

ARTICLE III.

BOARDMAN'S HIGHER CHRISTIAN LIFE.¹

BY REV. JACOB J. ABBOTT, UXBRIDGE, MASS.

WE have, here, a work on Christian experience. Though not yet two years old, it has attained a popularity and influence of no ordinary extent. Of its author we know little, except what we have learned from the book before us.

The SUBJECT treated, if it be Christian experience in general, or the higher stages of it, that growth in grace by which the riper fruits of piety are reached, is one both of unspeakable interest and importance. The Christian world will never be tired of reading of this description. To no human benefactors will they make more grateful acknowledgments than to the Baxters, the Doddridges, the Flavels, the Bunyans, the Edwardses, and the Alexanders. Is the author of "The Higher Christian Life" worthy of a place in the church among those greater lights and benefactors? In other words: is "The Higher Christian Life" worthy to take its place by the side of Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*, Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying*, Pike's *Cases of Conscience*, Edwards on *Religious Affections*, the Alexanders (father and son) on *Religious Experience and Consolation* addressed to the *Suffering People of God*, James's *Christian Professor and Christian Progress*, and other standard works of that class? So much, and more, has been claimed for this treatise. Having given it a somewhat careful examination, we will proceed to state, as clearly and as fairly as we can, the results of our investigation.

And we remark, at the outset, that the book is a difficult one to analyze satisfactorily, for reasons that will appear as

¹ *The Higher Christian Life*, by Rev. W. E. Boardman. "That ye may be filled with all the fulness of God." Boston: Henry Hoyt; New York; D. Appleton and Co. 1859. pp. 330. 12mo.

we proceed. The treatise is, professedly, and in the printing, divided into three Parts — “The Higher Christian Life: What it is; How attained; Progress and Power.” But these three Parts, with some verbal changes, might be bound up in any other order, and the book would read quite as well. Indeed there would be something gained by putting the third Part first; for, in that only, and nearly at the end of it, do you find the definition that entirely relieves your suspense as to the author's theory — the one idea under which his mind is laboring.

In a word, the book has no method at all; no development, no progress, no “*lucidus ordo*.” We are not sure it would suffer (with trifling qualifications) by arranging its eighteen chapters in any order different from the present, even if that were by chance.

But to the treatise. What is the subject treated? What does the writer mean by the “higher life?” and by “second conversion?” as its equivalent, or the stepping-stone to it? Precisely what he does mean, we will not attempt to say; because it is not said *intelligibly* in the book, and cannot be inferred from the book. On the contrary, it can be inferred, most certainly, from the book, that he had no well-defined idea, in his own mind, on the subject (see p. 57).

One thing, however, is made clear. By the phrase “higher life,” to denote that higher experience which he thinks it the privilege and duty of all Christians to reach, he has no reference whatever to the comparatively matured results of a *progressive sanctification*. *Growth in grace*, as that is commonly understood by Christians, is entirely aside from his theory. Accordingly, “second conversion” is not an epoch in a Christian's experience, at which there is a return, by bitter repentance, from backsliding; or at which, by a more powerful baptism of the Holy Ghost and a clearer faith, there is a sudden rising up to a higher terrace upon the holy mount (p. 48).

Some critic has objected to the phraseology “second conversion,” when the number of epochs, more or less marked, in the process of sanctification, is *indefinite*; and one might

just as well speak of the third, or fourth, or twentieth, or fiftieth. No, not with Mr. Boardman's theory: there can only be the *second* after the *first*.

The theory relates to the MEANS of *Christian sanctification*. And the theory, as to the *means*, is that by a simple and single act of *faith*¹ we obtain sanctification, just as we, at first, obtained justification. It is the work of an *instant*, so far as the use of means for that end is concerned, precisely as justification is. We first receive Christ, by faith, for justification. That is our first conversion. The thing secured by it—justification—is *complete*, eternal: there is no more condemnation. But this is only a half salvation. By and by we begin to feel our need of holiness. And there are two ways pursued, he says, to obtain this. Most, in their blindness, seek it painfully, and slowly, and very unsuccessfully, by works, by strivings. Here and there one learns the true way, and takes Christ, at once and forever, for *sanctification*. This is the second conversion. Here is his own explanation: "practically always perhaps, and theologically often, we separate between the two, in our views and efforts, to secure them to ourselves, until we are experimentally taught better. We have one process for acceptance with God, that is faith; and another for progress in holiness, that is works. After having found acceptance in Jesus by faith, we think to go on to perfection by strugglings and resolves, by fastings and prayers, not knowing the better way of taking Christ for our sanctification, just as we have already taken him for our justification." Again: "There is a *second experience*, distinct from the first—sometimes years after the first—and as distinctly marked, both as to time and circumstances and character, as the first—a *second conversion*, as it is often called." Again: "Surely salvation is no more free, in the first draught of the waters of life, than in the second and deeper. Christ is no more freely offered in the faith of his atonement, than in the assurance of his personal presence and sanctifying power. . . . If we are content to

¹ A peculiar kind of faith, to which we shall by and by call attention.

take him as a half-way Saviour — a deliverer from condemnation, merely; but refuse to look to him as a present Saviour from sin, it is our own fault. He is a free Saviour. And, to all who trust him, he gives free salvation. To all and to each" (pp. 52, 47, 76).

"But," it will be asked, "does he not, after all, hold the common view on this subject? Christians all believe that sanctification is the work of *faith*: that the victory which overcomes the world is our faith. They all hold that the renewal and purification of our sinful nature is, from first to last, the work of God; and that *faith* connects us with the source of life and power in God; that the life which we now live in the flesh, we live by the faith of the Son of God. So that it may be as truly affirmed of sanctification, as of justification, that it is all of faith — by grace — and glorying is excluded. Does not Mr. Boardman, in these quotations, hold up, in substance, the same view? And if so, what serious objections can be offered to his teachings on the subject?"

So we hoped when we had read no further, though his forms of expression, on almost every page, were peculiar and suspicious; and though the air and tone told us all along, unmistakably, that the author was almost beside himself under the inspiration of a new and extraordinary discovery, which he was endeavoring to make known. We hoped he was only combating the *self-righteousness*, of which there is, everywhere, in the church, so much, and which is such a foe to grace.

