that are more deeply charged with ethical and spiritual meaning.

We turn now to the immediate consideration of the psychological terminology of the Scriptures.

BIBLICAL TERMINOLOGY

There are four primary terms which are important in any study of Biblical psychology. These are (1) SPIRIT (Ruach or pneuma); (2) SOUL (Nephesh or psyche); (3) FLESH (Basar or sarx); and (4) HEART (Leb or kardia). To these may be added as secondary but important (5) BODY (soma); (6) MIND (nous) and (7) CONSCIENCE (zuneidesis). It will be necessary also to give brief attention to such philosophical terms as the EGO, the SELF and the PERSON.

1. SPIRIT (Ruach or רוּחַ) This word occurs more than 370 times in the Old Testament, if its use to denote the natural mind and supernatural influences, as well as the human spirit be included. In the New Testament, St. Paul uses the term 146 times and its usage may be classified along the same lines as Ruach in the Old Testament. The word has a double significance, referring both to a supernatural influence and to a natural element in human nature. To St. Paul therefore, the pneuma supplied the point of contact in human nature for the regenerative and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit.

2. SOUL (Nephesh or נֶפֶשׁ). The word Nephesh is used more than 750 times in the Old Testament in its different senses. The word Neshamah, a kindred term signifies generally, the principle of life but is quite subordinate, being found only about 25 times altogether. St. Paul uses the term psyche only 13 times, the most important reference being that in which he refers to the sanctification and preservation of the whole spirit and soul and body. (I Thess. 5:23)

Ruach and Nephesh, רוּחַ and נֶפֶשׁ, are easily distinguished in their primal sense however, in that ruach is the principle of life, and nephesh the subject or bearer of life. The usage is practically uniform which puts spirit for the animating principle, and soul for the animated result. Dr. Weidner has summarized the positions of Beck and Delitzsch and given us the following succinct statements. (1) Spirit and soul are not two distinct natures, but two distinct elements in the psychical life of man. (2) The soul proceeds from the spirit and is the mediating link between the spirit and the body. (Note Soul is spirit in relation to body). (3) The spirit is the inbreathing of the God-head, and the soul is the out-breathing of the spirit. (4) The spirit is the life-center provided for the body, and the soul is the raying forth of this center of life. (5) The spirit is the inward being of the soul, and the soul is the external nature of the spirit.

(6) Man perceives and acts by virtue of the spirit which animates him, but the perceiving and thinking subject is the soul. (7) The impulse to act proceeds from the spirit, but the acting subject is not the spirit but the soul.

Bishop Merrill in his Aspects of Christian Experience, likewise makes a distinction between the technical use of "soul" and "spirit" although in more popular language. He says, "The Ego in which consciousness inheres is not an aggregation of distinct substances or essences, but is simple and uncompounded. We call this entity the soul, and then is is the soul that remembers, wills and imagines. It is the soul acting in different directions, or exercising different powers. Thus all the natural faculties, attributes and powers of the soul have a common nature, essence and being."

Now it is possible, he continues, to conceive of the soul with all its natural attributes, and yet as destitute of moral character. The soul does not so exist in fact, but when we so conceive by abstracting in the mind, everything from the soul that gives it character, then we have the true technical meaning of the word "soul" as it is used in connection with "spirit." But since the soul does not exist without something to give it character, we must recognize as belonging to it, a different set of powers, or attributes, distinct, and yet not separate, in quality and manifestation. These additional qualities are moral, and determine character, because they give bent or inclination to all the powers of the soul and determine the life and conduct of the person with reference to goodness or badness. They are qualities in the natural faculties, giving them tone, inclination, impulse and affinity. They are to the soul what temper is to the steel, or fragrance to the flower, or heat to the sunlight. We describe them as passions, impulses, desires and affections.... Consequently he argues, that the change is in the spirit and the heart, which are the subjects of cleansing, renewal and change. The soul with its natural attributes remains the same through all the experiences of sin and pardon, of pollution and washing, or death and life, retaining its identity and its essential aptitudes and powers; but the spirit, the seat and sphere of depravity, and of renewing and sanctifying influences, passes through these changes of character and condition, determining always the moral state of the man. A new soul is impossible, but a new heart and a new spirit are plainly promised and graciously realized. (p.117ff.)

3. FLESH (Basar or σάρξ) The term flesh occurs in the Old Testament more than 260 times to denote the corporeal element in human nature in its various shades of meaning. In its secondary or ethical sense, the term flesh is used for the principle, or seat of the principle, which in fallen nature resists the Divine law, and which even in the regenerate wars against the spirit of God. St. Paul uses the term sarx 91 times, 35 of which have a distinct ethical reference to the "flesh" as set in relation to sin, or as productive of evil. The "flesh" then is what nature conveys, the spirit is what God bestows. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (John 3:6). Human nature as now constituted can produce nothing but its like, and that like is sinful. Since humanity on its natural side owes its existence to the sarx, it is therefore called "sarx." Natural and sarkikal came to be convertible terms. On the other hand, since it is the pneuma or spirit that is connected with the Divine and supernatural, the terms spiritual and supernatural also came to be convertible terms. We may say then, that the natural man connected with the race through the sarx is sinful, while the new man connected with God through the pneuma is holy. It is not strange therefore, that the term sarx came to designate the natural man, and pneuma, the renewed or spiritual man.

4. HEART (Leb or καρδιά). This term is used in practically the same sense throughout the Scriptures. It is drawn from the metaphor of the physical heart which forms the center of distribution for the blood, and by easy transition came to signify the seat of man's collective energies,—the focus of his personal life. Now because it is the focus of the personal life, the working place for the assimilation of every influence whether of thought or intent, it becomes the seat of the moral and religious condition of the man. For this reason the Bible places depravity in the heart, because sin as a principle has penetrated to the very center and hence corrupts the whole circuit of life. Likewise the Bible also regards the heart as the center and sphere of all divine influences, the starting point for all moral renovation. It is the heart that contains the "hidden man" (I Peter 3:4), and the heart is expressly stated to be purified by faith in Christ (Acts 15:9)

The Secondary Terms

There are certain secondary terms also, which are used in Scripture terminology and must be given consideration at this time. Following this we shall mention a third set of terms which belong more especially to metaphysical or philosophical psychology, but which have a direct bearing upon theology.

5. BODY (σωμα). The term "body" is not so frequently found in the Old Testament, but pairs of words such as "body and soul" or "flesh and spirit" are employed to point out the contrast between the material and immaterial portions of man. Dr. Laidlaw holds that the expression "body and Soul" links the individual with the organism; while "flesh and spirit" links the earthly substance in which life inheres with the Divine spark or principle of life. It is evident that the term "body" and "flesh" may be used in the same sense, but flesh is "living matter" and therefore has an ethical connotation as well as a physical. The body is not sinful, and any view of an inherent evil in matter is radically opposed to the entire teachings of the Bible. "If sin were the inevitable outcome of a man's possession of a body," says Dr. Laidlaw, "redemption ought to culminate in deliverance from it, instead of its restoration and change to a higher form. (Phil.3:21). To say that the matter of the body is or contains sin, and then to say as Paul does, that the last result of the Redeemer's Spirit dwelling in us shall be to quicken these mortal bodies, would be a flat contradiction." (Laidlaw, -The Bible Doctrine of Man, p.81)

6. NOUS or MIND (νοῦς). The Nous or Mind is that which, or by means of which, the self-conscious spirit thinks and wills. The Nous is both the thinking and willing faculty, inasmuch as will is an endeavor of the conscious spirit directed towards an object that has also become conscious, and therefore, is enclosed on all sides by thought. Willing, thinking and experiencing are thus closely connected and are all predicated of the spirit, soul and heart indiscriminately, in that the spirit is the supreme power, the soul the subject, and the heart the internal focus of the threefold life of man. The term "nous" however, is not a characteristically Hebrew word, but St. Paul uses it as a convenient term for the highest intellectual faculty in man. As he uses it, nous may be the "mind of the flesh" (Col. 2:18); or as awakened by the law, "the law of the mind" (Rom.7:23), and as the "spirit of the mind" it may be renewed. (Rom.12:2; Eph.4:23).

The term Nous is used of the Godhead in such expressions as "the mind of the Lord" or "the mind of Christ" (I Cor.3:16) Man being made in the image of the Triune God, it follows then, that there must also be a triplicity of the human spirit. This is everywhere taken for granted in the Scriptures. The Divine Spirit being the archetype, the triplicity of the human spirit will correspond in some finite measure to the hypostases of the Trinity. As in the one substance of the Godhead, there are three persons or hypostases, so in the human spirit as inbreathed of God there is a nous, a logos and a pneuma of the nous, -or a mind, a word and a spirit of the mind.

(1) The Nous has been previously defined as that by which the self-conscious spirit thinks and wills. As the pneuma is the region of immediate experience and intuition, so the nous or mind is the region of the understanding. But knowledge or understanding (νοεΐν) does not begin until man becomes objective to himself as Ego, and therefore is not possible until the original thought completes itself by taking upon it the form of the word.

(2) The Logos or word is a product of the nous or mind. The human spirit is endowed not merely with consciousness but with self-consciousness, and is therefore a speaking spirit, or a spirit capable of speech. The logos then, is not only the efficiency of the nous but also the organ of the nous. "Thought is inward speaking, and speech is audible thinking," says Delitzsch, and therefore speech is inseparable from thought, for the word is the comprehension of thought."

(3) The Pneuma of the Nous, or spirit of the mind is the third and final stage in which words are at an end, and the spirit, although in a more fully realized sense, is again thought of as in the beginning before the birth of the word. As there is a "mind of the Spirit," so also there is a spirit which belongs to the mind and is therefore called inversely, "the spirit of the mind." When St. Paul speaks of the "renewing of the spirit of the mind," he indicates that there is to be a change in the depths of the spiritual nature before it comes to expression in either word or deed.

Nous throughout the Pauline writings is not a substance like pneuma, but faculty, conscious faculty, and knowledge both of God and duty (I Cor.14:19) Even in the heathen it manifests itself as knowledge of God and law of conscience. (Rom.1:20; 2:14) It may become so blinded and blunted as to be "the mind of the flesh" (Col.2:18) or a "reprobate mind." (Rom.1:28)

7. CONSCIENCE (συνείδησις). Conscience is a word which occurs only once in the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament (Eccl.10:20); only once in the Gospels (John 8:9), but is found more frequently in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul. Here it is used in practically the same sense as in modern speech. Dr. Bresee gave the students of the college this definition. "Conscience is that somewhat or some one within us that pronounces as to the rightness or wrongness of the choice of motives." Here every word is important. If the word "somewhat" be omitted, and "some one" alone used, he stated that we should then have Isaiah's definition of conscience. Lightfoot defines conscience as "the crowning triumph of ethical nomenclature, and a function of the pneuma carried to its full ethical import." (Lightfoot, -Philippians, p. 302)

8. THE EGO: THE SELF: and THE PERSON. These three terms belong primarily to metaphysics or philosophical psychology, but have great practical and theological significance. They are all in a general way identified with the soul. Thus Tennant in his Philosophical Psychology identifies the Ego and the Soul; Bowne in his Metaphysics identifies the Soul and the Self, as also does Pratt in his Personal Realism. Dr. Calkins was the champion of the self-psychology, and while maintaining that there is a self underlying all conscious experiences, makes the statement that psychology steadily refuses to study the nature of the soul, its permanence or immortality, or its relation to matter, and simply analyses the forms of self-consciousness, or studies people in their social relations. (Calkins, -Introduction to Psychology, p.5)

Briefly stated, by the term Ego we mean that property of the soul by which it is able to divest itself of everything it has in itself or that belongs to its nature, and thus make even the spirit objective to it. So far as man is able in the depth of his innate being to apprehend himself as Ego, and to comprehend his entire being in the thought of the Ego, we call him a Person. And in so far as all personal experience of thought, feeling or will have an abiding center of reference, we call this unifying center the Self. The Ego then, is the Self regarded as divested of its experiences; the Self is the Ego viewed as the abiding center of its experiences; while the Person, is the Self conscious of itself and its experiences.

EGO and SELF are terms which serve to unite the structural and functional aspects of the soul, or perhaps more accurately stated, its ontological and psychological aspects. The SPIRIT is substance knowing itself, and the SOUL is substance knowing itself only by virtue of the SPIRIT; while the EGO or SELF combines in thought the essential conditions of the soul into one luminous point. The thought of the EGO is of the SPIRIT, but in man's apprehension of this thought, as previously indicated, everything which he has in himself, even his spirit is objective. "The pure Ego," says Tennant, "is not an existent without an essence any more than it is an essence without an existence. It is no such abstraction as the critics have set up, and have demolished instead of the Real thing. Its known essence is to function; and to suppose that it is exhausted in the functioning is perhaps to confound a psychological with an ontological issue."

Now the soul is turned on one side toward the body which it animates, and on the other toward the spirit to which it owes its origin,-for soul is spirit in relation to body. Everything which pertains to the condition of the being and to the inborn individuality of man, he possesses without his own agency. This includes also, his Adamic inheritance as a member of a fallen and depraved race. But in apprehending himself as Ego, he places himself at the center of this inheritance and makes it the circle of his knowledge and power. It is to this being that Nephesh (or soul) belongs. Nowhere does nephesh indicate the Ego of man as distinguisher from his essential nature. Now the self-distinguishing of man as Ego from all that belongs to his nature, is a fact of supreme soteriological importance. In it is to be found the secret of human freedom. It is here the work of salvation begins, for "faith is the union of the Ego with the word of grace." The re-establishment of communion with God is through the New Birth and its inflow of life, and this is possible solely because of the ultimate freedom of the Ego which is able to dissociate itself in thought from its condition, and through Divine grace, again be brought into living communion with its Creator.

Schoberlein says, "The soul is the subjective principle in man. The spirit indeed causes the soul to soar up to the Ego; the spirit is that which constitutes the person, but the seat of the Ego-personality itself is the soul; in the soul man leads his own, his self-life." Delitzsch in commenting on this says, "This representation, that the spirit is that which constitutes the person, can only be carried out if we understand with Schoberlein, by the spirit, the Divine Spirit, but not as we distinguish spirit and soul as separate created substances." (Delitzsch, System of Biblical Psychology, p.184)

The distinction here made is brought out most clearly in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Here St. Paul says (I or ego) delight in the law of God after the inward man (Rom.7:22) referring of course to the Ego as dissociated theoretically at least from its moral condition, and acting solely in the light of the natural image of God in man. But referring to the deeper aspects of the heart and its moral condition, he continues, "I find a law warring against the law of my mind, and bringing it into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." (Rom.7:23) Here the distinction between the function of the Ego in the natural image of God in man, and that of the moral condition as a result of sin stands out most clearly. St. Paul further states, that "to will is present with me" this time referring more to the power of volition in the natural image rather than to the intellectual aspect of knowledge; and then again turning to the moral condition of the heart he states "but how to perform that which is good, I find not." This lack of power he attributes to the "sin that dwelleth in me" for he was alive without the law once, i.e. before coming to the age of responsibility; but when "the commandment came, sin revived and I (ego in its moral aspects) died." (Rom.7:9) So that the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." (Rom.7:10) "Sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." Now the law as revealed in the consciousness of man is holy and just and good. "But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might appear exceeding sinful."

But something needs to be said also concerning the unifying activity of the self. "From the beginning," says Dr. Pratt, "I have maintained that the self is a substance; and that means an existent possessing qualities. But there are many grades and kinds of substances and a self is a substance of its own kind. It is sui generis I cannot make this too emphatic." "Again, substance does not mean an abstract core of being taken by itself, but an entity with characters. There is no substance without attributes, and no characterless self. 's well ask for an existent form divorced from matter. The self is full of variety, and in it unity and variety are harmonized. Further still, the self is sui generis in possessing an inherent sort of unity which no other substance possesses. Non-living material things have indeed relations, but no inherent unity. Living organisms

have a certain degree of inherent unity. But so far as this unity is unconscious, unrealized, it is of a potential sort. The unity-in-variety which uniquely characterizes a self is seen in each of these three notable characters or functions. The first of these is its role as subject in feeling and cognition.. The second is its agency as the actor, the doer of deeds, the one who wills in volition, the efficient cause in its achievements. Finally, the self is not only the unity that lies behind each mental state and the grasper that unites and compares; it is also the unity and the unifier in successive states, the identical being that endures in the midst of its changing acts and states. As Professor Wilson has so admirably put it, the self is 'that which maintains itself through all its experiences.'" (Pratt, -Personal Realism, p.161)

If now we state in untechnical terms the position of Biblical psychology we have been considering, we may say that we do not hold that consciousness is the ultimate reality, but a self which has consciousness. Intellect, feeling and will are not the ultimate factors, there is a self that thinks, and feels and wills. What is therefore thought, felt and loved is one thing, and the self that thinks, feels and loves is another. Furthermore, the moral quality of the thoughts, affections and feelings is not to be found immediately in themselves but in the character or nature of the self. And by the nature of the self, we mean the organic law under which it functions. Here we must anticipate that the finite is always dependent upon the Infinite, for it "has its existence only upon the Infinite and in relation to other members of the system." (Bowne) By nature then, we mean, functioning in dependence upon the Infinite which is its source of life, or functioning apart from God in its own weak sufficiency which is death. (St. Paul calls the former, the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus;" the latter he calls "the law of sin and death which is in my members".

It will appear at a glance therefore, that it is futile to look for the source of sin by merely analysing the content of consciousness, although its consequences are found there. The fault of "infirmity" known as inbred sin or inherited depravity lies deeper,- in the very nature of the self as a conscious spiritual entity. The difficulty is not in the stream,- however polluted this may be,-the difficulty is at the source, in the fountainhead itself. "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Or the fig tree my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine figs? so can no fountain both

yield salt water and fresh." (James 3:11-12)

Our Lord frequently used the same figure of speech, "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." (Matt. 7:16-18). In fact, Christ is the only religious teacher who demands of his people a moral condition antecedent to the act. "He goes behind the act," says Bishop Newman, "behind the motive, behind the thought, and takes cognizance of that moral state out of which these spring as the effects of a persistent cause. His doctrine is, that we think and feel and do are expressions of a character (or nature) which lie deeper than the will, deeper than the affections, deeper than the conscience; that this character (or nature) is the sum of what a man is, in all his appetites, passions, tendencies; and that out of this character (or nature) issue man's totality and finality."

TWO OPPOSITE ERRORS

Before proceeding further in our attempt to solve the problem of sin and holiness, there are two errors which we must carefully avoid, first the danger of locating sin in the substance of the soul; and secondly, making it lie purely in its functional aspects. Dr. Borden Parker Bowne speaks of these two errors as those of the metaphysical realists and the metaphysical doubters.

