

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

THE VICTORIOUS LIFE (I.)

THE REVEREND W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.
WYCLIFFE COLLEGE, TORONTO

EVERYTHING that comes from Dr. Warfield deserves the closest attention; and as one of his very many debtors, who has learnt to value what he writes, even though it may not always be possible to accept his conclusions, I have naturally read with care his articles in the *Princeton Theological Review* and in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA on The Victorious Life, especially because of my connection with the Keswick Movement and the corresponding Movement in America, and also because of Dr. Warfield's criticism of my own position. I hope I am ready to listen carefully to all criticism and also to correct anything wrong. But I now desire to present certain considerations suggested by his articles, in order to show that those who favor in general what is known as the Keswick Movement are not altogether without reasons which they regard as adequate. It must also be added that they do not believe Dr. Warfield's interpretation of their position is always and necessarily the true one.

I

It will be convenient first to comment on certain points raised in Dr. Warfield's articles. No attempt will be made to deal with every contention, but only an effort to consider the more outstanding of his criticisms. For convenience I call attention to the pages of his articles and, as far as possible, quote what he said. The references are all to the *Princeton Theological Review*.

P. 321, July, 1918. The opening sentences seem to im-
Vol. LXXVI. No. 303. 1

ply that those who favor what is known as "The Victorious Life" "ask to be themselves made glorified saints in the twinkling of an eye." I have never heard anything of the kind set forth; and, indeed, the whole argument of the opening page of Dr. Warfield's first article, which suggests that men are impatient with God's slow processes and "demand immediate tangible results," is not true of those who are the subjects of his criticism. It is said that such people "themselves cut the knot and boldly declare complete salvation to be within their reach at their option, or already grasped and enjoyed." I would submit that Dr. Warfield is all unconsciously conveying a wrong impression, for, so far as I know, nothing like this is held by those against whom he writes. Everything, of course, depends upon the meaning of the term "complete salvation." All the books I have been able to consult on this subject maintain that salvation is threefold (including, first, deliverance from the penalty, then, from the power, and, last of all, from the presence of sin), and that salvation cannot possibly be "complete" until the third stage has been reached, which will never be experienced in this life. I would, therefore, urge respectfully, and yet strongly, that it is not fair to charge opponents with "adjusting the nature of complete salvation to fit their present attainments."

P. 322. More than once Dr. Warfield maintains that the modern view of what he calls "entire, instantaneous sanctification" is due to John Wesley, and in more than one place Holiness teaching is described as "Wesleyan doctrine." But I do not think Dr. Warfield is either accurate or fair in attributing all "Holiness" teaching to the Wesleyan view. While many are deeply grateful for the emphasis laid on Holiness by John Wesley, John Fletcher, and their friends, it is well known that the Keswick Movement is absolutely separate from the Wesleyan Movement, and claims the right and takes the opportunity to state the truth of Holiness in a distinctly different way.

P. 323. Several times in his articles Dr. Warfield has

called attention to what he believes to be an essential element of Holiness teaching, in the separation of justification and sanctification, which are said to be "divided from one another as two separate gifts of God." Now while it may be possible for Dr. Warfield to quote writers to this effect, I would like to point out that it is no essential part of the Holiness position. On the contrary, I have heard speakers at Keswick and elsewhere insist in the strongest way that justification and sanctification are to be regarded as essentially one gift, the faith which accepts justification as an act issuing in an attitude of faith for sanctification. Again and again it has been urged that in the normal Christian life the soul receives at the outset a complete justification, together with a commencing sanctification, and both of these in Christ (1 Cor. i. 30). But while this is so, may it not be said that a man can enter upon the position of justification without fully realizing what is involved in sanctification? Let me quote from a book by a Keswick leader which, so far as I can see, Dr. Warfield has not noticed, though it contains some of the soberest and clearest teaching. I refer to "The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life" by the Rev. Evan H. Hopkins, one of the earliest members, indeed one of the founders, of Keswick. Mr. Hopkins is calling attention to the exhortation in Rom. vi. 14 to "yield your members instruments of righteousness," and then adds:—

"If the Apostle had felt sure that these Christians at Rome had, immediately on their conversion, thus surrendered themselves to God, would he have deemed it necessary now to press upon them so earnestly this definite act of consecration? The truth is, the Apostle does not assume or take for granted that all those Christian converts were really walking in a condition of practical consecration to God" (p. 108).

Does not this aspect represent a truth which is experienced from time to time among Christian people?

