

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1996 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this CD by any means is forbidden, and
copies of individual files must be made in accordance with
the restrictions stated in the B4Ucopy.txt file on this CD.

* * * * *

THE TERMINOLOGY OF HOLINESS

By J. B. Chapman

Beacon Hill Press Of Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri

Original Printing, 1947 Revised Edition, 1968

Printed In The United States Of America

* * * * *

Digital Edition 08/08/96
By Holiness Data Ministry

* * * * *

BACK COVER TEXT

About This Book

Dr. J. B. Chapman, one of the most lucid writers the holiness movement has known, presents here, not a theological disputation on the doctrine of entire sanctification, but an analysis and clarification of the basic terms used in reference to Christian holiness

His chapter titles are:

The Importance of Terminology
The Terminology of Sin
The Terminology of Redemption
The Terminology of Salvation
The Terminology of the Christian Estate

* * * * *

CONTENTS

1
The Importance of Terminology

2
The Terminology of Sin

3
The Terminology of Redemption

4
The Terminology of Salvation

5
The Terminology of the Christian Estate

Appendix

* * * * *

PREFACE

The material contained in this book was prepared for delivery in the Nease Lectures at Pasadena College and in the Gould Lectures at Eastern Nazarene College. The purpose of the lectures was not to convince anyone of the truth of the Wesleyan interpretation of the theme of Bible holiness but rather to offer assistance to those who hold this doctrine in the matter of describing it as accurately and fairly as possible. The plan was to say what we as a people believe in terms that we ourselves use, and by repetition and explanation help ourselves to use these terms more intelligently. Thereby we would be able to make ourselves better understood by those who do not hold with us on this central thesis of our doctrinal interpretation of the Christian faith.

Language is simply a system of symbols, and its usefulness depends upon one's ability to interpret the symbol when others use them, and to use them so that others may interpret them readily. Thought approaches reality more closely than do words. But even thought, if it is altogether speculative and not in correspondence with reality, is far from the noblest thing in the universe.

We have, in view of these facts, not made a strong contention for words, although words are involved in the title and subtitles of our subject matter. We have sought rather to confirm the general understanding of accepted terminology which has been used by those who in the past have testified of the grace of God in Christ Jesus to the full deliverance from sin; for it is because of misunderstanding of the import of these words that much of the opposition to the Wesleyan interpretation of Bible holiness has arisen.

Nothing that we have said, however, is intended to suggest any change in the concepts of the fathers of the holiness movement of the past. They said what they believed and felt in words that were forceful and true. And there is a surprising uniformity of vocabulary among them, even

though they came from many and varied historical communions of the Protestant division of the Church. It is ourselves of the present who need to be instructed rather than the fathers who require to be corrected. When it is said that "we need a new holiness vocabulary," the meaning is that we need to have the vocabulary of the fathers revitalized in our own thinking and feeling; for the fathers found their vocabulary a splendid vehicle for the purpose they had in mind.

Words have pedigree, even as men have ancestry. But the meaning of a word involves much more than etymology. The important question is, What do these words mean to the speaker, and what do they mean to the hearers? If they mean one thing to the speaker and another thing to the hearers, they fail of their purpose of being a means for the communication of thought. Either the speaker should learn new words or else he should explain his old words—he cannot expect his hearers to do either of these things.

If any shall find occasion to disagree with some of the conclusions of this book, our prayer is that we may not allow this disagreement to becloud the main issue, which is that both reader and writer shall be established unblamable in holiness at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints.

-- JAMES B. CHAPMAN --

* * * * *

1

The Importance of Terminology

In science, art, business, philosophy, and other fields of human interest where the holding and the communication of clear ideas are essential, terminology is of high importance. Mathematics has been described as the only exact science. But when it is remembered that mathematics treats of the relationship of quantities, and not of quantities themselves, this boast of exactitude loses somewhat of its practical meaning. Furthermore, mathematics, being altogether theoretical, assumes no responsibility for reality, and hence escapes the tests that other branches of knowledge must meet. But the progress of mathematics has been made possible by the adoption of symbols, usually just numbers, which are universally defined and are invariable in meaning.

In sciences, other than mathematics it is necessary to make a beginning by suggesting that certain symbols or words shall bear certain meanings. Once accepted, such symbols or words take on the same significance as numbers in mathematics, so far as this is possible. But the fact that such symbols are used in defining quantities rather than just defining the relation of quantities, makes their invariable meaning difficult to maintain. With the passing of time and the advancement of knowledge, it sometimes becomes necessary to qualify or limit the meaning originally assigned; for quantities are whatever they are, and when change is required, it is the symbol, not the quantity, that must change.

Philology and etymology are useful—indispensable, in fact—in the study of terminology, but they are neither sufficient nor altogether dependable. The fact is that with the passing of time a term sometimes not only gets away from its historic basis, but in some instances reverses its

meaning entirely. After all, all substantives take on somewhat the nature of proper names and numbers. It has been remarked that proper names are established by usage, and that a man's name is whatever he and his intimates say it is. But this is true in a large measure with substantives in general. That is, a term means whatever usage has made it mean, even though that meaning may be different from (or even the reverse of) the etymological meaning.

In this study we are to be concerned with terms of a somewhat limited class, and in illustrating our approach we make a kindred idea serve as an example. Take the idea of cleanliness: we think we know what this idea is, but we should not overlook the fact that the idea as we hold it required many centuries of repetition to make it clear. There is, perhaps, no section of the Bible that impresses the casual reader as being so monotonous and impractical as that section which deals with the ceremonies and the domestic lives of the ancient Hebrews. There are laws relating to clean and unclean animals; laws relating to leprosy and other physical ailments; laws relating to camp sanitation, and to the initiation of priests. Many of these seem trivial now, but they are part of the long process by which God ground into the thinking of men the meaning of being clean in body, clean in mind, and, above all, clean in heart. The idea of being clean had no such connotation as we now unconsciously attach to it until that idea was illustrated and enforced, under divine authority, and until it had time to penetrate and take effect.

If we ask now what it means to be clean, we have no difficulty in thinking, even though we may find it difficult to express the idea in accurate words. And thus it is possible for us, being heirs of all the past, to know the difference between the good and the evil, and between the clean and the unclean.

It is evident, therefore, that in the study of terminology, one must consider all branches of linguistic science, including philology, etymology, grammar, rhetoric, phonology, morphology, semantics, and textual criticism in their full historic scope. Then, after this, he must take cognizance of the current connotation of the term; for, in the end, the term means what it meant in its root form, what it meant to those who handled it during its growth (and during its decay, if it is decadent), and what it has come to mean by common consent. One of these or a combination of some or all of these or some variant of one or more of these is what the terms means now.

There are those who say, "We need a new terminology. Our old terminology is unadapted to the present age, and its use brings unnecessary misunderstanding and opposition." Or they say that the old terminology is inadequate to the new era. But the only way a term can become unacceptable is for it to cease to bear the meaning it once bore or else to be wanting in euphony -- that is, be difficult to pronounce or of unfamiliar sound. But I think as regards the terminology of Bible holiness neither of these legitimate objections holds.

Take the word sanctification, for example. That is a euphonious word; it is of unquestioned pedigree; it expresses a very definite idea; and yet it is not a popular word. The objection, therefore, is not legitimate, for the objection is to the import of the word. Men don't like the word because they don't like the idea it bears. Take the word eradication. That is a good word, easy to pronounce, of honorable extraction, and of definite signification. It is unpopular because of what it means, and those who would substitute some other word would escape persecution only until their new word attained a force corresponding to the force this one has already attained, and then they

would be right back where they started. Likewise, if the time ever comes when terms like "the victorious life," "a higher state of grace," and such like terms mean exactly the same thing as being sanctified wholly by the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire, these gentler terms will be listed as harsh, and there will again be call for a new vocabulary.

It is the idea conveyed that makes or breaks a word on the markets of men. And I think it will usually be noted that the call for a new terminology is a call for less definition, rather than for more definition; for new words cannot possibly be as clear and as rich as those which have been aged by the usage of the generations. Old words are better than new, for the reason that they are better understood, whereas the symbolism of the new words requires much time for maturing and for enrichment.

The real question is, Do we want to be understood? There are those who seem to think truth may be effective without being understood. They seem to think it is enough that the speaker or writer shall know what he himself means, whether his hearers and readers know or not. Such persons are willing to occupy themselves uttering pleasant sounds and recording smooth words, and hold to the hope that hearers and readers will possess what is meant by the symbols, even without themselves being aware of what it is they desire and finally possess. But if light is truth apprehended, then terminology that is intelligible, even though it be offensive because it is clear, is the terminology we want. It is better to be understood and disliked than to be misunderstood and admired; for truth that is oil to heal must first be a hammer to break.

But heretics not only coin new words; they also seek to alter the meaning of old words. And many of the arguments which divide the people of God into sects and factions would be avoided if more attention were given to terminology, and if men used their words discriminatingly. Take the question of sin, for example. One man argues that it is impossible for one to live in this world without committing sin. The other answers, "He that committeth sin is of the devil." But it may turn out that the first man insistently holds that any deviation from the perfect law of God, whether the variation is conscious or unconscious, is sin. He therefore logically contends that one would be required to be perfect in knowledge, that he might fully comprehend the will of God, in order that he might live without sin. The other holds (and, of course, I believe correctly) that sin to be sin must be knowing and conscious; that the measure of light is the measure of responsibility, and that he who is perfect in love, and who wills always to do the Father's will, is without sin and pleasing in His sight. Now before the argument can be fair and helpful, it will be necessary for these two men to define their words and to use their terms with the same meaning. This does not mean that definition will dissolve all arguments, but it will make the ground for disagreement intelligible, and will confine debate to actual differences.

However, our motive here is not so much to prepare for the assuaging of argument as to get ready to set forth our own message in words that are understood. It is our confidence that our message is better liked and more acceptable, the better it is understood. It is when our thesis is hazy that it is wanting in appeal. And we believe that our wonderful message of full salvation is worthy of the clearest possible statement. It is not our idea to suggest new meanings, but rather to set forth, as nearly as possible, what the terminology of Bible holiness meant to those of the past and to us of today. John Wesley was accused of preaching something new. But his answer was that he was a discoverer, rather than an inventor, and that his work was to dig up the apostolic

doctrines, rid them of the incrustations that their neglect had occasioned, and then to present them clearly and unequivocally, as did the first preachers of the era. To his own preachers, Wesley advised plain preaching, saying that under plain preaching some will be offended and some benefited. But under equivocal preaching, while few are offended, few are benefited. It is in the acceptance of such a thesis that we would use plain words plainly, and make men hear in language that both we and they can understand.

We would not, however, suggest that the only difference is a difference of terminology; for the thing we seek to tell is far greater than the words by which we seek to tell it, and there are those who oppose what we say, even though they understand the terms we employ in saying it. The message of salvation to the uttermost is a message of fact and reality, and those only who know the reality have full need of the vocabulary for its expression. John Wesley in his own day observed that there were some preachers in the Methodist societies who did not preach perfect love -- some, he had heard, did not even believe in the doctrine. He warned that such as these should not be permitted to occupy the pulpit. He even questioned that they should be allowed to remain in the society. These early Methodists were committed to the task of spreading scriptural holiness, and Wesley was wise enough to know that men cannot be trusted to preach to others that which they do not believe and know themselves.

The pulpit does not remain silent on any theme very long until the pew ceases to believe that that theme is true and important. For this reason it is necessary that even the most familiar truths shall be iterated and reiterated. And it is remarkable that the faithful do not weary of the "old, old story." Doubt feeds on silence, and doubt soon festers to become opposition. We must disabuse our minds of the idea that people are informed, and therefore do not care for that which is familiar.

But important as terminology is, we must not forget that a description of the road is still not the road itself, and that ability to give intelligent directions does not constitute proof that one has actually traveled the road himself. And, what is more, the fact that one has once traveled a road does not constitute proof that he is still on that road--he may have left the road before the final goal is reached. One may be sound in doctrine and abundant in good works, and yet be of that company who have left their first love.

There is no purely intellectual road by which one may find God in truth apart from the heart's affections, and there is nothing that is deadlier than dead orthodoxy, except, perhaps, dead heterodoxy. Just as clear thinking is the absolute prerequisite of clear expression, so likewise definite experience is the indispensable mainspring in the demand for definite terminology. Therefore it is the existence of a scriptural and experiential grace in holiness that gives rise to our interest in a holiness terminology that is unequivocal and full. And along with our former question, Do we want to be understood? we now ask, for emphasis only, and not as a symbol of any doubt, Do we have a distinctive message of holiness that demands a distinctive and well-defined vocabulary?

Turning again to the thought of the origin, growth, and use of words, we suggest the most significant of all words as an example. Take our word God: this is our symbol for the Deity or Supreme Being, and by its use we present all the divine predictables and attributes. But originally,

in the language of our northern European fathers, this word was used in describing quality, and was frequently spelled with a double o. It was applied to the Deity at first only when it was desired to point to His benevolent attributes. But in time it became a proper name, and now we must say, "I believe in a God of infinite wisdom, power, and love"; for the name itself does not convey the partial description of the Supreme Being that it once did. And now when Mary Baker Eddy wants to use this word in an accommodated sense, she must needs work it over so completely that nothing remains of the word but the sound, and she would have done better and been more honest with the general public if she had taken a new word altogether for her specialized purpose. But from times immemorial it has been the habit of error to steal truth's clothing; for just as the wolf can better catch his prey when garbed in the garments of the sheep, so likewise error has found that the vocabulary of truth has carrying power that is of tremendous propaganda value.

Our interest in the terminology of Bible holiness is twofold. In the first place, we want to know what terms men of the past used in expressing the truths they held and propagated. We want to know these words both for the assurance such knowledge will give us that their users did indeed hold the views we have heard they held, and then we want to know them that we may include them in our own list of words for the sake of variety and fullness.

In the second place, we are interested in terminology for practical purposes, for we want to tell others of the treasure we have found in language that is both accurate and adequate. This practical interest suggests that we shall do well to major on perspicuity rather than on plentitude. We shall do well, both personally and as a people, to use a few terms until they are well-known and clearly understood, and then keep on using them because they are well-known and clearly understood. Distinctions that are not based on real differences are not only wearisome, but misleading as well. An old book on homiletics, that dignified itself with the title Sacred Rhetoric, gave the example of a novice who referred to Moses as "the peerless son of Amram," more to the muddling than to the enlightening of his hearers.

Language, to serve its full purpose, must be clearly understood by both speaker and hearer or writer and reader. Serious speakers strive earnestly to master the tongue of their hearers, and are never content until this end is gained. One well-known preacher said that if he planned to use a word and then discovered that twenty people in his audience did not understand that word, he would cross it out. But it is not enough for the Christian teacher to use the words his people already know. It is also his duty to give content to words in order that he may use them to convey his message. The Christian teacher is like the traveler who must build roads, as well as travel roads that already exist, for the language of secular and worldly life is but partially adapted to the purpose of bearing the full message of the gospel.

We find, then, that we must not only learn what terms mean to others; we must also be clear that they have definite meaning to us. And if some would entrap us by defining our words for us, we must not give way to the pressure. The ideas are ours, and it is ours to find terms for their expression. If existing words do not convey the idea, then we must burden words with the content we have in mind, and then make these words mean this to others.

A little while ago I sat in a Methodist church on a Sunday morning, and was not a little surprised when the minister announced that his subject was "Sanctification." I was fairly dazed by his introduction, for in it he said that the Methodist movement was raised up under the leadership of John Wesley for the express purpose of preaching sanctification. Wesley and his coadjutors, the preacher said, were faithful to the task. But in time the Methodists largely lost interest in the subject, and many ministers neglected to preach it, although there were always some who did believe in it and seek to propagate it. The neglect of the Methodists, the preacher said, made way for what was known as the holiness movement.

I found myself wondering if I had found here one who had been faithful to the mission of primitive Methodism. But when the formal introduction was finished, the minister proposed the question, "What is sanctification?" Answering this question, he said, "Sanctification is just consecration, nothing less, nothing more. It means full devotion to God. Surely no Christian would want to be less than this, and it is sure none can be anything more." The whole proposition was a fiasco, for the preacher assured his listeners that, whatever sanctification is, they as Christians have it, and there is nothing to worry about. Instinctively one could feel that the net result was that even the concerned were lulled to sleep, and that far from promoting the search for holiness, the preacher had destroyed the central idea by his faint praise. He had used the vocabulary of holiness, but had attached his own meaning to the terminology, and had effectively opposed the progress of the work. Heresy had been promoted by the use of the language of orthodoxy.