First, we must insist that sin is not a change in the substance of the soul, by which mean the constitution of man as God created him. One of the earliest errors in this connection was that of Flacianism, so-called after Matthias Flacius, one of the second generation of German Reformers. He contended that the substance of the human soul was by the fall, changed, corrupted and depraved. His position was condemned by the Formula of Concord about two years after his death. The main objection lay in this, - that it destroys the distinction between the substance of the human soul, or man as created by God, and original sin which inheres in his nature and corrupts it. "It is clear," says Laidlaw, "that according to Scripture, neither the fall on the one hand nor regeneration on the other can be regarded as effecting a change in the substance of human nature. (Laidlaw, -The Bible Doctrine of Man, p.181)

Secondly, we must insist also, that sin is not merely in the functions of the soul apart from the soul itself, as is done in the depth psychology which has been under consideration. This is to make sin lie in the stream instead of the fountain, in the fruit instead of the tree as we have previously pointed out. The over-emphasis upon the functional aspect of the soul in modern psychology, has had a tendency to drive the soul as an entity, further and further back, until in many instances it is denied altogether.

Dr. Crawshaw in his excellent work entitled, "The Indispensable Soul," begins his chapter on "The Mechanism of the Soul" as follows: "When Bunyan's pilgrim was passing through the Valley of Humiliation on his way to the Celestial City, there met him a certain 'foul fiend' named Apollyon. Then Apollyon straddled quite over the whole breadth of the way and said, 'Prepare thyself to die; for I swear by my infernal den that thou shalt go no further, here will I spill thy sou.' If the immortal dreamer of Bedford could have beheld in prophetic vision the progress of the modern pilgrim, he might still have found a certain aptness in his allegory. Every age has its Apollyon, the destroyer or enemy of the soul. Our enemy is the earth-born giant of materialism. He too, straddles 'quite over the whole breadth of the way,' threatening to spill our soul in a scientific manner by proving that we have no souls. If he could prevail in his argument, his victory would be a conclusive one; for surely the fatal and final way to destroy the soul would be to convince the soul of its own nothingness and thus make the soul destroy itself." (Crawshaw; The Indispensable Soul, p. 3.) Our honored professor, Dr. John Wright Buckham, once said with his usual good-natured sarcasm, "When I read that 'an individual is a system of habits,' I find myself asking, 'whose habits?'" "It is one of prerogatives of Reason I suppose, to reason itself away."

But the central point of psychology as well as of metaphysics must be the soul. "In all articulate experience," says Dr. Borden Parker Bowne, "the self appears as the abiding subject, the same yesterday and today. The experience is owned; and the owning self which thinks and feels and wills we call the soul." The denial of the soul as a substantial reality therefore, is what modern science

and philosophy has sought to spill, by straddling quite over the whole breadth of the way.

The first attempt to do away with the soul and its substantiality was made by materialistic science, which regarded consciousness as merely an epiphenomenon like the sparks that are created by striking steel against flint. Then followed modernistic monism,-a revival of Spinozism with its two-faced substance, which lost the soul in the haze of pantheism. After this, coming from a suggestion of Kant's philosophy, it was said that the soul had existence as a phenomenon but not as a noumenon,-that it had appearance but not reality. Kant himself held, that the self as an object of knowledge must come under the conditions of knowledge, and by so doing becomes a phenomenon. After this, from Hume to Spencer, the thing-series was regarded as a series of vivid states of consciousness, and the Ego as merely a faint series. Here says Bowne, "is the place where materialism always tumbles into nihilistic idealism; and it is well-known that when Spencer saw his system about to collapse, he endeavored to save it by re-instating the Ego. In still more modern times,-especially since Fichte, there has been a tendency to regard consciousness as the ultimate of existence, the unity of which, William James found in the over-lapping states or moments of consciousness.

Now if we regard the spirit itself as being self-conscious or knowing itself, there is a measure of truth in the statement; for the spirit is the soul's foundation of consciousness. But for us who hold that self-consciousness is but the realization of the foundation of the spirit, such a position is without meaning or intelligence. The spirit is potentially and actually self-conscious, that is, a Being reflected in itself, but this is a different thing than making selfconsciousness itself the ultimate. The spirit is essence, the self-consciousness in its essence is the confirmation of this spirit-essence; and the self-thought, or thought of self, is the result of the consummation of self-consciousness.

THE BIBLICAL IDEA OF HOLINESS AND SIN.

With this study of the psychological terms used in the sacred Scriptures, we are prepared in a general way to consider the question of holiness and sin, although the lectures to follow will deal more specifically with these questions. Then too, we shall find it necessary to analyse further, such terms as life and nature, doxa and chokmah, which also are found in the Scriptures.

Wherein does original sin or inherited depravity lie? not in the structure of the soul itself as God created it; nor in its functions alone as the depth psychology would have us believe, but in the whole being of man as a creature cut off from its source of life in God. God breathed into man's nostrils "the breath of lives" and he became a "living soul." As such, the soul of man functioned under the law of the spirit of life. This as we have seen is the highest meaning of the term spirit in the Pauline sense, i.e. "the human spirit as the unseen self related to God." Cut off from its source of life, the soul takes on a different nature, -not now holy but sinful, - and functioning under the law of sin and death. This "deprivation" becomes a "depravation" for deprived of life, the forces of death and decay immediately set in. The heart as the focal center of the soul, becomes the seat of depravity, for sin has penetrated to the very center of man's being. Hence the sinful self is manifested in a darkened intellect, alienated affections and a perverse will. For this Reason Jesus says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Only by the new birth can life be restored to the soul dead in trespasses and sins.

1. The Meaning of Life and Nature. Jonathan Edwards has given us perhaps, the best definition of the new life, and consequently of life itself, in his "Treatise Concerning the Religious Affections." He says, "This new spiritual sense and the new dispositions that attend it are no new faculties, but new principles of nature; I use the word principles for want of a word of more determinate signification. By a principle of nature, in this place, I mean the foundation which is laid in nature, either old or new, for any particular manner or kind of exercise of the faculties of the soul; or a natural habit or foundation of action, giving a person ability and disposition to exert the faculties in exercises of

such a certain kind, so that to exert the faculties in that kind of exercises may be said to be his nature. So this new spiritual sense is not a new faculty of understanding, but is a new foundation laid in the nature of the soul for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of understanding. So that the new holy disposition of heart that attends this new sense is not a new faculty of will, but a foundation laid in the nature of the soul for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of will." (Quoted in Laidlaw, Bible Doctrine of Man, p. 187).

Curtis understands by the nature of anything, neither more nor less than the structural law by which the thing is precisely what it is. With Professor Bowne's idea of being as active, one would say that this structural law is the law of the thing's action. Now this rule or law which determines the form and sequence of a thing's activities represents to our thought the nature of the thing, or expresses its true essence. Towards the idea that an individual's nature is a sort of inner pulp out of which qualities are extracted as literally as pins out of a cushion, Curtis thinks that there is no worthy mood short of impatience for such a crude, materialistic conception. (Curtis, The Christian Faith pp. 242ff.)

2. Doxa and Chokmah. There are two other words which are identified with the meeting point of the Divine and human spirits, the word Doxa (usually translated glory); and chokmah translated wisdom.

(1) The word Doxa or glory is frequently used in the Scriptures, and generally means a manifestation or a phenomenon. The peculiarity of the term lies in the fact that it is always associated with Deity, and yet is thought at least, is separate from it. As an instance of this we may note also, the word "Presence"- "My presence shall go with thee." Frequently the Holy Spirit is spoken of as the "shekinah" or the "glory" but this is not quite accurate. The glory is the reflection of the light and life and love of the Godhead gathered up in the Holy Spirit and reflected toward the world. The light which shines through this is the reflection of the Son of God who is the self-living and absolute light that goes forth from the Father. The doxa or glory is the point where the transcendence and the immanence of God meet, and therefore the focal point in which God and the creature come together, - the link between God and man, and God and the world. In the trinity of the human spirit, patterned after the Divine archetype, the

soul is the doxa or glory of the spirit, in which all the forces of the spiritual and material realms are focused and conjoined. This is expressed as the outgoing Spirit in his sevenfold perfection, - Wisdom, Counsel, Might, Knowledge, Reverence and Piety. These represent the efficiency of the Spirit or what is to be effected in the world, and therefore imply metaphysical existence.

(2) By Chokmah or wisdom we mean the divine wisdom which comes down from above, and is likewise expressed in its sevenfold perfection. It is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. This is the wisdom which comes down from above and is by the efficiency of the Spirit communicated to the human soul. We may say then that the doxa represents the efficiency of the Spirit, and the chokmah or wisdom, its spiritual content.

THE GODHEAD

Father (nous) "I"
Son (Logos) "thou"
Spirit (pneuma) "he"

DOXA (it) WORLD

THE HUMANITY

Nous (mind)
Logos (word) DOXA (SOUL) BODY
Pneuma (spirit of mind)

But there was one to come, - the Seed of Abraham, of the House of David, who should be not merely a living soul, as was the first Adam at his best, but a quickenng spirit. In Him, - in His soul, - there was to play all the forces of the Divine Nature on the one hand, and all the powers of a purified human nature on the other. In Him the Divine and human natures were conjoined in one Person, and the moment that human nature was again brought in contact with the Divine in the Incarnation, it was sanctified and made holy. Hence Christ became a new man, - created in righteousness and true holiness, as to His own Person, and the Lord and Giver of Life to His people. In the Incarnation, - the conjoining again of the human with the Divine, is the source of life restored to man, and hence Christ says of Himself, "I am the way, the truth and the life. No man cometh unto the Father but by me." (John 14:6)

From Christ also as the Doxa, the point where the Divine and the human meet, was to go forth the sevenfold efficiency of the Spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and might; the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord; and he shall be quick of scent, or draw His breath in the fear of the Lord. This is the sanctifying Spirit of Pentecost.

Not only was the doxa restored in Christ, but by the efficiency of the sevenfold Spirit, there was to be restored to fallen human nature, the Chokmak or wisdom which cometh down from above as the sevenfold content of the efficient Spirit, - the wisdom which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

We read that "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give us the light, of the knowledge of the glory (doxa) of God, in the face of Jesus Christ." (II Cor. 4:6) And "that we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory (doxa) of the Lord are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (II Cor. 3:18) But there is something further in this word (doxa) that broadens the horizons of Christian thought. Our Lord in His great high-priestly prayer said, "And now O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." (John 17:5) What glory that must be! Here in His humiliation

that glory had been relinquished, - He acted not from His own initiative but became a servant under the tuition of the Holy Spirit. There He shall again be the full and perfect manifestation of the infinite depths of light and life and love. There will be nothing to obscure, nothing to veil the divine presence, nothing to obscure the full effulgence of the Divine glory.

But this is not all. We have not yet begun to fathom the depths of this prayer, or to rise to the heights of Christian privilege embodied in it. Again He prays, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." (John 17:24)

To behold the glory of God, - the infinite effulgence of the inner light and life and love of the Trinity, and to behold that in Jesus Christ without a veil, and in that beholding be transformed from glory to glory by the Spirit of the Lord throughout all eternity, - this is the heritage of the saints in light.

LECTURE III

THE NATURE OF THE ABSOLUTE AS HOLY

"Be ye holy for I am holy" -I Peter 1:16

We have already indicated that apart from the philosophical significance of the term personality as applied to God, there is also a religious significance to the word. As a personal Being, self-conscious and free, God stands in ethical and spiritual relations to mankind. God as Absolute Reality is the ground of all existence; as Infinite Efficiency, He is the cause of all existence; and as Perfect Personality, He is the reason or end, -the purpose of all existence. Applying these terms to the subject in hand, we may say that the nature of God as Absolute Holiness furnishes the ground for a derived holiness in man; hence He says, "Be ye holy for I am holy." Considering God as Infinite Efficiency, or the causal aspect of all existence, we have when this is applied to the moral nature of man, a new redemptive efficiency; hence the prayer of our Lord, "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." Lastly, viewing God as Perfect Personality, and as such, the reason, and or purpose of all existence, we find our Lord saying to His disciples, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

Turning now to the text under consideration, "Be ye holy for I am holy," we may analyse and restate it as follows: "I am holy," therefore "be ye holy;" that is, holiness in God as absolute, becomes the ground of holiness in man as derived from, or related to, the holiness of God. It is evident then, that our discussion of this subject must fall into two main divisions; (I) THE NATURE OF ABSOLUTE HOLINESS IN GOD; and (II) THE NATURE OF DERIVED HOLINESS IN MAN.

I. THE NATURE OF HOLINESS IN GOD

Our discussion of the nature of God as holy will include the following:

(1) The Concept of the Divine Holiness; (2) The Concept of Divine Love; and (3) The Relation of Holiness and Love in the Divine nature.

I. THE CONCEPT OF DIVINE HOLINESS

1. THE NATURE OF HOLINESS IN GOD. In considering the holiness of God, we must regard Him as the Absolute Personality in whom holiness, love and power are conjoined, are perfect, and are one. A few years ago, says Dr. Mackintosh, theologians concentrated on the idea of moral perfection and purity as forming the essence of holiness; but due largely to Rudolf Otto's striking book, "The Idea of the Holy," there is now a renewed emphasis upon the power of God also. He has made us feel that the exclusively moral conception of God is not quite in focus, and that the Biblical conception of holiness properly understood, stands also, for all God's being that transcends reason in the narrower sense, all that towers up to infinite sublimity over man and the world. There is an element of majesty in holiness, something that awakens a feeling of awe when we listen to the great words, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts." This cannot be reduced to a combination of the moral attributes. Even the New Testament with its emphasis upon Divine love, declares also that "God is a consuming fire." Otto maintains that the holy is a category, i.e. a fundamental conception by itself, just as the good or the beautiful is; it cannot be derived from any other idea, or grown out of it, any more than the moral can be grown out of the useful, or the beautiful out of the pleasant. So also Dr. Mackintosh holds that the holy has a nature of its own and is not reducible to elements which do not already contain its distinctive quality. It is in some sense indefinable, but not therefore meaningless, for we cannot define "blue" or "sweet" in the sense of finding a simpler explanation of them, yet we know quite well what the words mean. Similarly, holiness can be talked about, and statements made about it which the devout understand perfectly.

Holiness like truth, is a simple, uncompounded element or quality, and continues unchangeably the same under all circumstances. It can never be made anything else in its essential nature; being the absence of all moral iniquity, in whomsoever and whatever it is predicated of, in God, angels, or men. (J.A. Wood, Purity and Maturity, p. 24)

2. The Perfections of God. All the perfections of God as manifested in His moral government may be resolved into two, -His holiness and His love. These in their essence and relations can only be understood through a proper analysis of the nature of personal life. It is characteristic of personality to mark itself off as separate and distinct from all other existences, personal or otherwise. This is generally known as self-grasp, or self-affirmation. But it also belongs to personality to reveal and impart itself. This is known as self-communication or self-impartation. If then we view the ethical nature of God from the standpoint of self-grasp or self-affirmation, we have the concept of Divine holiness; if we view it from the standpoint of self-communication or self-impartation, we have the concept of Divine love. We may then with perfect propriety say that the nature of God consists in holy-love, but in this statement we neither identify or confuse the terms.

3. Holiness as Nature or Attribute. Theologians have greatly differed in their positions concerning the holiness of God. Three positions may be and are taken concerning this subject. First, holiness may be regarded as one attribute alongside and coordinate with other attributes; Secondly, it may be regarded as the sum total of all the attributes; and Thirdly, it may be regarded, -not as an attribute, but as a nature of which the moral attributes are the expression. This latter is the position of Watson in his Theological Institutes, and Wakefield in his Christian Theology. So also, Dr. Dick, the eminent Scottish theologian, held that holiness was not a particular attribute, but "the general character of God as resulting from his moral attributes." Dr. Pope in his Compendium of Christian Theology holds that the two Divine perfections, holiness and love, may be called the moral nature of God; and that these two are the only terms which unite in one, the attributes and the essence of God. (CCT.1,331) Holiness then is primarily that disposition which is back of all the attributes, -a disposition or a nature which manifests itself in a love for righteousness and a hatred of iniquity. It is holy love. But as previously indicated, holiness belongs to the self-affirmation of personality, rather than self-communication; and self-affirmation is always deeper and more fundamental than self-manifestation. That which severs God from

creaturely nature, even apart from sin,-that by which the soleness and integrity of His Being is maintained, is holiness. Nor must this idea of separateness be forgotten or over-looked. Holiness is not merely synonymous with perfection generally, nor can it be interpreted as communicative goodness,-that is, an indefinite flowing into man's nature of divine love. thereby excluding sin. Holiness is never considered apart from moral distinctions, or separateness from sin.

4. Holiness as the Nature of God. Every objection urged against ascribing a nature to the Divine Being rests upon a false and unreal conception of the Absolute. The arguments for the existence of God presuppose His ethical character in order to account for the moral nature of man. But to ascribe a moral nature to God must therefore, carry with it something more than mere ethical distinctions. It means that moral feeling must be coordinated with perfect knowledge and unlimited power. It means further, that the Divine Will must give perfect expression to that which constitutes His Being, so that He wills that holiness which forms the essential quality of His nature. It follows also, that the moral nature of God is not merely a quiescent state, but active with infinite intensity in the free and unlimited range of His personal powers. If in the metaphysical realm we may speak of the existence of God under the twofold distinction of essence and attribute, we may also with equal propriety in the realm of God's moral government, observe the distinction between the Divine nature and the moral attributes. And if we may regard the metaphysical attributes as inhering in the essence of God and expressive of it; so also, we may regard the moral attributes as inhering in the Divine nature, to which likewise they give expression.

5. Holiness as Related to the Trinity. Holiness as the nature of the God-head, must therefore apply in a distinctive manner to each of the Persons of the Trinity.