P. 323. At this point it may be worth while to suggest the necessity and importance of a strict definition of terms.

What is to be understood by Sanctification? The New Testament teaches a twofold aspect of it,—the one referring to our judicial position, and the other to our spiritual condition. In Hebrews the term “sanctified” is descriptive of the whole company of believers and is almost equivalent to Justification in Romans. It seems important to recognize this primary idea of Sanctification as meaning “separation,” for it shows that in this respect there is no difference between one Christian and another, the youngest being as truly sanctified as the oldest (Heb. x. 10, 14). A careful study of Hebrews indicates that the terms “sanctified” and “perfected” describe the present judicial position of every believer by reason of the sacrificial work of the Lord Jesus. Then, arising out of this, comes the more familiar thought of Sanctification as a process, the judicial position being realized in experience. And so, while Justification may be considered to refer to a position which leads to a condition, Sanctification includes both position and condition. Justification and Sanctification are, therefore, complete from God’s standpoint; but while Justification needs immediate and complete acceptance, Sanctification calls also for thorough recognition, followed by constant realization.

P. 327. In the note on this page Dr. Warfield maintains that Scripture never connects Sanctification directly with Faith, not even in Acts xxvi. 18. But it may be fairly asked, Why may not Faith in this passage include and cover the entire process of salvation? It does not seem possible, nor even easy, to exclude “sanctified” from it, especially as faith is a principle of continuance as well as commencement (Gal. ii. 20). The entire thought of faith in the great chapter, Hebrews xi., finds its emphasis on living, so that the Christian life from first to last is “a life of faith.” For these reasons I would contend that Dr. Bartlet in Hastings’s Dictionary of the Bible, as quoted by Dr. Warfield, is absolutely correct.

P. 328. Dr. Warfield says that “the whole sixth chapter of Romans was written for no other purpose than to

assert and demonstrate that Justification and Sanctification are indissolubly bound together; that we cannot have the one without having the other." While this is, of course, true from the standpoint of God's purpose for the believer, it may be questioned whether Sanctification, in the sense of consecration, followed by purification, is always at once realized in personal experience. There is no desire at all to "wrest these two things apart and make separate gifts of grace of them." All that is intended is that there should be the strongest possible emphasis on the need of our experience agreeing with our acceptance. Once again, therefore, I desire to say that the charge of separating Justification and Sanctification is no essential part of the position criticized by Dr. Warfield. For this reason I would also maintain that it is not correct to speak of separating these two aspects of faith and life and "describing them as unrelated operations" (p. 591). I may add that I entirely agree, and so would all who take the same general view as I do, with the quotation made by Dr. Warfield from Professor Livingston (p. 329).

P. 329. It is difficult for me to understand the criticism made by Dr. Warfield of the Greek word *katargeo* in Rom. vi. 6: "that the body of sin might be done away." He says: "The attempted weakening of the phrase 'that the body of sin *might be done away*' by resurrecting the etymological sense of the Greek word . . . is . . . bad." I have always had the impression that there is a clear distinction here, and elsewhere, between *katargeo* and *apollumi*, the former being understood to mean to "render inoperative" or "inert," as distinct from "annihilate." At any rate, it is used of our Lord's dealing with Satan in Heb. ii. 14, where it cannot mean "annihilation." And Dr. Warfield allows support for this view from Sanday and Headlam on Romans.

P. 329. With regard to the word rendered "condemnation" in Rom. viii. 1, whether Deissmann is right or wrong does not really matter; the main point is whether the idea of "condemnation" is to be limited to the judicial aspect,

or whether it may not include experimental condemnation as well. Dr. Warfield evidently favors the former, but I do not think he need dismiss as impossible the other view, especially as it has the support of a well-known commentator like Lange, who remarks:—

“The question of the reference to justification or sanctification must affect the interpretation of *condemnation*, since verse 2, beginning with *gar*, seems to introduce a proof. The position of the chapter in the epistle, as well as a fair exegesis of the verses, sustain the reference to sanctification. (Not to the entire exclusion of the other, any more than they are sundered in Christian experience.) We must then take *no condemnation* in a wide sense.”

On this view it would be perfectly legitimate to *include* in it the thought of “disability” to which Dr. Warfield takes such exception. Then, too, I fancy there must be something of emphasis in the first word of Rom. iii. 1, *ouden*. Godet renders and expounds it in such a way as to imply “no sort of condemnation”; and for this reason some of us feel, following Lange (and Godet himself), that it can (and ought to) have a wider view than that of judicial condemnation.

