

Obedience to God in outward conduct is refraining from actual sin, voluntary sin, the first form of sin. But that is not Bible holiness or sanctification. By itself it is only the experience of justification and regeneration,

4. WHAT IS SANCTIFICATION OR HOLINESS ?

These terms are synonymous. In the Authorised Version of the New Testament the same Greek noun was translated five times holiness and five times sanctification. In the New Version it is every time translated sanctification. Our English lexicons show that they are synonymous terms. The same Greek adjective is the root of the noun sanctification and the noun translated holiness. For brevity of discussion we may treat them as one. Holiness is sanctification. What is that ?

(1) Webster's Dictionary defines it as :

“The ACT OF God's grace by which the affections of men are PURIFIED or alienated from sin and the world, and exalted to a supreme love to God ; also THE STATE OF BEING THUS PURIFIED.”

(2) The Century Dictionary defines it thus :

“In theology, the ACT OF GOD'S GRACE by which the affections of men are purified and the soul is CLEANSED from sin and consecrated to God. . . . Conformity of heart and life to the will of God.”

(3) Worcester's Dictionary :

“Sanctify: (1) To FREE FROM THE POWER OF SIN; TO CLEANSE FROM CORRUPTION; to make holy. Sanctification: the ACT of sanctifying or PURIFYING from the dominion of sin. (2) The act of consecrating or setting apart to a sacred end or office.”

(4) Standard Dictionary:

“Sanctify: To make holy; render sacred; morally or spiritually pure; CLEANSED FROM SIN. Sanctification—specifically in theology—the GRACIOUS WORK of the Holy Spirit whereby the BELIEVER IS FREED FROM SIN and exalted to HOLINESS OF HEART AND LIFE.”

The thoughtful, critical reader will no doubt notice a surprising agreement in these definitions. The reason evidently is that the lexicographers were scholarly men who were honestly defining words. They were not riding any theological hobbies. They were not trying to agree with or disagree with any theory of any class of men whatsoever. They were simply defining words. They all clearly assert:

(a) That sanctification is wrought in us by God, and three of them say by an “ACT OF GOD.” This rules out all slow process and the “get-it-by-growth” theory. God puts forth His acts instantaneously, and that is the way He brings sanctification to the life.

(b) Four of them distinctly assert that it is

a PURIFYING, CLEANSING work, by which the soul is "CLEANSED FROM SIN."

(c) One of them says it is the work of THE HOLY SPIRIT, the Third Person of the Trinity. The others do not disagree with this, but use the more general term "God." Let us remember, then, that as they and the Scriptures affirm, it is the specific work of the Holy Spirit to sanctify.

(d) One of them affirms distinctly that it is only "BELIEVERS" who are thus cleansed from sin, persons "who are already IN JESUS," and "UNITED TO HIM BY FAITH." The others say nothing to the contrary. Now that rules out the "*get-it-all-at-conversion*" theory. It establishes a distinct, epochal SECOND WORK OF GRACE.

(e) These lexicographers all use phrases of similar import, "cleansed from," "purified from," "freed from sin." All these phrases in combination distinctly teach the ERADICATION of indwelling sin and NOT THE SUPPRESSION of it. They teach deliverance from it. It is very important for the reader to bear these distinctions carefully in mind, for we have a class of so-called holiness teachers who deny every one of these truths.

Now let us hear from the theologians and the well-known holiness teachers on this subject. Dr. John Owen said: "To be cleansed from the defilements of sin, whatever they be; to have a heart inclined, disposed, enabled

to fear the Lord always and to walk in all His ways and statutes accordingly, with an internal, habitual conformity of the whole soul unto the law of God, is to be SANCTIFIED or HOLY."

Wesley wrote: "Both my brother Charles and I maintain that Christian perfection is that love of God and our neighbour which implies DELIVERANCE FROM ALL SIN." "It is the loving God with all our heart, mind, soul and strength. This implies that no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remains in the soul; and that all the thoughts, words and actions are governed by pure love." "Certainly sanctification (in the proper sense) is an INSTANTANEOUS DELIVERANCE FROM ALL SIN."

Notice, during the different years of Wesley's life, what terms he used to express it.

1739. "Renewal of our heart after the image of God." "The mind that was in Christ."

1741. "Deliverance from inward and outward sin." "The evil nature, the body of sin destroyed."

1742. "Cleansed from all the filth of self and pride." "To perfect health restored." "To sin entirely dead."

1757. "Having received the first fruits of the Spirit, patiently and earnestly wait for the great change whereby every 'root of bitterness' may be torn up."

1758. "A heart entirely pure." "Perfected in love and saved from all sin."

1761. "Delivered from the root of bitterness." "Cleansed from all unrighteousness." "After being convinced of inbred sin, in a moment they feel all faith and love, no pride, self-will, or anger."

1762. "Full renewal in the image of God." "In an instant emptied of all sin and filled with God." "An instantaneous deliverance from all sin." "Cleansed from sin, meaning all sinful tempers."

1763. "The second blessing." "Destruction of the roots of sin in one moment." "Pure love."

1765. "Love taking up the whole heart, and filling it with all holiness." "The soul pure from every spot, clean from all unrighteousness." "Sin destroyed in a moment."

1768. "The image of God stamped on the heart." "The mind that was in Christ, enabling us to walk as Christ walked." "The perfection I have taught these forty years." "I mean loving God with all our heart and our neighbour as ourselves. I pin down all opposers to this definition; no evasion; no shifting the question."