(1) Holiness as it relates to the Father expresses the perfection of moral excellence which in Him exists unoriginated and underived. It is therefore,

first, the ground of reverence and adoration. "Exalt the Lord our God, and Worship at his holy hill; for the Lord our God is holy." (Psalm 99:9); secondly, it is the standard of all moral goodness. "Be ye holy, for I am holy." (I Peter 1:16); thirdly, it is goodness eternally opposed to sin. "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look upon iniquity. (Hab. 1:13)

(2) Holiness as it relates to the Son is found both in His revealing and enabling mission. Since holiness repels every approach of defilement, it can only be known by sinful man through an economy of Divine grace. The love of the Father finds its highest expression in the gift of His Son, but this gift is specifically declared to be a propitiatory offering for sin. If love sent the Son, it was holiness that demanded the sacrifice. Sanctification is not by an effusion of love, but by the sprinkling of blood. "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach." (Heb. 13:12-13)

(3) Holiness as related to the Holy Spirit is holiness imparted or made accessible to men. It is through the Spirit that we become "partakers of the Divine nature," or partakers of his holiness. Hence the term "Holy Spirit" affirms not only the nature of the Spirit as in Himself holy, but declares also, that it is His office work to make men holy. Holiness and love thus appear to be closely conjoined if not identified in the Holy Spirit. The distinction however remains, and must be given due consideration. Note this petition in our Lord's high-priestly prayer: "I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them." (John 17:26) Here is a revelation of both the holiness and love of God which is to be imparted or communicated by the Spirit. The "name" or nature must first be declared before the love can be manifested. The Spirit by His hallowing act must identify man with the sanctifying blood of Christ,—the propitiatory offering which cleanses from sin before there can be any free inflow of Divine love. There must be a partaking of His holiness before there can be the fulness

of His love. We may say then, that our partaking of the Divine holiness is by the sanctification of the Spirit; while our partaking of the Divine love is explained to be "because he hath given us of his Spirit. "While the act of the Holy Spirit in sanctification must ever precede logically that communication of Himself by which "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts," yet in Christian experience the two may be said to be concomitant.

II. THE CONCEPT OF DIVINE LOVE

1. Divine Love in Its Origin. Holy love demands a community of persons, each separate and distinct, and the purity of love depends upon the strict regard that is paid to the limits which separate one from the other. We may say then, that love has its origin in the triunity of God. In the mysterious intercommunion of the Father and the Son, love is the bond of union. Thus St. Paul characterizes charity or Divine love as the "bond of perfectness" (Col.3:14). The communion of the Father and the Son is vital and real as between a personal Subject and a personal Object. But not only are the terms Father and Son personal, the organ of this reciprocal interaction and intercommunion must likewise be personal.

The bond of union which exists between the Father and the Son as personal beings, and furnishes both the condition and ground of communion is the Personal Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the adorable Trinity. And this absolute intercommunion and reciprocity of love demands the equality and consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and with the Son, "the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal." It is for this reason that He is called the Spirit of communion in the Apostolic Benedictions. We may note then, that holiness belongs to the essential and necessary relations of the Persons of the Trinity, while love has its seat in their free relationships. The former is more metaphysical, the latter essentially ethical. Holiness therefore may be said to be more fundamental, -at least it must be given logical priority, -though love may occupy the more exalted sphere. "The kingdom of love," says Bishop Martensen, "is established on the foundation of holiness. Holiness is the principle that guards the eternal distinction between the Creator and the creature, between God and man, in the union effected between them; it preserves the Divine dignity and majesty from being infringed upon by the Divine love; it eternally excludes everything evil and impure from the Divine nature. The Christian mind knows nothing of a love without holiness." (Martensen, -Christian Dogmatics, pp.99ff.)

2. The Nature of Divine Love. There are three factors which enter into the nature of Divine love, -self-communication, fellowship, and a desire to possess

the object loved. These may be illustrated by the three following definitions: first, that of Schleiermacher who defines love as "that attribute by reason of which God communicates Himself;" secondly, that of Francis J. Hall who calls it "the attribute by reason of which God wills a personal fellowship with Himself, of those who are holy or capable of being made so;" and lastly, that of William Newton Clarke who regards it as "God's desire to impart Himself and all good to other beings, and to possess them for his own spiritual fellowship."

Referring again to our characterization of holiness as the self-affirming aspect of God's nature as holy love, we insisted that holiness is not merely self-affirmed purity in the negative sense, but includes also a positive delight of complacency in the right. Here we see these qualities re-appearing in a new light within love itself. Love must come to expression in the twofold desire to possess other beings for Himself, and to impart to them, Himself and all other good. In all true love, the self-assertion and the surrender must be equal, nor can either increase without the other if love is to be maintained. If self-assertion is not accompanied by its equivalent in self-surrender, we have not love but selfishness under the guise of love; if self-surrender be not balanced by self-sacrifice, and also in its desire for the possession of the object loved then we have not love but weakness. When therefore St. John declares that "We love him because He first loved us," (John 4:19 1st.) he is giving voice to that reciprocal love which delights the heart of God. From the standpoint of Divine love, it is well to bear in mind also, that without God, man is an orphan; without man, God is bereaved.

III. THE RELATION OF HOLINESS AND LOVE IN THE DIVINE NATURE

We have all along carefully guarded against any confusion of holiness and love, and therefore we are under the necessity of showing their relation one to the other. If the nature of God as holy love, is from the standpoint of self-affirmation to be defined as holy, and from the standpoint of self-communication to be interpreted as love, then holiness and love are equally of the nature of God. Holiness is considered fundamental solely from logical priority, for self-affirmation must always precede self-communication or expression. Holiness demands not only a nature, but a nature consistent with itself. Since that nature in its outgoings is always love, then holiness in God requires that He always act out of pure love. If on the other hand, we view the nature of God from the standpoint of self-communication, then it is God's nature to impart Himself and that self is always holy. Holiness always acts according to love, and love must always win its object to holiness.

II. THE NATURE OF HOLINESS IN MAN

In our study of holiness and love, we have sought so far, the foundation of these in the Divine Nature itself, -holiness being the self-affirmation of God and love His self-expression, and both finding their unity in His Perfect Personality. The perfect love of God flows from his perfect nature as holy. Nor can there be pure love without that purity of being which is the fountain of all love, -the holiness of God. If now we bring this concept into relations with created human nature, we must interpret the injunction "Be ye holy for I am holy" as an assertion that man's nature must likewise be one of holy love. If so, then in the self-affirmation of his human personality, he must be made holy before he can be actuated solely by pure or perfect love. If God is holy and therefore acts out of pure love, man must be made holy before he can act out of pure love.

We must now turn our attention to the nature of holiness in man as derived from the absolute holiness of God. Here we shall consider, (1) The Nature of Primitive Holiness; (2) The Fall and Original Sin; and (3) Christian Purity. We shall then make some application of these truths in an effort to show the misinterpretations of the Scriptural and Wesleyan position by those attempting a reinterpretation based on the depth-psychology.

In degree, there is no absolute perfection in holiness, except in the infinite God. "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty!" With Him, holiness is underived, unchangeable, unlimited and infinitely glorious - the model and source of all holiness - "Be ye holy for I am holy." (J. A. Wood, Purity and Maturity, p. 26)

This moral state is derived from Christ our second Adam through faith, hence cannot be transmitted. This God has withheld. While the Holy Spirit quickens man's dead spirit into divine life, he does not impart the power to transmit that life; and if the life cannot be transmitted, the moral quality of the life cannot be transmitted. God makes us partakers of the Divine Nature, but withholds the power of transmitting that nature; hence each child that comes into the world has a depraved bias, needs personal redemption, and must embrace Christ for himself. (J. A. Wood, Purity and Maturity, p. 108)

I. THE NATURE OF PRIMITIVE HOLINESS

In dealing with the question of primitive holiness, we shall omit all reference to the historical back-ground and merely indicate some of the fundamental distinctions necessary to an understanding of this important subject.

1. The Distinction between Innocence and Holiness. By innocence we mean a negative aspect of neutrality,--the mere possibility of holiness. This is the Pelagian position. By holiness we mean a positive attitude of the soul, a spontaneous tendency to obey the right and reject the wrong. This has always been regarded as the orthodox position. It finds its best illustration in Christ, of whom it was said, "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity."

2. The Distinction between Holiness as a Donum Super-additum and Concreated Holiness.

The former is the position of the Roman Catholic Church and was adopted as a means of accounting for the loss of original righteousness. According to this theory, holiness was not originally a part of man's nature but a super-added gift. The loss of this gift of original righteousness leaves man in the natural state in which he was created. The Reformers held to the idea of concreated holiness or holiness as an element in man's nature as originally created.

3. The Distinction between Primitive Holiness and Ethical Holiness. This is sometimes referred to as holiness of nature and holiness of character. In order to account for the fall, many branches of Protestantism came to make a distinction between primitive holiness or man's holiness by creation, and ethical holiness, or a character built up by personal choices. Primitive holiness alone is concreated, and is therefore without merit; ethical holiness is built up by personal choices and is therefore holy only as the choices are holy.

4. The Personal Presence of the Holy Spirit. There is a fourth element in primitive holiness which is too frequently over-looked,--the personal presence of the Holy Spirit. This truth lies midway between the Augustinian idea of a concreated ethical holiness, and the donum super-additum of the Roman Catholic Church; and it may be that originally, the latter was intended to convey the

idea of the presence of the Holy Spirit as an essential factor in primitive holiness. Arminian theologians however, have always stressed this important aspect of holiness, sometimes regarding the Holy Spirit as in close affiliation with man's estate, and sometimes as acting more independently, but always present and operative. Thus Dr. Pope says, "This doctrine is incomplete without the addition of the supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost, if that may be called supernatural which belonged to the union of God with His elect creature.....He did not add the moral image, but He guided the principles of action of man's soul created in that image. This solves the difficulty sometimes expressed as to the creation of a character, which, it is said, must of necessity be formed by him that bears it. Man was led of the Spirit, who was the power of love in His soul, already in his first estate, as now in his last estate." (Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology, 1,427)

Miley on the Arminian Position

Dr. Miley states the mediating position of Arminianism as follows: "We have previously dissented from the Augustinian limitation of that holiness to a mere quality of the Adamic nature. We have also dissented from the papal doctrine of its purely supernatural character; but the weighty objection, that it implies serious defects in the nature of man as originally constituted, is valid only against so extreme a view. The presence of the Holy Spirit as a constituent element of primitive holiness has no such implication. The Adamic nature could be holy in its own quality and tendency, and yet need the help of the Spirit for the requirements of a moral probation.....Hence the Divine plan might include the

Howe speaks of the "Retraction of God's Spirit from Adam" as follows: This we do not say gratuitously; for do but consider the plain text (Gal. 3:13) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law.....that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through faith, or through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. "If the remission of the curse carry with it the conferring of the grace of the Spirit, then the curse, while it did continue, could not but include and carry with it the privation of the Spirit. This was a part of the curse upon apostate Adam, the loss of God's Spirit. As soon as the law was broken, man was cursed, so that thereby this Spirit should be withheld, should be kept off, otherwise than as upon the Redeemer's account, and according to His methods it should be restored. Hereupon it could not but ensue that the holy image of God must be erased and vanished." (Quoted in Watson, Institutes, II, pp. 30-31)

presence of the Spirit as an original and abiding element in the holiness of man. We need this truth for the proper interpretation of human depravity. The fall of man was not only the loss of holiness, but also the corruption of his nature. This corruption we may not ascribe to any immediate agency of God, but may interpret it as the consequence of the withdrawal of the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit. This is the doctrinal meaning of 'deprivation.'" (Milroy, Systematic Theology, I, pp. 421-422)

5. Inner and Outer Holiness or Holiness of Heart and Life. We are now prepared to carry further, our discussion of the holiness of nature and the holiness of outward, personal character. In all human life, there is an inner realm of desire and aspiration which tend to come to expression in outward activity. But this inner life is not passive - it too, is in the realm of free, personal choices, and therefore, supremely ethical. However, below this realm there is a nature, and it is in this nature that we find the determining law of life. It is to this which our Lord referred, as previously pointed out, when He said, "Either make the tree good and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by his fruit." (Matt. 12:33) Thus the tree has a quality in itself distinct from the fruit. So also man was created with a subjective nature which underlies and gives character to both the inner realm of personal choices, and the outward realm of personal activity.

Mr. Wesley on Pelagianism

Mr. Wesley was strongly opposed to both Pelagianism and Socinianism. One of the most powerful opponents with which he had to contend was Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, a Unitarian of the first half of the 18th century, and one of the most learned defenders of Socinianism. He held that "Adam could not have been originally created in true holiness; because habits of holiness cannot be created without our knowledge, concurrence or consent; for holiness in its nature implies the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it cannot be holiness. (N. B. Sounds like Dr. Sangster's reference, but note how differently Mr. Wesley replies). In his reply, Mr. Wesley says, "A man may be righteous before he does

what is right, holy in heart before he is holy in life. The confounding of these two all along seems to be the ground of your strange imagination that Adam 'must choose to be righteous, must exercise thought and reflection before he could be righteous.' Why so? because righteousness is the right use and application of our powers? Here is your capital mistake No, it is not; it is the right state of our powers. It is the right disposition of our soul, the right temper of our mind. Take this with you, and you will no more dream that 'God could not create man in righteousness and true holiness.'" (Wesley, -Sermon on Original Sin)

II. THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN

No discussion of the subject of holiness is complete without some attention to the nature of inbred sin. Mr. Wesley attached great importance to this fundamental belief. He says, "All who deny this (call it original sin or any other title) are but heathens still, in the fundamental point which distinguishes heathenism from Christianity. But here is our Shibboleth: Is man by nature filled with all evil? Is he wholly fallen? Is his soul totally corrupted? Or, to come back to the text, is every imagination of the thoughts of his heart only evil continually? Allow this and you are so far a Christian. Deny it and you are but a heathen still." (Wesley, -Sermon on Original Sin) It is because of the twofold nature of sin, that a twofold work of grace is necessary in the redemptive scheme.

1. The Nature of Original Sin or Inherited Depravity. Original sin does not refer to the will solely, nor to the affections, nor to the intellect, but to that nature which we have been discussing, a nature which lies deeper down

But Kant feels profoundly what we have already seen to be the great crux of the problem of sin: the apparent antinomy, furnished by our experience, between the direct deliverance of conscience, on the one hand, behind which it is not possible to go, that we are chargeable for the guilt of sin, and the fact that, on the other hand, the bias to evil in us seems to be prior to any conscious act, and therefore born with us. Here is the old question of which Augustinianism and Pelagianism each only grappled with a side. But it was the merit of Kant to have first fairly estimated the difficulty involved, and to have given to the world the first clear statement of the problem.....'Nothing' Kant says, 'can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification, except a good will.' Consequently evil, in his view, exists in nothing except the will. It is the perversion of the right relation between reason and sense, the false subordination of the rational to the sensuous." (Tennant, -The Origin and Propagation of Sin, pp.50-51)

Schleiermacher marks somewhat of a return from Kant to Spinoza. The relation of the creature to that of the Creator is one of absolute dependence, so that there is no independent human will or efficient causation...It would seem to follow that God is the author of man's sin, unless sin has no reality. It is Schleiermacher's peculiar doctrine that sin has no objective reality, but is only sin from our subjective point of view. It is real but only in our consciousness. The God-consciousness in us is hindered by the sense consciousness, but we are not responsible for this,--the sense-consciousness developing first, there is of necessity an inadequacy of the God-consciousness. Its cause is God, but in His sight it does not constitute sin to which guilt attaches. Schleiermacher thus eludes the implication that sin is a necessity (or an unreality) for us, and that there is no need of Redemption. Thus internal strife is developed, and while from God's point of view this is not sin, He has ordained that we should attribute guilt to this state of consciousness; and this has been ordained in order that there might be redemption. (Cf. Tennant, -Origin and Propagation of Sin, pp.69-70)

and further back than the intellect, the feelings or the will. If as we teach, the intellect is darkened, the affections alienated and the will perverse as a consequence of inbred sin, then sin does not lie primarily in any one of them or in all of them together. The soul separated from God who is its life, functions under the law of sin and death, and all its faculties and powers are not only vitiated, but perverted and sinful. Neither can original sin be explained by the dominance of the self and sex instincts over the herd instinct as previously considered. That the instincts are unbalanced no one can doubt, but the question immediately arises, what causes this lack of balance? There can be no answer but that which has been given by the Church from earliest times,—it is due to the corrupt nature of man. Attempts have been made to locate depravity in the will, but all such attempts are simply forms of the error which would endow the will or other faculties with personal powers. Depravity belongs to the whole person

St. Augustine taught that evil has no causa efficiens but only a causa deficiens. With him however, the privatio with which moral evil was identified, was more than mere non-existence. It was also corruptio, perversio. It was the depraved activity of the will, loss of good which ought to belong to every person Schleiermacher holds that "sin, considered objectively, is mere negation demanding no divine causality; and this negation or deficiency becomes sin for us because God has caused us to reckon it as sin; and in this sense, but in this sense only, God is the cause of our sin. Sin in fact, in so far as it is real, is identical with the consciousness of sin." (Tennant, -The Origin and Propagation of Sin, pp. 48 and 79)

Schleiermacher only attaches guilt to the individual subject of inherited sinfulness by "blurring the line between congenital disposition and acquired habit."

Ritschl following Schleiermacher maintains that the race as contrasted with the individual, is the proper subject of sin. This he calls "the web of sinful action and reaction which serves to pollute the atmosphere in which the individual is educated."

Tennant expresses his appreciation of Lotze. "God, for Lotze, is the soul reality, and finite souls are the differentiations of that reality. But he is far more than the unity of His differentiations; there is in Him what there is not in them, and their individuality separates them from Him whilst He is their underlying ground. Real self-hood is delegated to the finite creature. Hence Lotze is neither compelled to reduce evil to unreality or illusion, like Spinoza, and so deny it without explaining it. It is from Lotze, if anyone, that the Christian theologian can seek a metaphysical basis for the doctrine of sin, or for a satisfactory Theodicy.....His theory of the relation of God to the world, offers a metaphysical basis such as alone seems capable of maintaining a doctrine of sin which does justice at once to the reality of evil and the holiness of the personal God. His Monism embraces a pluralism, and his Absolute is transcendent as well as immanent. (Tennant, -The Origin and Propagation of Sin, pp. 66-67)

of man, and not merely to some form of personal manifestation, whether through the will, the intellect or the affections. Depravity is the state or condition in which the person exists, and this may be said to be the nature of the person.

2. The Source of Original Sin or Inherited Depravity. If now we analyse the Scripture teaching concerning original sin or inherited depravity, we shall find that it is a state of spiritual death due to the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit as the bond of union between the soul and God. Negatively, this was the loss of original righteousness; positively, it meant the depravation of those powers which in their united action we call man's moral nature. Arminius calls it "a privation of the image of God, but explains it, first, as a forfeiture of the gift of the Holy Spirit; and secondly, as a consequence of this, the loss of original righteousness. Depravity therefore, is a depravation arising from a deprivation. But this depravation is something more than merely the loss of original righteousness, it means the universal disorder which comes in the place of original righteousness. It is not only the lack of wisdom in the mind and rectitude in the will, but it is blindness and error in the mind and perverseness in the will. It is an alienation from the chief good, and an inclination to all evil. There is then, connected with this deprivation, a positive evil also, which arises as a consequence of the loss of the moral image of God.