This instance may serve to indicate the work required of us in establishing and defending the import of words. For while there is nothing new in the attempt to identify sanctification and consecration, to allow this claim to go unchallenged is to yield the whole point. For while the word sanctification does sometimes mean consecration, it also sometimes means purification, whereas consecration is seldom, if ever, used with anything more than a legal or ceremonial idea of purification attached. Generally speaking, consecration is human sanctification, while divine sanctification is purification. And now, at this late date, any who would ignore the work of generations in making this distinction clear, and go back again to confuse the meaning of the two words, is rendering a distinct disservice. It caters to those who are concerned to explain away the blessed divine grace and leave sanctification to stand as merely a human affair.

In the days when France was seeking to rid herself of God and at the same time establish free civil government, old Richelieu said, "If there were not a God, it would be necessary to make one before we can establish a free and dependable government." His idea was that men who do not fear God will not honor the oath, hence will not keep their promises to one another. Our situation is like that in reverse. We have the grace of holiness, and now require a vocabulary for the setting forth of the doctrine and testimony of holiness. It is therefore our hope that we may both serve ourselves and others by emphasizing and reemphasizing our term for better understanding. And having agreed that a term has a certain connotation, we ourselves must thereafter use that term discriminatingly. This practice is essential to both our integrity and our clarity. We should know what our terms mean, and then should use them unequivocally.

Our principal apology for this presentation is this: We have obtained an experience from God which we believe it proper to label Bible holiness. We desire to communicate the good news of our discovery to men everywhere, so far as it is possible for us to do so. To make this

communication, we have been given by our fathers certain terminology of well-defined meaning. For the most part, we have found this terminology well adapted to our purpose, and this presentation is our effort to help establish this terminology and to publish it as widely as we may. We do this in the hope that our effort may be useful in bringing to the attention of some hearers certain symbols by the use of which the blessed news of salvation to the uttermost may be made known, and that God's people may be encouraged to press on into the possession of that holiness "without which no man shall see the Lord."

Our approach is not that of one who has a set of words for which he seeks corresponding realities. Ours is the approach of one who, knowing the realities, seeks words for use in describing them. For this reason, therefore, we would not exalt any word to the place of a "shibboleth." We fully admit that many have obtained a fuller grace than their vocabulary would cause us to think, and we rejoice that experience is transcendent over doctrine. Men, like Charles G. Finney, who evidently possessed the full grace of Bible holiness but were never very successful teachers of the doctrine are more fortunate -- a million times -- than those who have made the doctrine a fetish but have not obtained, or having obtained have not continued to hold, the grace and blessing the doctrine is given to describe. But far from holding that the alternates lie between possessing the experience and not the doctrine or holding the doctrine and not the experience, we believe that the good way is both to possess the experience and to know the doctrine. For to possess the blessing and to know the doctrine is to be personally favored and also to be in position to help others.

Forgetting the clamor of words for the moment, let each one ask himself, What is my deep and real heart's estate? Is there yet something in me that makes me unhappy in the Saviour's company? Do I truly enjoy a sense of "a heart from sin set free, a heart that always feels Thy blood, so freely shed for me"? And in further preparation for the studies ahead, what do the words I use in describing Christian experience really mean to me? What do they mean to those who hear me testify and speak? Do I really want to be understood, or do I prefer to edify myself by speaking in language that is really unknown to those who hear me? Do I prefer to speak in riddles, lest I suffer persecution for the cross of Christ and for the fact that I would be, if understood, classified as an extremist? What is the motive that determines my choice of terms? Is it the genuine desire to be understood or is it the lame wish that I may save my own soul, and profit others without offending any? Proper answer to these questions will put us a long way up the road to both interest and profit in the succeeding chapters.

* * * * *

2

The Terminology of Sin

Just as one who would describe the doctrine of justification must first possess a doctrine of sins and guilt, so likewise one who would provide a doctrine of sanctification must first furnish a doctrine of sin and defilement. No picture can be drawn without a background, and except for sin there is no human background for redemption and salvation. And since we are concerned now with terminology, we are driven to the necessity of arriving at definitions for sin, that we may intelligently consider terms for describing the cure for sin.

It will be found, I think, that men's conception of sin is fundamental to all their thinking and speaking on soteriology in all its various phases. Those who hold to a liberal interpretation of sin, that is, who describe sin as a light matter, will logically make little of redemption and salvation; and history, I believe, illustrates the truth of this observation. When sin is believed to be at worst only a weakness or a want of maturity, salvation can be posited as something obtuse, indefinite, and mild. When man is held to be but a slight sinner, a mere human savior is sufficient to meet his need.

There is, of course, a contrasting error to the effect that man is a sinner, lost beyond hope; so lost indeed that no atonement can cover his debt, and no power can lift him from his pit. This error is father to atheism and the abettor of pessimism of the deepest and most incurable type.

But, as is usually the case, the truth lies between the extremes. Man is indeed a deep-dyed sinner with no worth or merit to cover his guilt and no power to lift himself from the mire. But the prevenient grace of God is universal, and must be reckoned with as though it were inherent in man in his fallen state. It is to this prevenient grace that we really refer when we say, "There is good in every man, and something in the worst to which good may appeal." That good and that something to which good may appeal is not a residue of man's original holiness, but is a bestowal of grace through Jesus Christ. And this unconditioned grace lifts man from the estate of a demon, and makes his recovery to the favor and likeness of God a possibility. It is this correct concept of sin that is basis for the gospel call to all men to repent, and it is this concept also that any and all who will heed that call.

Likewise, when we come to the subject of sanctification, correct and accurate thinking on sin as defilement or corruption of the nature of man is the necessary foundation for the superstructure of a true holiness doctrine. And there is in this sphere, as in that of sins and guilt, a tendency to follow the extremes rather than to pursue the golden mean. For there are those who would describe man's fallen estate, as distinguished from his guilt for personal transgressions, as mere weakness and susceptibility to evil, and they would not estimate the condition of depravity and carnality as really deplorable. Then, over against this shallow interpretation of sin stands the hyper-Calvinistic tenet which holds that man is so identified with sin, that sin so coheres in his flesh and in his human nature, that the two cannot be separated while man yet remains in the body. To these last, "total depravity" means that man is as totally fallen in every atom of the warp and woof of his nature and being as it is possible for him to be.

Now it will be readily seen that the first view of sin mentioned builds no foundation for a worthy doctrine of holiness. No wise physician would use strong medicine in the treatment of a minor skin rash, and no consistent theologian would bring infinite forces to bear upon a state and condition of moral nature that at worst is in need only of education and growth. If sin as depravity is not either serious or deep-rooted, then its cure is not a matter of high concern; or if it is to be accomplished, it can be done without the employment of major redemptive forces.

On the other hand, the hyper-Calvinistic interpretation of the fallen estate lays the foundation for nothing more than "positional sanctification," for actual, imparted holiness is made impossible by the definition of sin as proposed. This conception of sin, meeting the scriptural

demand for holy living, has given rise to such strange theories as those dubbed as "suppressionism," "counteractionism," and that still more delicate notion that even its fathers are reluctant to name, but which proposes that no one can really know that sin is gone or, in the fullness of the Spirit, cannot even know it is not gone. But all these errors regarding holiness hark back to a faulty definition of sin. A proper definition of sin is as essential to the sound theologian as diagnosis of disease is to the physician who would prescribe for the body.

Depravity

The true doctrine of sin, as it relates to depravity, may be stated in brief as follows: Man is truly fallen in every function and factor of his being. His body is fallen, and as a consequence is mortal and will die. His mind and judgment are fallen, so that he does not have either full or accurate knowledge or altogether dependable judgment in all things. His affections are polluted, so that he loves things that he should abhor, and is wanting in love for the good and true and holy. He is therefore "totally depraved" in that there is no function or factor of his personality that is not affected. But through prevenient grace the full blow of sin's curse is avoided. So that physically, though mortal, man in the flesh is not yet dead. In the moral sphere, though evil, man is yet not a demon in that he is redeemable. And every factor and function of man which is better than the possible worst is not a residue of man's Edenic state, but is a bestowal of God by reason of the intervention of Christ. This is prevenient grace.

As a further step in the development of this doctrine of sin, we hold that sin as a condition or state is like a virus in the blood, and is not in any way essential to one's life. But it is a menace to life and a hindrance to the functioning of life in both the body and the spirit. This virus can therefore be removed, the bloodstream can be purged, and the person can still live; in fact, can live more abundantly in both body and spirit than before. This doctrine of sin lays foundation for a doctrine of sanctification that is both consistent and practical.

We would not claim too much at this point. We cannot now take time to fully disestablish the definitions which we hold to be in error. Suffice it to say that all the systems mentioned are consistent within themselves, and that their truth or error is in the foundation—their definition of sin—rather than in the processes of their logic. Those we hold to be in error are in error in their premises. We do not charge them with inconsistent argument. Those who start with an insufficient definition of sin go on to say that holiness is not a subject that should very much concern us, for since we were never very sick, we need not concern ourselves greatly with any effort to become completely well. The others, holding that sin and man are inseparable, claim that holiness is impossible in the present world. Their concept of sin being what it is, their definition of holiness could not well be other than what it is.

Those of this school who attempt to obey the inner call to holiness, and yet determine to hold to their former definition of sin, logically and naturally differentiate between the baptism with the Holy Ghost and sanctification, and seek to possess the power of the Spirit while yet denying the necessity and possibility of being purified by the Spirit's incoming. So from this school of thinkers arise that whole band of earnest people who shy away from claiming purity, but covet earnestly the power of the Spirit, and bolster their untenable position by the invention of ideas like

"positional holiness," "suppression of inbred sin," "counteraction of indwelling sin," "suspension of sin within," and other such ideas that have no scriptural basis.

That we may not appear to be rabid, we call attention again to the fact that our subject is terminology, and not the facts which underlie terminology. We would not presume to judge any. Candor compels us to say that there are those who hold with us on what we believe to be the true doctrine who, nevertheless, do not attain to the standards of grace and practice which the true doctrine implies. Likewise there are those whose doctrinal position we sincerely believe to be in error, whose attainments in both experience and conduct are much better than their doctrines demand.

Every sin against God is treason against the Lawgiver and Judge, and is therefore both mortal and capital. Except it be covered by the blood of Jesus Christ it will eventuate in eternal damnation. But through the infinitely precious atoning blood of Jesus Christ there are grace and mercy for all, no matter how red their guilt or how crimson their pollution. That sin against the Holy Ghost hath no forgiveness is not a limitation on the mercy of God, but is a judicial consequence of the sinner's own persistent disobedience and neglect. The deepest guilt that can be charged against any man has its match in the fountain opened in the spear-pierced side of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in that blood there are pardon and purity for all.

There is a theoretical distinction between forgiveness, which is the act of God by which repentant sinners are justified, and regeneration and adoption. Forgiveness takes place in the mind and heart of God; regeneration takes place in the heart of man. Adoption is the restoration of proper relationship with God, and is based upon the facts of pardon and regeneration. But although these three are differentiated theoretically, there is no discernible distinction in experience, so that whoever is justified is also regenerated and adopted. When we speak of justified Christians, we refer to those who have come to God in repentance and faith and have been pardoned, regenerated, and adopted into the family of God, and have received the witness of the Spirit to their changed condition and rectified relation.

What, then, is the inner state of one who has been thus pardoned, regenerated, and adopted into the family of God? Let us first consider the orthodox conception of the state and condition of such a person. History, I think, sustains John Wesley's claim [1] that there was no controversy in the primitive Church as to whether or not inbred sin remains in the regenerated. Wesley contended that Count Zinzendorf, his own contemporary, was the first (except for some "wild ranting Antinomians" of whom he had heard) to suggest and teach that at the time we are regenerated we are also cleansed from all sin and made holy. But this heresy has been revived and propagated in our own times, as has also the error of the antinomians, who, as Wesley found, "say and unsay, acknowledging there is sin in the flesh, although not sin in the heart." But Wesley was clear as to what is meant by sin, the sin that remains in the believer after regeneration, for of this he says, "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."

Speaking of the practical aspect of the question of sin in believers, and in berating the theory of Count Zinzendorf, Wesley observes:

From what has been said, we may easily learn the mischievousness of that opinion, that we are wholly sanctified when we are justified; that our hearts are then cleansed from all sin. It is true, we are delivered, as was observed before, from the dominion of outward sin; and at the same time, the power of inward sin is so broken, that we need no 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 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 think, an innocent, harmless mistake. No: it does immense harm; it entirely blocks the way to any further change: for it is manifest, "They that are whole do not need a physician, but they that are sick." If, therefore, we think we are quite made whole already, there is no room to seek any further healing. On this supposition it is absurd to expect a further deliverance from sin, whether gradual or instantaneous. [2]

There is perhaps less call now for extended contention that sin remains in the heart of the regenerate than there was in the days of Wesley. The battle is now joined at a new point; for the general disposition is to admit that sin remains after regeneration, and then proceed on the assumption that this sin must remain until the end of the earthly life. If the followers of Count Zinzendorf were blocked from seeking sanctification by the unwarranted assumption that they received it when they were regenerated, those of our day who have by their very definition of sin made it impossible that we should be delivered from it in this life have doubled the bars and made the successful seeking of such deliverance a logical impossibility. Under such circumstances the quest for holiness must be abandoned before it is begun.

But what, indeed, is the nature of that sin which remains in the believer after regeneration? All agree that it is not a remnant of guilt for transgression; all this was fully canceled at the time of the new birth. The very terms by which this remaining sin is described are strongly indicative of the nature of the sin itself. These terms are such as "inborn sin," "inbred sin," and "inherent sin." The first two of this triad are not quite strong enough in that they fail by definition to indicate fully the clinging nature and character of sin. Also they fall short of intimating by what means a child born of sanctified parents will still appear possessed of the sinful nature. The last of the triad is too strong in that it implies that this sin is inseparable and unalienable from the person possessed of it. Thus the sin that remains in the regenerated hides in between the extremes of definition.

But the fact is that while the sin that remains in the regenerated is inherent as to the method of its transmittance, it is yet separable and alienable, and this statement is at the crux of our argument for both the need and the possibility of holiness. For it is evident that if the character and nature of sin is such that it cannot be separated from its possessor there can be no point in pursuing the subject further. No sane person can be expected seriously to follow after that which is unattainable. And, further, there could be no point in presenting commandments or promises, provisions or conditions for sanctification, if the nature of sin is such that deliverance from it is impossible in this life. If in the nature of things sin must remain in us until death, there is no point in debating the relative place of faith and growth in the processes of purification. If indeed sin cannot be alienated by any means whatsoever without destroying the personality of the man, then

all our longings for purity are in vain. There is nothing we can do except to wait for death to bring the release which the grace of God is found unadapted for doing.

The Scriptures clearly teach that before the fall of man there was neither sin nor death in the world, and that after the Fall both were present. Taking these facts into consideration, we have basis for the wide-reaching doctrine of sin and its consequences. For while death is not the only consequence of sin, it is the easiest of all universal consequences to recognize. And since no one can deny the presence of death in the world, it is likewise impossible for those who believe that consequences must have adequate causes to deny the presence and sinister character of sin. Furthermore, no thoughtful person can think of limiting the consequences of sin to the physical in the individual, any more than he can prescribe such limitations for the race and for the world at large. In general people have no difficulty in differentiating their bodies from their souls or spirits. But the exact point at which the physical stops and the spiritual begins may no man know. That there are weaknesses in the body as a result of sin, weaknesses that continue with us until the end of life, no sane person will deny. Nor will any question but that these weaknesses and destroying tendencies will finally eventuate in death. If, then, the term sin is to be applied to all the consequences of sin, no one may believe in the complete eradication of sin during this life.

But both the Scriptures and the experiences of men agree that there is also a residue of sin in the moral nature of the regenerated believer. This residue is not a remnant of guilt, as before observed, but is in the nature of a defilement. It is an impurity in the fountain from which all moral life takes its rise rather than a fault in the stream of life itself. There is little debate as to whether or not this sin does remain. The debate gathers rather about the question as to whether this remaining sin can be separated and destroyed while the Christian yet remains in the body.