At this point we will state what, to our surprise and grief, we finally found to be the real theory of the book. It is this: that sanctification is by *faith alone, without the INSTRUMENTALITY of God's truth. This is the one idea of the work*; the rare *discovery* that is to be so fruitful of good to the church in these latter days. There is nowhere in the volume a recognition of the fact that the truth, as revealed in the holy scriptures, is the means of sanctification. He wholly ignores the Bible on this subject. More than this: he puts faith in *opposition* to the use of means. "As the sum of all, let it be settled as a truth never to be doubted, that for

salvation, in any stage or degree, Jesus alone is the way, and faith alone is the means." "One thing may be safely affirmed of both alike — those converted again, and those now converted for the first time — that, in *every case, trust in Jesus was the sole condition of the work wrought in them*" (pp. 112, 113). Referring to the three classes into which, he says, those are divided who hold his peculiar views of sanctification, he says: "It may be added, that in the one essential doctrine of the way of sanctification, as by faith and not by works, they all agree, of course, if they agree in its practical reception in the experience in question." . . . "All agree in the facts of the experience. . . . And all agree in the doctrine of sanctification by faith; because, in every case, that is the great principle received, experimentally, in place of sanctification by works. And all agree that this experimental reception of Christ for sanctification is instantaneous, because it could not be otherwise" (pp. 56, 57). And in answer to the question: *What is attained?* etc., he says: "Nothing but a sense of unholiness, and a full consciousness that all efforts, and resolutions, and strugglings, and cries, for holiness of heart, are just as vain as the attempts of a leopard or an Ethiopian to bathe white in any waters. This, with a sense of absolute dependence upon Christ for holiness of heart and life, just as for the forgiveness of sin, is the sum and substance of the soul's attainment." "Then what follows? Then follows the work, according to our faith" (pp. 58, 59). Again: after giving an example of a person who had been striving for sanctification in the ordinary way, but had finally learned of the second conversion: "This traces, in lines clear and distinct, on our chart, one of the by-ways [of error]: that of *works for others as a means of sanctifying ourselves.*"

One quotation more, on this point. "Suppose comforts fail, light grows dim, clouds arise, the heart becomes laggard, courage sinks, joys fall into the sear and yellow leaf, or begin to — what then? Fly to means? No: fly to Christ — Christ is all we want. . . . Suppose you were in a church or hall at night. The lights were dim. Hardly light enough to make the darkness visible. And suppose you should see

the sexton busy, working away at the burners, trying to enlarge their apertures of escape for the gas, to increase the light; and all the while, you know, that the gas is partially shut off, in the pipe connecting with the main, and that is the reason of its faintness in the jets. You will go to him saying Man! man! let the jets alone. Go turn on the gas from the main. Then let him do it, and instantly the room is full of light. Every burner does its duty. Ten to one he will have to go round to each burner and reduce the light, to keep it within bounds" (pp. 174, 325). Strange he did not see that this illustration makes directly against himself and for the scriptural view of sanctification, by the truth. What is the man doing who is working away at the burners? This is the Christian who is trying to increase the light of piety in his soul by a simple effort of the will, without looking for a supply to any source beyond his own heart: either the word or the Spirit. And what does he do when he turns on the gas from the main? Does he not use some *means* for it? Does he not turn a screw? And then does not the gas come from the "main," through *pipes*, to the burners? And are not these channels of conveyance the *truth* as it is in Jesus, through which the virtues of Christ come into the soul? If he had taken *water-works*, instead of *gas-works*, to show how the living influence is supplied to the soul, he would have come nearer to the scriptural figures.

Before advancing to other points, we wish to fix very special attention to *this one* — his theory as to the *means* of sanctification — to wit: that it is derived *immediately* from Christ, by *faith*, and not *mediately*, through the *scriptures*, appropriating *them* by faith, and finding Christ in them, and through them bringing him into the soul. He quotes no such scriptures as these: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth;" and John 15:3. 2 Pet. 1:4. He has very little to do with the scriptures, any way; it is all *theory*, supported by what he calls experience. He draws largely from the experiences of men; very little from the inspired oracles of truth, and then with a strange perversion or misapplication. For example: he quotes these words of the

Saviour, "If ye keep my commandment, ye shall abide in my love," and twists them into his theory, by making that the *condition of retaining* what had been secured by faith, and not as the *means of obtaining* a sanctifying connection with Jesus, and of continual supplies of his Spirit and grace (p. 327).

This *theory* as to the *means* of sanctification, by Christ alone, received immediately by faith, in opposition to the view that it is by the Spirit of Christ working in us through the truth, is the one idea of the book, to which all else is intended to be subservient. And we have no hesitation in pronouncing it contrary to the dictates of reason, and the teachings of scripture.

But it will be asked, again: "Does he not, nevertheless, hold the *substance* of the scriptural doctrine? In saying that we receive Christ, *by faith*, for sanctification, does he not recognize the *instrumentality* of the scriptures? For, what can faith terminate upon, as its object, but the *truth* as it is in Jesus—the record God has given of his Son?" We held on to this charitable hope a long time, in reading his book, notwithstanding all that seemed to the contrary; but were compelled, finally, to abandon it.

And with this thought we will proceed to his idea of Christian faith. Near the end of the volume (p. 289), we have his definition of faith, given in language that cannot be misunderstood. It is as follows: "And now how is it that this transmutation is made? What is that power, better than the philosopher's stone or the lamp of Aladdin, which works this wondrous change? We have seen, already, that it is faith. Faith, which is the assured hope of a home eternal in the heavens, and also an assured knowledge of the presence and power of Jesus to deliver us from the dominion as well as the penalty of sin, and keep us, by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation. The very crowning thing, which completes the fulness of this faith, is the apprehension, not so much of the certainty of final salvation, as of the joyful confidence of the presence of Jesus, as a present Saviour from sin, and a present captain of salvation, to direct us and

sustain us in every conflict with Satan, and in every effort to extend the kingdom of God in the world. And this is *the very gist* of the experience sought to be illustrated and urged in these pages."