P. 335. Dr. Warfield considers that “the most fatal defect” in this Holiness Movement is “the neglect to provide any deliverance for the corruption of man’s heart.” I confess that this is surprising to me, for I have always thought that what is sometimes called “inborn corruption” was specifically dealt with by Holiness teachers. What they say about it is that, according to St. Paul, this corruption of man’s heart is hostile to God and is neither subject to God’s law nor can be (Rom. viii. 7). For this reason the teaching is given that the Christian is to reckon himself dead to it (Rom. vi. 11), although, of course, it is not dead in itself, nor will be until the believer is delivered hereafter from the presence of sin. Mr. Hopkins, in the book to which I have already referred, has the subject of Sin as his first chapter and points out various aspects of it, including sin as an offense against God, as a

ruling principle, as a moral defilement, as a spiritual disease, as an acquired habit, and as an indwelling tendency, on all of which he provides, in my judgment, clear, strong, balanced, and Biblical teaching.

P. 337. Dr. Warfield remarks that those who favor the Holiness Movement "teach a purely external salvation. All that they provide for is the deliverance from the external penalties of sin and from the necessity of actual sinning." I cannot think this is either true or fair, because salvation is decidedly internal and involves much more than "external penalties." It is certainly true that there is no present or immediate "deliverance from corruption," and it is also accurate to say that "the heart remains corrupt." I should have thought that this was the truth of the New Testament as well as that of personal experience. At any rate, some of us have not yet observed any essential difference between the youngest and the oldest Christian in regard to remaining corruption, which, but for the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, is as likely to start up in the mature saint as in the immature believer. Dr. Warfield thinks that "to keep a sinner remaining a sinner free from actually sinning" would be but a poor salvation (p. 340). But it may be asked whether, in spite of the criticism, this is, after all, not "the way the Holy Spirit operates in saving the soul." As I have already said, I do not think it is either Scriptural or true to experience to say that "He cures us precisely by curing our sinful nature." The common idea known as "a change of heart" does not seem to me to stand the test of Scripture in the light of such passages as John iii. 6; Rom. viii. 7. Then, too, Dr. Warfield says that "to imagine we can be saved from the power of sin without the eradication of the corruption in which the power of sin has its seed is to imagine that an evil tree can be compelled to bring forth good fruit" (p. 341). Here again I fail to see the support from Scripture for such an idea of "eradication," which is almost tantamount to the very "Methodist doctrine" which Dr. Warfield so strenuously opposes. And so I can only repeat

my contention, which Dr. Warfield quotes, that in the present life we have deliverance from the guilt, penalty, and bondage of sin, and "deliverance hereafter from the very presence of sin" (p. 341). This, I maintain, is the only "eradication" which can be found in Scripture.

P. 340. It is a great puzzle to me to read these words of Dr. Warfield's: "He cures our sinning precisely by curing our sinful nature . . . it is, in other words, precisely by eradicating our sinfulness that He delivers us from sinning." I cannot see how this is to be reconciled with the plain statement of the Apostle already quoted: "The minding of the flesh is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be." Are we to understand that the sinful nature actually becomes good, and that in process of time God "cures our sinning by curing our sinful nature"? I have always thought that our nature in itself is just as sinful now and to the end of life as it was when we were converted, and that there is no eradication of it, or even improvement of it possible; because, if only circumstances are favorable, it is as likely to burst forth at the end of a long life of Christian service as at the beginning.

P. 342. Dr. Warfield is strongly opposed to my suggestion that the true view of the relation of the believer to his sinful nature is neither suppression nor eradication, but counteraction; and although I have given very careful attention to his argument, I am afraid I still maintain the position that counteraction is the best way of expressing the truth. What I meant, and still mean, is that the counteraction of the Holy Spirit is intended to be a more powerful force than the downward tendency of sin. And I maintain that in proportion as we allow the Holy Spirit to rule in our life He does counteract the evil principle that remains in us. This thought of counteraction is no novel idea of mine, but is found in several of the Keswick statements; and I believe it represents the truth of those who consider that the thought of suppression does not go far enough, while the idea of eradication (immediate or

gradual) contradicts both Scripture and experience. Certainly Mr. Hopkins more than once calls attention to this truth as that which expresses what Scripture teaches in regard to the relation of the believer to his old nature. To use one of his illustrations: "When a light is introduced into a dark chamber the darkness instantly disappears, but the tendency to darkness remains; and the room can only be maintained in a condition of illumination by the continual counteraction of that tendency" (p. 29). And so I would say without hesitation that, if the Holy Spirit is permitted to "operate invariably in every action of the Christian," it would be, without doubt, impossible for the principle of sin to gain a victory. Dr. Warfield maintains that on this theory of counteraction I should teach "not that Christians need not sin, but that they cannot sin" (p. 343). But what I maintain is that, supported by the illustration used by Mr. Hopkins, Christians need not sin, and if they allow the Holy Spirit to "operate invariably" they will not sin.

P. 344. I am afraid that I cannot accept the view that the Holy Spirit is cleansing the foundation in the sense that He is attacking "directly the heart out of which the issues of life flow." All through this statement Dr. Warfield seems to me to imply a gradual extirpation of the evil nature; and, so far as I can see, this is disproved both by Scripture and by experience of everyday life.