The Human and the Carnal

Answering this question, we admit that the physical phases of the consequence of sin may properly be included under a general name like depravity. And when such general terms are used, a broad claim that depravity is separable is not valid. It is only the moral taint, the virus in the bloodstream of the spiritual man, which is included in the promise, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." The holiness which is commanded and promised for this life is a wholeness of spirit, not a wholeness of the complete personality. Dr. Wiley is undoubtedly correct when he says, "Since mental strain often weakens the physical constitution, and physical weakness in turn clouds the mind and spirit of man, there is ever needful, a spirit of charity toward all men." [3] And to this we would add, what I think Dr. Wiley implies, that this charity should not exclude ourselves. There are many sincere people who very much need their own mercy to save them from unnecessary torment because of their weaknesses and tendencies that are involuntary and which are of the physical rather than of the moral nature.

Because of the delicate measure of the line which divides the physical and the moral, the human and the carnal, it is not always possible to distinguish the one from the other. And while we need charity for ourselves and for others that we may not call human weakness sin, we also need to be exceedingly careful (especially when appraising ourselves) that we do not call that which is sinful and carnal by some softer name. To do so would compromise the fundamentals of holiness on the altar of a misplaced charity.

But however difficult it may be to distinguish the human and the carnal, it is the obligation of every Christian to do so within himself. Having made the distinction, human weakness remains as a badge of his humiliation, but sin is to be completely destroyed through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. In thought, and so far as possible in word, the term sin should be applied only to the carnal and separable. That which is only human and inalienable should be known as weakness or infirmity. Such an observance of terms would make for clarity and would save much misunderstanding.

Article V in the creed of the Church of the Nazarene is entitled "Original Sin, or Depravity." Dr. Wiley calls attention to the fact that the statement found here is historically related to Article VII of the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism, and to Article IX of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church. [4] The article in the Manual of the Church of the Nazarene reads as follows:

We believe that original sin, or depravity, is that corruption of the nature of all the offspring of Adam, by reason of which every one is very far gone from original righteousness, or the pure state of our first parents at the time of their creation, is averse to God, is without spiritual life, is inclined to evil, and that continually; and that it continues to exist with the new life of the regenerate, until eradicated by the baptism with the Holy Spirit. [5]

Commenting on the "Doctrinal Aspects of Original Sin," Dr. Wiley says, in part:

Depravity belongs to the whole person of man, and not merely to some form of personal manifestation, whether through the will, the intellect, or the affections. It is a state or condition in which the person exists, and thus may be said to be a nature -- a term which in its metaphysical form is not easily grasped, but which is very real in actual existence. By "a nature" we may mean either of two things, (1) the constituent elements of man's being which distinguish him from every other order of existence. In this sense human nature remains as it was originally created. (2) The moral development of his being as a growth from within, apart from external influences. It is in this sense only, that we speak of man's nature as corrupt. This corruption is inherent and not merely accidental. Sin, however, in the former sense of the word nature, is not inherent but simply accidental. It was not a constituent element of man's being as he was originally created. For this reason, sin is not in harmony with man's true nature, as is witnessed by conscience and the profounder law of reason, which is an element of man's natural image. This corrupt nature, therefore, is something alien to the primitive holiness of man's nature by creation, and in thought at least is separable from the person whose condition it represents. [6]

We give this quotation both to confirm and to explain our claim that sin as it affects the moral nature of man is separable from man, and is therefore not inalienable during the whole course of life upon earth. As originally created, man was without sin, and he was preserved in a sinless state by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. When man sinned, the Spirit was withdrawn, and this deprivation made possible the depravation of which we now complain. But the depravation is not in the nature in which man was originally made, but only in that nature which became his through sin. And since man could live without this depravation before he ever possessed it, he can yet live without it after it has been eradicated by the grace of God. Sin, even as depravity, is

unnatural (to man as originally made); and like a broken foot or an aching tooth demands to be repaired or extracted, so does sin require to be entirely removed from the moral nature of the Christian.

Of all we have said in this division, this is the sum:

1. Sin exists in two forms: (a) as guilt because of actual transgressions of the law of God, and (b) as defilement or corruption of nature because of the sinful state in which men have existed since the fall of Adam.

2. Sin as guilt for transgression is dealt with by the divine act of pardon by which means the repentant sinner is justified before God.

3. The defilement or corruption of nature which is ours because of our membership in a fallen race is not removed by pardon, since it does not take the form of guilt, and it therefore remains in the regenerate.

4. While in its form of transmission from parent to child this sinful nature is inherent, it is nevertheless separable and alienable, and may be removed without violence to the personality of the one from whom it is removed by the grace of God.

5. There is a physical phase of depravity which is separate from the moral, but which is often difficult to differentiate. From this physical phase of depravity we are not promised deliverance until the resurrection. But in the interest of clarity, this physical phase should not separately be called sin, although it is involved indirectly in such terms as "original sin." This phase remains as a badge of humiliation, and calls for watchfulness and care on our part, and demands charity of us in the judgment of others.

6. From the moral phases of sin we may be delivered right here in this life. These moral phases apply to the whole personality -- intellect, will, and affection -- and their removal involves and includes the clarifying and purifying of these in the sanctifying of the nature of the Christian.

"Hamartia"

From all this it is evident that the successful teaching of Bible holiness requires that certain terms shall be used with very definite interpretation. The common Greek word for sin is hamartia, and originally meant "missing the mark." When applied to moral things the idea is similar, and implies missing the true end of life. It is used to describe both the act of sinning and the result of sinning. In that latter sense it may, and often does, mean sin as a state or principle. In English it is not always possible to translate the context by the use of a different word for the two ideas. But whenever possible, it is well that we should observe that sin as transgression is usually in the plural, and sin as a state or condition is in the singular.

A good example is found in I John 1: 9, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." The Greek word for sin here is just the plural of hamartia, while the word for unrighteousness is adikos, a word that is usually

used as the opposite of dikaios (righteousness). The idea, then, is just unrighteousness as against righteousness, and the full thought is that He will cleanse us from everything that is opposed to righteousness or holiness. In I John 5:17 this same word for unrighteousness is used in the statement, "All unrighteousness is sin." But in the latter case the word is used in a distributive sense, and the more literal meaning is, "Every unrighteousness is sin."

There is ample warrant in such passages as the fifty-first psalm for the conclusion that sin in its twofold aspect was present in the thoughts and feelings of the people of God from the earliest times. Jesus made frequent distinction between inward and outward sin. Paul spent much labor to make it clear that there is another law in the nature of even the regenerated man that wars against the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The glimmer of light that came to him when he asked for deliverance from this annoying and dangerous thing occasioned a burst of thanksgiving, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." This was not a hope to be realized by a gradual process or to be delayed until death, but was the assurance of immediate freedom.

"Sarx"

The Greek word sarx, which is invariably translated "flesh" in the English, comes the nearest to being a word of mathematical exactitude as a symbol for sin as a state or corruption. But this word has almost the same limitations as its English equivalent, "flesh," and its use requires a consideration of the context. There are times when this word sarx (flesh) means simply meat (of the human body, of fish or birds or animals). Sometimes it means human nature as distinguished from divine nature, and again it means simply the race of man without any suggestion of moral implication. Occasionally it means material as contrasted with spiritual, or it may mean kinship (as in Rom. 11:14). Sometimes it serves only to emphasize human frailty. But in such instances as the word is used to contrast physical living in opposition to the spiritual, it certainly does mean the sinfully carnal. The flesh in this sense has no reference to the flesh or meat of the human body, but is descriptive of the sinful nature in which all men have been born since the fall of Adam. Whenever it is clear that this word means something evil as distinguished from that which is good, we should always understand it as referring to the corrupt, carnal, sinful nature, and not to the essential human nature in which man was originally created. The flesh, as meat, is neither good nor bad. As it always was, it is of neutral moral significance, being simply a form of existence that it pleased God to give to man. To say, then, that we must sin or be sinful so long as we are in the flesh (the meat) is to indict the Creator for folly and complicity with evil. When it is said, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God," we are not left to guess at the meaning, for the very next verse (Rom. 8:9) explains that "ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." This certainly does not mean that the human personality is dual, and that one may be "in the Spirit" in his heart and "in the flesh" as to his body at one and the same time. The meaning of the Scriptures plainly is that when the life is permeated by the Spirit of God, and ruled, indwelt, and directed by Him, that person (spirit, soul, and body) is not in the flesh (the carnal sinful flesh), but in the Holy Spirit.

It should be observed that our English word carnal and its variations are but translations of the Greek word sarx, and that no particular light is thrown on the general subject by use of the detached words carnal or carnality. The context must always be considered before exposition is possible. But when the context clearly shows that the reference is to something evil, and not simply

to something corporeal or natural, these words may be used as approximate symbols for the sinful state or sin within the heart.

Besides the terms that speak in accuracy and discrimination, we have in the Bible and in Christian literature a considerable vocabulary of metaphorical terminology which is exceedingly useful for illustration and emphasis. But these terms, like parabolic language in general, suffer if pressed too far. Examples from this category are: "sin of the world" (John 1:29); "root of bitterness" (Heb. 12:15); "the old man" (Rom. 6: 6); "the sin that doth so easily beset us" (Heb. 12: 1); "the stony heart" (Ezek. 36: 26); and "dross" and "chaff" in Malachi 3 and Matthew 3. All these and many more of their kind often clearly point to a spiritual state and condition that is undesirable, and from which prayer is made for deliverance. And while there are sometimes more literal meanings in given passages, the presumption of the moral and spiritual is also often there.

Theologians have spoken of inbred sin, inherited sin, original sin, depravity, pollution of nature, corruption of nature, self, sin that remaineth in believers, indwelling sin, moral inability, and besetting sin. Poets have sung of enemies in the castle; allegorists have described enemy reservations in the city of Mansoul; and saints have prayed for purging from "the clinging remnants of sin." But beneath all terminology, both accurate and metaphorical, is the fact of the sinful nature -- which, not being guilt, is not the subject of pardon, but, being pollution, demands purging and cleansing. There is no disputing the fact that men and women who are truly born of the Spirit do long for deliverance from this foe within that wars against them in their efforts to live "soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." Our purpose in pointing out the offending thing as clearly as we can is not to bring fruitless embarrassment to such as would know the way of true holiness. Rather our purpose is to define the disease that we may the better know and apply the remedy which will effect a cure.

ENDNOTES

1 John Wesley, sermon on "Sin in Believers."

2 John Wesley, sermon on "Repentance in Believers."

3 H. O. Wiley, Christian Theology (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1940), II, 140.

4 Ibid., pp.121 f.

5 Manual of the Church of the Nazarene (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1944), p.27.

6. Wiley, Op. cit., II, 119 f.

* * * * *

There are instances in Christian speech and literature, and even in the New Testament, when the words redemption and salvation are used as synonyms. But in general, salvation is the wider term, and involves redemption as one of its specific branches. In our approach we plan to speak of redemption in the limited sense of God's provision for man's recovery from sin. In this sense it is potential salvation. And we shall treat salvation as applied redemption, or deliverance in fact as well as in provision.

It is not our plan to enter into detailed theological differentiations. Such a process involves more labor and more ability than we are able to provide, and calls for time and space beyond our allotment. But to those who desire to go into the discriminations of definition regarding the matters we here present, we suggest application to Dr. H. Orton Wiley's three-volume Christian Theology.

In thinking of the terms by which the hideousness and heinousness of sin are described, the substance of sin as guilt for transgression is such that it deserves the heaviest judgment in punishment. Also, sin as defilement or corruption of nature is a pit too deep for human exploration, much less for human amendment and cure. But now, having come to God's provision for recovery from sin, we find ourselves again dealing with terms that emphasize the superlative.

The hyper-Calvinists who hold to the tenet that some men were doomed to be lost, even before they had their being in the world, do not base their conclusions on the thought that the atonement of Jesus Christ was or is insufficient. They arrive at their conclusions on the basis of the divine decrees which they believe determine the limits to which the sufficiency of the atonement are applied. They claim that, even though the merits of the atonement are enough to provide for the salvation of all men, they are limited by the divine decrees to those only whom God, by His sovereign will, has determined shall be saved. There is no ground for such belief in the Holy Scriptures, and no proof anywhere that God has so limited the sufficiency of the atonement. Our faith is that Jesus Christ did, through His sacrificial life, vicarious sufferings, and substitutionary death, provide salvation for all men, and that this salvation is available to all on terms that all may meet. We believe, therefore, that every son of Adam's race who is finally lost will be denied the consolation that would be his if he were able to say that his estate is of God's planning and not of his own disposition.

The positive statement of our thesis is this: God did provide a way of salvation for all men through the life, sufferings, and death of Jesus Christ, His Son, so that it is possible for all men to be saved from sin here and to live with God forever in the world to come. This we understand to be the meaning of such words as, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). And in addition to the specific passages, the general trend of the whole Bible is to present the offer of salvation to all men without any limits at all. If there are limits, they are set by men, and not by the Lord.

All the blessings of life, including life itself, are ours by reason of the intervention and atonement of Jesus Christ, and the fact that any man at all is within the reach of God and salvation is creditable to the grace of God through Christ. All general and specific agencies making for man's salvation, like the preaching of the gospel, the influence of good people, the vitality of the conscience, and the ministrations of the Holy Spirit, are benefits of the atonement and the

intercessions of Jesus Christ. All these blessings are given without any merit on our part, and should be cause for genuine thanksgiving, as they should also be thankfully received and gladly acted upon to our own salvation.

But justification, sanctification, the witness of the Holy Spirit to our sonship and cleansing, and power to live before God in holiness and righteousness all the days of our lives are offered to us through the atonement and intercession of Christ on terms we may meet -- and must meet, if the blessings named are to be ours.

However, our present thought centers on our complementary claim that the atonement of Jesus Christ is not only as wide as the human need in its reach, but also as deep as the human need in its possible application to the individual. By this we mean that the redemptive scheme of Christ provides full salvation for every man, as well as free salvation for all men.

Whatever sin may be, sin is at the base of all our woes. And whatever holiness may be, holiness is something apart from sin. Sin is soul sickness. Holiness is soul health. The atonement and intercession of Jesus Christ are to the end that we may be delivered from sin and made holy. To this statement, I think, no just exception can be taken. Nor can it be denied that the redemptive scheme through Jesus Christ provides the way and manner in which this transformation from sin to holiness may take place. If brought face-to-face with the necessity of answering, I think all Christians would say that Jesus came to save us from our sins, from all sin in whatever form, and that He is able and willing to do all He came to do. Openly sin may have its apologists, but when the question is pressed, every true believer will find his heart protesting against any word which suggests that sin is any match for our wonderful Saviour. There may be those who will say the time for the application of the full powers of deliverance has not yet come, but they know also that there are no limitations in Him.

It appears, therefore, that the time factor is the only one at issue. To the question, Is man, left to himself, a hopeless sinner? the answer is, He is. To the question, Did Jesus Christ come into the world to provide salvation from all sin for all men? the answer is, He did. To the question, Is Jesus able and willing to do what He came to do? the answer is, He is able. Then comes the final question, Is it the plan and purpose of God to make full salvation effective in those who believe on Him in this world? Our answer to this is, This is indeed God's plan and purpose.

Limits of the Atonement

At this point it is necessary for us to restate our definition of sin, and to say that we understand that, properly speaking, sin involves only the guilt and corruption of sin and does not extend to the full consequences of sin. So while we admit that there is no promise of deliverance from all the weaknesses and scars caused by sin on the bodies and minds of men (these having to await the second coming of Christ for their erasure), there are plan and promise of a present deliverance from the guilt and pollution of sin, and the bringing of the true believer into the relation of justification and the state of holiness.

Our claim, then, is simply this: The plan of redemption through Jesus Christ does so apply the benefits of the atonement to those who believe on God through Him that they may be saved

from all the guilt and inward pollution of sin right here in this present world. This claim is in complete harmony with our thesis on sin, and in harmony with the specific and general teachings of the Holy Scriptures. It is also in agreement with the experiences of multitudes of Christian people who have in the past or do at the present time enjoy this full victory and freedom from sin.

Dr. Wiley [1] makes note that the Scriptures set forth three aspects of the atonement: (1) as propitiation in relationship to God, the idea of propitiation being that in Christ God is brought near; (2) as reconciliation in relation to God and man; (3) as redemption in relation to man. The three words, involving the three aspects of the atonement, are of first importance in any attempt to understand the subject.

H. E. Brockett, in *Scriptural Freedom from Sin*, says:

By the Godward or objective aspect of the truth of the blood of Christ, we mean what that blood has accomplished for God in His redemptive plan for sinners. It was only because of the blood sprinkled on the mercy seat in the tabernacle that Israel of old could be maintained in a position of favor in the sight of God. It is only because of the infinite value of that precious blood in the sight of God that He can be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus (Romans 3:26) [2]

Brockett goes on to say:

Scripture also declares that Christ, by His own blood, entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption (Hebrews 9:12). It is only on the ground of that precious blood, shed at the cross and sprinkled in heaven, that the believers can have any position of favor at all in the presence of God or can approach Him and be accepted by Him as true worshippers (Hebrews 10:19-22)....