Take the correlative view of the term "spirit" and mark the relation of its two meanings to the psychology of the passages before us. We have traced the connection between its earlier and natural meaning of "life as derived from the Creator," and its fullest spiritual meaning of "the new life implanted in regeneration." We have said that the latter was arrived at, not by a mere process of human thought, but by a clearer discovery of the personal Author of spiritual life, the Holy Spirit, and by the altogether new revelation of Jesus Christ, the quickening Spirit, as the Head of a redeemed humanity. In its natural meaning however, "the spirit" ranges from the mere physical sense of wind or breath (John 3:8) and from denoting life in general, up to the indication of man's innermost mental and moral being. In the New Testament, and even within the Pauline Epistles, pneuma is freely used in this natural sense: sometimes as the simple psychological correlate of the flesh or the body (Cor. 5:3; James 2:26; Col. 2:5; at other times as the seat of self-consciousness (I Cor. 2:11); or again, as the inner essence of man, which, as well as the flesh, is defiled by sin (II Cor. 7:1)), and the salvation of which is the aim of all Gospel work (Cor. 5:5). But it is worthy of our exact attention that in the great passage (Roms 7 and 8) where the new life is to be designated by the term pneuma in its intensified spiritual force, flesh and spirit are not introduced antithetically earlier than the beginning of Chapter VIII, when the dominion of the new principle has been asserted. The higher elements of the human being to which the law makes its appeal are denoted in Chapter VII, not by pneuma, but mind (nous) and "inward man" (____); so that confusion between the two senses of pneuma is avoided, and that term reserved in this connection to denote the new life introduced by regeneration. (Laidlaw, -The Bible Doctrine of Man) (pp. 197ff)

Watson on Spiritual Death

Mr. Watson explains this by an analogy of physical death. "For as in the death of the body, the mere privation of the principle of life produces inflexibility of the muscles, the extinction of heat and sense of motion, and surrenders the body to the operation of an agency which life, so long as it continued, resisted, namely, that of chemical decomposition; so from the loss of spiritual life, followed estrangement from God, moral inability, the dominion of irregular passions, and the rule of appetite; aversion in consequence of restraint; and enmity to God.....This accounts for the whole of man's corruption. The Spirit's influence in him, did not prevent the possibility of his sinning, though it afforded sufficient security to him, as long as he looked up to that source of strength. He did sin, and the Spirit retired; and the tide of sin once turned in, the mound of resistance being removed, it overflowed his whole nature."

The psychological terms of the New Testament writers generally, and Paul in particular, are based upon the corresponding Old Testament expressions. A consistent view of the terms, flesh and spirit will not allow us to narrow them each to a single meaning. There is first, the simple, natural meaning, according to which they respectively denote the lower and higher, or the material and immaterial elements in man's constitution, characterized however, rather by their origin than by their nature,-the one from the earth and perishable, the other immediately from God. Later the term flesh becomes identified with the force of principle of sin in the fallen nature, and spirit with the principle of spiritual life in the new creature. This idea of two distinct applications in the Pauline writings of both flesh and spirit, first a physical and then an ethical, has value. (Laidlaw, -Bible Doctrine of Man)

We see at once then, the superior simplicity and truth of the view that the higher meaning was poured into the terms by the increasing volume of divine ideas opened up to such as Paul by the Holy Spirit. Take first the two meanings of flesh and note how impossible it is, in a way of mere ratiocination, to develop the one out of the other. The attempt to get the ethical significance which Paul gives to it out of the elementary Hebrew conception of the perishable (i.e. the bodily) part of man signally fails. It leaves out the clearly Scriptural position of the change in human nature caused by the fall. It is quite inadequate to account for selfishness, wrath, pride, and other non-fleshly sins bearing prominently the name of "works of the flesh." To assert that sarx, from its primary meaning, "living material of the body," can by a natural process of thought and language come to mean "the principle of sin," is to assume human nature to be subject to sin by its physical constitution,- a view wholly untenable, because at variance with the most radical conceptions of the Bible from its earliest to its latest writings. (Laidlaw, -Bible Doctrine of Man, p.197)

This fallen nature is called by St. Paul, the flesh or sarx (____), a term which he uses to indicate that the whole being of man, body, soul and spirit, have been separated from God and subjected to the creature.

On this basis it is easy to account for the active nature of sin. The whole being created to operate under the law of righteousness by virtue of the holiness of its nature, now operates under the law of sin and death because of its depravity. The self being essentially active, must find expression, either in the graces of the Spirit or the works of the flesh. Is it any wonder then, that the flesh or sarx, expressing itself in sin and unrighteousness should itself be called sin? And so we have such appellations as "the old man," the "sin that

Tertullian observes,—"The corruption of nature is another nature, having its own god and father, to wit, the author himself of corruption; so however that good should exist in the soul, that principal, that divine and genuine and properly natural good. For what is from God is not so much extinguished as overshadowed; since it may be over-shadowed, because it is not God; extinguished it cannot be, because it is from God." (Tertullian, -De Anima, c.41, -.295)

St. John gives us one of the few formulated and philosophical propositions found in the Bible; and in this, precise relation of sin to the divine law and the holiness of God are sharply determined. "Sin is the transgression of the law," is the reading of our version, which if properly understood, is a just and felicitous rendering. The law is the line of unvarying rectitude, which sin in its very being transgress. And yet the figurative idea of actually passing over the line, -a trans-gressing, or going beyond, -is not found in the original word anomia (____), which simply expresses being and character, but not action. Sin as here characterized by this eminently spiritual apostle, is an indwelling spirit of illegality, of disloyalty toward God, a law in itself opposed to the divine law.... The sin in which the word of God contemplates man, -the race as a whole, and each member of the race, -is primarily and essentially a state of soul, a disordered condition of the moral nature, and a spirit of real ungodliness. (Daniel Curry, -Fragments, pp.33,36)

Moral depravity is not in action or deed, but lies farther back and deeper down in our nature, at the fountain-head of all activity and character. It is enmity to God, and like the fatal worm at the root of the vine, withers every green leaf. (Bishop Hamline, -Sermon on Depravity)

Bishop Foster says that sin and depravity "are distinct the one from the other; since the depravity may exist without the act, and may be increased by the act, and carnality may exist without separate transgression to which it prompts." "Sin committed and depravity felt, are very different; the one is an action, the other a state of the affections." (Foster, -Christian Purity, pp.111-112)

Dr. Daniel Steele in Love Enthroned says, "The spirit of sin, or inbred sin, technically called original sin because it is inherited from Adam, is the state of the heart out of which acts of sin either actually flow or tend to flow. Until this state is changed, the conquest of love over the soul is incomplete." (Steele, -Love Enthroned, p.37)

dwelleth in me," and the "carnal mind" which seem to personify if not personalize sin.

In the light of this Scriptural distinction between holiness and love, let us now examine some of the confused and confusing statements of Dr. Sangster on this important subject. He says,

"Wesley never tired of insisting that love was the mainspring of the holy life, and having made the world his parish, he saw that no human being could be excluded from God's family life. What perhaps Wesley did not see, but what we may notice with more than ordinary interest was that, had he held to his better title of perfect love and permitted nothing to deflect his stress from it, certain serious defects would never have developed.... Wesley would not have been led off into sterile discussions about whether sin could be eradicated or not. The weight of the doctrine would have rested elsewhere and "sinlessness" would have been thrust from the forefront of thought simply as a happy consequence, if God gave it, of something positive and more important still." (pp. 155ff.)

But in all candor we ask, -Why should we want to change the emphasis from sinlessness to love? Would not this miss the whole point of redemption? And what could possibly be more important than the remission of sins? Is it not declared of Jesus "that he shall save his people from their sins?" And did not John the Baptist introduce Jesus to the world as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world? Is it not declared that "God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh" for the express purpose of "condemning sin in the flesh?" Is it not also recorded that Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, "that he might present it to himself as a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish?" And is not the supreme purpose of the incarnate Christ expressed in the words, "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate?" And are we not enjoined to "go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach? What can be more important than the deliverance from sin that man may again be restored to communion with His Maker?

But we are not through with these ill-founded and unscriptural statements, even though they are presented under the guise of advanced psychology. He continues:

"Not only would Wesley, had he both held the name and put the stress on perfect love, have avoided these defects in his doctrine, but the weakness of the great synthesis would not have developed so obviously." "If we found it impossible," he says, "to accept the reasoning that, because we have faith in God for our justification, we must have faith in God for our sanctification (when that second phrase is taken as meaning entire sanctification imparted in a moment), we did so only because the static idea of sinlessness was set up as a goal, and attention was directed to a sum of negations.....The positivity of love is the answer to each of these weaknesses, for the fruit of goodness is not found by lopping off healthy branches of the tree of life, or exalting asceticism to the skies. Hating one's self can become as obsessional as hating others. Not purgation and more purgation, but love and more love. The way forward is to let purgation be the by-product and let love crowd sin out." (pp.155ff.)

We may say that it is difficult to understand how one can so misinterpret the teachings of Mr. Wesley, especially in view of the fact that Mr. Wesley himself makes so many plain statements to the contrary. Does he mean by "purgation" and more purgation" the idea of works or ascetical practices, which if he does is foreign to the whole subject, for Wesley everywhere insisted that sanctification was by faith not by works. Does he mean that sin can be purged away by degrees,-if so he has again misinterpreted Mr. Wesley who says, "To talk of this work being gradual, would be nonsense, as much as if we talked of gradual justification." In all probability he means that God infuses love into the heart, and thereby crowds out sin to the extent that love fills the consciousness. Below this however, in the unconscious, sin would remain. This seems clear from a statement found in his discussion of the idea of perfection, as follows: "Now, as we have seen from the hymns, the infusion of love into the soul of the believer and the consequent expulsion of sin, is a gift of God in answer to faith, and happens in a moment. " This is Dr. Sangster's interpretation

of Wesley. But what a strange position we have here! It is a reversal of the whole redemptive process. Instead of the fountain sending forth a pure stream, we have the anomaly of a stream making the fountain pure. Instead of obeying the injunction to make the tree good and his fruit good, we have an attempt to make the tree good by making the fruit good.

Closely related to the fore-going is another statement of Dr. Sangster's which demands some consideration. He says,-

"And, in addition to these considerable gains from centering all in perfect love, the given-ness of holiness so conceived would have been far more intelligible than Wesley's exposition left it. To be made holy in a moment, when holiness is thought of as eradicated sin, seems to savor more of magic than of religion, and leaves the plain man sadly perplexed and asking, 'How can holiness be given; surely holiness can only be achieved?' But, if the stress be kept on love, while its givenness may still out run experience, it will carry no hint of contradiction on its face. For even the plain man knows that there is a given-ness about love--even human love. He cannot explain its rise in his own heart and yet he will not deny that it is there and that it is an ultimate in motive..... Nor is it a big step in thought from the given-ness of human love to the given-ness of divine love." (pp.156ff.)

Dr. Sangster assumes that the plain man believes that holiness is to be achieved,-and therefore by works. Instead of attempting to correct this fundamental error as did Mr. Wesley, he avoids it, assuming that the plain man can understand the given-ness of love,-as of either holiness or love could be given apart from a definite act of the sanctifying Spirit. This error is parallel to that of the Roman Catholic Church concerning justification. It confuses justification and sanctification by assuming that we are justified by an infusion of righteousness. The Reformers saw that on this ground there could be neither justification nor assurance. Dr. Sangster makes the same error in regard to entire sanctification. Instead of the simple and clear utterances of Mr. Wesley that entire sanctification is a work of the Spirit which purifies the heart and sheds abroad within it, the love of God, that is, purifies the heart from everything

contrary to love, he would have an infusion of love that proportionately excludes sin. This however, may not entirely exclude all sin, and even if it did, "the angels might whisper it" but man himself could never know it. But does it not seem strange, that one who would interpret Mr. Wesley's idea of a sin as a "thing" to be removed, as a cancerous growth or a sore tooth, should then view love as a "thing" to be infused into the heart, - a sort of a fluid to be poured from God's great reservoir and thus be a means of crowding sin further down or further back?

But what about this given-ness of love? Where is love said to be given, other than as the outflow of the Spirit in the heart? If the heart is impure, there will be manifested the works of the flesh; if the heart is pure, love will be pure and perfect in quality, as will all the graces of the Spirit. In regeneration life is given, the guilt of sin is removed and the power of sin is broken; in entire sanctification, inbred sin, or as the Methodists called it "the being of sin" is removed. As to the relation of holiness and love, let us examine a few of the many Scriptures bearing on this subject.

(1) I Tim.1:5 "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." Here St. Paul teaches that the heart must be purified before the stream of pure love can flow from it, - not an impartation of love that purifies the heart.

(2) Romans 5:5 "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." It is the gift of the sanctifying Spirit that purifies the heart from all that is contrary to pure love, and then sheds abroad this love within the sanctified heart.

(3) I Peter 1:22 "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently. Here it is clearly evident that the purifying work of the Spirit in the heart preceded the outflow of love. We are purified unto unfeigned love.

(4) Acts 15:8-9) And God who 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. This statement of St. Peter which

occured some eighteen years after Pentecost is his mature judgment of the work then wrought. This he declares to be purity of heart. Put this with the preceding statement, and we have unquestionable evidence that the purification of the heart from all sin has its inevitable consequences in unfeigned or pure love.

LECTURE IV.

INFINITE EFFICIENCY AND ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

Sanctify them through thy truth.

We have now considered the nature of holiness, absolute in God, derived in man. The basis of this study was the conception of God as Absolute Reality, and His nature as that of holy love. Holiness we saw, conveys the idea of self-grasp, or that which marks God off from every created being and every evil thing. It is the holiness of God that marks His majesty and constitutes Him as the supreme object of worship. It demands the reverence of every responsible creature. Today we must consider another aspect of the Divine Being,—that of His Infinite Efficiency. It will be readily seen that it is possible to regard God as Absolute Reality, and still deny to Him the Christian concept of volitional activity both as it effects creation and providence. For this reason we must give attention to the Divine efficiency if we are to maintain the Christian conception of the Perfect Personality of God. It was this that guarded the early church against the attacks of Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism, and still guards it against every form of pantheism. Christianity conceives of the world as proceeding from God, not by physical or logical necessity, but as an act of the Divine Will. It conceives also, the world as mediated through the Divine Word, or Logos, in whom the transcendence and immanence of God as separate potencies remain united, the Logos of God within the world, furnishing a resting place for the God without the world. Hence St. John sweeps away with a single stroke all thought of emanations and declares, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God." It is the Word that bridges the chasm between the infinite and the finite, between God and the world. This Word was creative. "All things were

It is true that the Jesus of the incarnation was but the forerunner of the Christ of the Holy Ghost; and what He could not do, because shut up in the chrysalis of the body, He can do in the freedom and power of the Holy Spirit. It is now His province to make new climatic conditions which will soften the valleys and make the mountains flow. There is power in the Holy Ghost to melt snow and rock.. It is His office to break up the fallow ground, to awaken and break the stony heart. If the life of God abounds in us our life will be strong. Difficult conditions only add to the vigor and power of life development. Strength of soul, health of spirit means large measure of the Divine manifestation in us, and gives large opportunity for His manifestation through us. (Dr. Bresson, Sermons, p.117)

made by him." Furthermore, this Word is the pleroma or fulness. Of his fulness have all we received and grace for grace." Thus the Word or Logos is both creative and redemptive, and Christ is the Mediator in both nature and grace.

With this brief background we are prepared for the redemptive statement of Divine Efficiency, i.e. "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." Here we shall deal, not with the nature of holiness as a state or condition of the soul, but with sanctification as the act by which we are made holy. We shall of necessity distinguish between initial sanctification and entire sanctification, and also between justification as an objective work and sanctification as a subjective experience. This we have seen was an objection made by the depth psychologists to Mr. Wesley's teaching that as we are justified by faith, so also are we sanctified by faith; and further their objection to the idea of assurance attaching to sanctification in the same manner as to justification. These positions will be given later consideration.

THE NATURE OF ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

Richard Watson, the earliest Methodist theologian, defines entire sanctification as "a complete deliverance from all spiritual pollution, all inward depravation of heart, as well as that, which expressing itself outwardly by the indulgence of the senses, is called filthiness of the flesh and spirit."

(Watson, -Institutes, II, p.450)

Dr. Adam Clarke, a contemporary of Mr. Wesley, says of entire sanctification, that it is "the cleansing of the blood, that has not been cleansed; it is the washing of the soul of a true believer from the remains of sin." (Clarke-Christian Theology, p.206)

Dr. Pope, a later Methodist theologian gives us the following definition. "Sanctification in its beginnings, process and final issues is the full eradication of the sin itself, which reigning in the unregenerate, coexists with the new life of the regenerate, and is abolished in the wholly sanctified."

(Pope, -Compendium of Christian Theology, II, 468)

Dr. Edward F. Walker in his book entitled "Sanctify Them," states it thus,

"Perfect purity plus perfect love in the heart by the efficiency of Christ and the power of the indwelling Spirit, equal personal sanctification." (Walker, -Sanctify Them, pp.42ff.)

Dr. P.F.Brosse defined this grace more from the standpoint of the baptism with the Holy Spirit. "It is evident," he says, " that the baptism with the Holy Ghost is the conveyance into men and through men, of the 'all-power' of Jesus Christ,-the revelation of Him in the soul." Again he says, "The baptism with the Holy Ghost is the baptism with God. It is the burning up of the chaff, but it is also the revelation in us and the manifestation to us of Divine Personality, filling our being." (Sermons, p. 193) While Dr. Brosse never undervalued the cleansing aspect of entire sanctification, his chief emphasis was always upon the Divine infilling -the unfolding of the entire being in "loyal relation to the divine."

The real differences of opinion concerning this great work of entire sanctification may be reduced to two: first, the time element, or when this experience takes place; and secondly, the question of imputation or impartation,-the former making a distinction between the legal standing and the actual state; the latter identifying the two,-or at least making them concomitant.

1. The Time Element. This demands only a brief consideration. There are four general positions on the subject: (1) that entire sanctification is concomitant with regeneration. This is commonly known as the Zinzendorffian theory; (2) that holiness is to be regarded as progressive, extending from the time of regeneration until the death of the body. Entire sanctification according to this theory is merely a growth or development,-perhaps reaching its culmination at death. (3) That entire sanctification takes place in the hour and article of death; and (4) that holiness begins in regeneration but is perfected in entire sanctification as an instantaneous work of the Holy Spirit subsequent to regeneration. This is commonly known as the Wesleyan theory. It is possible also, to add another theory,-that of the Roman Catholic Church, which maintains that purification takes place in purgatory after death. However this theory is not generally included in Protestant classifications.