Now we ask, is that *evangelical* faith at all? And have we any warrant for exercising such a faith? The amount of it is, that we are to believe something *about ourselves*: it is an assured hope of heaven; an assured knowledge of the presence of Jesus in his saving power! We had read with astonishment, in the early part of the work, what he quoted, with an apparent endorsement, from a monk, who was directing Luther how to be saved. Said the monk: "The commandment of God is, that we believe *our own sins* are forgiven" (p. 25). Where do we find a warrant for so believing, and calling it saving faith? What kind of a faith would that be for impenitent men? believing that their own sins are forgiven, an assured hope of heaven, an assured knowledge of the saving presence of Jesus! Would it not be, what a great many are doing, believing a lie, that they might be damned?

We hear too much of such direction, given to the sinner, and to the Christian: "You must believe that *your sins* are forgiven." "You must have no doubt about your own state and prospects." What *is* the object of Christian faith? Is it not "the glorious gospel of the blessed God?" Is it not the salvation of Christ, the "good tidings" revealed in his word? Can anything be a proper object of justifying or sanctifying faith, but what God has recorded in his word?

I may believe in the provisions of grace, as set before me in the gospel; I may believe that Christ is an all-sufficient Saviour; and that all the blessings offered in the new covenant are offered to *me*, and will be mine if I accept them; that Jesus Christ loved me and gave himself for me, and that if I place my sole reliance upon him, I shall find rest to my soul; and I may believe that he is able and willing to do for me exceeding abundantly, above all that I can ask or think. All that, and much more, I can believe, because God has revealed it. But I cannot, in the same sense, believe

anything concerning my interest in Christ and my title to eternal life, because I do not find it in the Bible. I may be such a believer as to have *evidence* that I have passed from death unto life, and may thus have strong consolation in the gospel. But this hope that springs up amid the fruits of a renewed heart, must not be mistaken for the *faith* itself, that works by love, and purifies the heart, and overcomes the world.

Let us now pass on to that which is obtained in "second conversion." And here we forewarn the reader that we have got to the end of the author's self-consistency, and shall henceforth wander about, in fogs thicker than those of the Grand Bank. What does he mean by the higher life, reached through the gate of second conversion? Does he mean that we obtain instantaneous and entire sanctification? He seems to *teach* that, in some parts of the book; though in other places he disclaims it.

"Whether the question relates to justification or sanctification, the answer is the same. The way of freedom from sin is the very same as the way of freedom from condemnation. Faith in the purifying presence of Jesus brings the witness of the Spirit with our spirits, that Jesus is our sanctification; that the power and dominion of sin is broken; that we are free, just as faith in the atoning merit of the blood and obedience of Christ for us, brings the witness of the Spirit that we are now no longer under condemnation of sin, but freely and fully justified in Jesus."

"Christ offers himself to be the bridegroom of the soul. He offers to endow his bride with all the riches of his own inheritance in the heirship of his Father. Taking him as our Bridegroom, and giving ourselves to him as the bride espouses her husband, with him we have all he has, as well as all he is" (pp. 94, 119). That looks like coming into immediate possession of the full benefits of Christ's mediation, so far as it is *possible* for God to bestow them upon us in this sublunary abode.

Take another passage. "They have learned (those who have experienced the second conversion, in distinction from

Christians who have not learned the better way) that there is deliverance now, here in this life, through faith in Jesus. While the others sigh and groan in their bondage, as if there was no deliverance this side the grave." "They have learned experimentally, they know, that Jesus Christ our Lord, through faith in his name, does actually deliver the trusting soul from the cruel bondage of its chains under sin, now in this present time; while the others have learned, not that Jesus does deliver, but that their own resolutions, in Jesus' name, do not deliver them; and not knowing that Jesus can do it, they turn, with a sigh, toward death, as their deliverer from the power of this death, as if death was the sanctifier or the sanctification of the children of God" (p. 267).

A favorite expression with the author is "full trust and full salvation;" and he tells us, in the Preface, that this would have been his "next" choice as the title of the book. "Trust," he observes, "is perhaps the only other word that conveys the original meaning of faith. And as faith is the all-inclusive condition of salvation, *full trust* expresses the sole condition of *full salvation*, which it is the design of this volume to illustrate." Expressions like the following occur numerously: "The experience is a reality. Jesus is freely offered as our sanctification as well as our justification. Faith, full trust in him, will bring full salvation, with him, to the soul." "Christ all-sufficient—faith all-inclusive." "From that day onward, until now, he has rejoiced in full salvation, through full trust in Jesus."

If, now, one has *full salvation*, what more can he desire for himself? Does not this include entire sanctification? If the power and dominion of sin are broken, so that we are free, are we not sanctified wholly, in soul, body, and spirit? And yet he teaches that those very persons who have "conquered an abiding peace," and who enjoy the "full salvation," are yet full of all the uncleanness of sin. How can the two ideas be reconciled? Is it by the *imputation*, to the believer, of Christ's personal holiness? There are some passages that look like this. For example: "he [one who had just passed through the second birth] had his eyes opened to

see his utter unholiness, and to see that Christ must answer wholly for him, and clothe him altogether with his own [Christ's own] righteousness." "She [another case] became perplexed, really distressed, with the question: What shall I tell them? Shall I tell them I have experienced entire sanctification? I never felt my unholiness more, or so much. . . . I never saw my imperfection so clearly, or felt it so deeply. I see Christ a perfect Saviour, and he is mine, and all I want; but I am a perfect sinner, needing a perfect Saviour indeed." And he concludes the account of her with the words: "she has the *liberty* as well as the *fulness* of the blessings of the gospel" (pp. 69, 72, 73). In another part of the book, we find an explanation that looks very much like antinomianism. "In every case," viz. when the second conversion is about to take place, "hungering and thirsting for true holiness is induced; and, after varied strugglings, the issue, in all alike, is that of finding, in Christ, the end of the law for sanctification" (p. 42).

Now, after such teaching as to the *fulness* of the salvation received, instantly, upon the exercise of "full trust" for that purpose, it would be surprising to see the proof made out, from the same book, that the author is quite orthodox on the subject of progressive sanctification. Yet we have statements like the following: "There is a radical difference between the pardon of sins and the purging of sins. Pardon is instantaneously entire; but cleansing from sin is a process of indefinite length. . . . In the first, the work of Christ is already done the instant the soul believes; while in the second, the work of Christ remains yet to be done, in the future, after the soul believes." And he speaks, elsewhere, of the acceptance of Christ as the soul's sanctification, being the "*entrance*, merely, upon the true and only way of being made holy" (pp. 116, 60, etc.). Let those who have a fondness for such puzzles, endeavor to reconcile these statements with those, more numerous ones, which affirm that immediately, upon second conversion, "the power and dominion of sin are broken;" that, taking Jesus as our bridegroom, "we have all he has, and all he is;" and that those

who have done it, "have learned experimentally, they know, that Jesus Christ our Lord, through faith in his name, does actually deliver the trusting soul from the cruel bondage of its chains under sin, now in this present time;" and that those who have spent "a whole life-time [after the first conversion] before learning that faith is the victory that overcometh, may at last [like an example cited] learn the great secret of the gospel as the way of salvation from sin, and have a peaceful, yea a gorgeous, sunset of it" (p. 200).