By the manward or subjective aspect of the truth of the blood of Christ, we mean what that blood accomplishes in the believer. In the Old Testament, the blood of animals was not only sprinkled upon the mercy seat in the holiest for God to see; it was also sprinkled upon persons such as the people (Exodus 24:8); Aaron and his sons (Leviticus 8:23, 24, 30); and the leper (Leviticus 14:7, 14). Now this actual contact of the blood with persons typifies the truth that the blood has an inward, subjective effect upon the true believer. [3]

Coming to the crucial question, "Does the blood of Christ avail to cleanse the heart of the believer from indwelling sin?" Brockett quotes from Dr. Andrew Murray's *The Holiest of All* (a commentary on the book of Hebrews), as follows:

"We know what conscience is. It tells us what we are. Conscience deals not only with past merit or guilt but specially with present integrity or falsehood . . . The conscience is not a separate part of our heart or inner nature, and which can be in a different state from what the whole is. By no means. Just as a sensibility to bodily evil pervades the whole body, so conscience is the sense which pervades our whole spiritual nature, and at once notices and reports what is wrong or right in our state. Hence it is when the conscience is cleansed or perfected, the heart is cleansed and perfected too. And so it is in the heart that the power the blood had in heaven is communicated

here on earth. The blood that brought Christ into God's presence, brings us, and our whole inner being, thereto." [4]

Brockett calls attention to the fact that Sir Robert Anderson, in his book, *The Gospel and Its Ministry*, after stating that the meaning of cleansing by the Blood is governed by the types in Leviticus, then errs in presenting just the one type, namely, the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat on the Day of Atonement. In this case the blood was not actually applied to the people, and the cleansing was judicial -- "a cleansing which maintained Israel in the favor of an infinitely holy God." But there is another type of "cleansing by blood" in Leviticus. It is the cleansing of the leper in Leviticus 14. Mr. Brockett says:

In this type the blood was actually applied to the leper and there were two distinct applications of blood in order to make the leper's cleansing complete. On the first occasion, the blood of a slain bird was sprinkled upon the leper and he was pronounced "clean" and allowed to come inside the camp with God's people. This was the first stage and is a beautiful type of the cleansing and impartation of spiritual life at regeneration. But that was not all. On the eighth day afterwards, there was a second cleansing by blood--a much closer application--it was applied in detail to the ear, the thumb and the toe; then the oil was likewise applied and finally poured upon the head. Now if the oil upon the leper typified the Spirit within the believer, surely the blood upon the leper typified likewise a full and blessed cleansing within the believer. How beautifully this second, deeper application of the blood, coupled with oil, typifies the second work of grace in entire sanctification when the blood of Christ is applied within, in all its sin-cleansing efficacy and the Holy Spirit comes in with His sanctifying power, fully to possess the sin-cleansed heart. [5]

Mr. Brockett then passes to the consideration of the blood of Christ in the works of the Apostle John. [6] It is observed that, while Paul speaks of the cross of Christ and John of the blood of Christ, they are both talking of the same thing--the power of the atoning work of Christ. In his Epistle to the Romans, Paul looks upon indwelling sin as a hostile power from which we can be freed through the Cross. John regards sin as a corrupting pollution from which we can be cleansed through the blood of Christ.

In the Book of Revelation, John repeatedly and continuously attributes our full and final salvation, and all the glories of the heavenly estate, to the blood of Christ. This he does, not in some sense of accommodated, imputed righteousness, but by reason of the fact that he hath "washed us from our sins in his own blood," and the redeemed have "washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Those who have overcome the devil have done so "by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." Through it all it is evident that there are inward, personal cleansing from sin and empowerment for life and service involved, as well as judicial and outer cleansing in pardon and justification.

All these general references shed light upon the meaning of John in his First Epistle, chapter one, verse seven: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," and make it evident that inbred sin, as well as actual sins, is involved and included. This is our position over against any and all suggestions that the blood of Christ makes atonement only for transgressions, and that our holiness is nothing more than a calculated, positional, or imputed possession. Nay,

through the precious blood of Christ we may be cleansed both without and within, and made free from sin-from sin as guilt and from sin as pollution.

This blessed provision of God has its complement in the deep longing for purity which is one of the surest evidences of the born-again state. In expressing this deep and altogether scriptural desire, Charles Wesley spoke for us all, when he sang:

Oh, for a heart to praise my God,
A heart from sin set free,
A heart that always feels Thy blood
So freely spilt for me!

It is not within the scope of our present purpose to consider objections, to attempt to explain difficult Scripture texts, or to offer refutation to those who would wrest the Scriptures to nullify the blessed promises. But we do say that the promise of cleansing from all sin is the hub of the wheel of applied redemption, and with it all the types and shadows, precepts and promises, prayers and praise of the blessed Book agree. Even if we are not able always to clear up the mysteries, we proceed in the full confidence that what God has promised He is able and willing to perform, and that He requires and accepts no compromise of meaning to make His work conformable to His Word.

The statement, "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him" (Heb. 7:25), from which text has been deduced the term "full salvation," is the climax of an extended treatment of the full sufficiency of the high priesthood of Jesus Christ. The section includes Heb. 5:1-8: 6, and the climax is reached when it is shown that the high priesthood of Jesus was so superior to Aaron's that it becomes necessary to introduce Melchizedec as a fuller type. In applying the benefits of the high priesthood of One who is sinless and deathless, it is said that He can do in the fullest measure all that a priest is required to do. This throws us back again to the altar and the leper of Leviticus, and justifies the claim that Jesus can cleanse both without and within by means of His most precious blood.

In the abridged edition of his *Fundamental Christian Theology*, Dr. A. M. Hills says:

We infer the possibility of sanctification from the revealed purpose of the life and death of Christ. The Scriptures declare that Christ came "to make an end of sin, to make reconciliation for iniquity and to bring in everlasting righteousness" (Daniel 9:24). "That he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all our days" (Luke 1:74, 75). Here is sanctification, not at death, nor after death, but "all the days of our life." "Christ loved the church and gave himself for it that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it that it should be holy and without blemish" (Ephesians 5:25-27).

Again, "Wherefore Jesus also that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (Hebrews 13:12). "Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify for himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14). "Christ suffered for you, leaving you an example that ye should follow his steps, who

did no sin" (I Peter 2:21, 22). "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness" (I Peter 2:24). Manifestly God designed the great plan of salvation, and Jesus died on the cross that He might restore fallen man to holiness. [7]

Dr. Asbury Lowrey, in *Possibilities of Grace*, after presenting the blood of the Old Testament sacrifices as symbols and prophecies of the blood of Jesus Christ, says:

This typical blood-shedding and blood-sprinkling, which formed so large a part in the Jewish ceremonial, had three chief significations. First, it was symbolic of the necessity of general atonement for the sins of the people. Nay, more, it was accepted as the actual expiation for sins in its prospective relation to Christ. Having no intrinsic efficacy, it was, nevertheless, full of anticipative and promissory purification. It was a relative salvation.

Second, it was the blood of the covenant. It was the seal and ratification of God's gracious engagements with His people. It was also a vivid representation of the loss of purity by man, and the necessity and costliness of its restoration. It told the dismal story of human apostasy, and foreshadowed the painful price of redemption. It said to a sinful world, "Your Saviour is a Lamb that He might bleed, and He must bleed that He may be a propitiation. And, having bled, that awful fact becomes a pledge and a guaranty that God will cleanse those who trust in Jesus from all unrighteousness.

The third significance of this symbol respects its cleansing property. All things sprinkled were made typically clean by the blood. It was a ceremonial sanctification. This external application having so great a virtue, by imputation, upon material objects, is made to argue stoutly the purgative quality and power of the blood of Christ when applied to the inner man. Thus: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Hebrews 9:13, 14).

Here is an argument from the less to the greater, from the material to the spiritual, and from the human to the divine. In place of animal blood and ashes, we have the blood of Christ. In place of altars of wood and stone on which to rest the offering, we have the altar of the eternal Spirit. Instead of unclean animals, we have the spotless Christ. Instead of only fleshly purification, we have a clean conscience. Wherefore as a continual result, in lieu of presenting to God a gross material service, we become a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. It is this purifying potency of our Lord's sacrificial work that makes the word blood so prominent in the New Testament in connection with spiritual sanctification. It is this which has authorized the metonymy by which the blood of Christ is so continually represented as cleansing -- cleansing from all sin -- cleansing from all unrighteousness. It is not merely a basis for reconciliation-a ground for the cancellation of guilt and the remission of sins. Nor is it merely the procuring cause or price of purity -- the consideration accepted of God as a sufficient reason or motive to work purity and generate life in a dead soul.

The blood of Christ is sacramental and causative. To trust in it is to be cleansed by it. It is an element whose contact with the touch of faith heals a leprous soul. It is the fountain filled, not with animal blood, or with human blood, but with the blood of the Lamb. This Lamb, being offered to God through the eternal Spirit, has poured forth a crimson stream, which is impregnated with infinite merit and power of purification. In this, robes of character may be, and must be, washed until they are made white. This is the sole qualification for heaven. It is the only essential and indispensable meetness required that we may dwell among the saints in light. It alone gives a valid claim to "an inheritance among all them who are sanctified." All antecedent grace and concomitant relations are comprehended in perfect holiness. It is like the trunk of a tree. If you have that in its integrity, and in live condition, you have all its roots and branches. The forces of religion are massed by entire sanctification. It secures the maximum of spiritual power. It graduates life and efficiency up to the standard of highest possibility. And this is most effectually done by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, who is the great antitype of the paschal lamb, and all the bleeding birds and beasts of the Jewish ritual.

Bless God! we "are not to come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire," but we are to come "to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." [8]

Dr. D. Shelby Corlett, in his book on *The Meaning of Holiness*) says:

The emphasis of the provision in the atonement for purity or entire sanctification for the Christian is as definite as the provision made for the forgiveness for the sinner. Let us note a few of the statements of the Scriptures emphasizing this deeper benefit: ". . . our Saviour, Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people (a people for his own possession -- R.V.)" (Titus 2:13, 14). "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, . . . that it should be holy and without blemish" (Ephesians 5:25-27). "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Hebrews 9:14). "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (Hebrews 13:12).

These scriptures stress a deeper benefit and emphasize a deeper experience than that emphasized in the former scriptures used relative to the benefit provided in the atonement for sinners. These scriptures state primarily the provision for cleansing, for entire sanctification, for the purifying of the heart, for making holy the child of God.

There are scriptures which give another emphasis to this deeper benefit of redemption, scriptures that teach that Jesus in His death dealt as definitely with the nature of sin, the old sin principle, in the heart of the child of God, as He did with the actual sins of the sinner. Let us note several of these scriptures: "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" (Romans 6:6). God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Romans 8:3).

There is a marked contrast between the terms used here to indicate the deeper benefits of the provisions of redemption and those used in stressing the benefits for sinners. For the sinner, the words used were "justify," "forgiveness," "brought nigh to God." But concerning this deeper benefit the words used are "crucified," "destroyed," "condemned," all of which emphasize the destruction of the sin principle or nature remaining in the heart of a justified believer or child of God. These latter terms specifically refer to that phase of the provisions of redemption made for the removing from the nature of the child of God those inner conditions which keep him from being holy in the scriptural sense of that word.

The terms used in these scriptures, namely, "the old man," "the body of sin," "sin in the flesh," and other terms such as "carnal," "the carnal mind," "the flesh," and the like, designate sin in the nature, the impure or unholy condition remaining in the heart of a person after being born again. Whatever may be the interpretation given these terms, we must recognize that the destruction of that state is provided in redemption: "the old man is (was, R.V.) crucified with him (Christ), that the body of sin might be destroyed"; and, "God ... condemned sin in the flesh." Here is emphasized a wonderful and complete provision of redemption to meet the deepest needs of man and to make him holy. [9]

A. Paget Wilkes, in *The Dynamic of Redemption*, says:

Many of God's children, I know, find it hard to understand in what sense we are made holy by the blood of Christ. The atoning work for our justification and the indwelling of His Spirit for our sanctification are easy to comprehend, but in what sense can we be made holy in heart by the shedding of His blood? This difficulty arises partly from ignorance of the nature of sin. In the minds of many sin is regarded merely as an act of wrong doing, wrong thinking, or wrong speaking. According to this view, the Holy Spirit can of course keep us from yielding to temptation and thus "free from sin" in the above sense; while the blood of Christ avails to remove all stain of guilt and condemnation, if we do so transgress. This, however, is a very defective view of sin and in consequence of sanctification. The truth is that in the Word of God, sin (as distinguished from sins and sinning) is spoken of as a spiritual entity, e.g., "the body of sin," "the carnal mind," etc. Sanctification, then, in its principal meaning is the destruction of that entity, a moral cleansing of our nature from its defiling presence and power, a real healing of the soul and a removal of inward depravity. A further difficulty of understanding in what sense we are made holy by the blood of Christ is due to our failure to recognize the use of figurative language. The late Thomas Cook writes thus:

"But some cannot understand how this cleansing is through the blood of Jesus; we need to explain that we are obliged to use figurative language. We sing of a 'fountain filled with blood,' but we know there is no such fountain. When we speak of the blood of Jesus cleansing from sin, we do not mean that the blood of Christ is literally applied to the heart. What is meant is that through the great atoning work Christ has procured or purchased complete deliverance from sin for us exactly as He has made forgiveness possible for us. But while Christ is thus through His death what may be called the procuring cause of sanctification, the work itself is wrought in us through the agency of the Holy Spirit. He comes to the heart in sanctifying power, excluding the evil and filling it with love (when we believe the blood cleanseth us from all sin) just as He comes in regenerating power when we believe for forgiveness and are adopted into the family of God." [10]

Now it is evident that all who say, "Jesus died for me," do not include all that is involved in that statement -- at least not for present realization. On this account we have made these several quotations to emphasize the understanding that believers in Bible holiness have of the scope and depths of redemption. Nor do we suppose that this is anything of a modern interpretation. David, for example, in the fifty-first psalm, was evidently aware of the two forms in which sin exists, and he therefore prayed for both forgiveness and cleansing. His metaphor regarding the hyssop harks back to the ceremony of cleansing a leper, and, as already noted, this ceremony stood for a second and deeper cleansing than was involved in the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar for the sins of the people.

The ancient prophet spoke of the fountain that was opened or was to be opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem "for sin and for uncleanness." This indicates that, while sin was discerned in its dual form, redemption likewise was conceived of as a fountain in which both guilt and pollution could be washed away. When the side of Jesus was pierced on the Cross by the Roman spear, there came forth "blood and water" -- blood for forgiveness, water for cleansing. Toplady, therefore, was very scriptural when he sang:

Let the water and the blood,
From Thy wounded side which flowed,
Be of sin the double cure,
Save from wrath and make me pure.

Extent of Redemption

We would not accommodate the language of redemption to those who limit it to sin's guilt. Rather, we would iterate and reiterate the scriptural meaning of this blessed truth in the hope that many who now see but dimly may behold the full deliverance there is in the blood of the Lamb. We would account as inadequate any conception of the redemptive work of Christ that does not involve, require, and promise a cleansing as deep as ever the stain of sin has gone. Nor would we minimize sin that redemption might stand out the more boldly. Sin as transgression is a thing that is heinous beyond comparison. And sin as pollution is like that dead, putrefying corpse which the ancient criminal was sentenced to carry about with him until the criminal's life gave way to the putrefying death. But horrible as is the figure, and more horrible still the reality of sin, yet, thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord there is release and deliverance.

Sin is crimson red and scarlet clinging, but it is matched and overmatched by the royal blood of God's only Son, so that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

In his "Queries to Those Who Deny Perfection Attainable in This Life," John Wesley asked: "Does the soul's going out of the body effect its purification from indwelling sin?" Answering those who held this notion, he said: "If so, it is something else, not 'the blood of Christ which cleanseth it from sin'! [11] But if indeed it is the blood of Jesus Christ that cleanseth us from all sin, then this is the world in which that Blood was shed, and here also is the place to have it applied.