P. 344. Dr. Warfield maintains that this difference of standpoint between him and me is due to my misconception of the seventh of Romans, which he says "depicts for us the process of the eradication of the old nature." I am afraid I cannot see this in that chapter. Here again I quote from Mr. Hopkins:—

"It is worthy of note that whilst the Apostle in those eleven verses (Rom. vii. 14-24) refers to himself, either directly or indirectly, some thirty times, he does not there make a single reference either to Christ or the Holy Spirit. In reading that passage it is not necessary to suppose that the Apostle is speaking from the standpoint of a present experience, but from the standpoint of a present convic-

tion, as to the tendencies of the two natures that were then and there present within him" (p. 49).

For my part I have long ceased to be concerned as to whether this chapter refers to a believer or an unconverted man; and the fact that there is much to be said for both sides seems a reason for avoiding the question altogether. On the one hand, it certainly is difficult to think of the unconverted expressing his delight in God's law (ver. 22); but, on the other hand, it is equally difficult to think of a believer saying that he is "carnal, sold under sin" (ver. 14). For this reason I favor the view that this chapter is concerned with the man, whatever his exact spiritual position, who is trying to be holy by his own effort, just as in chapter iii. the man is trying to be justified by his own effort. And the fact that in this chapter, as Mr. Hopkins points out, there is no reference to the Holy Spirit, as there is in chapter viii., convinces me of the truth of what Dr. Warfield quotes from my book that "there is no Divine grace in that chapter; only man's nature struggling to be good and holy by law." It is a surprise to me that Dr. Warfield can see in it "Divine grace warring against the natural evil of sin" (p. 345); for, if this were the case, I do not see what need there would be to go on to chapter viii., which, according to my view, gives the normal life of the Christian as possessed by Divine grace and dominated by the Holy Spirit. Dr. W. P. Mackay, a Presbyterian clergyman, the author of that fine book, "Grace and Truth," puts the matter thus:—

"How does the Christian grow in grace? Does his old heart get better? The Spirit of God in John teaches that in a converted man there is a new fountain. Many Christians seem to think that all we get at conversion is a divinely given *filter* to the old fountain, which will gradually increase in its power until it renders the filthy waters of the old fountain clean. In Gal. v. 15-26 the whole point is stated. Two *fountains* are spoken of in the converted man, sending out their natural streams. The streams from the old fountain, the flesh, are given in the 19th verse. Are we anywhere taught in Scripture that this evil nature is

refined, is purified? Certainly, indeed, the man, the individual, is purified, is cleansed, made more holy, is morally sanctified; but it is in altogether another way than by trying to cure what is 'incurably wicked.' The streams from the new fountain—the Spirit—are given in the 22nd verse; and we are told that the Christian's holy life is walking in the Spirit, mortifying the 'members which are upon the earth' (Col. iii. 5), keeping them in their place of death, 'not fulfilling the lusts of the flesh.'"

P. 346. Dr. Warfield is very severe on the doctrine of the two natures which he associates both with "the Brethren" and with the Holiness Movement. And yet, in my judgment, the question is not settled by Dr. Warfield's criticisms, because there is much in Scripture that seems to indicate the presence of two elements, whether or not we call them "natures," in the believer. When the Apostle says, "If any man is in Christ he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v. 17), I do not think this means the entire removal of the old nature from the moment of conversion. Nor do I believe that putting away the old man and putting on the new (Eph. iv. 22-24) can refer to anything else than a twofold attitude which concerns the entire Christian life. At any rate, the view is not to be limited to the Holiness Movement, as Dr. Warfield himself admits, and there are also thoroughly good Presbyterians who take the same line; so that if the Holiness people err they err in good company, and they certainly find themselves supported by a number of passages which, on Dr. Warfield's view, are inexplicable (1 Cor. iii. 3; Gal. iii. 3; vi. 8; Rom. viii. 4-7).

P. 347. Dr. Warfield contends that the teaching against which he writes involves the thought that the Holy Spirit "is only at our disposal and everything is, after all, in our own control." And he evidently objects to the statement that a Christian possessed with the indwelling Spirit of God may choose to walk after the flesh. I should have thought this latter idea was too obvious for denial, not only in the light of such a passage as Rom. viii. 4-9, but also as illustrated by, most unfortunately, very many a Christian experience. Even on Dr. Warfield's own showing this may

be true, for, according to him, a Christian can describe himself as "carnal, sold under sin" (Rom. vii. 14). But it is not accurate to charge the Holiness Movement with teaching that the Holy Spirit is "in our own control." This gives an entirely wrong impression and tends to ignore the truth that the Holy Spirit works in and through us, according to our faith and faithfulness.