The inquiry will naturally arise: What affinity has the theory of the higher life with modern perfectionism? That question our author considers at length (pp. 55—63). He divides those who hold to the second conversion into three classes: Lutherans (in which class he himself is found), Wesleyans, and Oberlinians. Admitting that there are some shades of difference (and pointing these out), that "both Wesleyans and Oberlinians differ from Lutherans in the use of terms, and in the theology of the experience described, but [he says] aside from this, in all that is essential to the experience itself, all are agreed." "It is worthy of special note that their differences are altogether those of opinion, not at all of fact. All are agreed as to the essential facts of the experience in question. The shades of difference in the manner of narrating are not at all essential. All agree, especially in the one great matter, that the experience is that of the way of sanctification by faith; that of really practically receiving Jesus for sanctification by faith, as, before, he had been received as the sacrifice for sins. This may be variously expressed, but this is the marrow and substance of the whole matter, in every case, and with every class. Again: all agree as to the fact that this practical, experimental apprehension of Christ is instantaneous in every case." "All agree in the facts of the experience, because the facts themselves are in harmony, in all cases. And all agree in the doctrine of sanctification by faith, because, in every case, that is the great principle received, experimentally, in place of sanctification by works" (pp. 41, 55, 57). That will suffice on this point.

Thus far we have confined ourselves to the *doctrine* of the

book before us, with the endeavor of showing what the theory which it puts forth is. It is time that we pay some attention to the *proofs*, that he may see how such a theory is supported. And here we come to what is the most remarkable thing about the whole production. His proofs are drawn principally from real life. And so far as we have the means of verifying them, there is not one of them that stands upon the ground of historical truth. A hard accusation, we admit; but let us see.

He tells us, in the Preface, that by "second conversion" "it is not intended to convey the idea of a second regeneration; but that expressed, by President Edwards, in the term 'remarkable conversions,' which is the title of his account of several remarkable cases of higher life attained after conversion." Now the title of Edwards's treatise is not "Remarkable Conversions," but "Surprising Conversions." And its sole object is to give an account of the wonderful work of grace in Northampton, by which so many hundreds were born into the kingdom of God. He says not a single word about "cases of higher life attained after conversion," except in a sentence of five lines, in which he speaks incidentally of the refreshing the church had received from the revival.

The first example taken from real life, and which, like "The Young Irishman," in the "Pastor's Sketches," is the masterpiece of the whole work, developed at length, and often afterwards referred to, is the experience of Luther. "What! Martin Luther a perfectionist!" We will show you. After sketching his history, giving the narrative of his first conversion, his entering upon the duties of professor and preacher, he comes at length to the scene upon "Pilate's staircase," where his second conversion took place. He draws his narrative from D'Aubigné's History, as certain references and quotations show. He says: "Luther had not yet learned to take the Lord Jesus for his sanctification. He had one process for the forgiveness of sins, that of faith; and another for the pursuit of holiness, that of works. He believed in Jesus, and trusted that, for the sake of Jesus, who had died and risen again for his justification, his sins were all

freely forgiven. But he longed for a holy heart and a holy life, and sought them by *means*, not by *faith*. The truth that Jesus is *all* to the sinner, that in Jesus he has all if he takes him for all, he had not yet perceived. Christ a propitiation, he accepted; but Christ a sanctification, he rejected. Strange that, having Christ and believing in him, and having in him the fountain of holiness, indeed our own holiness, just as really and fully as he is our sacrifice for sin, we should go about to work out," etc. Now for the great discovery while climbing Pilate's stair-case on his knees. "As Luther crept, painfully, from stone to stone, upward, suddenly he heard, as he thought, a voice of thunder in the depths of his heart: 'The just shall live by faith!' These words had often, before, told him that the just are made alive by faith; but now they thundered through his soul the truth that even so the just shall *live* (be kept alive) by faith. . . . By faith, their hearts and lives shall be made holy" (pp. 30, 31).

Turn, now, to D'Aubigné himself, and what will be your surprise to see that he is totally misrepresented; that he has no specific reference at all to sanctification, but to justification; that he relates only, on the stair-case at Rome, Luther obtained a clearer view, than ever before, of the doctrine of justification in the scripture, there suggested to him: "The just shall live by faith." He says: "We have seen how he had, at first, submitted to all the vain practices which the church enjoins, in order to purchase the remission of sins." Then follows the account of the scene upon the stair-case. Appended immediately to which is the historian's remark: "It is frequently necessary that a truth should be repeatedly presented to our minds, in order to produce its due effect. Luther had often studied the Epistle to the Romans, and yet never had justification by faith, as there taught, appeared so clear to him."¹

But we have not quite done with the example. Mr. Boardman, after exclaiming, a while, over Luther's discovery of the means of sanctification, quotes Luther's own language, as

¹ D'Aubigné, I. 170, 171 — Carter's edition.

found in D'Aubigné, to show its instantaneous and powerful effect upon his mind : " Then I felt myself born again, as a new man ; and I entered, by an open door, into the very paradise of God. From that hour I saw the precious and holy scriptures with new eyes. I went through the whole Bible ; I collected a multitude of passages which taught me what the work of God was. Truly this text of St. Paul was, to me, the very gate of heaven." That is the whole of the quotation, as given by Mr. Boardman. It fits very well into his theory, and seems to speak much for it. But look again into D'Aubigné, and supply the rest of Luther's words. The sentence *next preceding* the one with which Mr. Boardman's quotation begins is : " But when, by the Spirit of God, I understood these words — when I learnt how the justification of the sinner proceeds from God's mere mercy by the way of faith — then I felt myself born again, as a new man," etc.