And, finally, we would again suggest that our conception of redemption is no innovation. Rather, we believe it is the conception of those who lived nearest to the Lord in the time of His passion, and of those who have walked closest to Him in the Spirit's dispensation. Amidst the confusion of those who have sought to analyze, there have been found those who knew that they might believe, and those who believed that they might know. May we, and all who hear these words, be among those who both believe and know, and who shall find by following on to know the Lord a joy and victory that the world can never know.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Cf. Wiley, Christian Theology, II, 290-95.
- 2 H. E. Brockett, Scriptural Freedom from Sin (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1941), p.66.
- 3 Ibid., pp. 66 f.
- 4 Ibid., pp. 68 f.
- 5 Ibid., pp. 69 f.
- 6 Ibid., pp. 70 f
- 7 A. M. Hills, Fundamental Christian Theology, Abridged ad. (Pasadena, Calif.: C. J. Kinne, 1932), pp. 45 f.
- 8 Asbury Lowrey, Possibilities of Grace (Chicago: Christian Witness Co., 1884), pp.120-23.
- 9 D. S. Corlett, The Meaning of Holiness (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1944), pp. 43-45.
- 10 A. P. Wilkes, The Dynamic of Redemption (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1946), pp. 80 f
- 11 John Wesley, Plain Account of Christian Perfection.

* * * * *

4
The Terminology of Salvation

Salvation is the great word of the gospel, being in a sense a summing up of all the acts and processes involved in that glorious message of good news. Having come to this section by way of the terminology of sin and the terminology of redemption, we shall take for granted a knowledge of the things presented in those sections, and shall avoid repetition as much as the clarity of the present thesis will permit.

There is at the present time a strong sentiment in favor of blotting out any and all lines that separate Christians from one another in order to "present a united front to the non-Christian world." From certain approaches this sentiment has merit, for divisions which are not based on fundamental differences are indefensible. But we must avoid laying emphasis on numbers, since this ignores the principal basis of strength in the Christian movement. Likewise we must beware lest in calling for union we ask those of higher attainments to concede to those of lower possession, and insist that the orthodox compromise with those who hold to mixed creeds.

It does not avail anything for bankrupts to form partnerships, for if the parties are insolvent separately, their liabilities will still outweigh their assets when they come together. There is therefore always the call to "Christianize Christianity," as Dr. Bresee used to call the work of preaching holiness to God's people.

Quoting from the Olin's Lectures, Bishop Foster says:

The actual state of education, morals and happiness in a community may be regarded as the true expression of the power of the moral and intellectual forces engaged for its improvement. The efficiency and usefulness of a church, for instance, are precisely what the zeal, purity, and intelligence of its members make it. We may conclude, therefore, that the Christian enterprises of the present time must remain stationary, without some new accession of moral resources. If the rising generation shall come forward with only the same degree of piety and intelligence that belonged to their fathers, then the utmost that can be expected is, that the cause of religion and humanity shall not retrograde. Progress, under the circumstances supposed, is wholly out of the question. The Church is now barely able to hold its ground against the opposing forces of sin and error, or to advance with tardy steps to future triumphs; and if it is to be recruited and reinforced by such members and ministers only as already wield its destinies, it must remain in essentially the same condition, while the accession of even a few persons of deeper piety, and stronger faith, and larger views, might sweep away the obstacles that retard its progress, and open a career of unexampled success. A single individual of enlarged conceptions of duty and burning zeal for Christ, is sometimes able to communicate new spirit to a whole church which has for years scarcely given a sign of vitality. It had just enough power to maintain a bare existence, and resist the pressure from without; and now the additional impetus given by one true man of God puts everything in motion and triumphs over obstacles. What victories then might we anticipate, what enlargement for Zion, could the whole Christian host be induced to gird themselves with strength, and enter upon the whitening field to which they are called with something like the spirit of primitive Christianity? It would be as a new life from the dead. It would be as the birth of a new dispensation. They who are ready to perish would revive again, and all the islands of the sea will re-rejoice. [1]

In a previous paragraph, Bishop Foster says:

There may have been, and doubtless has been, on the part of most Christians, a vague and indefinite idea of the greater blessings, not yet included in their experience, and a general outgoing of heart after them; but there has been so much indefiniteness and vagueness on the subject of privilege and duty as to awaken neither hope nor concern; and if in some instances aspirations, and even great and distressing convictions, have been awakened for a time, they have too often

perished for want of guidance and support. No earnest Christian, I am persuaded, will dissent from these lamentable statements. They are not morbid. They are not made in a carping or fault-finding spirit. They are simply the record of a sad fact which has filled the heart of Christ and of His Church with sorrow through all the ages of Christian history. [2]

John Wesley said:

From long experience and observation, I am inclined to think that whoever finds redemption in the blood of Jesus-whoever is justified-has then the choice of walking in the higher or lower path. I believe the Holy Spirit at that time sets before him "the more excellent way," and incites him to walk therein-to choose the narrowest path in the narrow way-to aspire after the heights and depths of holiness-after the entire image of God. [3]

Charles H. Spurgeon once wrote: "There is a point of grace as much above the ordinary Christian as the ordinary Christian is above the world." Commenting on this statement, Thomas Cook, in *New Testament Holiness*, says:

The experience to which Mr. Spurgeon refers has been described as the higher life, entire sanctification, Christian perfection, perfect love, the rest of faith, and by numerous other names or terms. Modes of expression have been selected by various Christians which have best coincided with their theological views. There may be shades of difference in their import, but, generally speaking, the terms mean one and the same thing. We do not contend for names. It is immaterial which expressions are employed; the main point is, do we possess the experience designated by these terms, and which is recognized and professed by Christians representing all our churches? [4]

Evidencing early preference for the term holiness, Thomas Cook says:

When used in a general sense, the word "holiness" includes whatever is connected with Christian life and character. Thus Interpreted, it may be applied to any and all stages of religious life and development. But the term is used in a more definite sense to describe an experience distinct from justification-a sort of supplemental conversion, in which there is eliminated from the soul all the sinful elements which do not belong to it, everything antagonistic to the elements of holiness implanted in regeneration. It includes the full cleansing of the soul from inbred sin, so that it becomes pure or free from sinful tendency. Says Thomas Carlyle: "Holy in the German language -- heilig -- also means healthy; our English word whole -- all in one piece, without any hole in it-is the same word. You could not get any better definition of what holy really is than healthy, completely healthy." We do not say that this definition embraces all that we mean by holiness -- it does not. The experience includes also the gracious endowment of perfect love, and the abiding fullness of the Holy Spirit. To explain more in detail in what sense the Scriptures teach this to be a present duty and privilege and to meet the difficulties of those who really and honestly desire to understand the doctrine, is our purpose in these pages. To hit a mark we must know where it is. We walk faster when we see plain, definite steps. We must know what we want and seek that. Unless we can separate the experience from its accidental surroundings, confusion is sure to follow. We may not be able to understand the doctrine in all its relations and bearings, but we need to have before our minds some distinct point of attainment. Just as the pressing of men to an immediate and

definite point of conversion produces immediate and definite results, so it is with Christians. When a definite point is presented as immediately attainable, distinct and definite experiences follow. Prayer is no more at random. The blind man cried for "mercy," but "mercy" was too general a prayer. Jesus wanted to know what special kind of mercy the man desired. When he asked for mercy that took the form of the gift of sight, that special bestowal was granted." [5]

The Wesleyan View

It is not within the scope of this series of lectures to present the evidences which we believe amply support that view of Bible holiness which has been called the Wesleyan view, and which is the view of that group of ministers and people who constitute what is known as the holiness movement. This movement includes within its scope a number of denominations like the Free Methodists, the Wesleyan Methodists, the Pilgrim Holiness church, and the Church of the Nazarene, and many ministers and members of churches which as a whole are not committed to the interpretation mentioned. Our purpose is to inquire as to the terminology used by this group, to determine from their literature and history what sense they give to these terms when they use them. We do not give large place to the terminology used by others than the holiness people. It may be that their terminology is adequate to express what they have to say on the subject, and they may be able to make the message plain by the use of their own vocabulary. But as "one of them" myself, I am free to say that we need a large and forceful terminology to serve us in making our message effective. If some claim that they mean the same things as our terminology expresses, then we suggest that, seeing our terminology is older and better established, they just adopt it as theirs also. A new and unknown terminology demands much effort and patience for its establishment, and all concerned with the message of full salvation should be thankful for the instrument of expression which the fathers have wrought out for our use.

It is no accident that all holiness lexicographers go, sooner or later, to John Wesley for the testing of their terminology. For John Wesley was, under the guidance of the providences and Spirit of God, a father to the holiness movement. He disclaimed any credit as an inventor, but consistently contended that he and his Coadjutors preached, and designed to preach, nothing that had not been known and preached in the Church in all its generations, beginning with its Founder, the Lord Jesus Christ. He thought that he and his people might at times serve as discoverers, and that they might do good service in breaking away the incrustations which had gathered about certain of the apostolic doctrines and restore these doctrines to the Church and to the world. But always his thought was that the primitive Church held the full content of the gospel, and that there was no need at any time for either changing or adding thereto.

Commenting on John Wesley as a theologian, someone has remarked that John Wesley said more that is fundamentally true and less that had to be corrected than any who have spoken in the Church since the days of the inspired apostles. However, we do not quote Wesley as final authority. For this there is no appeal except "to the law and to the testimony" -- to the Bible, the true Word of God. Wesley's work is useful to assist us in expressing what we know in our hearts and have found taught in the blessed Book.

Wesley himself used a wide variety of terms to express his conception of Bible holiness, and he spent more time on some which he preferred least. This he did because his opposers

misinterpreted, and he had either to defend or abandon these terms; and in abandoning them, he felt that he would be understood to be leaving the meaning as he, not as his opposers, understood it. Wesley wrote and declared before Oxford University his sermon on "The Circumcision of the Heart" when he was thirty years of age. He wrote his tract on The Character of a Methodist, his first tract on Christian perfection, when he was thirty-six years of age. When he was thirty-seven years of age, he had an interview with Dr. Gibson, the bishop of London, who is reported to have found no fault in Wesley's definition of Christian perfection, and on the basis of that interview Wesley wrote his sermon on "Christian Perfection." And because his opposers continued to misinterpret, Wesley continued to explain, so that Christian perfection became almost the outstanding word in his preaching and writing. There is evidence, however, that he never originally intended that it should be that way, and that he personally preferred other terms to this one. Wesley's second sermon on perfection was written when he was eighty-two, just six years before his death. And during this long period, covering fifty-two active years and fourteen years of a little lessened activity--sixty-six years in all -- he used many expressions in describing his central thesis. But his biographers have found that the term "perfect love" was probably the term which he actually preferred.

Dr. A. M. Hills, in *Scriptural Holiness*, says:

Wesley wrote, "Both my brother Charles and I maintain that Christian perfection is that love of God and our neighbor which implies deliverance from all sin. It is the loving God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength. This implies that no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remain in the soul." "Certainly sanctification (in the proper sense) is an instantaneous deliverance from all sin. [6]"

Dr. Hills continues:

Notice, during the different years of Wesley's life, what terms he used to express it. 1739, "Renewal of our heart after the image of God." "The mind that was in Christ." 1741, "Deliverance from inward and outward sin." "The evil nature, the body of sin destroyed." 1742, "Cleansed from all the filth of self and pride." "To perfect health restored." "To sin entirely dead." 1757, "Having received the first fruits of the Spirit, patiently and earnestly wait for the great change whereby every root of bitterness may be torn up." 1758, "A heart entirely pure." "Perfected in love and saved from all sin." 1761, "Delivered from the root of bitterness." "Cleansed from all unrighteousness." "After being convinced of inbred sin, in a moment they feel all faith and love, no pride, self-will, or anger." 1762, "Full renewal in the image of God." "In an instant emptied of all sin and filled with God." "An instantaneous deliverance from all sin." "Cleansed from sin, meaning all sinful tempers." 1762, "The second blessing." "Destruction of the roots of sin in one moment" "Pure love." 1765, "Love taking up the whole heart, and filling it with all holiness." "The soul pure from every spot, clean from all unrighteousness." "Sin destroyed in a moment." 1768, "The image of God stamped on the heart." "The mind that was in Christ, enabling us to walk as Christ walked." "The perfection I have taught these forty years." "I mean loving God with all our heart and our neighbor as ourselves. I pin down all opposers to this definition; no evasion; no shifting the question." 1770, "An entire deliverance from sin and recovery of the whole image of God." "A second change, whereby we shall be saved from all sin and perfected in love." 1774, "The second blessing, properly so called, deliverance from the root of bitterness, from inbred as well as actual

sin." 1781, "Christ in a pure and sinless heart, reigning the Lord of every motion." 1785, "A full deliverance from all sin and a renewal in the whole image of God." "Full salvation now by simple faith." 1789, "The whole image of God wherein you were created." "O be satisfied with nothing less and you will surely secure it by simple faith." [7]

Other Holiness Leaders

But no history of the Wesleyan terminology is complete without the inclusion of Adam Clarke, who said: "What, then, is this complete sanctification? It is the cleansing by the blood of that which has not been cleansed; it is washing the soul of a true believer from the remains of sin." Nor should we omit John Fletcher, who said: "It is the pure love of God and man shed abroad in a faithful believer's heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him, to cleanse him and to keep him clean from all the filthiness of the flesh and spirit."

Joseph Benson, who came a little later, said: "To sanctify you wholly is to complete the work of purification and renovation begun in your regeneration." Binney, of yet a later period, said: "Entire sanctification is that act of the Holy Spirit whereby the justified soul is made holy."

Summing up the idea expressed by the full, early Methodist terminology, Dr. A. M. Hills suggests as a definition of sanctification or scriptural holiness this statement:

Entire sanctification is a second definite work of grace wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer subsequently to regeneration, received instantaneously by faith, by which the heart is cleansed from all inward corruption and filled with the perfect love of God. [8]

Rev. J. A. Wood, who lived and wrought during the last half of the nineteenth century, and who left a lasting heritage in his books, *Perfect Love and Purity and Maturity*, was one of the clearest exponents of Bible holiness that we have had. In Section I of *Perfect Love*, he says:

The Scripture terms [for expressing full salvation] are, "perfect love," "perfection," "sanctification," and "holiness." These terms are synonymous, all pointing to the same precious state of grace. While they denote the same religious state, each one of them indicates some essential characteristic, and hence these terms are significantly expressive of full salvation..

The word "sanctify" and its derivatives occur in the Scriptures, with reference to men and things, over one hundred times. The term "perfection" signifies completeness of Christian character; its freedom from sin, and the possession of all the graces of the Spirit, complete in kind. "Let us go on unto perfection." The word "perfection" and its relatives occur one hundred and one times in the Scriptures. In over fifty of these instances it is predicated of human character under the operation of grace. The term "holiness" is more generic and comprehensive than the others, including salvation from sin, and the possession of the image and Spirit of God. To be holy is to be whole, entire, or perfect in a moral sense, and in ordinary use is synonymous with purity and godliness. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." The word "holy" and its derivatives occur not less than one hundred and twenty times in their application to men and things. [9]

In contrast with these many occurrences of words expressing full salvation, Wood observes:

The word "justify" and its derivatives occur seventy-four times in regard to men; and the word "pardon" with its derivatives, in their application to penitent sinners, occurs only seventeen times." [10]

On the phrase "perfect love," Wood says:

It is expressive of the spirit and temper, or moral atmosphere in which the wholly sanctified and perfect Christian lives. "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him," and "Herein is our love made perfect." [11]

In all matters religious, men respect the ancient, and no man who is compelled to say that his concepts are new can hope for much regard. The maxim, "Nothing is new in theology," is well-established in both the intelligence and the sentiments of men. "What is new is not true, and what is true is not new" is but another putting of the same idea. In this particular, revelation differs from invention. In invention the last and latest is better than the first and former; but in revelation the stream is purest where it breaks forth from the fountain's head.

We have endeavored to keep close to the Bible in all we have presented herein. Our inner challenge has been, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." It is only Bible holiness that concerns us. What others may call holiness is of no interest to us. But the holiness of the Bible is of utmost concern, for we have it on highest authority that, without the holiness which the Bible teaches, none of us shall see God and be happy in His presence.

Far from being confined to a few proof texts, the doctrine of holiness is the meat and core of the Bible of both the Old and the New Testaments. The moral requirements of this thesis were emphasized by the law given at Sinai, but four hundred years before that God called on Abraham to walk before Him and be perfect.