1770. "An entire deliverance from sin and recovery of the whole image of God." "A second change, whereby we shall be saved from all sin and perfected in love."

1774. "The second blessing, properly so-

called, deliverance from the root of bitterness, from inbred as well as actual sin."

1781. "Christ in a pure and sinless heart, reigning the Lord of every motion."

1785. "A full deliverance from all sin and a renewal in the whole image of God." "Full salvation now by simple faith.

1789. "The whole image of God wherein you were created." "O be satisfied with nothing less and you will surely secure it by simple faith."

Plainly Mr. Wesley had no idea of what has been called the "suppression" theory—the evil nature being kept down by dominant grace in the heart. His idea of full sanctification was COMPLETE DELIVERANCE FROM INWARD AND OUTWARD SIN.

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

Rev. John Fletcher: "It is the pure love of God and man shed abroad in a faithful believer's heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him, to *cleanse* him and to *keep him clean* from all the FILTHINESS of the *flesh and spirit.*"

Rev. Joseph Benson: "To sanctify you wholly is to complete the work of PURIFICATION and reparation begun in your regeneration."

Binney : " Entire sanctification is that act of the Holy Spirt whereby the JUSTIFIED SOUL is made holy."

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

We are now prepared to give a formal definition of sanctification or Scriptural holiness, which would probably be accepted by the three hundred teachers and preachers in the National Holiness Association of America, and by the holiness teachers in the Salvation Army, and by Methodist advocates of holiness.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION IS A SECOND DEFINITE WORK OF GRACE WROUGHT BY THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE HEART OF THE BELIEVER SUBSEQUENTLY TO REGENERATION, RECEIVED INSTANTANEOUSLY BY FAITH, BY WHICH THE HEART IS CLEANSED FROM ALL INWARD CORRUPTION AND FILLED WITH THE PERFECT LOVE OF GOD.

Let us now discuss this blessing more fully.

(1) *Sanctification is more than deliverance from the committal of sins.* To be kept continually from wilful sins is not peculiar to sanctification. Regeneration, as described by the Scripture, we have seen, does all that. The grace of God implanted in all at conversion is strong enough to give us constant victory over every temptation. But this is below the state we are now considering.

(2) *Sanctification is also deliverance from the existence of INDWELLING SIN.* The "old man" is crucified, and the "body of sin" is done away (Rom. vi. 6). The sinful disposition is purged away (Is. i. 25), or removed by the refining fire of the Holy Spirit (Mal. iii. 3). Entire sanctification is a state of being *cleansed from all sin*, even INDWELLING SIN, called depravity (I. John i. 7).

(3) *Again, sanctification is even more than cleansing from all sin. That is only the negative side of the blessing.* But there is also a positive side to it. It is being "filled with the Spirit" (Eph. v. 18). This brings love in its fulness and power for service. "The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit" (Rom. v. 5). "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you" (Acts i. 8). Sanctification is a great experience. It means the purity of believers and the Church, and the unwonted progress of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER II.

WHY WE TEACH A SECOND BLESSING.

The modern Church was taught this by God Himself. About 1757 there broke out what has been called the second great Methodist revival. The peculiarity was that it was a revival among *believers*, an outpouring of the Spirit upon those who were *already regenerated* and living *in Christ*. It did not seem to come about through the design or the efforts of any single preacher, for it broke out simultaneously in various parts of England. Christians here and there began to enter into the enjoyment of a *conscious full salvation from sin*.

On March 12th, 1760, John Wesley wrote of many such: "It is plain:—

"(1) They feel no *inward sin* and, to the best of their knowledge, they commit no outward sin.

"(2) They see and love God every moment, and pray, rejoice and give thanks evermore.

"(3) They have constantly as clear a witness from God of sanctification as they have of justification. Now in this I do rejoice and will rejoice, call it what you please; and I would to God thousands had experienced

thus much. Let them afterward experience as much as God pleases."

July 29th, 1761, Wesley wrote of his Christian members: "Many have and many do daily experience an unspeakable change. After being deeply convinced of inbred sin, particularly of pride, anger, self-will and unbelief, in a moment they feel all faith and love, no pride, no self-will or anger; and from that moment they have continual fellowship with God, always rejoicing, praying and giving thanks. Whoever ascribes such a change to the devil, I ascribe it to the Spirit of God."

Such examples as these of well-known Christians of an unquestioned experience of salvation, always foremost in piety and good works in their several communities, entering suddenly into another epochal experience of salvation, a deeper work of grace, led Wesley and those who have come after him to study anew and most critically God's method of saving men. We find and teach that there are two separate and perfectly distinct works of grace. The first work of conversion and regeneration does not do for the soul all that needs to be done. As the Ninth Article of the Church of England says: "*This infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerate, whereby the lust of the flesh is not subject to the law of*

God." . . . This lust hath in itself *the nature of sin.*"

Now everything in us that is unlike God and of the nature of sin must be taken out of us before we are fitted for heaven. Hence the need of a second work of grace. The Bible gives us many examples of such a work, clear and unquestionable. We find that "Abram believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness" (Gen. xv. 6). But about twenty years afterwards he got a call to a second blessing of holiness (Gen. xvii. 1). His name was changed to Abraham, to indicate a change in his life. A rite was given to typify it, explained in Col. ii. 11 as signifying "the putting off" of his old sinful nature.

We find Jacob had his Peniel and Bethel experiences and a change of name to indicate his changed life.

We find David, after he knew that he was forgiven, praying for sanctification (Ps. li. 7).