He had been speaking of the trouble and torment of conscience he had suffered, and how he could not endure the expression : " the righteous justice of God." Why did not the author of the Higher Life begin his quotation a little further back, so as to let Luther say, for himself, what he had found which gave birth to such joys ? And why does he *omit* a sentence next to the last one of his quotation, in which Luther reverts to his previous hatred of the expression : " the righteousness of God," and says : " I began, from that time, to value and to love it, as the sweetest and most consolatory truth ?" ¹ Ah ! that would have spoiled the whole. Luther would have been lost as the champion of this new method of sanctification. What shall we say to such an expedient for getting the patronage of great names in support of an ism, in direct opposition to the general belief of the church ! What would Luther say to it, if he could speak for himself ? — a doctrine that he never, in his life, thought of, and one most abhorrent to his cherished belief ! We will not try to characterize it. We will use no epithets. We confess that when we discovered what was done, our moral nature felt a

¹ D'Aubigné, I. 171, 172. Cf. Higher Life, 31.

shock similar to that we experience when the tidings come to us of the fall, by heinous transgression, of some prominent one in the church that had stood high in our confidence.

Thus the Higher Life starts off; a good and strong start, as is felt. For, the next chapter begins: "The experience of Luther has been given at length, because the great reformer stands in the forefront of Protestantism, a true and noble type of the real, ripe, whole-souled Christian. . . . It is entitled to great weight as an example."

The next one summoned, in his long list of confessors (whose name is, for any one who can avail himself of it, a tower of strength), is the historian of Luther, D'Aubigné himself. The same use and *abuse* is made of him. And then follow, scattered all along through the book, witnesses almost innumerable (*homines illustres, et homines novi, et feminæ, ad libitum*). The most precious names in the theological and Christian world, names embalmed in the church, and that can never perish, are brought up and made to bear testimony in favor of second conversion. Frederick Monod, Charles Rien, Richard Baxter, Jonathan Edwards, Mrs. Edwards, McCheyne, James Brainerd Taylor, Dr. Payson, Legh Richmond, Felix Neff, and a multitude of others, whose experiences have fallen under his own observaion, or with which he has in some way become acquainted, are made to confirm, from their own wonderful experience, his theory. He says of Dr. Payson, that he "was a polished and powerful shaft in the hands of God. Hundreds were saved by his ministry; but much of his strength was wasted, in what he saw, afterwards, to have been vain strugglings. Had he known to trust in Jesus for his own soul's sanctification and for all fitness to herald the Saviour to others, not only would he have been saved what he himself said was wasted; but his life might have been spared long to the church, and his success, great as it was, increased vastly in its measure" (p. 286). And in another place he quotes, as relating to this new experience, an exclamation of his, uttered upon his death-bed: "O, had I only known, what I now know, twenty years ago!" If you

will take the pains to turn to the Life of Dr. Payson, you will see that there is no foundation for that representation of his change of views on the subject of Christian sanctification. The views he held during the years of his ministry and usefulness, he held to the last. It is true he had a wonderful experience in the closing days of his life. But it was only a more complete absorption of his will in the will of God, a more vigorous faith, and a sweeter communion with God. Less than four weeks before his death, he said: "Christians need not be discouraged at the slow progress they make, and the little success which attends their efforts; for they may be assured that every exertion is noticed, and will be rewarded by their heavenly Father." And to a young convert he said: "You will have to go through many conflicts and trials; you must be put in the furnace, and tempted, and tried, in order to show you what is in your heart. Sometimes it will seem as if Satan had you in his power, and that the more you struggle and pray against sin, the more it prevails against you."¹ Why did he not point out to that convert the way he had newly discovered of avoiding all those struggles, by taking Christ for sanctification? Because he had discovered nothing new on the subject. *Experience* had taught him (what he knew before, in theory), that he could be happy in God while deprived of outward good, and while suffering great bodily distress. This resulted from a more hearty submission of his will. That is what he had learned in the school of experience. But his system of theology remained precisely as it had always been: not a doctrine was changed.

So much for the proof promised from this quarter, when he says: "Take a few examples of the higher life, or full trust and full salvation. First, Martin Luther." And, as a climax of the absurdity and ridiculousness of building up his demonstration out of standard orthodox testimonies, he crowns the pyramid with the Assembly's Catechism! "Cases of it [the experience in question] have always oc-

¹ Memoir by Cummings — Tract Society edition, pp. 466, 467.

curring in every great awakening ; and solitary instances, in the furnace of affliction. . . . Such cases have generally received the convenient name "second conversion ;" but in the standards, as in the Westminster Assembly's Confession, it is called "the full assurance of grace and salvation," and elsewhere, "the full assurance of faith," while, in hymns, it is often named "full salvation" (p. 57). The professed quotation, "the full assurance of grace and salvation," is not found, in those words, in either the Confession or the Catechism of the assembly of divines.¹ That which comes the nearest to it, of the consonance of which with the doctrine of the higher life the reader will judge, is found in answer to the eightieth question of the Larger Catechism : "Such as truly believe in Christ, and endeavor to walk in all good conscience before him, may, without extraordinary revelation, by faith grounded upon the truth of God's promises, and by the Spirit enabling them to discern in themselves those graces to which the promises are made, and bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace, and shall persevere therein unto salvation." In the Shorter Catechism it is : "assurance of God's love." And the explanation given, in their Confession of Faith is : "This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties before he be partaker of it ; yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain thereunto."

From the way in which the testimonies of men are handled, it can be readily inferred how those of the holy scriptures would be handled also. Peter's case is, of course, the standard one. Referring to what our Saviour said to him, of his being sifted by Satan, of his afterwards being converted and strengthening his brethren, he adds : Satan did

¹ The quotation *may* have been made from the *Index* of "the Standards," published by the Presbyterian Board, where we find "Assurance of grace and salvation."

have the apostle, and did sift him, too. . . . By and by, on the day of Pentecost, the time came for the apostle's second conversion" (p. 110). Now, who does not know that the conversion of Peter referred to by Christ, was his being restored from his sudden *fall* and apparent apostasy; and that this virtually took place, probably, when he "remembered," and "went out and wept bitterly;" and that his *formal* restoration was at the sea of Galilee; at all events, that the conversion (whatever or whenever it was) took place before the baptism of Pentecost?