J. A. Wood, tracing the history of holiness, says:

That the Apostolic Fathers, Martyrs, and primitive Christians believed in, and walked in the light of this grace, is very evident. They lived and died abiding in Christ, under the cleansing blood of the atonement. It was this grace that gave them their great success, and afforded them sustaining power in the jaws of death. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who was given to the wild beasts at Rome when one hundred and seven years of age, said: "I thank Thee, O Lord, that Thou hast vouch-safed to honor me with a perfect love towards Thee." . . . When threatenings were sent to Chrysostom from the hand of the Empress, he replied, "Go tell Eudoxia that I fear nothing but sin." Irenaeus taught that those were perfect "who present soul, body, and spirit faultless to the Lord. Therefore those were perfect who have the spirit and perseverance of God, and have preserved their souls and bodies without fault. Clement, in his Epistle to the Ephesians says: "Ye see, then, beloved, how great and wonderful a thing love is, and that no words can declare its

perfection. Let us beseech Christ that we may live in love unblameable." Macarius taught the doctrine more clearly than any of the Fathers. Of our duty and privilege, he says: "It is perfect purity from sin, freedom from all shameful lusts and passions, and the assumption of perfect virtue; that is, the purification of the heart by the plenary and experimental communion of the perfect and divine Spirit." [12]

There were witnesses of this doctrine and experience down through the Middle Ages and on up to Wesley's day. Among those who lived and preached and suffered, some of them even unto death for the faith, were Molinos and the Quietists of France; Archbishop Fenelon; Madame Guyon, who spent four years in the French Bastille for her piety; and George Fox, the sanctified Quaker. More than two hundred fifty years ago, Samuel Rutherford said, as quoted by J. A. Wood:

Christ is more to be loved for giving us sanctification than justification. It is in some respects greater love in him to sanctify than to justify, for he maketh us more like himself in his own essential portraiture and image of sanctification. [13]

That there were extended periods during which the witnesses to holiness were few is no argument against the truth of the doctrine and no reflection on the terminology by which the doctrine was and is defined, for the same thing could be said as regarding justification and every essential tenet of the Christian creed. That there was a new interest in the doctrine, and consequently a reviving of the terminology by which the doctrine is expressed, in the Wesleyan reformation is cause for rejoicing, seeing no sane person can separate the moral revival which saved England and the Anglo-Saxon civilization from demoralization in the days of Wesley and the doctrine which he and his coadjutors preached. The Wesleyan revival is just another instance substantiating the fact that separation, not amalgamation, is the prelude to power. God's people can do more to save the world by being delivered from it than ever they could do by becoming mixed with it.

Holiness

If it be said that the terminology of holiness is offensive, by the same words it is said that holiness itself is offensive to many. J. A. Wood says:

Much of the prejudice and opposition to this doctrine comes from remaining depravity in unsanctified believers. Indwelling sin is an antagonism to holiness, and, in so far as any Christian has inbred sin, he has within him opposition to holiness. Many do not yield to it, but resist it, pray against it and keep it under; others, we are sorry to know, both in the ministry and laity, yield to their depravity, and stand in opposition to God's work. [14]

It is evident, therefore, that the nature and fact of holiness are what they are, regardless of the terminology by which they are described. And it is further evident that it is not always to the terminology, but to the fact and nature of holiness itself, that opposition is really directed.

However, nothing can be gained either on the part of promoters or on the part of honest opposers that any attempt should be made to carry through a meaning of terms without doing so openly. If the tenets of holiness teachers are untenable, let them be shown to be so; but let the

terminology by which they present their theses be defined by them and understood (not misunderstood or misinterpreted) by others. There is an indispensable element of intelligence in our holy religion, and our Master told us to go forth and "teach all nations." The idea that more will find God and full salvation by a staggering rather than a straight and purposeful walk is too fallacious to merit more than the passing mention. Some may find the way over byways and unmarked courses, but more will find the way if the highway is fitly prepared and well marked.

If others use our terminology with a meaning other than that we hold, it is their duty to attach their meaning to our vocabulary, seeing ours is first on the historic field. Our vocabulary stands approved, and sanctification, holiness, Christian perfection, perfect love, the baptism with the Holy Ghost, Christian purity, and other such terms imply the same work and state of grace. That work is wrought in the hearts of believers subsequent to regeneration, on the basis of the merits of the blood of Jesus, on condition of faith, and by the efficient agency of the Holy Ghost.

The Second Blessing

We have not spoken in detail of the Wesleyan term "second blessing," a term that Wesley used infrequently. This term, though not found in the Scriptures, is, nevertheless, as we believe, scriptural. Wesley said that sanctification is "a second blessing, properly so-called." By this he seemed to mean that it is second to justification, and the only "blessing" in this life that stands on the same level of urgency and meaning with justification. The fact then that there are "thousands of blessings" in the course of the Christian life does in no sense invalidate "the second blessing," as it does not invalidate the first blessing of justification.

The treatment this term has received at the hand of critics has served rather to enhance its value and to increase its usefulness. In their endeavor to de mote the term, critics have the more closely identified it with the grace and estate it was invented to describe.

John Wesley did not make extended use of the term "second blessing," and in his day no one seems to have made any special attack upon it. Wesley wisely preferred Scripture terms or terms that are a little better identified with Scripture expressions; and in this, as in many other things, we do well to imitate his example. This we say without intentionally yielding in the least the idea expressed by this term, and with no thought that it shall or should be discarded altogether.

Eradication

In our time the special prejudice has been directed against the term eradication, and against the idea expressed by this term. Some urge that we discontinue the use of this term on the ground that it is not found in the Scriptures. But many who raise this objection seem to have no scruples against such words as "suppression," "repression," and "counteraction" -- words which are neither scripture nor scriptural. But although the word eradication is not found in our English Bible, the idea contained in the word is there in bold type. Note such passages as those which exhort that your old man may be crucified, "that the body of sin might be destroyed," that "the old man" may be "put off," that we might be made "free from sin," and that the Christian may "purge himself from these," and others.

Dr. Asbury Lowrey, in his chapter on "The Greek Text," in Possibilities of Grace, says: "A critical knowledge of any doctrine, duty or privilege of the New Testament requires an examination of the language in which it was first promulgated." [15] Such a study, followed without prejudice, will serve but to substantiate the following observations:

1. Although there are words in the Greek language that mean suppression, not one of them is ever used in connection with the disposition to be made of inbred sin. Invariably the word used (and there are a number of them) signifies "to loosen," "to unbind," "to disengage," "to set free," "to deliver," "to break up," "to destroy," or to "demolish." If it were the plan of God that sin should be suppressed or counteracted, is it not reason that the use of the Greek would indicate this purpose? If it were not God's plan to eradicate sin from the hearts of believers, is it not beyond explanation that a Greek word carrying this meaning was invariably used in indicating what the disposition was to be?

2. The tense of the Greek verbs used in all passages like Rom. 6:6 where the death-stroke to sin is described is always aorist, which indicates an act as being completed at a definite time and continuing as complete until the present time. And when the energy of the Holy Spirit in the work of entire sanctification is described, the verb is never in the imperfect tense, the tense which the Greek uses to describe a gradual process.

On this basis we conclude that the word eradication is permissible, and the idea it involves is essential. Those who use terms which imply that inbred sin is to be suppressed or counteracted are using words which are not permissible, and holding views that are altogether erroneous. Dr. A. M. Hills quotes from an unnamed writer as follows: "Repressive power is nowhere ascribed to the blood of Christ, but rather purgative efficiency." [16]

Then Dr. Hills goes on to say:

The truth is, we have the most critical and scholarly commentaries and Greek exegetes, the lexicons and grammars, on our side in this matter. If the Greek New Testament can teach anything by nouns, adjectives, and verbs, and even adverbs and prepositions, about a spiritual experience, our doctrine of sanctification, as a heart-cleansing work, is taught by the Word of God. [17]

There has been, on the part of some, an effort to identify the word and idea of self with the flesh or carnal mind. But such a tendency is evidence of unsound philosophy and a careless use of terms. Sound holiness teachers have never used the word self in this sense. Self means "one's own individual identity," "one's own person," "personality," "individuality," "personal identity," and any claim that this is to be eradicated is of course pure nonsense. John says: "Every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." This indicates that it is an abnormal condition from which self needs to be purified, and then that self shall be pure as Jesus is pure.

Perfection

Opposers of the doctrine of Bible holiness have invented such words and phrases as "perfectionist," "perfectionism," "absolute perfection," and "sinless perfection," terms that have never been employed by sane promoters of the doctrine. Concerning the use of these terms, Rev. E.

W. Moore well says they are "the devil's scarecrow to frighten God's people from the finest wheat. People are much more afraid of the doctrine of sinless perfection than they are of the practice of sinful imperfection."

The phrase "Christian perfection" or, as some prefer, "evangelical perfection" is not "sinless perfection" in the sense that those possessing it "cannot sin." But the phrase in either form is just the equivalent of "perfect love," seeing it is only in the sense of purified affection and holy intentions that any implication of perfection is claimed or taught by accredited holiness teachers.

Baptism with the Spirit

The phrase "baptism with the Holy Ghost" is descriptive of the efficient means by which the believer's heart is made clean from sin. John the Baptist emphasized the deeper purging of the heart when he contrasted his baptism with water with Christ's baptism with the fiery Spirit. Water baptism is a symbol of the regenerating work of the Spirit, but fire is the symbol of that purifying that comes when the Spirit is received in sanctifying fullness. The baptism with the Holy Ghost is also a baptism for power; but they who say it is for power only must ignore the plain teachings of the Scriptures, and must nullify the import of the symbols.

The term "baptism with the Holy Ghost" or "baptism with the Spirit" makes clear historic reference to the Day of Pentecost when the Spirit came suddenly upon the waiting disciples, and cleansed their hearts from sin, as Peter afterwards affirmed (Acts 15: 7-8), giving them power and unction that they might be witnesses of Christ to the uttermost part of the earth. From this historic connection we learn that the Spirit's coming is in keeping with all the promises of God for instantaneous cleansing. And although, like other terms, this phrase has its own particular emphasis, it is always implied, even when it is not specifically mentioned in connection with entire sanctification. All who are baptized with the Holy Ghost are by that means sanctified wholly, and all who are sanctified wholly in truth have arrived at that state by reason of the fact that the Holy Ghost has come upon them in sanctifying fullness subsequent to the new birth.

Thomas Cook, in *New Testament Holiness*, says:

We must recognize the fact that to possess the Holy Spirit is one thing, but to be filled with the Spirit is quite another. Before Pentecost the Holy Ghost was given to the disciples. Christ had breathed upon them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." But Pentecost made an unspeakable difference to them. The visible tongues of fire were only emblems of what had passed within. What new creatures they then became! How their gross conception of Christ's kingdom was purged away, and how they were raised from earthliness to spirituality! Their intellects were flooded with divine light, their souls throbbled with divine sympathy, and their tongues spoke so wonderfully of the things of God, so that all who had known them previously were amazed, saying, "What meaneth this?" They were all raised to a new altitude; a new energy and force possessed them. Each one became strong as an iron pillar, "the weakest as David, and the strong as the angel of the Lord." They met together as the sincere but timid and partially enlightened followers of Christ, but they left the upper room full of light, and power, and love. They are now filled with the Holy Ghost as an all-illuminating, all-strengthening, all-sanctifying presence. The baptism of fire had consumed

their inward depravity, subsidized all their faculties, and filled to the full each capacity with divine energy and life.

"Baptized with" and "filled with the Holy Ghost" are often convertible terms in the Acts of the Apostles, but it is instructive to note that they are not always so. The apostles received but one baptism, but they were "filled" with the Spirit over and over again. The baptism of the Holy Ghost was, and still is, a sort of initiatory rite to the life of Pentecostal service, and fullness and victory. Christian life begins at Calvary, but effective service begins at Pentecost. Before Pentecost there was not much service rendered by the apostles that was worth the name. But with the Spirit's baptism they entered upon a new phase of service. The analogy of the sacrament of baptism connects the baptism of the Spirit with a new era in Christian life. Pentecost, and the visit of Cornelius, when the baptism of the Spirit is spoken of, were not only historical events, but great representative occasions, which may be held to typify and signify the beginning of the Spirit-filled life. [18]

Thus far in this section we have applied ourselves to only that terminology which has to do with the divine phases of the grace and blessing of Bible holiness. We may not give lengthy consideration to the prerequisite (a well-authenticated justified state) or to the conditions (consecration and faith). Thomas Cook says:

Some writers of advanced Christian experience magnify the will and emphasize the importance of absolute submission, while others urge faith as the condition of the blessing. Both are right. Perfect trust cannot exist without complete surrender. Nor can we surrender our will to One whom we cannot trust. Lady Maxwell could pray, "Put a thorn in every enjoyment, a worm in every gourd, that would prevent, or in any measure retard my progress in Divine life." And when we can say, from our inmost heart, "I am willing to receive what Thou givest, and to want what Thou withholdest, and to relinquish what Thou takest, and to suffer what Thou inflictest, and to be what Thou requirest, and to do what Thou commandest. Have thine own way with me and mine in all particulars," we are not far from the Canaan of God's perfect love.

This full surrender is consecration. It means an entire willingness on our part to be, to do, and to suffer all that God wills. We use the word "consecration," not because it is the best word, but because it is the word in most common use and the word most likely to be understood. What repentance is to justification, consecration is to entire sanctification. Just as repentance towards God must precede faith in the Lord Jesus Christ in the case of those who seek Divine forgiveness, so unconditional surrender is the indispensable condition of trusting Christ as a Saviour from indwelling sin. Some think they must struggle and make great effort, but faith does not come as the result of effort. It rises up spontaneously in the soul when hindrances are removed. Unbelief has always a moral cause -- unwillingness to do the will of God in some point. The difficulty is not with our faculties, nor with evidences, but with our moral state, our disposition to follow unhesitatingly where the truth leads. Faith becomes as natural as breathing when we dethrone our idols. [19]

The list of terms suggested in this section is not long. It may be that some will find still other terms useful and, in certain instances, preferable. But our own judgment is that the advantage of a lengthy vocabulary is largely offset by the justifiable tendency of hearers to suppose that every

distinction is based upon a worthwhile difference. I believe that the end can be better reached by investing the familiar terms with a rich and definite meaning, and then by using the additional terminology principally in illustration and enforcement.

ENDNOTES

1 R. S. Foster, *Christian Purity* (New York: Nelson & Phillips, 1869), pp. 32f.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 27 f.

3 John Wesley, Sermon on "The More Excellent Way."

4 Thomas Cook, *New Testament Holiness* (London Eng.: The Epworth Press, 1935), p.10.

5 *Ibid.*

6 A. M. Hills, *Scriptural Holiness* (Manchester, Eng.: Star Hall, n.d.), pp. 26-28.

7 *Ibid.*

8 *Ibid.*, p.29.

9 J. A. Wood, *Perfect Love* (Chicago: Christian Witness Co., 1902), pp. 9f.

10 *Ibid.*

11 *Ibid.*

12 *Ibid.*, pp. 265f.

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 268 f.

14 *Ibid.*

15 Asbury Lowrey, *Possibilities of Grace*, p.35.

16 Hill's, *Scriptural Holiness*, pp. 75 f

17 *Ibid.*

18 Cook, pp. 75 f.

19 *Ibid.*

* * * * *

5

The Terminology of the Christian Estate

In the promotion of Bible holiness it has been necessary to lay stress on the crises of regeneration and entire sanctification, for these crises are the essentials of the beginnings of spiritual life and of holiness in the heart. There are just the two crises, no more, no less, essential in the attainment of the blessed estate which is designated the "inheritance among them that are sanctified," and which is the goal of grace for the people of God in this world. Regeneration and justification give us the right to fellowship with God here and in heaven above; sanctification gives us preparation for these blessed privileges.

It must not be supposed, however, that the crises of regeneration and sanctification, having been passed as crises, are to remain only in the form of fond recollections. The grace of God bestowed in the crises makes permanent changes and introduces us into a new and blessed estate, an estate that is to be continuous both in confidence and in consciousness.

In his chapter on "Christian Purity," in his book *Purity and Maturity*, Dr. J. A. Wood says:

Purity is a state or quality of being. It is the inversion of our sinful moral nature -- freedom "from all filthiness of flesh and spirit." It does not consist so much in a repetition of good acts, as, in a moral condition of the soul from which all good actions proceed; as depravity, or inbred sin, does not consist so much in vicious acts or habits, as in a state or quality which occasions those acts or habits. [1]

In another paragraph of the same chapter, Dr. Wood says:

Holiness like truth, is a simple, uncompounded element or quality, and continues unchangeably the same at all times, and under all circumstances. It can never be made any thing else in its essential nature; being the absence of all moral iniquity, in whomsoever and in whatever it is predicated of, in God, angels, or men.