2. The Imputation Theory. The imputation theory as applied to sanctification is the same as that formerly applied to justification. It is the imputation of Christ's holiness to us, as a legal status or standing however, as a state of the heart, it is merely the beginning of holiness, which as a progressive theory, holds that the carnal mind is little by little brought under the power of the new life bestowed in regeneration. This may be classified as a growth theory, but actually, it amounts to what we are generally accustomed to denominate the suppression or repression theory, -or in some instances what is called the counter-action theory. We are never actually cleansed from sin, -we are holy solely by the imputation of Christ's holiness. It was this that brought about the break between the Moravians and Mr. Wesley, and the latter's writings are the best refutation of this false position. Dr. Chadwick says of the theory of imputation, "It makes man holy by exemption instead of righteousness. Such teaching contravenes the plainest statements of God's Word in which Christ is declared to have made provision for man's deliverance from all sin. Christ died not that He might secure our exemption from the law, but 'that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.'" (Chadwick, -The Call to Christian Perfection, p.84) These lectures will not permit any extended discussion of the imputation theories, but our presentation of the Wesleyan position will in itself furnish a sufficient refutation of these erroneous opinions.

Dr. Chadwick's full statement is as follows: "There is a theory which regards Christian Perfection as "metaphysically attainable," and denies the fact of actual attainment. It is too subtle and too devout to bluntly deny the doctrine, but it regards it as an imputed perfection and not an actual possession. In this teaching inbred sin is not eradicated but repressed, and holiness is not imparted but imputed. Here is a summary of this doctrine.

"He who is our Great High Priest before God is pure, without sin. 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 He 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."

"Such a theory makes void the law through faith. It is a process of sheer make-believe, by which God shuts His eyes to our real state and agrees to accept fiction for fact." (Chadwick, -The Call to Christian Perfection, pp. 83-84)

Wesley's Break with the Moravians

"The difference between the Moravian doctrine and ours," says Mr. Wesley in this respect, lies here. They believe and teach,-

1. That Christ has done all which was necessary for the salvation of all mankind.

2. That, consequently, we are to do nothing, as necessary to salvation, but simply to believe in Him.

3. That there is but one duty now, but one command, viz. to believe in Christ.

4. That Christ has taken away all other commands and duties, having wholly abolished the law; 'that a believer is therefore 'free from all law,' is not obliged thereby to do or omit anything; it being inconsistent with his liberty to do anything as commanded.

5. That we are sanctified wholly the moment we are justified and are neither more nor less holy to the day of our death; entire sanctification and entire justification, being in one and the same instant.

6. That a believer is never sanctified or holy in himself, but in Christ only; he has no holiness in himself at all, all his holiness being imputed, not imparted.

7. That if a man regards prayer, or searching the Scriptures, or communicating, as a matter of duty; if he judges himself obliged to do these things, or is troubled when he does them not; he is in bondage; he has no faith at all, but is seeking salvation by the works of the law."

(To all this, Mr. Wesley says, "We believe that the first of these propositions is ambiguous, and all the rest utterly false.") (Wood, Christian Perfection, pp.126ff.)

THE RELATION OF REGENERATION AND ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

We are all familiar with Mr. Wesley's statement, that "Regeneration is holiness begun, and entire sanctification is holiness completed." In a still broader sense, the term sanctification is used to express the whole work wrought in man, as justification is the whole work wrought for him. In this broad sense, Mr. Wesley holds that the work of salvation begins with prevenient grace and is viewed as a series of successive stages each representing a different and higher level, although no one can be said to be saved in the proper sense of the term until justified and regenerated. Justification is a relative change which has reference to the new relationship established between God and man; while regeneration is a real change, liberating man from the power of sin and restoring him to spiritual life. These are concomitant, that is they occur at the same instant of time.

Dr. Lindstrom in his work entitled, "Wesley and Sanctification" states that it has often been maintained that revivalism and conversion are the typical features in Wesley and Methodism; and these basic elements are supplement with Wesley's doctrine of Christian Perfection. The New Birth and complete sanctification have been looked upon as two isolated phenomena unconnected organically with his doctrine of salvation as a whole. Because he maintains that both are conferred upon man in a single instant, only the instantaneous element in salvation has received attention. "Thus the fact that Wesley also sees salvation as a gradual development has been overlooked. Actually the idea of gradual development is a most prominent element in his conception of salvation, and indeed, in his thought generally. What happens is that these two elements, the instantaneous and the gradual, are merged, and the order of salvation peculiar to Wesley is the outcome of this mergence. Salvation is seen as a process by which man passes through a series of successive stages, each stage representing a different and higher level." (Lindstrom, -Wesley and Sanctification, p.105)

Mr. Wesley says, "By salvation I mean, not barely, according to the vulgar notion, deliverance from hell, or going to heaven; but a present deliverance

from sin, a restoration of the soul to its primitive health, its original purity; a recovery of the divine nature; the renewal of our souls after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness, in justice, mercy and truth. This implies all holy and heavenly tempers, and by consequence, all holiness of conversation."

(A Farther Appeal, 1745, Works VIII, p.47)

1. The Meaning of the Terms Regeneration and Sanctification. The outstanding discussion of this phase of the subject, in our opinion, is that of Bishop Pock in his well-known volume, "The Central Idea of Christianity." It is to this that we now give our attention. He says, "Just as natural life and the condition of the living being are distinct, so also spiritual life and the moral condition of the spiritually alive are distinct. Certain invariable coincidence between these two things, in no respect interfere with their essential difference. Now, two things so entirely distinct, as the fact of spiritual life and the moral state of the spiritually alive, ought to have different names. Regeneration appropriately denotes certain treatment of the soul, which God has brought to life, as regeneration does the fact of bringing it to life. Sanctification (from sanctus, holy and facio, to make) is literally the act of making holy, and this is its essential meaning in systematic divinity. Now here are two things totally distinct from each other, as much so as a fact and a quality of a fact, a thing and an accident of a thing, can be; and here are two terms, of entirely different import, completely adapted to represent these two things respectively--regeneration, the production of spiritual life; sanctification, the treatment of the soul spiritually alive,--neither of which, can without violence of the laws of language, perform the office of the other. We humbly submit therefore, that they ought not

Our Lord consecrated Himself for the sake of those He loved, His disciples, His church, His elect. The word for consecrate is not adequately translated by either "consecrate" or "dedicated." The old King James verb "sanctify" is much better, for the whole point of the passage, as Dr. Bultmann makes clear in his Commentary on John, is that it is the sanctifying of Himself as a sacrificial offering, the sacrifice of which He Himself is the priest, His own life which He gives for the life of the world. The thought of the Gospel of John at this point is not far removed from that of Paul or even that of the Hebrews. Indeed it seems nearer the Hebrews in some respects than to Paul. (Dr. Frederick C. Grant, Self-Consecration in Union Seminary Quarterly Review, January 1951)

to be used interchangeably, and that attempts to so use them have caused nearly all the confusion which has embarrassed these great points in theology. (Peck, - The Central Idea of Christianity, p.15-16)

2. The Nature of Regeneration. Much of the difficulty in understanding the doctrine of entire sanctification is attributable to misconceptions concerning the nature of regeneration. We shall continue Bishop Peck's discussion. Speaking of regeneration, he says, "The leading idea of this great work is reproduction of life,-life which originally existed in man, but which had become extinct by violence; spiritual life, depending upon union with God, -a union interrupted by sin; hence the soul was 'dead in trespasses and sins.' No mode of restoring this life could be possible, but that which should unite the soul with God. Christ became the bond of union. He became our 'daysman' our intercessor. 'He took his seat at the right hand of the majesty on high,' where 'he ever liveth to make intercession' for us. Converted men, by faith, have accepted His mediation, and appropriated the merits of His death, and thus, through Him, the elements of a new and spiritual life have been imparted to the soul." "But we think some err very much in regarding this work as a literal creation; and this leads them to inquire whether a holy God can permit imperfection to inhere in this 'new creation.' Others, are perhaps more spiritual in a similar conception. They think of it as an organic 'change of heart' and say, it must indeed be total. Such a conversion of the soul, undertaken and effected by such a power, must it is assumed, leave it perfectly holy."

"By a consent almost universal, the word regeneration is now used to designate, not the whole work of sanctification....but the instantaneous change from spiritual death to spiritual life." "According to the Scriptures, and the undeniable evidence of history, regeneration does not remove all sin." (Hodge,- Systematic Theology, III, p.290)

"The implantation of spiritual life does not destroy the carnal mind; though its power is broken, it does not cease to exist. While the new birth is the beginning of purification, it is perhaps, more the process of imparting or begetting life, than the process of refining or purification; which in entire sanctification is the extraction of remaining impurity from regenerated human nature." (Woods,-Purity and Maturity, p.112)

"But let us lead to the contemplation of this gracious work from another direction. We would humbly ask you to take God's favorite language for its expression, -'born again,' 'born of God,' 'born from above,' 'sons of God,' 'heirs of God.' Now conceive the soul morally dead. That soul (with its natural faculties)-with its living intellect, to apprehend God; with its living sensibilities, to feel the impressions of His Holy Spirit; with its living will, to resolve upon the abandonment of sin; upon real, instant, saving faith in Christ. Suppose that is done. Now that soul is united to the Father through Christ. Now life runs through, quickens and pervades it. No new spiritual essence has taken the place of the old; nor is it changed from one kind of organic being to another. But it has received a living energy from God; a power that sets in motion the moral heart, and throws the life current sweetly through the whole man. This is God in the soul. It is God, the Father, the originating Life; it is God the Son, the atoning life; it is God the Holy Ghost, the sanctifying, witnessing Life. As natural life is the product of Divine power alone, the spiritual

Dr. William Mc Donald in his excellent work, "The New Testament Standard of Piety" gives us the following comparative statements concerning Regeneration and Entire Sanctification.

1. In regeneration, sin does not reign; in sanctification it does not exist.
2. In regeneration sin is suspended; in sanctification it is destroyed.
3. In regeneration, irregular desires -anger, pride, unbelief, envy -are subdued; in sanctification, they are removed.
4. Regeneration is salvation from the voluntary commission of sin; sanctification is salvation from the being of sin.
5. Regeneration is the old man bound; sanctification is the old man cast out and spoiled of his goods.
6. Regeneration is sanctification begun; entire sanctification is the work completed. (McDonald, -New Testament Standard of Piety, p.123)

The Methodist Catechism; "What is sanctification?" "The state of being entirely cleansed from sin, so as to love God with all the heart and mind and strength." (The earlier catechism simply states. "Sanctification is the act of divine grace whereby we are made holy.")

The German United Brethren Church has this statement. "By perfect holiness we understand the separation and purification from all inhering sin, after regeneration, by the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; and the filling of the heart with the love of God by the Holy Ghost."

Dr. John Dempster, in an admirable sermon on Christian Perfection, before the Biblical Institute, said, "Do you then demand an exact expression of the difference? It is this: the one (regeneration) admits of controlled tendencies to sin, the other (entire sanctification) extirpates these tendencies. That is, the merely regenerate has remaining impurity; the fully sanctified has none." (Cf. Wood, -Perfect Love, p. 37)

life must be also. Generation expresses the operation of this power in the one instance, and regeneration in the other. Generation and birth produce new natural powers and functions, regeneration and the new birth produce spiritual powers and functions entirely new. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." The result of natural generation is life with its accidents; the result of regeneration is spiritual life with its accidents; the degree of health may be mentioned as an accident of the former, and the degree of sanctification or holiness as an accident of the latter." "We have shown that regeneration does not necessarily include entire sanctification. It implies neither a literal creation nor an organic change, but the reproduction of life. Then whether or not the soul is made perfect in holiness and love, at the same time energy restores it to life, is wholly a question of fact." (Peck, The Central Idea of Christianity, pp.71ff.)

3. The Experience of Regeneration as a Mixed Moral State. The condition of the regenerate is in some sense a mixed state, that is, both grace and inbred sin have existence in the same soul. Mr. Wesley uses this term in his sermon on Patience. He says, "Till this universal change (purification) was wrought in his soul (the regenerate) all his holiness was mixed." But we must clearly understand what he means by the term "mixed." He does not mean that there is such a commingling of holiness and sin as to imply a homogeneous character, combining and assimilating both factors into a common nature. There can be no such thing as an adulterated holiness. Grace and sin may exist in admixture in the human soul, but grace is still grace, and sin is sin. If we may be permitted to use a common figure in holiness circles drawn from the material realm (which both

The merely regenerate is possessed of both grace and inbred sin. The reader will please notice that these have existence in the heart without forming any combination or composition, the same as mixtures may take place in natural substances without combination, being opposed to each other, and possessed of no affiliation. There is no such commingling of grace and inbred sin, as to make an adulterated holiness. Strictly speaking, an adulterated holiness is an absurdity—a contradiction. Holiness is holiness. (Wood, Purity and Maturity, p.110)

There is but one kind of religious life; but that life, though divinely imparted, may exist in a partially purified soul, or in one entirely purified; and in that sense there may be a distinction; hence the propriety of regarding the merely regenerate as, in a modified sense, in a mixed moral state—possessed of both spiritual life and indwelling sin.....Partly holy, and partly unholy, as in a sense is the case with the regenerate, does by no means imply a homogeneous character, combining and assimilating into a common nature.

Dr. Williams and Dr. Sangster object to in us, but which they freely do themselves) this "Mixed State" is like vegetables and weeds in a garden. The garden is in a mixed state, but the vegetables are still vegetables and the weeds are weeds, though both are growing in the same enclosure. Furthermore, these two elements are antagonistic one to the other, are in their essential nature opposed to each other; and while existing in the soul of the believer are always at war, one with the other. This is the meaning of St. Paul's injunction, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are the contrary one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." (Gal. 5:16-17)

Against the assertion that the regenerate are in part holy and in part unholy; in part sanctified, and in part not yet sanctified wholly, Mr. Wesley met strong opposition from two sides, - the first from Zinzendorfianism, which taught that man's soul was purified wholly or entirely sanctified when he was converted; and on the other hand from Antinomianism which asserted that man is only made holy legally by imputation, never actually by the removal of inbred sin from the heart. We have noticed already a modified form of this antinomianism in our discussion of Dr. Sangster's position, but it comes out more fully in the

"Mixed, necessarily in a restricted sense. Both grace and inbred sin have existence in the same soul, though antagonistic and at war with each other, and in their essential nature diametrically opposed to each other. Though existing for a time in the same person in admixture, they are distinct in nature and tendency; they are 'contrary the one to the other,' and are irreconcilable enemies." (Wood, - Purity and Maturity, p. 111)

Bishop Hamline says, "The field may be cleared of weeds, while the tender blade is springing up, and months may be necessary to grow the grain. So the heart may be cleansed from all sin, while our graces are immature, and the cleansing is a preparation for their unembarrassed and rapid growth." (Hamline, - Sermon: "Beauty of Holiness," 1862)

Mr. Wesley says, "It is true, we are then delivered, as was observed before, from the dominion of outward sin (in regeneration); and at the same time, the power of inward sin is so broken, that we need not longer follow, or be led by it; but it is by no means true, that inward sin is then totally destroyed; that the root of pride, self-will, anger, love of the world, is then taken out of the heart; or that the carnal mind, and the heart bent to backsliding, are entirely extirpated. And to suppose the contrary, is not, as some may think, an innocent, harmless mistake. No: it does immense harm; it entirely blocks up the way to any further change." (Sermons, I, p. 124) (Cf. Wood, - Purity and Maturity, p. 102)

positions of the Plymouth Brethren. It is necessary for us therefore, to carefully guard ourselves against either form of error. Let us note the Wesleyan teaching concerning these positions.

(1) Zinzendorffianism. In 1763 Mr. Wesley said, "I retired to Lowisham and wrote the sermon on 'Sin in Believers,' in order to remove a mistake which some were laboring to propagate, that there is no sin in any that are justified." It is in this sermon that he says, "Indeed this grand point, that there are two contrary principles in (unsanctified) believers, -nature and grace, the flesh and the Spirit, runs through all the Epistles of St. Paul, yea, through all the Scriptures." "I cannot therefore, by any means receive this assertion, that there is no sin in a believer from the moment he is justified: first, because it is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture; secondly, because it is contrary to the experience of the children of God; thirdly, because it is absolutely new, never heard of in the world till yesterday; and lastly, because it is naturally attended with the most fatal consequences; not only grieving those whom God hath not grieved, but perhaps dragging them into everlasting perdition. (Sermons, I, p.III) Mr. Wesley further says that this whole argument, "If he is clean, he is clean," "If he is holy, he is holy," (and twenty more expressions of the same kind may easily be heaped together), is really no better than playing on words" it is the fallacy of arguing from a particular to a general; of

Mr. Wesley also names the following statements of objectors: "However, there is one Scripture which will put the matter out of question: 'If any man be a believer' in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things are passed away, behold all things are become new." (2.Cor.5:17) Now, certainly, a man cannot be a new creature and an old creature at once." "Yes, he may: he may be partly renewed, which was the very case of those at Corinth. They were doubtless 'renewed in the spirit of their mind,' or they could not have been so much as 'babes in Christ;' yet they had not the whole mind which was in Christ, for they envied one another." "But it is said expressly, 'Old things are passed away; all things are become new.'" But we must not so interpret the apostle's words as to make him contradict himself. And if he will make him consistent with himself, the plain meaning of his words is this: his old judgment concerning justification, holiness, happiness, indeed concerning the things of God in general, is now passed away; so are his old desires, designs, affections, tempers, and conversation. All these are undeniably become new, (they are not wholly new) greatly changed from what they were; and yet though they are new, they are not wholly new. Still he feels, to his sorrow and shame, remains of the old man, too manifest taints of his former tempers and affections, though they cannot gain any advantage over him, as long as he watches unto prayer. (Wesley, -Sermon: Sin in Believers)

inferring a general conclusion from particular premises. Propose the sentence entire, and it runs thus: 'If he is holy at all, he is holy altogether. 'That does not follow; every babe in Christ is holy, and yet not altogether so. He is saved from sin: yet not entirely: it remains though it does not reign. If you think that it does not remain (in babes at least, whatever may be the case with young men and fathers), you certainly have not considered the height, the depth, and length, and breadth of the law of God; and that every anomaly, disconformity thereto, or deviation from this law, is sin. Now is there no disconformity to this in the heart and life of a believer? What may be in an adult Christian, is another question; but what a stranger he must be to human nature, who can possibly imagine, that this is the case with every babe in Christ?" (Wesley, -Sin in Believers, p.265ff)

The doctrine that inbred sin remains in the justified believer is held all but universally in the churches, -both Protestant and Roman Catholic. It is set forth in the Reformed Churches in even stronger statements than the Arminian, for the latter hold to a mitigated depravity, that is that guilt does not attach to this moral condition in the believer. Depravity is mitigated in this sense, that it is in a measure offset by a universal gift of grace as a result of the universal atonement of Christ.