But notice the further use he makes of the pentecostal scene. "The Holy Spirit (the promise of the Father) was received by the Son, and shed down upon him [Peter] and his fellow disciples. Fire-crowns sat upon their heads, and with other tongues they spake of the wonderful works of God. These tongues of fire and tongues of eloquence were, however, only the outside symbols and the outspoken manifestations of the glorious work wrought in their hearts" (p. 110). What a confounding of two things which are entirely distinct in their nature, and between which the scriptures carefully distinguish! viz. miraculous gifts, and a sanctifying work upon the heart. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass;" and so of "prophecy;" the gift of the inward experience being not necessarily identical at all.

But to proceed to the awakening that followed the preaching. "A great work was wrought on that day. . . . Many were then, for the first time, convinced of their sins and converted to God. Many more, who had already been converted under the preaching of John the Baptist, and of Jesus himself, and of the twelve, and the seventy, were converted anew. . . . And one thing may be safely affirmed of both alike — those converted again, and those now first converted — that in every case trust in Jesus was the sole condition of the work wrought in them. The apostle Peter did not say to the one: Believe in the Lord Jesus and ye shall be converted; and to the other: Watch, pray, struggle, read, fast, work, and you

shall be sanctified. But to one and all he said: Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost" (pp. 112, 113). Now, why did he not quote Peter's language as it is: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Why did he leave out "for the remission of sins?" Was it for the same reason that he omitted what was essential to the thought in the quotation from Luther?

"The apostle Paul," he says, "lived" in this full salvation "himself, and commended it and commanded it to others." "The apostles and primitive Christians generally enjoyed it from the day of pentecost onward" (p. 45). As exceptions, he refers to the Galatians. And he has a few pages, in the usual style of that class of writers, on Christians passing out of the seventh chapter of Romans into the eighth chapter, where "the dead body" of sin being "dropped," they are "now linked to the living Saviour as their deliverer from present corruption, and from all the power of sin" (pp. 265—268).

Such, in substance, is the Higher Christian Life, by Rev. W. E. Boardman. We are aware that he, or a defender of his system, may take the same book and convict us of unfairness. For we have already given some examples of the contradictions it contains. There are others. Passages may be cited from it which seem, taken out of their connection, quite orthodox, on the use of *means* for sanctification. Whatever there is of this, however (and there is, comparatively, not very much), is in a direction entirely contrary to the theory, and to the great drift, of the work.

A few thoughts, in conclusion, upon the *popularity* and *influence* of the book. If we may believe the publisher's statements, there has been great demand for it. Indeed, it is heard of in all quarters: you will rarely find a religious person who has not either read it, or at least who does not know something about it. It has been republished in Great Brit-

ain. It is, unquestionably, one of *the* books that sell, and make their authors and publishers rich. If, then, the work is such as has been described, what reasons can be assigned for the great favor with which it has been received by the Christian public? We would suggest the following:

1. Its style; and principally the fact that it is of the narrative, rather than the directly *didactic*, style; or, rather, that the didactic is so constantly relieved by the narrative style. What professes to be narrations of personal life will always interest most readers. And what professes to be *heart-experience*, in the things of Christ, the struggles and victories, the sorrows and joys, of men pressing into the kingdom of God, will have an especial interest for *Christian readers*. Besides, the style has the merit of being somewhat *lively*, and *fresh*, and *cheerful*, and *hopeful*. If, however, we look at the *literary* qualities of the style, we shall find it to be as far from *classic* as can well be imagined. It shows a great want of true literary taste and culture. It is *inelegant*: "The poor African woman lived in a cabin on an alley, all alone, without chick or child, kith or kin." "Persecution crucified the disciple of the crucified Jesus to the world" (pp. 239, 249). He has a great fondness for paronomasia and for dichotomizing; either of which, when carried to excess, is a puerility. He is fond of using nouns as adjectives: "angel-messenger," "serpent-rod," "fire-crowns," "boy-prophet," "thought-circulation," "planter-merchant," "crucible-discipline," "bridegroom-deliverer." It is often *fulsome*: "The fire in his veins burned on, steadily and surely consuming the vital forces of his manly frame; but the fever of his spirit was all allayed by the copious and cooling draughts given him from the gushing fountains of the waters of life flowing from the smitten Rock." "A life which, life-long, is a living sacrifice to God, unceasingly sending up the smoke of its incense from the glowing fire in the heart, kindled, and fanned, and fed by the Holy One of Israel; and yet with no particular Damascus Road or Bethel-scene to mark it, from first to last" (p. 204, 206). There is a feature of the style that might be called, in modern newspaper phrase,

hifalutin: "And the sown seed knows the spring-time, and snuffs the sunshine and showers, bursting its prison shell," etc. "The memoir of another merchant of eminence, . . . , gave him to see as within reach even of the care-pressed and toil-worn business man, amongst boxes and bales, customers and notes to meet, and paper to be discounted, sharpers to unmask and risks to encounter, a life both of joy and peace in Jesus" (pp. 212, 134). Take the following specimen, for which we have been able to find no term for its classification: "The missionary spirit was poured into the heart of an obscure cobbler upon his bench; and, as he cut the leather into shape, and pounded it upon his lap-stone into solidity, and drew the waxed ends, sticking together soles for his customers, he was cutting out, compacting, and stitching together thoughts which were destined to shoe the feet of thousands upon thousands with the preparation of the gospel of peace, to go to the outer bounds of the earth with the glad tidings of a crucified Saviour" (pp. 226, 227). It is easy to see how such qualities of style would be fascinating to multitudes of illiterate persons, and give them high notions of the *smartness* of the writer.

2. *Its pretension*. This undoubtedly has had no little to do in creating its popularity. The multitude will gape after the knowing ones. Quack doctors would not set all the world to running after them, if they were as modest as men in general. But as they assume to know more than all the learned profession, and surround themselves with such a halo of mystery, there are comparatively few whose sober conservative common sense can so control this natural credulity and love of the marvellous, as not to be taken captive. Here, we think, is one of the chief elements of power in this book. The author knows it all. He looks down from his position of pure light towards us, poor things! all enveloped in the mists of ignorance, and talks to us, and counsels us, and encourages us, in such a way as to leave no doubt that he has the pity of a father and the authority of a prophet. His theory claims to be a new and grand discovery, the time having now come for this morning-star of the millennium to rise.