It is a pure nature, giving character and sweetness to our affections and activities-purity in the heart flowing through the life. It is not holy actions primarily, which make a man holy, but a holy heart which makes the actions holy; as, a pure heart must be the source or foundation of all pure passions, appetites, and activities. "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things; and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things."

The treasure in a "good man" is holiness or the "divine nature." "The end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart." Holiness is expressive, not of an advancing process of growth, but of moral quality; and has respect mainly to the kind or quality, rather than to degree. The terms perfection and holiness, significant of completeness or entirety, are proper to this state; but are not, strictly speaking, when used in respect to growth and development, which are always incomplete and indefinite. [2]

Dr. Asbury Lowrey, in *Positive Theology*, says:

Entire holiness is the extermination of all sin from the soul. It is a pure, unsullied heart; it is "death to sin," a "freedom from sin," a "cleansing from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." The fountain of thought, affection, desire, and impulse, is pure. [3]

Holiness

These quotations are given as tokens of the many which are available, to show that the term holiness is used to describe the estate of those who are entirely sanctified. One has said that "holiness is sanctification perpetuated." It is the word by which the estate of those from whose hearts inbred sin has been destroyed and eradicated by the sanctifying agency of the Holy Spirit is described. The word holiness is a synonym for wholeness-for soul health-and is perhaps the clearest of all expressions used in this connection. It is perhaps for this reason that the term holiness has commonly drawn the hottest fire from opposers of the grace for which it stands. Some have opposed because of a misunderstanding of the term. But many have opposed because they do understand it, and their opposition is not to the word only, but to the testimony for which it stands.

While, strictly speaking, the term holiness emphasizes the negative phase -- freedom from sin -- the term perfection being rather a necessary complement, it is in ordinary use a description of all that is implied by the grace and blessings its possession involves. The fact is that no one can be just negatively holy. If holy at all, one is made so initially by the agency and in coming of the Holy Spirit, and is kept so by the administrative work of the Spirit, who continually sheds abroad the love of God in the heart. He who is emptied of sin is also filled with love and with the Holy Spirit.

The testimony to holiness should always be given in such form as to give full credit to Christ, and not to bolster our human side of the matter. It is exceedingly unwise for anyone to use the form, "I am holy." Rather, the form should be, "The Lord graciously sanctifies my heart." And whatever the term used, the same order should be observed in giving God the glory. It is a rather curious inconsistency that many who draw back from the testimony, even when given by others, to the effect that God has sanctified and cleansed from all sin do not scruple to say they are fully consecrated to the will of God. And yet, come to think of it, the latter claim is the extolling of a human act or virtue, while the former is making one's boast in the Lord. But the same bent has been observed also regarding all profession the world and worldly people honor claims of human endeavor to be good, but look askance upon one who claims to have been inwardly transformed by regenerating grace. If therefore the definite testimony to initial salvation is cause for stumbling on the part of those who have not been born again, we should not be surprised that the profession of full salvation should appear to be incredulous to those who have not themselves entered therein. And yet, in both cases, it is the obligation of the redeemed of the Lord to say so; for while some may be offended by definite testimony, some will be benefited. But indefinite testimony neither offends nor benefits.

The desire to be spared classification with "holiness people" is historic. There have been and are now many who enjoy the estate of holiness who are not identified by the term holiness. But our concern is for a terminology that will be useful to those who desire to be identified, and who

strive to let their joy be known. And for such a purpose we commend the term holiness ("sanctification perpetuated") as perhaps the most suited of all. Any who will turn to the blessed Book will find that, far from avoiding the word, the men of the Bible and the blessed Lord himself loved to use the term holiness in describing both obligation and privilege in the truth and grace of God.

Perfect Love

After holiness, perfect love is perhaps the most useful of the terms by which to describe the estate of the entirely sanctified. This was a favorite term with John Wesley. His opposers compelled Wesley to come to the defense of the term perfection, but there is evidence that this was not his choice.

The term perfect love is scriptural, and while involving a high profession, is also becoming in modesty. It indicates much grace, but makes no claim to either superior light or outstanding advancement in growth and maturity. It is a definite and limited term—qualities highly desirable for the purpose at hand. It is definite because it indicates the absence of anything contrary to love, and limited because it describes affections and intentions only, and does not include judgment or conduct. It is just the equivalent of the "great commandment," which underlies all commandments, and which Jesus defines as loving God with all our hearts, and our neighbors as ourselves. Paul also gave the summary in epitome when he said, "Love is the fulfilling of the law," and, "The end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart

An analysis of perfect love is found in I Corinthians 13, where also the relative importance of the grace is presented in comparison and in contrast. This chapter is a summary of the qualities and factors which make up the New Testament grace, just as the Sermon on the Mount is a statement of what the New Testament Christian should be both outwardly and inwardly. These two sections (the Sermon on the Mount and I Corinthians 13) must be taken together, if the picture of the New Testament estate is to be full and complete. While the one is the statement of requirement, the other is the summary of enablement. In the old Discipline of the Methodist Church was the statement: "No man can keep the commandments of God, except the grace of God prevent him." The word "prevent" was used here in the obsolete sense, meaning "to go before." That is, no man can keep the commandments of God except the grace of God go before and prepare him to do so. Either intentionally or inadvertently, those who deny the possibility of perfect love as an experience also deny the possibility of keeping God's commandments in such a manner as to be well-pleasing in His sight. And it must be admitted that it is consistent for one who denies the one of these to deny the other also. But when these two tenets of our holy faith are forsaken, Christ and the Christian system largely become the logical defenders and countenancers of sin rather than Saviour and salvation from sin.

Wesley was always careful to make it plain that it is the grace of God alone, communicated to us by His Spirit, that enables us to love God with all our hearts, and our neighbors as ourselves. He made the ability so to love, the test (subjective as it must always be) of the possession of the grace. Thus the possessor himself is the only human being who can properly judge his estate. Others are dependent upon demonstration, which must contend with so many human and

circumstantial factors that one is likely to stand, in the estimation of others, either better or worse than his real estate in the grace of God warrants.

However, it is consistent for one who has the realization in his heart to profess openly that the grace of God enables him to love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself. This is just as consistent as for one to profess initial grace upon the basis of the internal witness of the Spirit to his sonship and adoption. Such testimony is an indispensable factor and an effective force in the propagation of the doctrine and the promotion of the experience of holiness among the people of God. For unless there are those who consciously possess the grace, it profits little to preach the doctrine and exalt the ethics.

Christian Perfection

Christian perfection is a term synonymous with perfect love, and is so defined by authentic holiness teachers. Critics have called attention to the fact that the word Christian in this connection is a limitation, rather than an addition, and this we frankly admit. The word perfection standing alone is not unequivocal. It does sometimes mean Christian perfection, but it also sometimes includes the idea of growth and maturity, and sometimes reaches forth to resurrection perfection. The term therefore must be limited to be useful as a means of describing the estate of the entirely sanctified.

A flower, for example, may be said to be perfect at any state or stage of its life, if it is at that particular stage free from disease and as well-developed as its age and circumstances of existence require. But there is another sense in which the plant is not perfect until the blossom is in full bloom. And that these two ideas are expressed by the term perfection in the Word of God and in Christian literature, no clear thinking Christian will deny. In the Scriptures the context is always the explanation, so that it is seldom necessary to be in doubt which kind of perfection is intended. But in the terminology describing the estate of the entirely sanctified, it is necessary to use the word Christian as a limiting word -- hence Christian perfection.

In the Christian sense persons are perfect when their affections and purposes are both pure. We are familiar with this idea in practical things. If a parent, in the endeavor to save the life of his sick child, should accidentally give his child deadly poison, no intelligent and fair-minded person would call him a murderer. On the other hand, if a vicious and wicked parent should give his sick child good medicine, when his intention was to give poison, that parent is a murderer, even though the courts of men are unable to place blame upon him by the force of testimony. In that deeper sense, one who loves God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself is a perfect Christian in that his motives and affections are holy, even though his conduct may not meet all the requirements of the highest ethical standards of his contemporaries. Such is the frailty of the "earthen vessels" of which Paul speaks.

But with these qualifying ideas in mind, the term Christian perfection serves our purpose of definition well. The perfect Christian is simply a sanctified Christian, and the sanctified Christian is one who loves God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself, being enabled to do this by the agency and indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who sheds this love abroad in the heart.

Holiness, perfect love, and Christian perfection are, therefore, the three terms in the first rank for describing the estate of those who have been regenerated and sanctified wholly. They can be used without equivocation or detailed explanation. And the order of the force of these words is, I think, just the order in which we have given them in this paragraph. There is no call for any diminishment in the use of these terms, and to forsake them in any degree is to lessen the force by which the facts which they imply are brought to bear upon the minds and consciences of men.

Other Terms

We come now to another class of terms, which, although useful to the purposes of variety and the pointing out of special characteristics, are yet not as fundamental and unequivocal as those already discussed. The list includes: "the Spirit-filled life," "the more abundant life," "the rest of faith," "full assurance of faith," "perfect peace," "fullness of joy," and "abiding grace."

The sanctified life is indeed a Spirit-filled life, and this term is applicable and useful in emphasizing the power and unction which are essential factors in the experience and life of holiness. Dr. A. M. Hills chose a fortunate title when he called one of his books *Holiness and Power*. Literalists have erred in positing a state of holiness which is like the house that was "empty, swept, and garnished." In truth, there is no such state that can in any wise be called a state of holiness. We are made holy by the baptism with the Holy Ghost -- the incoming of the Spirit in Pentecostal fullness and we are kept in a state of purity and holiness only by the Spirit's indwelling fullness. Analogies must be used with discretion, but, as we think of it, the Holy Spirit is the Guardian of our purity. If by any means He withdraws himself from us, sin breaks in, like water through the dike, and thus to be without the Spirit is also to be without holiness.

It is an error to consider the term "Spirit-filled life" as anything other than a synonym of the sanctified life. To be filled with the Spirit is to be emptied of sin, and the means of our being emptied of sin is itself the infilling of the Spirit. So, then, whoever is sanctified wholly is filled with the Spirit, and whoever is filled with the Spirit is sanctified wholly. However, as pointed out in another instance, there is sometimes a distinction between being baptized with the Holy Spirit as the initial filling of the Spirit is properly called and being "filled with the Spirit" in the frequent outpourings which are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles and known in the faithfully followed sanctified life. We protest any suggestion that the Holy Spirit can indwell a heart in His fullness without at the same time sanctifying that heart. Such an idea is a compromise that is indefensible.

Some have thought to escape the reproach of holiness profession by saying, "I do not claim simply to have the blessing; I also have the Blessor." Such a saying has no apostolic precedent, and savors of sacrilege. It should be avoided. But Paul did say, "I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ" (Rom. 15:29), and that does constitute a precedent for use of the term "the blessing" as a synonym for the grace of holiness.

"The more abundant life," as a term, is derived directly from the words of Jesus, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10:10) And while this presentation of the gift of life in two phases or degrees does quite clearly prefigure the first and second works of grace, it is not an exact equivalent of the sanctified estate. The sanctified life is the more abundant life as compared with the justified estate, but the word "abundant" is so

great in scope and indefinite in limits as to make it possible for it to involve both time and eternity for its realization.

"The rest of faith" was a favorite term with A. B. Earle, a sound holiness preacher of the Baptist communion. He was able, during a long and faithful ministry, to lead many into the reality of the grace which he used this term to describe. "The rest of faith" which he emphasized was and is reached only when the Holy Spirit comes in response to faith and gives witness to the cleansing and infilling of the soul with love. Until this stage was reached, Earle and his coadjutors urged seeking Christians to "pray on," and "seek on," until the divine assurance should be given. The estate reached by obedience to this truly scriptural instruction was the grace and experience of holiness, and was so understood by those who applied to it the very wonderful term "the rest of faith." But the term better describes a special characteristic of the state and grace than it serves as a name for the grace itself.

It has been the practice all along to allow for certain provincialisms in the terminology of Bible holiness, as the preferences of people have suggested. Therefore people have used the term that best fitted their denominational experiences, home training, and other factors that served to give content to their words. We would not criticize, but rather commend this liberality; for in the process of giving content to special terminology the truth is preached, and the reality behind all terminology is made clear.

"Full assurance of faith," or "blessed assurance," as Fanny Crosby, the blind, singing saint, called it, is not much distinguished from "the rest of faith," as used by A. B. Earle. In fact, these are but varieties of the same term, and were current in much the same circles in the time of their greatest usefulness. There can be no doubt that Fanny Crosby had in mind the definite estate of the truly sanctified when she sang, "Blessed assurance, born of His Spirit, washed in His blood," but others have followed her words and sentiment without fully discerning the definite meaning that was so clear to her.

"Perfect peace," "fullness of joy," and "abiding grace" are likewise terms that are useful to many, but they likewise describe certain characteristics of the grace of holiness rather than answer as definitions of the whole. For those who speak discriminatingly and with this understanding, these terms are proper and useful.

There are yet other terms by which this estate is designated, and for all these we rejoice. Like the glory of Solomon, so with this blessed grace, the half cannot be told. There are many who are helped by the various terms that make up the full salvation vocabulary, because the words bear special meaning in their own experiences.

Figurative Terminology

And now, in the third place, we come to a consideration of the figurative terminology of Bible holiness. All language is at best but a system of signs and symbols, and its effectiveness depends upon its usefulness in impressing pictures of reality upon the minds and hearts of those who read or hear. Figures are for illustration, not for proof, and for this reason the terminology of this division is not pressed unduly. But after the truth of God's Word is established by plain

statement, the figures will be found to agree with and to illustrate the truth. It is never safe to found an important doctrine or to establish an important practice upon a type or figure, even though the figure be in the Word of God. For such doctrines and practices we have a right to expect the Bible to be plain and explicit. But having taken all the Bible says in this direct and explicit form, the types and shadows of the Bible and of Christian life and literature will be found useful for illustration and emphasis.

"Canaan" is the best known figurative term used for describing the estate of the wholly sanctified. Canaan was the inheritance of God's ancient Hebrew people, and the transference of the idea to the Christian dispensation is natural and easy. There is close analogy between the ancient Hebrews and the Christians of today. Martin Wells Knapp wrote a book which he called *Out of Egypt into Canaan*, in which he traced these similarities. Egypt was found to be a type of sin and its bondage; Pharaoh was a type of Satan; making brick without straw stood for continuing in sin after the pleasure of sin has turned into bitterness; crossing the Red Sea was likened to spiritual regeneration; life in the wilderness, up to Kadesh Barnea, pictured the justified life in which there are "twelve wells of water" (a well for each month of the year), "threescore and ten palm trees" (a tree for each year of life on earth), "daily manna," and many other graces and blessings in the favor of God. Then the crossing of the river Jordan was found to be strikingly typical of dying out to sin and the world, and Canaan was a prefigure of the Christian's inheritance in perfect love. This general figurative picture has been pretty well adopted by teachers of Bible holiness, and there is uniformity of practice in allowing Canaan to stand for the "inheritance among them which are sanctified."

The word Jordan means death, and with many it stands for physical death. Canaan, of course, stands for heaven. But there are many difficulties to overcome in such a putting, since Canaan was yet a land of conflict and battles, even though it was designed to be a land of victory. "The city foursquare" which is the eternal home of the glorified does not partake of any of these limitations.

Christian literature, and especially Christian hymnology, abounds in references to Canaan as a spiritual experience to be possessed and enjoyed in this world. On the whole, the historic evidence favors this interpretation of the figure. Christians generally sing of Canaan as they extol the joy and peace of full assurance and fellowship with God—such an estate being clearly the blessed lot of the fully sanctified.

"Beulah Land" is a figurative term for the sanctified estate. This word appears in the Scriptures (Isa. 62:4), where in the marginal reading the idea is given as "married," and is in contrast with the situation of desolation. But it is Bunyan who made Beulah Land so well-known. He located Beulah as out and beyond Doubting Castle and the Slough of Despond, but yet this side of the River of Death. He said the sun shines all the time, the flowers bloom perpetually, and the situation is always pleasant in Beulah. Many, he said looked with longing eyes across the river from Beulah to the Celestial City, and some thought they could see the tower of that blessed place on certain clear days. When the time came for crossing over from Beulah to the Celestial City, Bunyan said many entered the waters with singing, and gave back to friends on the Beulah bank wonderful testimonies of the glory their eyes glimpsed as they themselves were passing on from sight. Beulah Land has therefore become a striking and beautiful type of the highest and best in the

Christian experience and life. Being definite in its location and boundaries, it has no actual antitype except in the experience and life of the wholly sanctified. Every Beulah song that one ever hears is a misnomer except it be interpreted as a description of the estate of holiness. An examination of the work of the poets will substantiate this claim.