P. 352. Dr. Warfield criticizes Mr. Trumbull for what he calls "quietism" and he also speaks of "Quietistic Perfectionism" (p. 353). In reply to this I should like to quote some words of the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Moule, spoken at the last Convention at Keswick:—

"So the power of peace is a mighty thing in the Christian life, and for forty-four years 'Keswick' has consistently and with ever-renewed emphasis dwelt upon that side of the Christian life. 'We who have believed do enter into rest,' that rest at the centre which is the very best possible thing for action at the circumference. When a great wheel is well geared at the centre it can run its swiftest round.

"But, when I have said this, I come back to my text and ask, What has *labour* to do with this *rest*? What has taking pains to do with this peace? We sang a beautiful hymn at the opening of the meeting. Like many a great spiritual utterance, it, wisely and rightly, as our Lord and Master Himself often did, lays the whole stress upon one truth, one side of truth, leaving the thoughtful believer to recollect connections. That hymn seemed almost to prompt the question, 'What is there left for me to do but just to trust in Christ?' If the truth of that hymn is taken as the whole truth, it is transparent that one of those critics of 'Keswick,' of whom Mr. Fullerton so helpfully reminded us last night, might raise a valid objection to it. Perhaps there are some such friendly critics in this assembly, as many a one has been who has ended with thanking God for 'Keswick.' (So George Macgregor did. He came to judge us, he came to see what those good people could say that a well-trained young Scottish theologian did not know much better before. And he went away with a vision of God which made his life the wonderful thing it was to the last hour.) But critics of 'Keswick' might easily say, if we struck that note only, and touched only that string:

‘What is there more for you to do? Is this life really so effortless, so careless? Is it a life in which you simply get into a stream and swim with it, and let it take you on for ever? Is that all?’ No, that is much, but it is not all. Hallowing and keeping grace is indeed a stream, and the stream is strong, and to be in it is blessed. Nevertheless, there is a large place in the true life for labour and for pains. How does this come in? Surely with the recollection that we can use the trusted Christ only when we are *keeping awake*. And you do not keep awake by growing slack in your habits, in your devotions, in your thinking, in your self-examining, in your serving and loving; you do not keep awake by indolence in any of these matters. To take God’s means that we may keep awake needs pains.”

On pages 362 and 363, as well as elsewhere, Dr. Warfield reflects seriously on what he calls “the dogma of the inalienable ability of the human will to do at any time and under any circumstances precisely what in its unmotivated caprice it chances to turn to.” I do not believe this is a fair statement of the Holiness doctrine of free will. But quite apart from this, I would submit to Dr. Warfield that there is more truth in the doctrine of what is generally called the freedom of the will than he is apparently ready to allow.

He charges Mr. Trumbull with a “Pelagianizing doctrine of the will” (p. 367; see also pp. 371, 373). Here again I am convinced Dr. Warfield has failed to recognize the element of truth, even in what he calls Pelagianism. While no one for an instant would wish to set aside or underemphasize grace, it is equally true, that, though grace cannot be commanded, it can, unfortunately, be hindered; and, so far as I can see, this solemn thought finds no adequate recognition at the hands of Dr. Warfield.

In more than one place Dr. Warfield is very severe on Methodism. There is no need to discuss this in detail. But I will make bold to say (in spite of my Anglican Augustinianism) that no system could live which did not possess and emphasize some aspect of truth. In the light of what is known of men like John Wesley, Charles Wesley,

Fletcher of Madeley, and many more, it seems imperative to inquire what there was in their teaching that represented elements of New Testament truth and how, moreover, it is that Methodism has become such a power at the present time.

P. 364. Dr. Warfield speaks of "our wills being the expression of our hearts continually more and more dying to sin." This expression strikes me as curious; for, so far as I have been able to discover, every reference to our being "dead" or "crucified" is in the past tense and implies a definite and complete action, which necessarily rules out the idea of "more and more dying," whatever that may mean. I should have thought it would have been far better to say, like the Apostle Paul, "ye died . . . put to death therefore" (Col. iii. 3-5). As Godet well puts it, Christian Holiness is fundamentally different from all pagan ethics. Paganism says, "Become what you ought to be"; Christianity says, "Become what you are."

There is, of course, constant danger of disproportion in the statement of this truth; but so there is in everything else. Even Predestination, as taught at Princeton, for instance, can easily be exaggerated to the virtual exclusion of the human element altogether. But, notwithstanding all such perils, the old saying is just as true as ever, that "abuse does not take away use."