We are not stating it too strongly. He says: "Great periods have been marked by great revivals, and great revivals have been characterized by the developments, each one of some great truth made prominent and powerful, in its application to the experience and life of the church. The great truths, which now have their unchangeable position in the faith and formulas of the church, have been born into the world one by one, and one by one have taken their positions, in orderly array, in the great family of truths. Like children, they have come, crying, into the world; and, like warriors in battle, each has had its own way to fight." After referring to some of these, he comes to his own, and says: "The question may have arisen already: Why — if it is true, that the experimental apprehension of the principle of sanctification by faith is the privilege of all — why has the fact not had greater prominence in the past? Why have eighteen centuries been allowed to roll away before it is brought distinctly and prominently before the mind of the church? The answer is, that until now, the time has never come for it. Now is the time." And, ten pages further on, he says: "The present, the *now* present, would seem to be a round in the heaven-ward stretching ladder, near to the top. One step more, or two at most, so it seems at least to us poor short-sighted mortals, and the summit will be gained" (pp. 213, 215, 225).

In keeping with all this, has been the extravagance in advertising the work. The publisher's Circular, sent throughout the land, announcing the forth-coming book, says: "I anticipate for this work a large and continuous sale. . . . The book will take its place amongst the standard productions of the times, and can hardly fail of meeting a wide circulation." In a religious weekly, close by an advertisement of Sand's sarsaparilla, we find this, as a part of its advertisement: "a book full of inspiration, and written with enthusiasm and strength. A richer legacy to the church and the world could not well be found than in this comprehensive treatise on the growth of religion in the soul." Add to all this the voluntary puffing from ministers and others, and that warm commendation and recommendation of it that ap-

peared, a few months ago, from the pen of a distinguished theological professor; and add, moreover, the adroit manner in which the author has attached to his doctrine the most powerful names in Christendom: Luther, Edwards, Baxter, James Brainerd Taylor, Payson; and who can wonder that the book has been admired and sought after?

3. It is a fascinating *ism*. The short road to holiness it points out: one that leaves to the left the seventh chapter of Romans, avoiding all the conflicts with remains of a carnal nature, and all griefs and sorrows over indwelling sin, and coming out, at once, into the eighth of Romans, where is nought but the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valleys — “Why! this is the way; let us find it.”

4. The *subject*: the higher Christian life. The want is felt, in our churches, of a higher life. Christians are not satisfied with their low attainments, and their bondage under sin. They feel that they are living both beneath their duty and their privilege, that there is some better thing provided for them. An excellent minister of the gospel wrote us, a few months ago, that he had just read the *Higher Life* with great interest, and he hoped, profit. That he had never felt satisfied with the type of his Christian experience. That is a feeling with which most Christians, certainly, sympathize. And, it seems to us that a book on Christian sanctification, written from the point of *union to Christ*, showing how, by faith, we are one with Christ so as, in our *legal* relations, to have the benefits of his atoning sacrifice and propitiation for sin; and are vitally united to him in spirit, have received such an ingrafting into him, set forth in the fifteenth of John and sixth of Romans, as to be made partakers of his life, and to draw from his Spirit the whole life and power of godliness, is a real desideratum in our Christian literature. Such a work, properly written, would be, to thousands, what the author of the *Higher Life* hoped his would prove to be. In his words: “they would rejoice in anything defining to them distinctly the relations of this blessed Christian life to further Christian progress, and to all Christian duty. And moreover, they would be thankful to God for a book which they could

safely put into the hands of others, hopeful of good, fearless of evil; one they could heartily commend as unfolding the fulness of the blessings of the gospel, without feeling under the necessity of cautioning and warning against false theories, wrong terms, or evil tendencies" (p. 18).

What, now, must be the *influence of such* a book, and of such popularity? We doubt not some will be profited by it, as a spiritual Christian may, now and then, be profited under a Unitarian sermon. An orthodox sense will be put upon much of its heterodoxy; and there is in it not a little of excellent truth. Some of the sketches are not without merit: as, for example, "The Shakeress," "Gov. Duncan," "The Hon. Judge and the poor African woman," "The Miner of Potosi," "Oriental Prince and his Captive."

Still, the principal influence of the book cannot but be most unhappy. It so totally misleads the mind, on the whole subject of evangelical experience. The idea here held out is, that, after going through the struggle of a "second conversion," we may then dismiss trouble about our own hearts and rejoice in the full blessings of a present deliverance.¹

¹ Perhaps we ought in justice to the author, as throwing some light upon his inconsistencies, to allude to his theory of sanctification itself as an actual *process* and *accomplishment*. This is only *incidentally* touched in the book, and that for the sake of showing a point of divergence from the Oberlinian doctrine of Perfection. Our review has confined itself to the one subject the author professedly has in hand — the *means* of Christian sanctification. (*Condition* might be a more appropriate term than *means*, or "Principle," as he has it.) This is an instantaneous reception of Christ for sanctification, a faith not *usually* associated with the faith by which he is first received for justification, but an after experience, a "second conversion."

Now on the point as to what is "obtained" in second conversion, how can the author *seem* to teach that we obtain instantaneous and entire sanctification, and yet maintain that "unholiness" still remains, and only the "entrance" of a "process" of sanctification is reached? that "cleansing from sin is a process of indefinite length"? His idea appears to be this: that, while *our* work is done, Christ's is just begun. "The transfer and the trust of the soul, for the whole work of sanctification by the Holy Spirit, is but the first effectual step in the work." But that is the whole step taken in "second conversion."

He does not profess to have *matured*, or given much time to this part of his theory of sanctification; for he considers it more a matter of curious speculation than of practical importance. "Lutherans [he is a *Lutheran* on this subject] have discussed the experience less as a thing distinct, and therefore have known

He speaks of the second conversion as almost perfectly analogous to the first conversion, in conviction, unwilling-

it less, and named it less distinctively, than either Wesleyans or Oberlinians." And yet his notion is, as a thing essential to his whole doctrine, that Christ in some unrevealed way, without any of our coöperation, gradually assimilates the soul to himself by forming it in his own image. Nothing can be more fanciful, or more contrary to scriptural teaching, yet it is sufficiently apparent that he makes that fancy a *sine qua non* to his general theory. "This [a full consciousness that all efforts and resolutions, and strugglings and cries for holiness of heart, are just as vain as the attempts of an Ethiopian to bathe white in any waters] with a sense of absolute dependence upon Christ for holiness of heart and life, just as for the forgiveness of sin, is the sum and substance of the soul's attainment" in second conversion. It is simply "a confidence *that he will do it*, [the italics are his own in all our quotations] according to the plan of God.