"Soul rest," a term dependent upon the analogy drawn in the Book of Hebrews between the Sabbath of God's ancient people and the assurance of the fully sanctified, is a very valid and precious picture of certain phases of the blessed estate enjoyed by the pure in heart. Those who would weaken this symbolic use by suggesting that the Sabbath is really a prefigure of rest in heaven must explain the wording "labour . . . to enter into that rest" (Heb. 4: 11). Especially is the idea embarrassing when it must be acknowledged that the word "labour" harks back to the experience of the children of Israel under Joshua, when the word is "hasten." If therefore the rest that "remaineth to the people of God" is heaven, and God's people are to hasten to enter into it, it would seem difficult for one to apply that exhortation to those whose life tenure has not yet been fulfilled. No, the true sabbath is the sabbath of holiness, where the soul is freed from sin and turmoil and strife.

"The heavenlies" or "heavenly places," an expression Paul uses in Eph. 1:3 and in 6: 12 (where it is translated "high places"), is undoubtedly a figure representing the sanctified estate. It is not of heaven that the apostle here speaks, but of a spiritual estate that is like unto heaven. We have the idea in the song, "Where Jesus is, 'tis heaven there." And the testimony points unfailingly to the life of one who has been delivered from actual and inbred sin and is in the enjoyment of the grace and blessing of full salvation.

"The mountain-top experience" is the experience of Bible holiness. The figure pictures one who has by grace arisen from the plains of the justified life to the holy mount of entire sanctification. This putting is familiar, especially in the sacred songs which have sprung up, in which the poets have tried to help us describe the glories of the sanctified estate.

There are many other figurative expressions both in the Bible and in the literature and hymnology of the Church that sanctified Christians delight to use in their endeavor to share the good news of full salvation. Just as every good person in the Bible is a type of Jesus, the supreme embodiment of all goodness, so every word and every figure which presents a wholesome and satisfying picture of the Christian estate helps to describe holiness of heart and life.

Holiness, perfect love, and Christian perfection are the three unequivocal terms for describing the estate of the sanctified. These words have been given full content by the careful and conscientious labors of "holy men of old" whom the Spirit of God inspired to give us our holy Bible. They have been made familiar by a long list of worthies adown the Christian centuries, and now can be used in confidence and clarity by us today. We are thankful for the labors of those who have gone before us, for they have left us a rich and ready vocabulary which is well understood by Christians generally. In this, as in other matters, we "stand upon the shoulders of the fathers," and by such means become "the true ancients," and co-laborers with all who have made it their calling to "spread scriptural holiness over the land."

We claim as a heritage that long list of terms which describe in part, or represent in measure, the grace and estate of those who are sanctified, and we pledge ourselves to use these ready instruments in the blessed task of "telling to the world around what a glorious Saviour we have found." Even those terms of the second rank when used understandingly, are capable of both clarifying the theme and enforcing its urgency.

Who is there that does not like pictures? Who is not intrigued by the possibility of obtaining an inheritance in a spiritual Canaan, a land more fruitful by many fold than that which was given to the tribes of Israel "beyond Jordan"? Who does not thrill to the invitation to "come over into Beulah Land"? "Illustrations are windows to let in the light" And while we would not make our walls all of windows, we are thankful for the light that shines through the windows of the history of God's ancient people, and through the examples and testimonies of all the saints of the ages past. Being sure that ours is a spiritual inheritance, we find consolation in the assurance that no age of the past offered better things to its children than are the possessions of those today who will "follow on to know the Lord." We do not envy Abraham his dreams, nor Joshua his visions. We know in truth the spiritual meaning of the fire-touched lips of Isaiah. Even the holy apostles who walked with the Master in the days of His flesh were taught to look forward to the fullness of the Spirit's baptism which is the normal heritage of all God's people in this blessed dispensation. To be saved from the guilt and pollution of sin and to be filled with the love of God, to have His love made perfect in our hearts-there is nothing better than this until we shall see His face in heaven.

Oh, the joy of sins forgiven!
Oh, the bliss the Blood-washed know!
Oh, the peace akin to heaven,
Where the healing waters flow!

Even though words cannot express content fully, we are thankful for their help. And when words have done their full part, we are happy still to be able to say of the grace and blessing of Bible holiness, "It is better felt than told."

ENDNOTES

1 J. A. Wood, Purity and Maturity (North Attleboro, Mass.: Published by the author, 1882), pp.23 f.

2 Ibid., pp.24 f.

3 Asbury Lowrey, Positive Theology (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1853), p. 241.

* * * * *

Appendix

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

INTRODUCTION

Webster says of a definition that it is "a description of a thing by its properties," and "it is designed to settle a thing in its compass and extent." According to this no essentially new definition is called for unless some new property has been discovered. On this premise, Dr. Steele observes that in the natural sciences new definitions are constantly needed, as new discoveries are brought to light. But in philosophy and theology, new discoveries are rare, and new definitions are rare also. Therefore there is no call for a new vocabulary or terminology of Bible holiness, for the content of the subject is just the same now as when the fathers attempted to describe it.

Noah Webster grew up under Calvinistic influences, but there is no evidence that theological bias affected his work as a lexicographer. Theological lexicographers may be of the type who make definitions to suit their doctrines, or they may inadvertently give the meanings which they themselves hold rather than the definitions that are in common use. For this reason, the secular lexicographer is the safer of the two. In this glossary we have endeavored to be faithful to the English Bible and the English language.

GENERAL TERMS FOR BIBLE HOLINESS

The four terms: holiness, sanctification, perfect love, and Christian perfection are synonymous, when used in their general sense, and are defined as follows:

SANCTIFY -- (1) To make sacred or holy; to set apart to a holy, religious use; to consecrate by appropriate rites; to hallow. (2) To make free from sin; to cleanse from moral corruption and pollution; to purify.

SANCTIFICATION -- The act of making holy; the state of being sanctified or made holy. Theological-the act of God's grace by which the affections of men are purified or alienated from sin and the world and exalted to a supreme love to God. Also the state of being thus purified or sanctified. -- Webster's Dictionary.

SANCTIFY -- To make holy or clean, either ceremonially or morally and spiritually; to purify or free from sin . . . In theology, the act of God's grace by which the affections of men are purified and the soul is cleansed from sin and consecrated to God . . . Conformity of the heart and life to the will of God. -- Century Dictionary.

SANCTIFY -- (1) To make holy or sacred; to separate, set apart or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use. (2) To purify in order to prepare for divine service, and for partaking of holy things. (3) To purify from sin, to make holy. -- Imperial Dictionary.

SANCTIFY -- To free from the power of sin; to cleanse from corruption; to make holy . . . Sanctification: (1) The act of sanctifying, or purifying from the dominion of sin. (2) The act of consecrating or setting apart to a sacred end or office; consecration.

SANCTIFY -- (1) To make holy or sacred; to consecrate . . . (2) To make holy or godly; to purify from sin. -- Worcester's Dictionary.

SANCTIFY -- To make holy; render sacred or morally or spiritually pure; cleansed from sin . . . Sanctification: Specifically in theology, the gracious work of the Holy Spirit whereby the believer is freed from sin and exalted to holiness of heart and life. -- Standard Dictionary.

SANCTIFY -- To make holy or sacred; to consecrate or set apart; to purify from sin . . . Sanctification: Technically, an operation of the Spirit of God (Romans 15:16; II Thessalonians 2:13; I Peter 1:2) on those who are already in Jesus, i.e., are united to Him by faith (I Corinthians 1:2), by which they are rendered increasingly holy, dying to sin and living to God, to righteousness and to holiness (Romans 6:6, 11, 13, 19; I Thessalonians 5:23; I Peter 2:24) -- American Encyclopedia.

SANCTIFICATION -- The act of divine grace whereby we are made holy. -- Methodist Catechism.

SANCTIFICATION -- In the proper sense, is an instantaneous deliverance from all sin, and includes an instantaneous power then given always to cleave to God. -- John Wesley.

SANCTIFICATION -- In its beginnings, process, and final issues is the full eradication of sin itself, which, reigning in the unregenerate, coexists with the new life in the regenerate, is abolished in the wholly sanctified. -- Pope's Theology.

HOLINESS -- (1) Perfect moral integrity or purity; freedom from sin; sanctity, innocence. (2) State of being hallowed or consecrated to God, or His worship. -- Webster's International Dictionary.

HOLY -- (1) Set apart to the service of God; applies to persons and things. (2) Morally pure, free from all stain of sin (persons). (3) In the New Testament the original Greek word is used technically to designate all justified believers and is translated "saints," or holy ones.

HOLINESS -- The state of (1) consecration to God; (2) Moral purity.

SANCTIFY -- (1) To hallow, to consecrate to religious uses. "I sanctify myself" (Jesus). (2) To make pure, to cleanse from moral defilement. "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly" (St. Paul). (3) Sanctified. In the New Testament used technically to designate the justified. SANCTIFICATION, HOLINESS -- the act of making holy. -- Dr. DANIEL STEELE in Love Enthroned.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION -- The term entire sanctification is twofold: first, it denotes a complete work of grace, beyond which or adding thereto there is left nothing to be done, so far as the act or state of moral cleansing is concerned. . . . Secondly, the term entire is used to distinguish this state of grace from partial or initial salvation, received at regeneration. -- D. Grant Christman in The Etymology of Holiness Terms.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION -- The term Christian perfection as used is synonymous with holiness and entire sanctification. -- D. Grant Christman.

PERFECT LOVE -- The term perfect love implies an initial stage of love implanted in the heart by the Holy Spirit at regeneration, but completed, purified, perfected at the moment of entire sanctification. -- D. Grant Christman.

PERFECT LOVE -- The term perfect love is expressive of the Spirit, and temper or moral atmosphere in which the wholly sanctified and perfect Christian lives. -- J. A. Wood.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION -- Entire sanctification is that act of the Holy Spirit whereby the justified soul is made holy. -- Binney's Compend.

COMPLETE SANCTIFICATION -- What, then, is this complete sanctification? It is the cleansing by the blood of that which has not been cleansed; it is washing the soul of a true believer from the remains of sin. -- Adam Clarke.

COMPLETE SANCTIFICATION -- Complete sanctification is the pure love of God and man shed abroad in the faithful believer's heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him, to cleanse him and to keep him clean from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit. -- John Fletcher.

WHOLLY SANCTIFIED -- To sanctify you wholly is to complete the work of purification and renovation begun in your regeneration. -- Joseph Benson.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION -- Entire sanctification is a second definite work of grace wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer subsequently to regeneration, received instantaneously by faith, by which the heart is cleansed from all inward corruption and filled with the perfect love of God. -- DR. A. M. Hills, in Scriptural Holiness.

PERFECT HOLINESS -- This finished work of salvation from sin we call entire sanctification, or perfect holiness. It is known by various titles and phrases in the Bible; such as "perfection," "sanctification," "perfect love," "pure in heart" "dead to sin," "crucified with Christ," "Christ liveth in me," "mind of Christ," "partakers of the divine nature," "free from sin," "filled with the Spirit," "loving God with all the soul, mind and strength," "cleansed from all sin and from all unrighteousness," "cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit," "perfecting holiness in the fear of God," "sanctify you wholly," "that the body of sin might be destroyed," "that he might destroy the works of the devil," "purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver," "from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." -- Dr. Asbury Lowrey, in Possibilities of Grace.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION -- This work of entire sanctification is a definite experience, a mighty work of grace, wrought by God in the life of the Christian in response to his faith. It is an experience that marks a definite second Crisis in the spiritual life, purifying the heart, filling the life with the Holy Spirit, bringing a spiritual wholeness to life and the heart into full devotedness to God. -- Dr. D. Shelby Corlett, in The Meaning of Holiness.

THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST -- The baptism with the Spirit and entire sanctification are synonymous terms. Both include, and have as their principle, moral cleansing, but the baptism of the Spirit places emphasis on the positive side of the experience, while moral cleansing denotes the negative side. -- D. Grant Christman.

FILLED WITH THE SPIRIT -- The great positive work of this experience is the baptism with or fullness of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit in this work of entire sanctification accepts and fills His temple, the body or life of the individual Christian, which is entirely dedicated to God. It is an abiding fullness, a vital fullness, which is maintained as the Christian lives in the Spirit. "There is a fullness of the Spirit," says Dr. Daniel Steele, "which must imply entire sanctification -- the permanent gracious presence in the soul of the Holy Spirit in His fullness, not as an extraordinary gift, but as a person having the right of way through soul and body, having the keys to even the inmost rooms, illuminating every closet and every crevice of the nature, filling the entire being with holy love." -- Dr. D. Shelby Corlett.

TERMS ASSOCIATED WITH BIBLE HOLINESS

SIN -- Sin exists in the soul after two modes or forms: (1) In guilt, which requires forgiveness or pardon; (2) In pollution, which requires cleansing. -- Adam Clarke.

SIN -- By sin, I understand inward sin; any sinful temper, passion, or affection; such as pride, self-will, love of the world, in any kind or degree. -- John Wesley, in "Sin in Believers."

DEPRAVITY -- Depravity denotes the sinful perversion of nature which has come down to every member of the human race from the sin of Adam. Other terms having the same meaning are: pollution, defilement, corruption, and degeneracy.

ORIGINAL SIN -- The term original sin, like "old Adam," and "Adamic nature," is used to describe the source from which the defilement of nature proceeds, and to point out that it is the same in nature now as that which was inoculated into the hearts of our first parents.

INBRED SIN, INHERENT SIN, INNATE SIN -- Speaking of these terms, Harmon A. Baldwin, in *The Carnal Mind*, says: "The first term refers to the fact that sin is inherited; in the last the possibility might remain that the sin originated with the person who possesses it; while in the second there may be a strong intimation that sin can never be removed. Thus, when Adam fell his heart was filled with innate sin, but we, his children, possess inbred sin."

THE OLD MAN -- In addition to its reference sometimes to the old mode of life, the term "old man" refers sometimes to the depravity of the human heart. The Scriptures say: "The old man is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." The sinful nature is called "the old man" because of its age, being coeval with our personal existence, and dating back to the fall of man.

CARNAL MIND, CARNAL NATURE, CARNALITY -- "Carnal has reference to the fleshly tendency of sin," says Baldwin. Wesley used the term "carnal mind" to represent the depravity that remains in the heart of the justified. To be dominated by the carnal mind is to be "carnally minded," and thus to be without grace. But the remains of carnality may still cleave to

imperfect Christians, even to such an extent that, as Paul said of the Corinthians: "I could not speak to you as unto spiritual."

ERADICATION -- "Eradication denotes that the sin-principle, left in the regenerate but dealt with in the act of entire sanctification, is removed, and not weighted down or suppressed." -- D. Grant Christman. The word eradicate is not found in our English Bible, but the meaning it bears is expressed by all those scriptural passages which represent sin as being "put off," "crucified," "destroyed," "purged," "cleansed," etc. Dr. A. M. Hills says: "Now, there are twelve verbs (in the original) in the Old and New Testaments which teach God's method of dealing with this internal, indwelling sin. They all unite in declaring that He will 'crucify' it, 'kill' it, 'destroy' it, 'eliminate' it, 'burn' it, 'take it away' from the soul. And what is more, no other kinds of verbs are used when describing God's method of dealing with this foe of his dwelling in our hearts."

INFIRMITIES -- "Infirmities denote the impaired natural powers, resultant from the fall and actual sinful conduct, but which are wholly freed from sin at entire sanctification, and although still impaired, in their purified state are consistent with a fully sanctified life." -- D. Grant Christman.

CONSECRATION -- Consecration is the act of a regenerated person, not that of a sinner. It denotes dedication to God as the free act of the Christian concerned. It is the willing, determined setting of one's self apart to God and His service, and in its full sense, implies that this is done without reservation or limitation. Consecration is sanctification as a human act. That is, to sanctify one's self is to consecrate himself to God, and thus to bring himself into the place where God can sanctify him by purifying him by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Divine sanctification, which is purification, rests upon human sanctification, which is consecration, as its prerequisite. To say that sanctification means consecration and nothing more is parallel with saying that justification and regeneration are just repentance and faith and nothing more. But neither of such statements, both of which rule out the supernatural phase, is true. God does respond to the faith of the repentant sinner and pardon his sins and make him alive in Christ. Likewise, He responds to the consecration and faith of the truly regenerated believer and purifies his heart and fills it with perfect love.

* * * * *

THE END