Isaiah had been a prophet for years, his heart glowing with the fervour of deep piety. But in the sixth chapter we find him convicted for holiness and getting the experience, not gradually by a slow process of growth, but *suddenly*, in one hour of prayer and communion with God.

In Mal. iii. 3 we read that the "sons of Levi" are to be purified by refining fire. They were the priestly tribe that ministered

before the Lord continually; but even they needed the cleansing of fire to offer to the Lord an offering in righteousness. In Mal. iv. 3 a second blessing was promised to them who already feared the Lord.

In Matt. iii. 11 John declared that he indeed baptised with water, the initiatory rite of a religious life, but that Jesus should baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire. It is this fiery baptism which brings the cleansing needed. In the upper chamber, on the night before His crucifixion, Jesus prayed for those who were then His disciples. They had "forsaken all" to follow Him. They had been preaching for three years and casting out devils or demons in the name of the Lord. He said in His prayer: "Thou gavest them to Me, and they have kept Thy word." "They have received My words, and know of a truth that I came forth from Thee, and they believed that Thou didst send Me." "I pray not for the world, but for those whom Thou hast given Me; for they are Thine." "I have given them Thy word; and the world hated them because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." He had just given them the communion of the Lord's Supper. He had just said: "I am the Vine, ye are the branches; already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you." "Abide ye in My love." "Ye did not choose Me, but I chose you and appointed you that

ye should go and bear fruit." "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own; but because ye are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."

If these words of Jesus in that upper chamber are not a description of true Christian disciples, what words could describe a Christian? And yet afterward, in the same assembly, on the same occasion, in the same prayer, He prayed: "*Sanctify them.*" If this was not praying for a second work of grace to be wrought in a disciple of Christ after his regeneration, then the language of Jesus is painfully indefinite and brings confusion of thought to seeking souls.

But there is so much Scripture evidence that we are sure of our footing here. The prayer of Jesus for the sanctification of His disciples was answered at Pentecost. They were immediately *cleansed* from the pride and self-seeking and cowardice and impatience that had characterised their former lives, and they became marvels of Holy Spirit power, as well as holy living, from that very hour.

Philip went down to the city of Samaria and had a gracious revival, and "there was much joy in that city." A good revival of religion always brings joy to a community. A large number were baptised in the Name of Jesus. As soon as the Church of Jerusalem heard of it, they immediately despatched

unto them Peter and John, who prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. And the cleansing Spirit came upon them (Acts viii. 4-17).

Cornelius was "a devout man," who "feared God with all his house"—that is, he had a godly household. "He gave much alms and prayed to God always," and had a vision and a visit from an angel of God. "His prayer was heard and his alms were had in remembrance in the sight of God" (Acts x. 31). He worked righteousness and was acceptable to God (v. 35). He was not an unevangelised heathen, for he had heard the Gospel before (Acts x. 36, 37).

If I wanted to have a delightfully pleasant time in this world, I would like to be pastor of a large Church of as good and godly people as Cornelius and his household. But still God took great pains to have Peter go and preach to them, and they received the baptism with the Spirit. And what it did for them, Peter, years afterward, informed the Council in Jerusalem; "and God, Which knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us; and He made no distinction between us and them, CLEANSING THEIR HEARTS BY FAITH" (Acts xv. 8, 9, R.V.). This is incontrovertible evidence of the method by which God *cleanses* us of the "pollution remaining after regeneration" and thus sanctifies the heart.

Paul, years afterward, found a young body of disciples at Ephesus. His first question was whether they had received the Holy Spirit (Acts xix. 2). Their preacher had not told them that the Spirit was given, just as multitudes of preachers to-day do not seek this baptism, and nobody gets it under their ministry. Hence nobody becomes sanctified, and the Church members are ready to rise up in arms against anybody who preaches this precious doctrine of a second work of grace. But Paul led these disciples right into the experience. It was doubtless to this part of the Church at Ephesus that he refers when he wrote (Eph. i. 13), "After that ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."

We are sure we are not mistaken in our interpretation, but are confirmed in it by the letters to the Churches. Every command and call to sanctification in the New Testament is given to *believers only*, people who are already *in Christ*. Such a command is never laid upon sinners. Every *prayer*, for sanctification is prayed in behalf of the members of the Church. It is believers only who are *called* to the blessing. It is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, "Whom the world cannot receive." It was for the *Church* that "Jesus gave Himself that He might *sanctify* it, having *cleansed* it, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not

having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish (Eph. v. 26, 27, R.V.). Paul longed to get to the Church at Rome that he might impart unto it a spiritual gift (Rom. i. 11), and he was minded to reach the Church at Corinth that they "might have a *second grace*" (II. Cor. i. 15, R.V. m.),

The examination of a single Epistle of S. Paul will prove to a demonstration what I am saying. He writes to the Thessalonians in his first epistle:—

(1) Unto the Church in the Lord Jesus Christ.

(2) "We give thanks for you all" (i. 2). No one can suppose he was thanking God for sinners.

(3) He remembered their faith, love and hope (i. 3).

(4) He called them "brethren beloved of God" (i. 4).

(5) He knew of their election (i. 4).

(6) The Gospel came unto them in power and in the Holy Ghost, converting them to God (i. 5).

(7) These Christians had "*much assurance*" (verse 5). They did not guess or presumptuously imagine that they were Christians. They had assurance.

(8) They imitated the Apostle Paul and Jesus" (i. 6). Sinners do not live in that manner.

(9) They had "joy in the Holy Ghost." Sinners never have joy from Him. He convicts them of sin.