"Then what follows? Then follows the work, according to our faith. By faith the soul is now placed in the hands of Christ, as clay in the hands of the potter; and by faith Christ is received by the soul as the potter to mould it at his own sovereign will. . . . By faith the soul now is opened as a mirror to the Master, . . . the Master's image is taken. . . . By faith the soul is put into the hands of Christ, like paper into the hands of the printer, to be unfolded and softened and printed, with all the glorious things of God" (pp. 61, 59, 60).

The work, then, is in the future. Though out of our hands — transferred to Christ, to be executed "at his own sovereign will," "according to the [secret] plan of God" — the work yet remains to be done. We are yet in "utter unholiness." "In the first [conversion] the work of Christ is already done the instant the soul believes, while in the second, the work of Christ remains yet to be done in the future after the soul believes" (p. 116). Now if this is so, how can he speak as he does of the victory *already* obtained by all those who have experienced the "second conversion," and of their present unmixed joy and triumph? For, on the supposition of their having *arrived* at the goal of sinless perfection — of angelic purity itself — he could not speak in fuller terms of the value and blessedness of the attainment. Such a believer "has full salvation." "Faith, full trust in him, will bring full salvation with him to the soul." "From that day onward until now he has rejoiced in full salvation, through full trust in Jesus." "She has the *liberty* as well as the *fulness* of the blessings of the gospel." We have "the witness of the Spirit . . . that the power and dominion of sin is broken, that we are free." "They have learned that there is deliverance now here in this life through faith in Jesus. . . . They have learned experimentally, they know, that Jesus Christ our Lord, through faith in his name, does actually deliver the trusting soul from the cruel bondage of its chains under sin, now in this present time." "The chain is broken by the power of Christ. We are freed from the dead body of sin. We are linked to the living Saviour as our deliverer from present corruption, and from all the power of sin. The dead body is dropped."

How can he speak in such terms, if "as to holiness of heart" there is "nothing but a sense of vileness," and the universal confession is: "I never saw my imperfection so clearly, or felt it so deeply?"

There is, of course, much inconsistency with himself. But his general idea

ness to receive the light, vain attempts and fruitless struggles, temptations of the adversary, etc. In another place, he speaks of the experience as "within sure and easy reach of all who will make it a point." The tendency of his doctrine of sanctification must, therefore, be to remove from the church all that kind of experience which relates to brokenness of heart, the lowliness and meekness that think better of others than one's self, mortification of the earthly members, self-reproach, watchfulness, striving for victory, "glorying in infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon us, taking pleasure in reproaches, necessities, persecutions, distresses for Christ's sake, that when weak we may be strong." The tendency is to conceit and spiritual pride. He has afforded us an example exactly in point. He says: "a scene occurred, one morning, in far-famed Old South Boston chapel. At the close of the meeting, . . . two of the

seems to be that what we have (in second conversion) is a proper *equivalent* for a completed sanctification. We have made the "transfer" to Christ; we may, therefore, in the full confidence that he will carry on the work to its completion, dismiss trouble about our present imperfect state. We may act and feel and rejoice and triumph just as if the work was already consummated. We have "conquered an abiding peace, and gained the full salvation."

Or we may conceive of the matter in another way (the book authorizes this view also). Christ's personal holiness (imputed) is an equivalent—more than an equivalent—for our own "unholiness." "Exactly what is attained in this experience? Christ, Christ in all his fulness, Christ objectively and subjectively received. That is all. And that is enough." "Taking him as our bridegroom, . . . with him we have all he has, as well as all he is." "He had his eyes opened to see his utter unholiness, and to see that Christ must answer wholly for him, and clothe him altogether with his own (Christ's own) righteousness." "Having Christ, . . . and having in him the fountain of holiness, indeed our own holiness, just as really and fully as he is our own sacrifice for sin" (pp. 58, 119, 69, 30).

Exactly here (in that *equivalent*) we find what is to our mind the special pernicious tendency of the book. Not only are *means* dispensed with, because it is perfectly needless, as well as useless, to "watch, pry, struggle, read, fast, work," in order to "be sanctified;" but a most deplorable spiritual state is induced. This book itself is an illustration of what we mean. You would not suspect from it, so at least it strikes us, that the author had on his mind so much as the *remembrance* even of the "fear and trembling" with which God commands Christians to work out their salvation. There is a lightness and flippancy, a want of true evangelical unction, and of the sweet savor of a penitential spirit, most painful to those serious, sober, solemn, watchful, wrestling Christians, who have only experienced the first conversion, and who "know no better" way than—abiding in Christ—to "labor to enter into that rest," and "give diligence to make their calling and election sure."

venerable men always occupying the front seats, with their ear-trumpets upturned to catch every word, arose and greeted each other. One placed his trumpet to his ear, and turned up its broad mouth toward his stooping white-headed companion. The other, bending down and almost burying his face in the open mouth of the trumpet, with a slow, loud, wailing utterance, said: 'Well, brother, we have been long — meditating — thinking — trying — to find out how — this divine life — could be best promoted — in the soul — and — we shall get it yet! yes, we shall find it yet!' 'O yes, yes! we shall — we shall!' was the answer. . . . In that same assembly, a moment before its breaking up, a fair-haired youth arose and said: 'Dear brethren, help me to praise God! I have found the way! Jesus is the way! He is mine, and I am his! He is complete, and I am complete in him?' Here were the venerable fathers, feeling after the better way, and here was the child in it already, happy and satisfied" (pp. 310, 311). This represents what we take to be the legitimate tendency of the doctrine. It puts the "child," the "fair-haired youth," in advance of the "venerable fathers" of the church and the ministry.

Upon the whole, we would say, as a self-evident truth, the more the book is circulated, the less sanctification there will be in the world, and the further off will be the millennium.

ARTICLE IV.

SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE OF THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

BY REV. DAVID B. FORD, SOUTH SCITUATE, MASS.

It is a question of our Saviour's asking, and therefore of some importance: What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? The scriptures tell us, in reply, that he is both the son