(2) Antinomianism. Antinomianism represents the opposite extreme, although strangely enough, both positions are found in the Moravianism which Mr. Wesley challenges. The statements in Moravian to which Mr. Wesley objects are these. "That a believer is never sanctified or holy in himself, but in Christ only; he has no holiness in himself at all, all his holiness being imputed, not inherent." To this he replies, "Scripture holiness is the image of God; the mind which was in Christ; the love of God and man; lowliness, gentleness, temperance, patience,

The extent to which antinomian principles were carried in Wesleyan times, is here given solely to show what is possible under the fallacious imputation theories. The following is taken from Rev. Richard Hill and is quoted in Fletcher's Checks, (I, pp.146-147) "Even adultery and murder do not hurt the pleasant child, because God always views me in Christ. Hence in the midst of adulteries, murders, incests, He can address me with 'Thou art all fair, my love, my undefiled, there is not a spot in thee.' Although I highly blame those who say, 'Let us sin that grace may abound,' yet adultery, incest and murder shall, upon the whole, make me holier on earth and merrier in heaven."

chastity. And do you coolly affirm that this is only imputed to a believer, and that he has none of this holiness at all in him?....Does a believer love God or does he not? If he does, he has the love of God in him. Is he lowly or meek or patient at all? If he is, he has these tempers in himself; and if he has them not in himself, he is not lowly, or meek or patient. You cannot therefore deny that every believer has holiness in, though not from, himself; else you deny that he is holy at all; and if so, he cannot see his Lord." Mr. Wesley sums up the whole position in these words, "What a heap of palpable self-contradiction, what senseless jargon is this." (Wood, -Christian Perfection, -128)

We ask now, is there an explanation, justifiable in Biblical psychology, for this mixed state of the soul, -"partly holy, and partly unholy" as Mr. Wesley puts it? We think there is. If now, we refer to our previous definition of soul as "spirit in relation to body," we can but note its twofold aspect: first, the soul is the subject of spiritual impulses, in that it is of the nature of spirit; and secondly, the soul is the subject of sensations from the outward world through the medium of the body. The soul then, is a unique spiritual entity, -sui generis, Dr. Pratt calls it. It is the doxa of the spirit in play the two contrasting forces, -spirit and matter. God formed man out of the dust of the earth, giving him a material body; and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, thus making him a living soul. The soul being finite is limited on both sides, and in some measure unites within itself the two contrasts, mind and matter, spirit and body. On the spiritual side, man's soul stands in relation to the Divine Creator; on the material side it is the animating principle of the body, and that which constitutes material substance flesh. The soul therefore, represents two natures in one person. It has its spiritual life from God but it functions through a fleshly organism.

Therefore the one personality has a double character: "the inward man of the mind," to which "to will is present," and the flesh or the body of sin, in which: how to perform that which is good I find not." But the one person, to whom these opposite elements belong, -an inner man, a reason, a will to good; an outer man, a carnal bias, a slavery to evil, -is behind all these, behind even the inner man. And in him, in the inmost secret of his nature, is the original vice which gives birth to these contradictions. It teaches most distinctly the freedom of the will, and at the same time the inability of man to do what is good. (Pope, -Compendium of Christian Theology, II, pp. 66-67)

for some time that the interpretation of the word "sanctify" differently as it applies to Jesus or to us, but plays into the hands of those who deny any cleansing from inbred sin. I think that the word sanctify means exactly the same thing in each instance. The root meaning of the word "to sanctify" is "to separate from common usage and to devote to the holy, that is, to the Deity." Three things are implied here: first, that the sanctification of things which have no moral quality is purely ritualistic; secondly, that the sanctification of a person who is holy, implies a voluntary devotion to a supreme and holy purpose; and thirdly, the sanctification of persons with a morally depraved character, there must first be a separation from sin and a making holy, before there can be any devotion to a holy purpose. The only person who was holy and thus sanctified was Christ, -He alone being without sin. With all others there must be a purification from sin before there can be a supreme devotion to God, and it is this that is implied in the words "truly sanctified."

Let us touch briefly on another phase of the work of sanctification. It not only means a purification from sin, but the term "devotion" or devoted to" implies acceptance on the part of God, and hence a divine indwelling. In the first verse of the Bible where the word "sanctified" occurs, it is said that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." (Gen.2:3) That in which God rests is holy; where He does not abide, there can be no holiness. Holiness therefore, is something more than purification, -it is purification plus the divine indwelling. These two points, -the purification of the heart, and holiness as a state or condition of the heart are phases of the Pauline, Wesleyan position that have been so subtlety attacked by the depth-psychologists. These will be given later consideration.

We can now understand why the proponents of entire sanctification have found it wise to present the doctrine from both the negative and positive aspects. Negatively, this experience is a separation, -the cleansing of the heart from all sin and unrighteousness, thus resulting in CHRISTIAN PURITY. Positively, love reigns supreme in the cleansed heart, and from this aspect, the experience is

Now in the Fall, two things took place, first, the loss of original righteousness through transgression; and secondly, the death of the soul through separation from God. As a consequence of this loss of life, the soul became depraved, that is, it exists in a "disordered state of the sensuous and moral nature." (Milroy) Here again, we find the distinctions made by Bishop Peck between life and the quality of life, or life and its environment. For our present purpose we shall speak of this twofold distinction as (1) life; and (2) the organism through which that life is expressed. Two things are wrong with man, first, he is dead in trespasses and sins and needs to be made alive; secondly, he is depraved, in that he has a disordered mechanism through which life is expressed, and therefore, needs renewal. The first we call regeneration, the second sanctification. When a man is born again, his soul is given life by being restored to right relations with God; when a man is sanctified wholly, the soul as the organ of the spirit, is purified from sin and thereby renewed in "holiness and righteousness." The organism of the soul (sarx) which in the unregenerate is the servant of sin; which in the regenerate wars against the new life of the spirit, is, in the entirely sanctified so purified that it becomes holy in nature and righteous in act. When therefore, Mr. Wesley says that a man may be in part holy and in part unholy, he is sound both doctrinally and experientially.

THE EXPERIENCE OF ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

Having established the relation between regeneration and entire sanctification, we are now prepared to examine the latter experience more critically. One of the texts which needs careful examination is that found in our Lord's high priestly prayer, "And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth," or "truly sanctified." It has appeared to me

Bishop Foster says of the person entirely sanctified, that he is in "a state in which he will be entirely free from sin, properly so-called, both inward and outward." The process of this work is in this order: beginning with pardon, by which one aspect of sin, that is, actual guilt, is wholly removed, and proceeding in regeneration, by which another kind of sin, that is depravity, is in part renewed, terminating with entire sanctification, by which the remainder of the second kind, or depravity, is entirely removed. (Bishop Peck, Christian Purity, p.122)

commonly known as PERFECT LOVE. The unity of this experience,-embracing both the negative and positive aspects,-both CHRISTIAN PURITY and PERFECT LOVE is to be found in the presence of the Holy Spirit. Christian Purity is a result of an act of the Holy Spirit, cleansing the heart from all sin by the blood of Jesus; and this state of purity is maintained by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and the constant sprinkling of the blood. (We are not cleansed apart from the blood, but with and under it). Perfect Love is likewise the result of an act of the Holy Spirit in shedding abroad the love of God in the purified heart; and this love abides in ever-increasing fulness only by the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit. It is to these aspects of the one gracious experience that we now turn our attention,-CHRISTIAN PURITY AND PERFECT LOVE.

CHRISTIAN PURITY AS THE NEGATIVE ASPECT OF ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

Purity of heart is the negative aspect of entire sanctification and is a prominent fact in human redemption. Hence our Lord says, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." Christian purity may be said to have the following aspects:

1. Christian Purity is a State or Quality of the Heart. Heart purity does not consist in the repetition of good acts, it is rather, a moral condition of the soul from which good acts flow. It is not holy actions that make a man holy, it is a holy heart that makes the actions holy. "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth evil things." The treasure of a good man's heart is holiness or the divine nature; that of an evil man is the car-nal mind.

2. Purity of Heart is Preparatory to the Fulness of Divine Love. Purity of heart does not so much signify the introduction of something into the soul, as it does the removal of something from the soul. It is the cleansing of the heart from all impurities,-from all that is contrary to pure love. As when a man is pardoned his sins are all forgiven; so when a man's heart is cleansed he is entirely pure, for the "blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." As purity of heart is the negative aspect of entire sanctification, so

perfect love is the positive. Richard Watson says, "The absence of all evil is necessarily the presence of all good." St. Peter makes this clear when he says, "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently." (I Peter 1:22)

3. Purity of Heart is Spiritual Health. As physical health is the absence of disease, so spiritual health or holiness is the absence of the moral disease of sin. As physical health does not refer to the size, the strength or the beauty of the body, so holiness as spiritual health does not refer to the capacity, the strength or the development of the soul, but only to its freedom from sin. Mr. Fletcher, speaking of heart purity says that it is as much inherent in us and yet derived from Christ, as the perfection of bodily health. The chief difference lies in this, that 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. (Last Check)

Here again, we must refer to the subtle attack of the depth psychologists on the doctrine of assurance. Dr. Flew says, "But if our criticism of Wesley's doctrine of sin is valid, the word assurance is inapplicable to the uprooting of indwelling sin. A man may bear testimony to his awareness of a God who is willing and able to 'destroy the last remains of sin,' he cannot know himself well enough to claim that God has already done it." Aside from doing away with the witness of the Spirit, which is from God and not ourselves, this position is but a repetition of one which the earlier writers on this subject were faced to meet and refute, -i.e. that we can have no consciousness of the quiescent states of the soul, and therefore no witness to Christian purity.

Dr. Curry in an address to the New York Preachers' Meeting made the statement that holiness being a state, condition or quality of being, he doubted as to whether this cleansed state could be one of consciousness. He said, "Consciousness takes notice of the soul's processes, but the range of observance does not extend to the quiescent states of the soul." To this Dr. J. A. Wood replied, "What are rest, freedom from condemnation, peace and repose, but

quiescent states of the soul, of which we may be as clearly and positively conscious as any of the soul's processes? We can no more doubt the testimony of consciousness, than we can doubt our existence, as no testimony is more certain. It is the only direct and positive testimony of the soul's existence, states and exercises. By this we know we live and breathe, we love or hate, we sit or stand, or walk. The sanctified soul may be as positively and fully conscious of purity, as the unsanctified of impurity. While wicked passions and vicious states -pride, anger, unbelief, and condemnation are matters of positive consciousness; love, peace, humility, patience, faith and obedience are equally so. Conscience usually speaks more loud and clear to the purified heart than to the impure, as grace quickens, while sin paralyses. (Wood, -Purity and Maturity, p. 109)

PERFECT LOVE AS THE POSITIVE ASPECT OF ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

The positive aspect of entire sanctification is perfect love filling the purified heart. Dr. George Peck gives us an admirable statement concerning the relation existing between heart purity and perfect love. He says, "By being saved from all sin in the present life, we mean being saved, first, from all outward sin, -all violations of the requirements of the law of love which relate

Ritschl's Analysis of Love

After defining love as "will, aiming at either the appropriation of an object, or at the enrichment of its existence, because moved by a feeling of its worth," he enumerates several conditions necessary to its existence. We may summarize these briefly as follows:

1. It is necessary that the objects loved should be of like nature to the subject which loves, that is persons. To speak of love for things or animals, is to degrade the conception of love beneath its proper meaning.
2. Love implies a will which is constant in its aim. If objects change, we may have fancies but cannot have love.
3. Love aims at the promotion of another's personal end, whether known or conjectured. Nor is love interested merely in those things which are accidental, it estimates everything which concerns the other by its bearing on the character of the loved one. Love desires either to promote, to maintain, and through sympathetic interest to enjoy the individuality of the character acquired by others, or to assist him in securing those blessings which are necessary to insure the attainment of his personal ideal.
4. If love is to be a constant attitude of will, and if the appropriation and the promotion of the other's interests and ideals are not to diverge but coincide in each act, then the person who loves must take up the other's personal interests and make them a part of his own. Love continually strives to appropriate the other personality, regarding this as a task necessary to his own conscious individuality. The characteristic implies that the will as love does not give itself up for the other's sake. (Ritschl, -Justification and Reconciliation, pp. 277ff.)

to our outward conduct; and secondly, from all inward sin,-all violations of the law of love which relate to the intellect, the sensibillites and the will." (Peck,-Christian Perfection, p.65) By perfect love is meant perfection in quality, not perfection in quantity. Beyond entire sanctification there is no increase in purity, but there may be an eternal increase in love and all the fruit of the Spirit.

Ritschl in his work entitled, "Justification and Reconciliation", Has given us an excellent analysis of love. The fellowship of love must embrace two factors,-self-surrender and self-assertion; nor can either increase without the other if love is to be maintained. If self-assertion is not accompanied by its equivalent in self-surrender, we have not love but selfishness under the guise of love; if self-surrender be not balanced by self-assertion we have not love but weakness. As love develops, it grows richer in self-sacrificing, and increases its desire for possession of the object loved. (Christian Theology, I, p.330)

Nor is St. John silent on this important subject. He says, "Herein is love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love." (I John 4:17-18) Here it is distinctly stated that there is a condition

Dr. Pope states that if we take the words, Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world, and connect them with those which immediately precede, and thou hast loved them, as thou hast loved me, and these again with the assurance, as the Father hath loved me, so I have loved you, it will appear how perfect is the identity in kind between finite and infinite love, between the reflection in us and the reality in the essential Trinity, and how profound is the meaning of those words, "Love is of God," a form of expression used of no other grace." "Thus," he says, "we may boldly repeat that more glorious things are spoken of the divine perfection of love than of any other." (Pope,-Compendium of Christian Theology, I, pp.344-345)

"Sanctification is that renewal of our fallen nature by the Holy Ghost, received through faith in Jesus Christ, whose blood of atonement has power to cleanse from all sin; whereby we are not only delivered from the guilt of sin, which is justification, but are washed entirely from its pollution, freed from its power, and are enabled, through grace, to love God with all our hearts, and to walk in His holy commandments blameless." (Luther Lee,-Theology, p.211)

of heart in which both love and fear exist; and also a state in which love excluded all fear, that has torment. This is not by growth, -we are made perfect in love. The Holy Spirit can so purify the heart from tormenting fears that nothing remains but perfect love. This love does not cast out the fear of caution, the fear that is a protective instinct, or the filial fear of reverence; but it does remove harmful, guilty fears, -the fear of man, the fear of want, the fear of death and the judgment, -all slavish fears that would torment the soul.

But our Lord lifts love to its supreme heights when He says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these." (Mark 11:30-31) The love of the heart is ethical, the love of the soul enriching, the love of the mind interpretative, and all these are gathered up in the final statement, -Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength. Love is all of a piece, and if genuine not only extends perpendicularly towards God but horizontally towards men.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION AND GROWTH IN GRACE

There are a number of statements in Mr. Wesley's teaching concerning entire sanctification that to most readers approach dangerously near the growth theory of Calvinism, which as Charles Ewing Brown indicates, probable embodies the most intelligent and forceful opposition to Wesleyanism found in Christian theology. We can give here but a few of these texts. In his sermon on the New Birth, he says of regeneration, "This is a part of sanctification, not the whole: it is the gate to it, the entrance into it. When we are born again, then our sanctification, out inward and outward holiness begins; and thenceforth we are gradually to 'grow up into Him who is our Head.' This expression of the Apostle admirably illustrates the difference between one and the other, and further points out the analogy there is between natural and spiritual things. A child is born in a moment, or at least in a very short time: afterward he gradually and slowly grows, till he attains the stature of a man. In like manner, a child is born of

God in a short time, if not in a moment. But it is by slow degrees that he afterward grows up to the measure of the full stature of Christ. The same relation therefore, which there is between our natural birth and our growth, there is also between our new birth and our sanctification." (Sermons II, p.302 The New Birth)

In answer to the question, "Is this death to sin and renewal in love, gradual or instantaneous?" he says, "A man may be dying for some time; yet he does not, properly speaking, die, till 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 of Christian Perfection, pp.51-52) Dr. George Peck explains this as follows: Sanctification implies both and death to sin, and the life of righteousness. When therefore, we speak of sanctification, as to the former part of it, we say that it may be attained at once,—it is an instantaneous work.....But in

Dr. Charles Hodge has a voluminous treatment of the doctrine of sanctification. He says, "Sanctification in the Westminster Catechism is said to be the work of God's grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness." "They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, by His Word and Spirit dwelling in them; the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified, and they more and more quickened and strengthened, in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. This sanctification is throughout in the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abideth still some remains of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh. In which war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much prevail, yet through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth overcome; and so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." ... (The time when this sanctification becomes entire, or is perfected is also clearly indicated. It is in the moment of death,—or as sometimes stated, "in the hour and article of death!") "The souls of the righteous, being then made free in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory."

(For a refutation of the above, cf. Wesley's "Queries to those who Deny Perfection Attainable in this Life," in his Plain Account of Christian Perfection, pp.239ff.)

relation to the latter part, that is, the life of righteousness, it is regarded as entirely progressive. The destruction of sin in the soul, and the growth of holiness are two distinct things...The one is instantaneous, the other gradual; hence it is that we sometimes say with propriety, that the work of entire sanctification is both gradual and instantaneous."

It is clear also, that Mr. Wesley viewed holiness from the twofold aspect of the nature of the life imparted, and from the subsequent purification of the soul from all antagonisms to that life. First, Regeneration is the impartation of a holy life, in which all the graces of the Spirit inhere; secondly, the unfolding of this life marks a gradual increase in holiness; thirdly, the growth of this life of holiness cannot itself extirpate sin; and fourthly, in addition to the gradual processes of growth and development, there must be an instantaneous act,-a cleansing of the soul by the blood of Jesus from all that hinders the unfolding of this holy life, that is, from inbred sin.

Viewed in this light, Wesley's teaching is not only harmonious in itself, but it is in harmony with both the Scriptures and Christian experience. Too often, regeneration has been presented as in opposition to entire sanctification, when in fact, it is regeneration which gives us that holy life that is forever to grow and increase. Must we not then, if we are true to the Wesleyan tradition, to the Scriptures and to our own experience give more attention to the cultivation of a holy life? More emphasis here would mean higher attainments in the divine life. Would that we all might be brought to the place where with William Bramwell we would cry out, "To be justified is great! To be sanctified is great! But O to be filled with all the fulness of God!"