(10) They were ensamples to Christians everywhere (i. 7).

(11) They "sounded forth the word of the Lord" everywhere (i. 8). They had such Christian earnestness that they could not be induced to keep still about their faith in Christ.

(12) They had "turned unto God from idols to serve the living and true God" (i. 9).

(13) They were waiting for His Son from heaven (i. 10). No sinners ever do anything of the kind. The last thing they wish is to have Jesus return and summon them to judgment for their sins.

Now here are thirteen unmistakable evidences that Paul was writing to an earnest body of Christians. He sends Timothy to them to see if they had continued in the faith. Timothy returned with the joyful intelligence that they had not backslidden (see iii. 6-9).

Notice now what the apostle wrote to this young Church. He tells them (iii. 10) that he is praying night and day that he may see their faces and may perfect that which was lacking in their faith, "to the end (verse 13), He may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness." They had exercised faith for justification, but he wanted them to exercise faith a second time for holiness. We know

we are treading on firm ground here from what immediately follows: "*For*," says the apostle (iv. 3), "this is the will of God, even your sanctification." "*For* God called us not for uncleanness but to sanctification" (verse 7).

In the next chapter (v. 23) the apostle prays: "And the God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame. . . . Faithful is He that calleth you (to sanctification), Who also will do it," sanctify you (v. 24). How could a second blessing be taught more strongly or plainly? These excellent Christians of the first chapter are assured that Paul wants their faith to reach out for holiness, for it is God's will that they should be sanctified; for He hath called them to sanctification. And He is faithful to do it for them (v. 24), and if they reject it, they reject not man but God (iv. 8), "Who giveth His Holy Spirit" to accomplish that very work in the soul. These passages are so linked together that no human ingenuity can rationally interpret them to mean other than a call to a *second work of grace*, namely, HOLINESS or SANCTIFICATION.

CHAPTER III.

WHY WE TEACH THE ERADICATION OF CARNALITY.

“The mind of the flesh (the carnal mind) is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; and they that are in the flesh cannot please God” (Rom. viii. 7). The word for “flesh” is “sarx,” used in the New Testament 140 times. It sometimes means the human body; sometimes it means human nature, and again humanity. Sometimes it means carnality, as in the above passage and in Gal. v. 19-21, “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like.” The first four sins in this list are physical sins. But it will be noticed that the next eleven sins in the list are purely mental and spiritual sins, having no connection with the body. So the word “flesh” here must refer to that moral derangement of our being which prompts us to sin. We call it in common speech *carnality* or *depravity*.

Depravity is defined by Webster as “per-

verseness. The state of being depraved or corrupted; a vitiated state of moral character; general badness of character; wickedness of mind or heart. It denotes an utter vitiation of principle or feeling. Its synonyms are corruption; vitiation; wickedness; vice; contamination; degeneracy." It refers to the trend or tendency to sin born within us. Jesus referred to this same sad, dark something within us which prompts us to evil when He said: "For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness. All these evil things proceed from within." Here again is a list of thirteen forms or manifestations of sin, and only three of them are physical.

We gather from the above facts that there is an inward corruption of being not natural to our race as it was originally created by God. It has permeated our whole being, body, soul and spirit. It is opposed to all godlikeness within us. It is "enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. viii. 7, 8). The word "flesh" cannot mean "body" here, for it would be equivalent to saying that no person, while he lived in the body, could please God. But Jesus lived in a body and He pleased God. Enoch walked with

God three hundred years, and had the testimony borne to him "that he had been well-pleasing to God" (Heb. xi. 5). But it is true that a person with a carnal mind, a proclivity to evil in him, a perverted nature is not wholly pleasing to God.

We have seen in Chapter I. that the second set of definitions of a New Testament word for sin is "A principle or cause of sin; proneness to sin; sinful propensity." This is, to use another Bible phrase, "the sin that dwelleth in me." In popular speech it is called "inbred sin." The phrase means, that we acquired it from Adam, through race connection, as a result of the fall.

Now the question arises, is there deliverance from this indwelling sin, inbred sin, depravity, carnality? No matter what we call this abnormal condition of our moral nature, can we get rid of it? This is a grave question, in the answer to which every member of our race has a profound interest.

We believe it can be got rid of and that ample provision has been made in the atonement of Jesus Christ to meet every necessity of our moral nature. We think so,

I. Because it would be unreasonable to suppose that God would have allowed a moral race to be propagated under conditions in which it could not possibly be pleasing to Him. As God made our first parents they were pleasing to Him. They were made in

His own image and He pronounced them "very good." It was superlative praise which Infinite-Wisdom bestowed. But sin marred the image. There is now a foreign element indwelling our nature which is enmity against God; "for it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be, and they that are in the flesh (in this sinful condition) cannot please God." Now who will be rash enough to declare that the atonement of Jesus Christ does not provide for the removal from our nature of anything which is displeasing to God? To me the proposition is unthinkable. "To this end was the Son of God manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil." And certainly no achievement of the devil was so disastrous to the human family as the injection into every human life of a spirit of alienation from God, a trend to evil, a tendency to sin. This is the black nest-egg which produces all the satanic brood of sins that were ever committed. This corruption of our nature was Satan's masterpiece. And to say that he could put an evil into us that the cleansing blood of Christ and the fire of the Holy Spirit cannot remove, is to rob God of His supreme glory and to put the crown of Omnipotence upon Satan's head. True piety *shrinks* from so abhorrent a conclusion. Reverence for an Almighty God refuses to accept as conclusive any argument which can

logically end in consequences so fatal to the glory of our Infinite Redeemer.