In regard to deliverance from the power of sin, which is to be sought in the death of Christ rather than in any process of sanctification wrought in us by the Spirit, Dr. Chalmers has a word which seems to me to express essential truth:—

"The man who — riveting all his confidence in the death of Christ — has become partaker of all its immunities and of all its holy influences, will not only find peace from the guilt of sin, but protection from its tyranny. This faith will not only be to him a barrier from the abyss of its coming vengeance, but it will be to him a panoply of defence against its present ascendancy over his soul. The sure way to put Satan to flight is to resist him, steadfast

in this faith, which will be to him who exercises it a shield to quench all the fiery darts of the adversary.

"We are aware of charges of being strange, and mystical, and imaginary, to which this representation, however scriptural it may be, exposes us. But we ask, on the one hand, those who have often been defeated by the power of temptation — whether they ever recollect, in a single instance, that the death of Christ, believed and regarded and made use of in the way now explained, was a weapon put forth in the contest with sin? And we ask, on the other hand, those who have made use of this weapon, whether it ever failed them in their honest and faithful attempts to resist the instigations of evil?

"We apprehend that the testimonies of both will stamp an experimental as well as a Scriptural soundness upon the affirmation of my text that he who by faith in the death of Christ is freed from the condemnation of sin, has also an instrument in his possession which has only to be plied and kept in habitual exercise, that he may habitually be free from its power" (Romans, vol. ii. pp. 90 f.).

P. 369. In the footnote, Dr. Warfield maintains that Mr. Trumbull and I differ in regard to the question of God's grace at the time of sleep, and he characterizes this difference as two doctrines "which stand apart, as far apart as darkness and light; they are polar in their antithesis." I do not feel at all sure of this. My own impression is that Mr. Trumbull and I were discussing the question of sleep in relation to grace in two different connections, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, Mr. Trumbull would not for an instant deny what Dr. Warfield quotes me as saying, while the essential truth of Mr. Trumbull's contention that "Christ forces no spiritual blessing upon a person" is certainly true in its proper place.

Dr. Warfield more than once indicates his strong disapproval of the distinction between conscious and unconscious sins. But once more I imagine there must be some misunderstanding of the position of the Holiness Movement. When, for instance, the old Church Hymn, the "Te Deum," says, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin," there seems to be a clear suggestion of this

distinction, for I do not suppose that the author, or authors, of the "Te Deum" ever meant to imply the entire extirpation or even the gradual eradication of the sinful nature. If this is so, then the thought of deliverance from sinning is much earlier than the modern Holiness Movement. In the same way when the English Prayer Book prays that "this day we fall into no sin," I cannot believe that the Reformers had any thought of the entire removal of the evil principle, but only that the soul might be kept from conscious wrong. Dr. Warfield well knows that in the Jewish economy there was a provision for sins of ignorance, and it has always appeared to me natural to suppose that there was some corresponding provision in the great anti-typal sacrifice of Christ for sins which God could see, though they are for a time, it may be a long time, hidden from the consciousness of the believer.

On p. 599 (October, 1918), Dr. Warfield states what will be perfectly astonishing to many who are associated with this Movement, that "the Christian's sinning is made merely auxiliary and contributory to his holiness . . . in the most literal sense the Christian's sins become stepping-stones to higher things." All that I can say is that there is nothing to warrant such a surprising statement in any of the books on Holiness which it has been my privilege to read. I do not think it is right to make the entire Movement responsible for the utterances of certain individuals, unless it can be proved (as it cannot) that the leaders of the Movement, as a whole, indorse these particular views.

P. 39 (January, 1919), Dr. Warfield is much concerned about what he calls "Perfectionism," and he maintains that every advocate of the Holiness Movement teaches perfectionism in some form; "the immediate attainment of sanctification and perfectionism are convertible terms." Let us not be afraid to face this question of perfectionism and inquire what it really means. On this point I cannot do better than quote from an address at Keswick, delivered

last year by the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton, one of the Secretaries of the English Baptist Missionary Society:—

“The first thing is, that ‘Keswick’ stands for perfectionism. I have heard that scores of times, and so have you—and it does. But it does not stand for the sort of perfectionism that the critic has in his mind. The word perfect is a maligned word. There are two words in the Bible translated ‘perfect,’ but neither of them means sinlessness. The one means equipment and adjustment, and the other full growth; and adjustment is in order to full growth. But that does not mean any sinless perfection in the flesh. That doctrine has never been taught at Keswick, and, please God, it never will be. Yet the blessing that comes to men and women, when fully adjusted to Jesus Christ, is so great and vital that it is not surprising that sometimes people are apt to think they have reached the end of their struggle with sin. But the Word of God does not teach us, and the message of ‘Keswick’ is not, that we are not able to sin, but that we are able not to sin. Have you caught that? It is not that we are not able to sin, but it is that we are able not to sin, if we keep trusting the power that is placed at our disposal.”