LECTURE V. THE PERFECT PERSONALITY OF GOD AND CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

"Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Matt. 5:48

We have now considered the NATURE OF THE ABSOLUTE AS HOLY, and have defined this holiness as "the glorious fulness of God's moral excellence, held as the principle of His own action and the standard for His creatures. (William Newton Clarke) For this reason we interpreted the words "be ye holy for I am holy" to mean that holiness in man is the same as holiness in God-this one distinction being made, i.e. that holiness in God is absolute, while in man it is derived. In the next lecture we called attention to INFINITE EFFICIENCY AND ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION, our text being "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy Word is truth." (John 17:17) Today we shall consider another aspect of the subject, that of THE PERFECT PERSONALITY OF GOD AND CHRISTIAN PERFECTION. This we shall find when considered in relation to the created universe, is indicative of the purpose or end of all existence. When therefore our Lord said to His disciples in the Sermon on the Mount, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect," He referred,-not so much to the nature and reality of holiness, nor to the potentiality of holiness in believers but to holiness as the supreme end of all moral life. This aspect of holiness will be the subject of our consideration in the present lecture.

In order to make it clear that the Perfect Personality of God represents the purpose or supreme end of all existence, it will be necessary to give this subject of personality some further consideration. This is one of the outstanding problems in both philosophy and theology, and at no point perhaps do they come into more immediate contact than in those conflicts which have arisen concerning the existence and nature of God.

1. The Origin and Meaning of the Term Personality. It may be well first of all, to keep clearly in mind the twofold sense in which the term person or personality is used in theology. Its earliest use was in the sense of hypostasis, and as such represented the three distinctions or moments in the one substance of the Godhead. When therefore, the term person began to be applied to the whole

being of God, it was natural that the trinitarians should view this concept as strictly unitarian; while on the other hand, those who used the word person of the entire Godhead only, necessarily viewed the contending parties as tri-theists. It is well however, when criticism of the term in the trinitarian sense arises, to remember that this is the original meaning of the term and therefore not to be despised

Let us ask how we came to use this word Person at all. It is an inheritance from the Latin Church and goes back to the days of Tertullian. In Roman law, from which some have derived its use, it meant "a holder of legal rights." In this sense it is not co-extensive with our use of the term, for we should call a slave a person, though incapable of sustaining legal rights; and we should not call a corporation or a college a person, although legal rights are vested in them. These differences of usage serve to bring out the meaning of the Latin word, which may be paraphrased as "one who performs, or is capable of, certain functions".... If this legal phraseology is the origin of the use of the word, there is no Greek theological phrase which precisely corresponds with it.

But there is another theory of its origin which connects it with the Greek "prosopon" (πρόσωπον). This word and its Latin equivalent mean a "character" in a play, and referred originally to the mask worn by the actor rather than to the part he played. Whatever be the exact history of prosopon and persona in the sense of prosopon, there can be no doubt that the words are inadequate to the purpose required of them. They tend to mean merely "aspects" of a Divine substance, and therefore savor of Sabellianism.

On the Greek side, there are two words of importance here, ὁυσία and ὑπόστασις. They seem originally to have been almost equivalent terms; that is, it seems to have been equally accurate to say that there is one ὁυσία, or that there is one ὑπόστασις in the nature of God. But by degrees through a process, ὑπόστασις was reserved to express the three persons, while ὁυσία was used as before for the Divine Substance. Thus it became necessary to speak of one ὁυσία and three ὑποστάσεις. It is worth mentioning that Heraclides Ponticus held that ὁυσία constantly means to play the part of, or to represent, which may possibly connect ὑπόστασις with the persona of the mask. (Thomas B. Strong, -A manual of Theology, pp.174-176)

2. The Psychological Argument for the Personality of God. Perhaps the best psychological argument for the personality of God is that presented by Dr. Shedd, although the argument of Dr. Olin A. Curtis is illuminating and helpful also. "Self-consciousness," says Dr. Shedd, "is, first, the power which a rational spirit or mind has of making itself its own object; and secondly, of knowing that it has done so. If the first step is taken, and not the second, there is consciousness, but not self-consciousness; because the subject would not, in this case, know that the object is the self. And the second step cannot be taken, if the first has not been taken. These two acts of a rational spirit or mind, involve three distinctions in it, or modes of it. The whole mind as a subject contemplates the very same whole mind as an object. Here are two distinctions or modes of mind. And the very same whole mind also perceives that the contemplating subject and the contemplating object are one and the same essence of being. Here are three modes of one mind, each distinct from the others, yet all three going to make up the one self-conscious spirit. Unless there were these two acts and three resulting distinctions, there would be no self-knowledge. Mere singleness, a mere subject without an object, is incompatible with self-consciousness. Consciousness is dual; self-consciousness is trinal. (Shedd, -Dogmatic Theology, I, pp. 183ff.) Self-consciousness being the most perfect form of consciousness, is applicable to God as the Supreme Being or Perfect Personality. It is evident however, that God like man cannot have consciousness apart from self-consciousness, because sentience cannot be attributed to God for God is spirit; and because there can be no growth or development of consciousness in God. Man comes to self-consciousness gradually through the increasing complexity of the relationships existing between the self and the objective world. God's reason on the other hand, is not discursive but intuitive. His reason is over "self-conscious, self-contemplating, self-knowing and self-communing." His reason is over "self-conscious, self-contemplating, self-knowing and self-communing." His knowledge of the world is not mediated through the senses as in man, and consequently is never partial or imperfect.

3. The Metaphysical Argument for the Personality of God. Here Hermann Lotze (1817-1881) has exercised a profound influence in modern philosophy and theology. He denies that personality is occasioned by the ego's activity reflected back from a non-ego, as in the Hegelian philosophy. This he asserts, is a mere supplement of thought devoid of all basis. Such a process he says, would not distinguish the "I" from the "thou" or the "he," our own personality from that of others. Instead of the ego being developed by a clash with the non-ego, it is the ego that makes possible the distinction between itself and the non-ego. This distinction, Lotze maintains, is not effected by means of pure ideation, but by the power of the self to combine its experiencing of feeling with its ideas. It is this combination that enables us to distinguish a personal state as our own. "The smallest capability for the experience of feeling, he says, "is sufficient to distinguish the one who experiences it from the external world, but the highest intellectuality apart from this capability for the experience of feeling," he says, "is sufficient to distinguish the one who experiences it from the external world, but the highest intellectuality apart from this capability, will not be able to apprehend itself as an ego over against a non-ego. This is to say once again, that personality presupposes feeling or self-feeling, and cannot be subsequent to intellectual construction only." Lotze in denying limitation as the essence of personality, lays a firm foundation for belief in the personality of God. "What justification is there," he asks, "for attributing the term personality to its incomplete form in man, and grudging it to the Deity completely endowed with it?" Finiteness then, according to Lotze is the limitation rather than the expression of personality, and only in the infinite is there the truest and highest personality. (Christian Theology, I, pp. 292ff.)

We must now draw our argument for the personality of God to a close. We have seen that infinity instead of placing God outside of the range of human knowledge, as agnosticism declares; or denying to Him personality, as pantheism maintains, is instead, the very presupposition of His Perfect Personality. Furthermore, Perfect Personality must of necessity include the concept of the

Absolute as the ground of all reality, and the Infinite as the source of all efficiency. But apart from the philosophical significance of the term personality, there is also a religious aspect of the term. The Absolute is holy, and therefore stands in ethical and spiritual relations to mankind. The personal alone must ever be the true end or object of acquisition, possession or enjoyment. God as Perfect Personality is the only worthy object of acquisition, possession or enjoyment. God as Perfect Personality is the only worthy object of human choice, and love to God is the fulfilling of the law. With perfect love to God and man, the soul must forever unfold in the light of this Supreme Good, and at every stage of its progress there will come enlarged conceptions of the true, the right, the perfect and the good.

We shall now turn our attention to a consideration of the nature of this perfection in God, in order to better understand the meaning of our Lord's words to His disciples, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (Matt.5:48)

4. The Nature of the Divine Perfection. As applied to God, perfection is usually regarded in theology as the principle of harmony which unifies and consummates the Divine attributes, thus preventing the sacrifice of one attribute to another, and bringing each to its supreme manifestation. Perfection in God is not the combination of many qualities, but only "the undivided glory of the several rays of the Divine character." It is the harmony of absolute freedom from inner contradictions. Beauty is therefore directly connected with holiness. (Psalm 96:9) But the Divine life as perfect, is not merely one of freedom from inner contradictions, but also one of positive content. It is filled with inner potentialities, and all these potencies in harmonious equilibrium, and therefore becomes essentially the Divine purpose. We read therefore, "that out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined." (Psalm 50:2) When then, our Lord enjoined perfection upon His disciples, He could have meant nothing less than that which we have just indicated as belonging to the perfection of God. First, He referred to that freedom from those inner contradictions which are brought about by sin and depravity, and the restoration to purity of heart and simplicity

of purpose. Secondly, He referred to the inner potentialities of Divine love, imparted and sustained by the incoming and indwelling of the Holy Spirit as the promised Comforter. Thirdly, He referred to outward righteousness in harmony with the inner nature of holiness,-or what is commonly termed "holiness of heart and life.:

It may be well to place the idea of perfection as stated above, over against that of Dr. Flew and Dr. Sangster,-especially the latter. (1) Instead of a freedom from inner contradictions, they speak only of a consciousness of love that would repress these sinful contradictions. (2) Instead of the inner potentialities of the Divine Spirit which led St. Paul to say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me," he has a deep dark cavern of the soul, so that "No man knows what is in him." Because of this it is a "deep, deep error" for any man to say like the saintly Fletcher, "I am freed from all sin." (3) Real inward holiness manifests itself in outward works of righteousness. Every holy man does what he believes to be right, and he does it from a holy motive. He may be mistaken as to what is right, but he never consciously wills contrary to this inner nature of holiness.

THE LEGAL ASPECT OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

The term perfection (τελειωσις) carries with it the thought of a completion or an accomplishment of the work in hand. Wescott defines it as a "consummation" or "a bringing to perfection." This may be through the lapse of time as in growth or development; or it may take place without regard to time, by legal enactment. This legal aspect of Christian Perfection is not often developed, and I ask your patient consideration as I attempt this difficult task. The careful student of the Epistle to the Romans cannot but notice that in the sixth chapter, St. Paul deals with the vital aspect of entire sanctification, using such terms as life, death, crucifixion, resurrection, mortification, the old man, the body of sin, servants, bondage, freedom, works, fruit, gifts and wages. In the seventh chapter he dwells upon the legal aspects of the same subject, introducing the chapter with the word, "Know ye not brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth." (Rom. 7:1)

Taking our suggestion from this division of the subject made by the apostle, let us introduce two legal terms, first, minority; and secondly, majority. Minority indeed pertains to children and youth, and majority to mature persons, but the basis of this distinction is not that of growth and development, but of legal enactment. A minor is a person under twenty-one years of age (except in Georgia); but at twenty-one years of age that person attains his majority and enters into the full rights and privileges of the State. To be sure the term is sometimes used in the sense of maturity, and rightly so, for one's majority is the time when the State adjudges him to be a mature and responsible citizen. A child as a minor, is in some sense a citizen, but has not yet entered into the full rights and privileges of one who has attained his majority. St. Paul refers to this when he says, "that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father." (Gal.4:1-2)

In answer to the question, "What is Christian Perfection?" Mr. Wesley replied, "The loving God with all our heart, mind, soul and strength. This implies, that no wrong temper, none contrary to love remains in the soul; and that all the thoughts, words and actions, are governed by pure love." (Wesley: Plain Account of Christian Perfection)

Now apply this to the realm of grace. We are citizens of another country, that is an heavenly. We are under a new covenant. The law is written in our minds and in our hearts,-in our minds that we may know it, and in our hearts that we may love it. Only those have attained their majority who have entered into the fulness of the new covenant, and this is accomplished by the baptism with the Holy Spirit which purifies the heart from all sin and fills it with perfect love to God and man. It is by one Spirit that we are baptized into the one body and have all been made to drink of the same Spirit. Now a regenerated person is a child of God,-born of the Spirit, and therefore a child in the Kingdom. But there is in this "born again" person, an inherited or racial depravity, "the carnal mind which is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." He is an heir but has not entered fully into his inheritance. Until then he "differeth nothing from a servant though he be lord of all." To keep this carnal mind suppressed he needs tutors and governors, i.e. instruction and discipline. But he is the heir of better things. The Father has appointed a time when he may receive an inheritance among them that are sanctified, and this appointed time is that of his baptism,-the hour of his submission to the baptism with the Holy Spirit by which he is purified from sin, and enters into the fulness of the New Covenant,-the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ.

Dr. Bresee could always wax eloquent when he preached on the Baptism with the Holy Spirit. "Now this baptism with the Holy Ghost" he says, "is the 'blessing of the Christ.' Someone may ask, 'Why is it called the blessing of the Christ?' Because it is; 'why is it?' It is the crowning glory of the work of the soul's salvation. All that ever went before was preparatory for it. Did prophets speak and write; did sacrifices burn; were offerings made; did martyrs die; did Jesus lay aside His glory; did He teach and pray and stretch out His hands on the cross; did He rise from the dead and ascend into heaven; is He at the right hand of God? It was all preparatory to this baptism. Men are convinced of sin, born again and made new creature that they may be baptized with the Holy Ghost. This completes the soul's salvation. Jesus came to destroy

sin -the work of the devil -the baptism with the Holy Ghost does just that. Jesus sought for Himself fellowship, communion and unity with human souls, and by this baptism He is enthroned and revealed in man. (Sermon: The Blessing)

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION AND THE NEW MAN

There is another approach to this subject also, which I feel has not been given the attention it deserves. I shall not be able to state clearly and as fully as it should be presented, and again must ask your prayerful consideration. I refer especially to St. Paul's statements in Ephesians and Colossians concerning the "old man" and the "new man," the exhortation to put off the one to put on the other. This may serve to clear up in a measure, the charge that Mr. Wesley believed in sin as a "thing" to be extracted or removed from human nature.

1. A Definition of Human Personality. In the beginning of this lecture we gave brief attention to the Personality of God as the end or goal of finite existence. We must now consider personality in the sense of individuals in an entangled human race. Boethius defined a person as "Persona est naturae rationalis individua substantia," or a "person is an individual subsistence of a rational nature." Here a person is characterized in a twofold manner,- first as an individual being separate and distinct from all others; and secondly, as a common rational nature, of which each individual is a partaker.

2. Realism and Human Nature. This leads us immediately to a consideration of philosophical realism in relation to human nature. I am not sure that we can go the full length with either Dr. Shedd or Dr. Hodge, different as their theories may be; but I am convinced that some sort of realism must be held, and that it was held by Mr. Wesley, Daniel Curry and other outstanding Methodist theologians. According to Dr. Shedd, "Human nature is a specific or general substance, created in and with the first individuals of the human species, which is not yet individualized, but which by ordinary generation is subdivided into part, and these parts are formed into distinct and separate individuals of the

species. The one specific substance by propagation, is metamorphosed into millions of individual substances or persons. An individual man is a fractional part of human nature, separated from the common mass, and constituted a particular person having all the essential properties of human nature." Again, "The conception of "nature" or specific substance must be kept metaphysical in Anthropology as it is in Theology and Christology. All visible and ponderable elements must be banished, and we must think of substance that is unextended, invisible and formless." (Shedd, -Dogmatic Theology, II, p. 73)

3. The Distinction between Personality and Individuality. We must now take a further step, i.e. we must make a distinction between personality and individuality. By personality, we mean the "individual subsistence of a rational nature," or that which is unique, separate and distinct from every other individualized subsistence. It not only marks off the human race from all orders below it as to quality of being, but it likewise marks off as unique, separate and distinct, each individual within the human race. By individuality, which we here define as "one of a class," we mean that nature which is common to all individual persons, and which constitutes them the members of a single order, - the genus homo. Each individual person roots down into a common human nature; and personality is the individualization of this common nature. If personality is real, then individuality is real, for both were created in Adam and Eve, and by natural generation individualized into the millions of persons that have and

Dr. Shedd says, "there is a spurious realism arising from a wrong definition of the term 'human nature.' Human nature is sometimes explained to be merely a common property of a substance, like rationality or immortality. As all individual men have rationality and immortality as a characteristic quality, so all men have humanity or 'human nature' as a characteristic quality. Human nature as thus defined, is only an attribute, or adjunct of each individual; and the whole of 'human nature' in this case belongs equally alike to each individual, as does the whole property of rationality or immortality."

Dr. Hodge, in his explanation of realism, and his objections to it, so understands and defines human nature. He regards it as an adjunct of the individual; as something united with it, which he explains as "the manifestation of the general principle of humanity in union with a given corporeal organization." "An individual man is a given corporeal organization in which humanity as the general life or force is present." "That which constitutes the species or genus, is a real objective existence, one and the same numerically as well as specifically." (Hodge, -Systematic Theology, II, p. 51)

do inhabit the earth. He who looked down upon Adam and Eve in Eden, the moment after their creation, saw in them the whole human race in its first form. And He who shall look on the millions of individuals in the day of judgment, will see the same race in its last form. The difference between the two visions is formal, not material. "(Shedd,-Dogmatic Theology, II,p.79)

The Racial Nexus. One more and final step in this portion of the argument, If there be a unity in the race, there must then, be some common nexus. No one I think will deny that the physical body is the racial nexus of the present order of being; and I think that it is equally evident that the rational nature in man is the social nexus. What else can St. Paul mean when he says, "What man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." Now 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." (I Cor.2:11-12)

It is this rational nature individualized in separate and distinct persons, which forms the basis of understanding in the social structure, and this has its source ultimately in the Logos or Word of God, by which all things are made and by means of which all things consist, or are made to stand together. (Cor.1:17)

Now it is this individualized human nature, which in fallen and depraved man,

Fallen human nature is flesh or sarx: the whole being of man, body and soul, soul and spirit, separated from God, and subjected to the creature....The disturbance in the very essence of human nature may be regarded as affecting the entire personality of man as a spirit acting in a body. He is born with a nature which is--apart both from the external Evil One and from the external renewing power of the New Creation--under the bondage of sin. That bondage may be regarded with reference to the lower nature that enslaves the higher, and the higher nature that is enslaved. (Pope,-Compendium of Christian Theology, II,p.65)

In the ancient discussion between the realists and the nominalists the question arose whether there is not on the divine mind, and in human thought reflecting the divine mind, a reality of human nature, of which every living man is an expression and representative. As there is an abstract _____, of which the Three Persons are representatives, so there is a human nature which the Second Person represented in the Incarnation, rather than as becoming a personal, individual man. Granting the truth of this mysterious principle-- not less true because we cannot fathom it--every man descended of Adam presents his own personal individualization of a generic character impressed by its Creator on mankind; and receives into himself the generic evil of original sin, which is the sin of the race in Adam. (Pope,-Compendium of Christian Theology, Ipp.436ff.)