II. We think this taint of nature can be removed because of the meaning of the verbs which God uses with regard to it.

(1) In Ephesians iv. 22 He says "PUT OFF" (apotithimi) the "old man."

(2) In I. John iii. 8 He says: "The Son of God was manifested that He might DESTROY (luō) the works of the devil."

(3) In Rom. vi. 6 we are assured that provision was made in the Atonement for the "old man" to be "CRUCIFIED" (sustoroo).

(4) In the same verse we are told that the "body of sin" might be DESTROYED (katargeo). The meaning of the word is, "to put an end to," to "annihilate."

(5) In Rom. vi. 18 and vi. 22 He tells us that we can be "SET FREE FROM" sin (eleutheroo).

(6) In Col. ii. 9-11 we are told we can have a spiritual circumcision which consists in the PUTTING OFF (apekdusii) the body of the flesh," meaning the same as the "body of sin" in Rom. vi. 6.

(7) In II. Tim. ii. 21 we are told that if a man purge himself from these (sins) he shall be sanctified. Notice a purged man is a sanctified man. The verb for "purged" (ekkathairo) means "to *cleanse thoroughly*," "to PURGE OUT," "to ELIMINATE."

(8) In Col. iii. 5 we are told to MORTIFY sin.

The verb is nekroo, which means to PUT TO DEATH, to KILL. Ellicott says the aorist tense in the text means, "to KILL AT ONCE."

In the Old Testament we learn the same.

(9) In Isa. i. 25 we learn that the dross of inward sin is to be "taken away" and "PURGED AWAY."

(10) In Ezek. xxxvi. 25 God promises to CLEANSE FROM all filthiness.

(11) In Mal. iii. 3 we are told that God will PURIFY the sons of Levi and PURGE them as gold and silver. The figure is that of purifying precious metals and the verbs mean the separation of the alloy from the gold.

Now, here are twelve verbs in the Old and New Testaments which teach God's method of dealing with this internal, indwelling sin. They all unite in declaring that He will "crucify" it, "kill" it, "destroy" it, "eliminate" it, "burn" it, and "take it away" from the soul. And what is more, no other kind of verbs are used when describing God's method of dealing with this old foe of His dwelling in our hearts. The conclusion is irresistible. God proposes, if we will consent to it, to *cleanse our hearts entirely and free us for ever from this devilish thing within us that constantly tempts us to sin.*

III. We are confirmed in our faith by the meaning of the adjectives which are used. Take the adjective "katharos." Its meanings are "Clean, pure, unsoiled, guiltless, void of

evil." It is found in such passages as these : Matt. v. 8, "Blessed are the *pure* in heart ; " I. Tim. i. 5, "Out of a *pure* heart ; " I. Tim. iii. 9, "In a *pure* conscience ; " II. Tim. ii. 22, "Out of a *pure* heart ; " James i. 27, "*Pure* and white linen ; " Rev. xxi. 18, "*Pure* gold ; " Rev. xxii. 1, "*Pure* river of water."

It is thus seen that it is applied to the heart, the conscience, religion, linen, gold and water. We know these other things can be pure, gold without alloy, water without sediment, linen not mixed with cotton or wool. Why may we not believe then that there can be a conscience cleansed by the blood and a heart made *pure* by the Holy Spirit, and free from the carnal mind ?

This adjective is the basis of the verb *katharizo*, which is used three times in Matt. viii. 2, 3 : "And behold there came a leper and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou *canst make me clean*. And Jesus put forth His hand and touched him saying, I will ; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy *was cleansed*." Now, did Jesus really cleanse the leper or only play at it and suppress its outward manifestations, but leave the disease still within to corrupt the body and spread its contagion to others ? Fortunately we are not left to any conjecture on this point. Luke v. 13, "Immediately the leprosy *departed* from him."

But this same verb is used in Acts xv. 9,

where we are informed that "the Holy Spirit . . . *cleansed* their hearts by faith." In the light of the use of the verb and the meaning of the adjective, are we not driven to the conclusion that the moral defilement and indwelling sin of the believers was ENTIRELY REMOVED from them by the baptism with the Holy Spirit?

Our conviction that we are right is still further strengthened by another use of this adjective. Remember, it means "clean," "pure," "unsoiled," "upright," "void of evil." It is compounded with the Greek preposition "ek," into another verb ekkathairo. The lexicons give the meanings as, "to CLEANSE OUT," "thoroughly PURIFY," "to PURGE OUT," "to ELIMINATE." It is used in I. Cor. v. 7: "Purge out the old leaven," and in II. Tim. ii. 21 we are informed that if a man is thus purged from the old leaven of carnality and sins, he is "SANCTIFIED, meet for the Master's use, prepared unto every good work." In four passages we are told that we are *sanctified by the Holy Spirit*. Here, then, are our conclusions:—

(1) We are sanctified by the Spirit.

(2) It is done by the baptism with the Spirit, cleansing our hearts (Acts xv. 8, 9).

(3) It consists of "PURGING OUT" or "ELIMINATING."

(4) It makes us "*pure*," like "pure water" or "*pure gold*" from which *sediment* or *alloy*

has been "*purged out*" or "eliminated," or like an Israelite's tent from which the leaven has been "*purged.*" Hallelujah! this is what every Christian heart hungers for, *deliverance* from the carnal mind.