I am sorry to have to say it, but somehow or other many of the assertions made by Dr. Warfield concerning the Holiness Movement would not be recognized by most of the leading teachers. In addition to what has already been stated, Dr. Warfield actually makes out a clergyman to mean that “nevertheless he falls whenever he wishes to and Christ does not keep him from doing so” (p. 59). This is most unfair to the one who is thus quoted, for, so far as I can see, there is nothing in the extract to warrant such a conclusion. Dr. Warfield objects to the idea that when a man’s trust fails Christ’s keeping fails. But surely some place must be found in the believer’s life for his own attitude of faithfulness. And if a man fails to trust he is certainly liable thus far to fall, notwithstanding Christ’s readiness and ability. It is, of course, the old question of the relation of the Divine and the human, and does not in any way involve eternal salvation, but only the keeping of the believer’s life. It is, therefore, true to say that the

believer needs both Christ's keeping and his own trusting if he is to live aright.

There is much more that could be said in regard to Dr. Warfield's strictures, especially the error, as it certainly is, of describing the Movement as involving "a fatally externalizing movement of thought" and "with it a ruinous underestimate of the baneful power of sin." In the light of the chapter on Sin from Mr. Hopkins's book, it is difficult to understand how such statements could be made. It is manifestly incorrect to say that "nothing was recognized as sinning but deliberate sinning," and that "ignorance" or "inadvertence was made the matter of Holiness" (p. 81). It only needs to be said that such statements would be met by the most earnest and intense denial on the part of those who are most closely associated with the Movement. Nor is it easy to understand Dr. Warfield's contention that the "Movement naturally fostered a thin religious life. The deep things are not for it" (p. 82). If he would go some time to the Keswick Convention, he would, I think, soon be disabused of this idea of "a thin religious life," for Keswick has proved again and again its association with "the deep things."

I will only call attention to one more of Dr. Warfield's serious and, as I maintain, inaccurate contentions, when he speaks of a little book by Mr. McConkey as "Arminian." This is a book on the Holy Spirit, which has been described by Dr. R. E. Speer as the best he has ever read on the subject, and many more feel the same and are deeply grateful to Mr. McConkey for what he has taught them on this great topic. Even Dr. Warfield admits that "in spite of his fundamental Arminianism Mr. McConkey believes in Perseverance." But it may be respectfully questioned whether Dr. Warfield is not a little too apt to see Arminianism and Pelagianism and free will (in the wrong sense) where they do not really exist. Truth has more sides than Dr. Warfield's articles would seem to indicate.

II

I have now gone through the more important points on which, as it seems to me, Dr. Warfield has either misunderstood or else misstated the position of those whom he criticizes. It is now time to call attention to some of the general features connected with the Keswick Movement which comes under Dr. Warfield's severe condemnation. First of all, let me say that, while the modern Holiness Movement came to England very largely, if not almost entirely, through Mr. R. Pearsall Smith, yet it is inaccurate and unfair to charge all the Holiness teachers with any errors or excesses which may seem to Dr. Warfield inexplicably bound up with Mr. Pearsall Smith's position. Some of us know a little more than Dr. Warfield suggests, perhaps more than he actually knows, about the personal circumstances connected with the early days of the Movement. There seems practically no doubt that the trouble was one of serious indiscretion rather than of definite wrong-doing. But the fact that the leader was thus set aside, and that the Movement has gone on from strength to strength until the present day, is to many of us a clear proof that it was not of man but of God. With regard to Mr. Pearsall Smith himself, it may perhaps be permissible to call attention to a letter which quite recently appeared in the English paper, *The Life of Faith*:—

“It was R. Pearsall Smith to whom, under God, so many owe a great deliverance from sin's dominion. Humanly speaking, but for him there would probably have been no Conventions, beginning with that at Oxford, extending to Brighton, and spreading all over the kingdom, of which the Conventions at Keswick are best known, as they have a world-wide influence. I have lately been re-reading his book, ‘Walk in the Light,’ with much pleasure, and my feeling is that a new edition of this work should be brought out, as I think many would find help and profit therefrom. I quote a sentence from the Preface which, I think, will prove how free Mr. Pearsall Smith really was from the errors attributed by some people to him. ‘Though we have not an absolute, unconditional sinlessness, it is an incalculable blessing and strength to the believer to have a

happy heart free from all known sin; a heart now able to accept the consciousness that Christ does indeed cleanse "from all" sin, and dwell in the purified temple of the being. To this faith brought us; in this faith keeps us. A lapse of faith would restore our old condition of conscious inward evil and outward trespass' (p. 8). I well remember one of his expressions, 'But the blood still cleanses, the bread from heaven still sustains, and the faith once delivered to the saints still gives victory.' I feel that many thousands who have been definitely helped in the experience of the grace of the Lord Jesus little know how much they owe to 'R. P. S.' for the life more abundant that they enjoy."