St. Paul calls "the spirit of the world" as over against this same individuality redeemed, which he calls "the spirit which is of God." Under other aspects this nature inherited from the race into which each personality roots down, is called the "carnal mind," "the body of sin," "the body of death," the "law which is in my members" or simply "the old man."

The Incarnation and the New Man. We turn now to the second part of our argument. Christ was a theanthropic being, -God and man conjoined in one new person. As the Son of God, the second person of the adorable Trinity existed from all eternity; but until the Incarnation, never were the Divine and human natures united in one Person, -a New Man. So also, the Spirit of God as the third person of the same adorable Trinity, existed from all eternity, but until the Incarnation, never was the Divine Spirit conjoined with the human spirit in an equally new person, the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost. The one is as much a person as the other. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." (John 14:16) A New Man demands a New Spirit; Christ is the New Man, the Holy Spirit is the New Spirit. The incarnation then commenced this mystery, -a created human nature united to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, which became the Temple of the Spirit.

The Apostles saw by faith that the Great High Priest was interceding within the veil, and that the Spirit was present by no direct communication, but through Christ's intervention between God and man. This was not like the Presence upon Mary, the wondrous overshadowing of a Divine Person, without aught of created life between her and God; but the Spirit was extended to the Apostles from the manhood of Christ; "of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." (John 1:16)...The Holy Humanity of the Redeemer was the channel of the Spirit's descent; He comes as the Spirit of Christ communicating Christ's Nature, -The Spirit's illuminations and inspiration, flow through the Mind and Heart of Jesus; and by means of outward and visible signs, He extends and perpetuates the pure energies of the Sacred Manhood in the Kingdom of grace. Thus the Holy Spirit is the source of unity, both by linking the members together by His Indwelling Presence; and by uniting the Body to Christ, the Head; and to Himself. (Hutchings, The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost, pp.137-138)

The Holy Spirit, or the Christ of the Holy Ghost. Let us take another step in our argument. The spirit as the third person of the Trinity is the bond of union between the Father and the Son, and for this reason is called "the bond of perfection." He is called the Spirit of Love, as linking Him more closely with the revelation of the Father; and the Spirit of truth, as revealing more specifically the Son as the Word of God. The Spirit is also the bond of union between Christ and His Church. Christ as the God-man,--God and man conjoined,--is our propitiation; so also the Holy Spirit as the Divine--human Spirit of the God-man brings a twofold benefit; first, he links us to Christ our living Head in a new and redeemed human nature; and secondly, He Himself dwells in this new Spirit-imparted nature, as He dwelt in the holy human nature of Christ. The holy humanity of the Redeemer therefore, becomes the channel of the Spirit's descent, and He comes as the Spirit of Christ communicating to us this holy nature. It is for this reason that the Spirit in this capacity is called the Holy Spirit,--not primarily because His nature is intrinsically holy, but because it is His office work to make men holy. From one viewpoint therefore, we are members of the body of Christ,--for "By one Spirit are we all baptized into the one body....and have been all made to drink of the one Spirit (Cor.12:13) From the other viewpoint, we are temples of the Holy Ghost, for "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (Cor.3:16 cf.also 6:19) We may say then, that the latter implies a Presence which has nothing of like nature with us,--the Spirit of God; the other implies a Presence which not only has its seat in us, but fellowship with us,--the Holy Humanity of Christ, in which the Spirit dwells. A new spring of pure humanity untainted by the Fall, as well as the Divine Spirit within it, is thus extended from the incarnate Christ to His mystical body, the Church. This holy humanity, created in Christ Jesus is the New Man which we are to put on.

The Church as the Body of Christ. We must view the Church then as the Kingdom of the Incarnation, as well as the Kingdom of the Spirit. We have shown that in the manhood of Christ there were two mysteries, viz., the union of a pure, unsullied human nature with the Godhead, and in addition an unmeasured

indwelling of the Spirit; so also there are two corresponding sources of life in the Church; first, there is the union with the exalted Head, through whose manhood the Divine nature is imparted; and secondly, there is the indwelling of the blessed Spirit. Christ is called the Head because of the excellency of the union that exists between Him and the body. The Church is therefore, not merely an independent creation of the Spirit, but an enlargement of the Incarnate life of Christ. It is not completed through the presence of pure Deity, but by the diffusion of a new nature, created in Christ Jesus and imparted by the Spirit to His body which is the Church. Hence it is said, "Ye are complete in Him," in whom the same Spirit dwells as in the body. Now this new nature is "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;" and it is this new man which forms the spiritual nexus of the Body of Christ. It is the channel way of blessing,-the sole medium of the Spirit's indwelling presence. Hence we are told that there is one body,-the Church, one Spirit which indwells that body, and one Lord to whom it is subject. The Apostle further states this as "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all;"(Eph.4:6) in you as a sanctifying Spirit, purifying the heart; through you as a charismatic or gift-bestowing Spirit, binding the members together in one body; and above you, as an anointing Spirit, resting upon the body as endowment of power for the accomplishment of its mission.

The effect of the Spirit's Presence in the Church, is to unite the members together in One Body; His Presence in the soul produces a like result. He not only makes men to be of one mind in a house, but a man to be at peace within himself. Through His presence the different powers of the soul begin to work harmoniously; and the desires, no longer drawn out to various objects which cannot be possessed and enjoyed together, are united and concentrated on one aim, and thus through the Spirit, the tranquility of order is restored to the soul. The loss of the supernatural life produced a dislocation of the different elements of man's being; the restoration of it by the Spirit, knits them together again in their proper places and relations, so that the interaction of the component parts of the spiritual mechanism resembles the union between the members of the Church. Sin between man and man had produced dissension, and in his own being disunion; the Spirit brings back concord between man and man, and peace within himself; his outward action in the one case is a reflection of his inward action in the other. (Hutchings,-The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost, pp.176-177)

The New Man Created in Righteousness and True Holiness. Let us now lift into prominence for further discussion, this question of the New Man. It has become evident I think, that this new man, "which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph.4:24) refers to this new humanity created in Christ Jesus and imparted to believers by the Holy Spirit. As referring to its source, it is called "the spirit which is from God" as over against "the spirit of the world." (ICor.2:11-12) It is for this reason that the Apostle Paul uses the term "put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom.13:14) almost, if not entirely synonymous with "put on the new man." Now as the common nexus of man in his fallen and depraved state is called "the old man" or "the spirit of the world;" so the spiritual nexus of the Church as the Body of Christ is called "the new man" or "the spirit which is of God." This truth is the ground of many practical thought, only two of which can be here considered.

First, -This marks an advance upon the grace bestowed upon our first parents. Between those who are now regenerated, and Adam and Eve still clothed with the garments of original righteousness, there is this difference, -with Adam it was the simple bestowal of Divine life; God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. There was no need of renewal for there was no contradiction or obstruction to be overcome; now a transformation must be effected for grace must act upon a corrupt nature. In Adam the natural and supernatural life were both fresh from the hand of the Creator, now the natural life has the stain and effect of the Fall upon it. Hence the indwelling of God

Both the individual and social aspects of personality are involved. As by the natural birth each individual comes into possession of a nature common to others, and thereby becomes a member of a race of inter-related persons; so also the individual born of the Spirit has a new nature which demands a new spiritual organism as the ground of holy fellowship. The old racial nature cannot serve in this capacity, for it is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts. (Eph.4:22) The new nature in Christ, created in righteousness and true holiness (Eph.4:24) can alone supply this spiritual nexus. Hence we are commanded to put off the old man and to put on the new man. The baptism with the Spirit therefore, must be considered under a twofold aspect: first, as a death to the carnal nature; and second, as the fulness of life in the Spirit. Since entire sanctification is effected by the baptism with the Spirit, it likewise has a twofold aspect -the cleansing from sin and full devotement to God. (Christian Theology, II, pp.323-324)

is not all that is now required, but also the gift of a new and pure humanity, within which the Spirit can dwell, and which He may use as a means of penetrating with a restoring energy the springs of human life. The Spirit must now purge the individual soul from sin and impart to it the nature of Christ, thus making it holy, before He can take up His abiding presence within it. The supreme act of the Holy Spirit then is to make men holy. He not only communicates life to the person as a free and responsible agent, but He strikes down into the depths of his being as an individual member of a fallen and depraved race, and makes him holy by the destruction of the "old man" or the carnal mind, and imparting the "new man," which after God is created in righteousness (justification) and true holiness (sanctification).

The indwelling of the Holy Spirit differs from the possession of a created spirit in three respects, which when they are taken into calculation, will leave the proof of His Deity in tact..... "The first distinction then, is that the Holy Spirit as God can dwell in the human spirit, but created spirits can only indwell the body, or act upon the human spirit from without. (To imagine that one created spirit can indwell another in the spiritual creation, is something of the same kind as to suppose that two bodies can occupy the same space in the material world.) Again, the diffusiveness of the Divine indwelling works it off from the possessions of created spirits, in that the created spirit can only enter into one body and is spent by that occupation. There is no form of created life, however high and exalted, which remaining unexhausted, is able to infuse itself into other lives. 'The substance of the Holy Spirit is alone capable of entering into many, and therefore is uncreated.' (St. Didymus) Thus the fact that He can dwell not only in one soul but in a multitude of souls, in the whole Kingdom of the Redeemed; that He can fill the Communion of Saints with His Presence; and remain still in all His Fullness Unspent, renders such an indwelling at once a proof of His Divinity. And a third difference lies in the effect of that presence; Hence makes each soul in which He indwells to become a temple, - ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you (Cor.3:16)" (Hutchings, -The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost, pp.174-176)

Mr. Wesley points out the analogy between the natural and spiritual births as follows: "A man's being spiritually born again, bears a near analogy to the natural birth. Before a child is born, it has eyes, but does not see; and ears, but it does not hear. It has a very imperfect use of any other sense. It has no knowledge of anything, nor any understanding. To that existence we do not even give the name of life. It is only when a child is born that it begins to live. He then begins to see the light, and the various objects which surround him. His ears are opened, and he hears sounds. And all the other senses begin to be exercised upon their proper objects, and he breathes and lives in a manner, very different from what he did before. In like manner, before a man is born of God, he has eyes, but in a spiritual sense, does not see. Hence he has no knowledge of God, or of the things of God, either of spiritual or eternal things. But when he is born of God, the eyes of his understanding are opened. He sees the light of the knowledge of the glory of God. He is conscious of a peace that passeth all understanding, and feels a joy unspeakable and full of glory. He feels the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost which is given to him. And all his spiritual senses are exercised to discern spiritual good and evil. Now he may be properly said to live; God having quickened him by His Spirit, he is alive to God through Jesus Christ." (Wesley, -Sermon on the

The Apostolic Exhortation. The Apostle exhorts the believers at Ephesus to put off the old man and to put on the new man. Having defined the old man as the carnal mind or nexus of the world; and the new man as the spiritual nexus of the body of Christ, two questions immediately arise: first, what part does our own volition play in the putting off and putting on; and secondly, does this connote merely a purification of the heart, is there actually, both a subtraction and an addition.

1. We are indeed commanded to put off the old man and to put on the new man, but it will be noted that between these two statements there is another of great importance, i.e. "Be ye renewed in the spirit of your mind." (Eph.4:23) This renewal is by faith in Jesus Christ, and binds the two statements together. The command is addressed to Christians and not to sinners, and refers not to actual sins committed, but to inbred sin, or inherited depravity; to the old man, or to the body of sin, or any other of the many terms used by St. Paul to portray this inward sin of our nature. We are to bring the old man to the altar and there like Samuel of old, hew Agag in pieces before the Lord. The same simple faith in the Lord Jesus that enables us through the Spirit to put off the old man, enables us likewise through the same Spirit to put on the new man. Entire sanctification is not merely an emptying, it is an infilling; not merely a death to sin, but a life of righteousness. Some have thought that the reference here is to the putting off of an old garment and the putting on of a new one.. If so, this is not out of harmony with the more abstract conception of sin as we have used the term. In regeneration, a new life is placed in a being with a nature sullied by the fall, and which cannot therefore, adequately express this new life. Putting off the old garment and putting on the new makes possible the expression of the inner life through an new and more beautiful medium. It is clear however, that we are equally responsible for the cleansing of our hearts from sin, as we are for the pardon of our actual transgressions. The old man must be put off and the new man put on, if we are to measure up to the New Testament standard of piety.

2. Is entire sanctification merely a purification of the heart, or is there some actual subtraction and addition? This question has already been partially answered in the preceding paragraph. Perhaps we may find here the answer for which our depth-psychologist brethren have been seeking. They have said that Mr. Wesley was mistaken in his teaching concerning eradication, the reason given,-- that he could not shake himself from the idea that sin was a thing to be removed like a sore tooth or a cancerous growth. They say that a burden on the back however heavy, can be removed in an instant, but how can one be delivered from himself? But it is just this deliverance from the carnal self that forms the very essence of the grace of entire sanctification! "I am crucified with Christ" said the great apostle. Sin is in the heart. St. Paul calls it the body of sin, the principle of sin at the center of our being using all the members of the body as instruments of unrighteousness. Christ speaks of it as a plant and says, "Every plant which my Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." (Latin,-- eradicated) But there is an answer to this question and the pattern is found in the fact that Christ not only died for sin but unto sin,--a fact too often overlooked by those who plead for remaining sin in the heart.

"What shall we say then, Shall we continue in sin (i.e. in the sin) that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that 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 is freed from sin.....Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord (Rom.6:1-7,11)

The pattern is plain, the exhortation clear and strong. We must die to the old man, the body of sin, the spirit of the world, or by whatever name it is called. It is not merely something subtracted from us, it is the death of the whole carnal self. Sin is a principle, simple and indivisible. If it is there at all, it is all there, and manifests itself in the works of the flesh. There is no deliverance from it except by death,--its own death. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts," that is, its carnal outcrochings which in the converted person are never allowed to come to expression.

But out of this death to sin comes a resurrection into newness of life.

But is there something of an addition in the putting on of the new man? We think that there is. What the imputations regard as a dying with Christ and a rising with him from the standpoint of mere fiction, we believe has in it an actual reality,-an actual death and an actual rising again in newness of life. Christ's life in the flesh, was a life lived under the liability of death. But having died and rose again,-this so-called resurrection life, marked a new order of being,-a life free from both the liability and possibility of sin. It is this new man,-created in righteousness and true holiness, that we put on, when we with Christ have died to sin and been raised to walk in newness of life. We actually put on something-we become partakers of the Divine Nature. What the imputationists have held in regard to dying with Christ and rising with him again, as a mere legal fiction, we believe becomes an actual putting off of the old racial and sinful nexus, and the putting on of the new and spiritual nexus which not only binds us to Christ but binds the church together in one body,-flesh of His flesh and bones of His bones.

We see here, as everywhere in Scripture, the value of the human nature of Christ. It was in Him what God intended it to be,-a revelation of God in our human nature, and which has lifted us up into fellowship with the Highest. Perhaps no higher heights have ever been reached than by St. Paul in the capstone of his Epistle to the Ephesians,-"In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." (Eph.2:22) I close with this paragraph from Dr. Moule, "Here is the eternal destiny of the true Church of God. It is not only to be saved in Christ forever, ineffable as is the wonder of that fact, It is not only that it is to enjoy God forever, though that amazing prospect is so amply and definitely revealed. It is, to be a holy sanctuary, a shrine, a Divine Presence-Chamber; a permanent habitation of God. In a measure, the wonderful fact has already begun to be; already He dwells in His people, and walks in them. Already as we shall see, the Eternal Son resides in the very heart of the true member of the Church, by faith. But all this is as when some building, planned already by the Master in its final glory, is slowly rising and

beginning to shew, amidst fragments and dust, and the noise of the workmen, some hints and outlines of what it is to be; the owner, the intending dweller in it, walks in and out amongst the vast beginnings, and perhaps rests and shelters himself under the unfinished walls and roofs. It will be otherwise when the last stone is in place, and the last splendid equipment of the chambers is completed, and he receives his admiring friends in the banquet-chamber, and shines out amidst the shining of his palace, himself the central splendor of it in all his dignity of wealth and welcome. So it is with the saints, and with their common life as the church of God. Wonderful are the beginnings.

Amidst all the apparent confusions of the field where the building is in progress, its form and scale begin to shew themselves across the perspective of the centuries and continents. And when the stones already in place are scrutinized, it is found that each of them is a mirror of the whole; a shrine, a home of the presence of the Lord by faith. But a day of inauguration is drawing on when "we shall see greater things than these." Then the divine indwelling in each living stone will be complete and ideal, And as for the community, it will cohere and be one thing with a unity and symmetry unimaginable now.

There all the millions of His saints
Shall in one song unite,
And each the bliss of all shall view
With infinite delight.

And the everlasting Father will perfectly reveal Himself, to all the watchers of all the regions of the eternal world, not anyhow,-but thus -in His glorified Church, in the Race, the Nature once wrecked and ruined, but rebuilt into this splendor by His grace. In the Church of the First Born, in the Bride, the Lamb's wife, the blessed universe shall see for ever, God present,-God resident. A transfigured creation shall be His temple-courts; a beatified human church shall be His sanctuary. That sanctuary shall reflect without a flaw its indweller's glory; our union and communion with Him shall be, in other words, perfect, absolute, ideal. And the crowning thought, for the soul which loves God is this, that we shall be His abode; He shall somehow find His home, His

shrine, His throne, in our happy congregated being.

It doth not yet appear,-no, not yet. It is coming. Every evangelization, every conversion, every spiritual union and combination now, is a contribution to that result. It is coming. But what will it be when it is come? Then at length the desire of God will be fulfilled, and His eternal joy will be felt through all the once groaning and travailing creation. Then, and therefore, will be at length fulfilled the innermost desire of every one of His true children; they shall all consciously contribute to the existence of what He had planned and, in the mystery of His ways, has waited for,-a perfect sanctuary, a perfect habitation, for Him the blessed King. Built on the Son, in the Spirit, for the Father, and finished to the last stone with the skill of infinite love, that will indeed be a sanctuary, for the manifestation, for oracles, for worship, to the endless ages. (Cf. Moule, -Ephesian Studies, pp.94-97)