IV. Let us consider the meaning of the Greek adjective "hagios." Its meanings are: (1) "Separate from common use;" (2) "hallowed;" (3) "pure, righteous." It is used about 240 times in the New Testament and in the sense of "pure, righteous," a vast number of times. It is used about a hundred times of God the Father, Son, and Spirit; four times of angels; nineteen times of men and women. We might infer from this that the blood of Christ and the purifying work of the Holy Ghost in our hearts would produce in us a holiness in kind like that in God and the angels, alike free from carnality.

From this adjective is formed the verb "hagiazō," which means, "to consecrate," "to cleanse," "to purify," "to sanctify." This is the verb S. Paul used when he prayed, "And the very God of peace Himself *sanctify* you wholly." (German, "through and through.") "And I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless." And Jesus used it in His intercessory prayer for His disciples: "Father, sanctify them" (John xvii. 17). For this He died (Eph. v. 26). Is it thinkable that Jesus prayed for nothing higher, and died for nothing better, than to

leave the members of His Church a mass of carnality and inward corruption? When the infinite God undertakes to sanctify you, make you "pure through and through," in spirit, soul and body, does He still leave every corner of your being infested with a carnality that is at war with God? Who can believe it for a moment?

The participle of this verb is used in Heb. x. 14: "For by one offering, He hath perfected for ever *them that are sanctified* whereof the Holy Spirit also is a witness to us." It might be proper to ask if God has no higher conception of "perfection" for His sin-hating, blood-bought and blood-washed children than that carnality should still remain in their hearts. And has the Holy Spirit no higher mission than to bear witness to every believer that he has within him an "*unremovable sin*" that is enmity against God?

Notice, further, that the noun "hagiasmos" derived from this adjective is used ten times in the New Testament. In the Revised Version it is always translated, "sanctification." It is used in the text, I. Thess. iv. 7, "For God hath not called you unto uncleanness but unto *sanctification*." Now why is this sharp contrast made between "*uncleanness*" and "*sanctification*," unless God, in sanctifying, removes the uncleanness of inbred sin entirely out of our being? If sanctification does not remove the indwelling sin, then the

uncleanness still remains and the text becomes meaningless.

But inward repression of sin is not inward *purity* or *holiness* or *sanctification*. In justification and regeneration, as we have seen, depravity is held in subjugation, so that it does not rule the life. Therefore, if sanctification only represses depravity, it is not anything more than regeneration. But if that were true we cannot explain why all the regenerated are so constantly urged to be sanctified.

The inference is irresistible. Choking down or repressing sin, or counteracting it, is not the process of cleansing the heart. "Purge me, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Repression is not **purging**, or washing. The inward impurities remaining in regeneration are removed by entire sanctification. "Holiness, or entire sanctification, is the carnal nature ERADICATED, DESTROYED, EXTERMINATED." Even as Jesus said, "Every tree that My Father hath not planted shall be ROOTED UP." He never planted carnality in human nature. The devil did it, and Christ will destroy the work of the devil, eradicate it from our hearts.

"The divine method of dealing with sin is always by extermination. All must see that the extirpation of inward pollution is Scriptural. Holiness is unmingled purity." The same noun is used in Heb. xii. 14: "Follow

peace with all men, and THE SANCTIFICATION without which no man shall see the Lord." Now if the Pentecostal baptism with the Spirit that brings sanctification still leaves within us "the old man that is corrupt," "the evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God," "the law of sin and death," "the carnal mind that is enmity against God," then in what conceivable sense does that unspeakable blessing fit us to *see God* and enjoy Him for ever?

This same wonderful adjective, "hagios," that has such a wealth of meaning, is used four times in that famous passage in I. Peter i. 15, 16: "Like as He Who called you is *holy*, be ye yourselves also *holy* in all manner of living, because it is written, Ye shall be *holy*, for I am *holy*." Here we are taught that our holiness, or sanctification, is to be "LIKE" God's. Could it be imagined that God and the angels are full of carnality and infested with propensity to sin? If not, why do some insist that the sanctifying baptism with the Holy Ghost still leaves us uncleansed from "*indwelling sin*"? May God open our eyes to see that God calls us to be "*cleansed*," "*sanctified*," and have a holiness like His own. As Dr. Steele observes: "The repressive theory of holiness is out of harmony with Divine purity. Holiness in man must mean precisely the same as holiness in God, Who announces Himself as holy and then founds

human obligation to holiness upon this revealed attribute. 'BE YE HOLY, for I AM HOLY.' Who dares to say that God's holiness is different in kind from man's holiness, save that one is original and the other is inwrought by the Holy Ghost?"

We come then to the same conclusion from this line of argument.

1. The adjective "hagios" means pure, righteous.
2. It is applied one hundred times to God.
3. We are commanded to have the spiritual quality denoted by this adjective LIKE AS God has it.
4. This adjective is the basis of the verb "*sanctify*" used sixteen times, and the noun, "hagiasmos," sanctification, used ten times, in reference to people.
5. The Holy Spirit does the sanctifying (Rom. xv. 16 and II. Thess. ii. 13).
6. The aorist tense shows that it is an instantaneous and completed action.
7. Acts xv. 8, 9 declares that this *cleansing*, or making holy, is produced by the Pentecostal baptism.

V. We believe that indwelling sin can be removed from the heart because of the doctrine of spiritual circumcision. Fifteen or twenty years after Abraham was justified he was called to be holy, had his name changed, and he was circumcised. The spiritual meaning of this was taught by Moses in Deut. xxx.

6: "And Jehovah thy God will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed to love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

This spiritual meaning, the removal of *something* from the heart, was also taught by Jeremiah (Jer. iv. 4): "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord and TAKE AWAY the foreskin of your heart, ye men of Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem."