This will show at least something of what many feel in regard to indebtedness to Mr. Pearsall Smith. But leaving him entirely on one side, I should like to call attention to a book which Dr. Warfield does not seem to know, though it represents Keswick as perhaps no other volume does or can. It is called "The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Its Method, and Its Men." It was published several years ago and consists of about twenty chapters, contributed by various men of the Keswick platform; and all who wish to know what the Movement means should give their careful attention to this book. It is only possible for me to call attention to some of those aspects of the Movement which are perhaps not well known on this side of the Atlantic.

The founder of the Keswick Convention was Canon Harford-Battersby, Vicar of St. John's Church, Keswick, Cumberland, who received such a spiritual blessing from the Oxford Conference of 1874 that on his return home he started a Conference in his own parish which has developed into the great world-wide Movement of to-day. Canon Harford-Battersby was a loyal Evangelical clergyman before he went to Oxford, and on his return home he was asked what he had learnt that was new at that gathering. He replied: "I learnt the difference between a struggling and a resting faith."

It has been my privilege to meet at Keswick quite a number of Scottish Presbyterians, like Dr. Elder Cumming of Glasgow, Dr. John Smith and Dr. George Wilson

of Edinburgh, and several more. Nothing in its way is more impressive than the experience of these Scottish brethren who, with their strong, intellectual, Calvinistic Presbyterianism, found in the Keswick teaching just that element of spiritual glow and experience which gave force and freshness to their rich theological equipment. Those who knew some of these men before going to Keswick, and their life and ministry afterwards, will bear testimony to the reality of the change; and, as Dr. Warfield knows, they were about as far removed from what he would call Arminianism as anyone could be.

On one occasion Dr. Horatius Bonar was prevailed upon to listen to an address on Christian Holiness from the Rev. Evan Hopkins, to whom reference has already been made. It was known that Dr. Bonar was strongly opposed to the Keswick view, and after the address he said to Mr. Hopkins: "I agree with all that you have said, but it is lop-sided truth; what is wanted is all-round truth." To which Mr. Hopkins replied: "This is true, because we have to do with lop-sided Christians, but, when we have got them back into the centre, we give them all-round truth."

Only last year a missionary from Africa, on his first visit to the Convention, gave this impression:—

"Keswick makes no claims to be an end in itself; it is only the means by which men are helped into closer touch with the mighty power of God, and encouraged to claim that power for every need of the soul. It is the idea of Christ trusted fully—yea, more, used fully—that day by day we may be more than conquerors through Him that loved us. It is the teaching of the surrendered life, surrendered to Christ in order that Christ may empower it and use it more fully and fruitfully in His service; it is the teaching of efficiency in the highest sense, and for the highest ends."

This is how Mr. Hopkins puts the truth which is taught at Keswick:—

"First, we would say we believe it is the distinct testimony of the Scripture that we can never in this life say we have no sin.

“We accept those words of 1 John i. 8 as referring to believers, to Christians even in the highest stages of the Divine life. The Apostle, we believe, included himself in that statement: ‘If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves.’

“And yet, while this is true, the Scripture teaches with equal clearness that we may walk with a conscience void of offence. We may know, and ought to know, what it is to be ‘cleansed from all unrighteousness.’ We may, and ought to be living, in the realization of that condition which our Lord intended when He pronounced that Beatitude, ‘Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.’”

In order to make this as clear as possible, I must again use Mr. Hopkins, who, in one of his booklets, has the following:—

“Does anyone ask, ‘What have you lately received which you did not possess before?’ I answer, as to my standing in Christ nothing; as to doctrine nothing. But I have been made to see that Christ can as fully meet my need as to walk as He has as to standing; that He is as truly my Sanctification as He is my Righteousness.”

Another testimony to Keswick has just appeared in an English paper from Dr. A. T. Schofield, a well-known London Doctor, who belongs to the “Brethren” :—

“A want of balance in the spiritual mind is not unfrequently the result of a want of balance of truth or of distorted or one-sided views. Another point may be noted, and that is that the higher the spiritual life the more closely should its essential sanity and reasonableness be safeguarded. Otherwise, we get the disastrous product of cranks and faddists instead of spiritual Christians. Keswick, as a leading school of higher spiritual life, most fortunately is keenly alive to this. Their teaching is twofold, and the second half preserves Christian sanity. ‘First of all,’ they say, ‘we have to make natural men into spiritual; and then *spiritual men into natural.*’ It is thus the balance is maintained. No one can carefully read St. Paul’s Epistles without being immensely struck with the Apostle’s anxiety and care to maintain spiritual health in this respect.”