S. Paul endorsed that spiritual meaning when he wrote Rom. ii. 28, 29: ". . . Circumcision is that of the *heart*, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God."

Undeniably something was removed from the physical being by circumcision. Jeremiah said that something was thus to be TAKEN AWAY (not suppressed) from the heart; and S. Paul reiterates the idea that something is to be removed from the heart by a *spiritual circumcision*. He explains what he means in Col. ii. 9-11: "In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands in the putting off of the body of the flesh (*sarx*) in the circumcision of Christ." Bishop Ellicott says "the body of the flesh" in this passage is synonymous with "the body of sin" in Rom. vi. 6.

Dr. Steele, of Boston University, says: "We call the attention of every Greek scholar to the strength of the original noun "putting

off." It is a word invented by Paul and found nowhere else in the Bible nor in the whole range of Greek literature. To show the thoroughness of the cleansing by the complete *stripping off* and *laying aside* of the propensity to evil, the apostle prefixes one preposition (apo) denoting separateness to another (ek) denoting outness (and joins to the stem of a verb denoting to strip or un-clothe), and thus constructs the strongest conceivable term for the entire removal of depravity.

When I was a student at Yale, President Dwight declared that the commentator, Meyer, was the greatest New Testament exegete living. Professor Schaff, of New York, called him the prince of exegetes. This Meyer thus comments on the above passage, Col. ii. 9-11, "Spiritual circumcision, divinely performed, consisted in a COMPLETE PARTING AND DOING AWAY WITH THIS BODY OF SIN, in so far as God, by means of this ethical circumcision, HAS TAKEN OFF AND REMOVED THE SINFUL BODY FROM MAN, LIKE A GARMENT DRAWN OFF AND LAID ASIDE."

And yet, in the face of God's own interpretation of this rite, and His plain declaration that God removes *the body of sin* (sarx), "*the old man*" of depravity from us in sanctification, and the testimony of the best Greek exegetes of the world as to the unmistakable

meaning of the words, and the teaching of the passage, a Keswick speaker makes the astounding declaration that "*there is not a line of Scripture to support this position!*"

We would also ask another Keswick speaker if this teaching about spiritual circumcision warrants him in saying, "Every part of Scripture teaches the retention of corruption in man to the last hour of life." These assumptions are something amazing.

VI. We believe that indwelling sin can be removed from us because of what God says about purity and being pure. In Titus ii. 14 we are told that Jesus "gave Himself for us that He might PURIFY unto Himself a people for His own possession." Can Jesus do no better work of purifying in us than to leave us still infested with carnality and a spirit of alienation from God? Did the Son of God come from heaven to suffer death for a work so superficial and trivial? We cannot believe it for a moment.

People who are already Christians are exhorted to "PURIFY their hearts" (hagnisate) (James iv. 8). The Bible says a great deal about being PURE and having PURITY. It must be a state of grace highly pleasing to God. He has set His heart upon sanctifying us so that we may have it.

Now this is one reason among others why we cannot accept the doctrine of suppression—it is not *purity*. The Bible has nothing to

say concerning the suppression of indwelling sin, but rather its removal. It is not even hinted at in the blessed Book; but it does urge upon us *purity*.

Purity means freedom from defilement, un-mixed, unpolluted. If anything is compounded with anything else it is adulterated and not pure. Water or air mixed with anything else is not pure; and the heart filled with depravity is not pure. A servant may sweep a room and not sweep under the mats: the dirt is left hidden and suppressed. It is a good example of *suppression*, but it is not PURITY. So sin held down and subdued, but still felt in the heart, is not purity. Hence suppression is only impurity. Some teachers tell us that this is the highest state of grace possible in this life, and they teach nothing more. But God pronounces no blessing upon it. Jesus says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." This is in the present tense, therefore there must be people who have pure hearts and purity. To teach otherwise is to teach contrary to the Word of the Lord.

VII. We believe that our moral beings can be delivered from the pollution of depravity, because of what God has said about "*perfection*" and being "perfect."

The adjective "teleios" is used in the New Testament many times. It means "brought to completion," "fully accomplished," "fully realised," "without shortcoming," "perfect."

It is used of persons ten times. Nouns and verbs derived from it and applied to persons are also used many times. We have such expressions as "Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, *perfecting holiness* in the fear of God" (II. Cor. vii. 1); "Wherefore, leaving the doctrine of the first principles of Christ, let us press on (or be borne on) unto *perfection*"; "Above all these things put on love, which is the bond of *perfectness*" (Col. iii. 14); "Let us therefore, as many as be *perfect*, be thus minded" (Phil. iii. 15); "Ye therefore shall be *perfect* as your Father in heaven is *perfect*" (Matt. v. 48).

The Holy Spirit surely meant something when He used this language, and these terms signify something that is precious to the heart of God. We believe that we can find some proper and definite meaning for these terms.

We get a valuable hint from I. Cor. iii. 1-3. Paul said the Corinthian Christians were *carnal* (*sarkikoi*)—even babes in Christ, and not spiritual (*pneumatikoi*). Then the "developed" Christians, the "*perfect*" Christians, would not be "carnal," "subject to the propensity of the flesh" (depravity, or pollution of the moral being). They would be sanctified or cleansed in their natures, and would be spiritual (*pneumatikoi*), having a nature derived from the Holy Spirit (*Pneuma*).

We believe this is what Christian perfection

is. It is a cleansed, sanctified moral nature, obtained by the baptism with the Holy Ghost. It is a state of heart in which innate evil has been removed, and for it has been substituted perfect love to God and man.

Just here we hear objectors saying, "Perfectionist!" "Perfectionism!" "Absolute perfection!!" "Sinless perfection!!" The Rev. E. W. Moore well says: "The phrase, 'sinless perfection,' is the devil's scarecrow to frighten God's people from the finest wheat. People are much more afraid of the doctrine of sinless perfection than they are of the practice of sinful imperfection."

Evangelical perfection, as revealed in the Bible, is not "absolute perfection." We never use that phrase, as God only has "absolute perfection." Our perfection is derived and inwrought by His grace.

Neither do we use the phrase, "sinless perfection." There was in the previous century a little obscure and short-lived company of people that claimed "sinless perfection." It generally means in its advocates a claim to *have never sinned*, or a claim that *they cannot sin*, both of which are unwarranted by the Bible. Accredited holiness teachers never use the phrase. Evangelical perfection is not "sinless perfection." "Sin, though forgiven," says Dr. Daniel Steele, "leaves scars and infirmities which look like sins to the prejudiced spectator. Hence Wesley refused to

call the holiest saint on earth sinless, because the term would inevitably awaken a fruitless debate." Reader Harris wisely observed: "All intelligent believers are agreed that there is in this life no such experience as 'sinless perfection'; that is to say, a state in which the believer will not be tempted, will not be liable to fall, and will not need the abiding presence of Christ."

Rev. Harry Bisseker, M.A., writes judiciously on this subject, as follows:—"Our Lord's precept in Matt. v. 48 does not mean that our perfection is to equal the Father's perfection. (a) The word translated 'perfect' implies not *absolute* but *relative* perfection. Its strict signification is, 'brought to its proper end.' It is used to describe those who are *full-grown* in contrast with those who are babes (Eph. iv. 13, 14). So in character also, it is employed to denote those who have attained that *completeness which they were created to realise*. What it suggests, therefore, is only a perfection *relative to the end for which a person or thing exists*. The true sense of our Lord's words is given in the paraphrase, 'Ye in your sphere shall fully realise the end of your being, just as in His higher sphere your Father realises the end of His being.' He calls us to a life of purity and perfect love. He who has it has the perfection which Christ requires."

John Wesley's doctrine of perfection does

not mean that our perfection was to equal the Father's perfection (in every sense).

(a) To the disciple as to his Lord, it is simply a doctrine of perfect love.

In a conference with clergymen Wesley was asked: "What is implied in being a perfect Christian?" "The loving God with all our heart and mind and soul," was the reply.

(b) This perfect love, he goes on to teach, does not yield a man *absolute* perfection. "He still grows in grace, in the knowledge of Christ, in the love and image of God; and will do so, not only till death but to all eternity.

(c) "Nor does it render its possessor immune from error. It does not imply, as some men seem to have imagined, an exemption either from ignorance, or mistake, or infirmities, or temptations." For this reason Wesley declined to use the term "sinless perfection."

(d) Nevertheless, he refused to treat such unintentional errors in a life of perfect love as though they were *sins*. "I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to involuntary transgressions. Such transgressions you may call sins if you please; I do not."

I am writing these pages within a few miles of a prominent preacher who ridicules Christian *perfection* and makes light of being "*filled*

with the Holy Ghost." He does it openly before his congregation, and publicly declared: "We run the Christian race with the devil in our hearts and the malignity of sin in our lives." It is perfectly safe to affirm that this is not the Christian life that God holds up to us as our ideal. It is not the perfection that God demands of us, nor the kind of life He lovingly calls us to. To affirm that that is the best experience that we can have in this life is to insult the Omnipotent Christ and the Infinite Holy Spirit. If we will permit Him to do it, He Who cast the demons out of the Gadarene can cast the devil out of our hearts to-day, and the fiery baptism with the Holy Spirit will consume out of our beings the "malignity of sin." We can then realise "the end of our being" and the purpose for which we were created. God is pleased to call this "perfection." "Wherefore, leaving the doctrine of the first principles of Christ, let us press on unto perfection," thanking God for the privilege of walking with Him and serving Him with a holy, perfect heart.

As we have already seen in I. Cor. iii. 1, 2, carnality keeps Christians in abnormal babyhood and childhood. But in Eph. iv. 11-13 Paul tells us that "God gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers (and we may add, the Holy Spirit) for the *perfecting of the saints*, till we all attain to a *full-grown man*, unto the measure of the

stature of the fulness of Christ, that we be no longer children."

Now, how can we reach this perfection unless the belittling, dwarfing "old man which is corrupt," is "put off," "crucified," "destroyed," "made dead," or "eliminated" out of our being? We are therefore forced to conclude either that God holds out to us a false hope of maturity and Christian perfection, or He has made ample provision for "taking away" from us the carnal mind. The former alternative is unthinkable; therefore we gladly accept the latter.

VIII. We are confirmed in our faith that God will remove inbred sin from us in this life by the teaching of the first chapter of the First Epistle of John. No passage of Scripture has been worse misinterpreted or more industriously used to defend the unscriptural doctrine of necessary and continual sin.

Let the reader remember that an evil sect of false teachers had arisen, who held that all sin resided in the body, and taught that one could practise all enormities of vice and impurity, and still his soul would remain innocent and uninjured. The practices of these teachers soon became as bad as their doctrines, and they literally wallowed in profligacy. The apostle Peter wrote against them: "False teachers who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that bought them. And many shall

follow their lascivious doings: by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of" (II. Peter ii. 1, 2). "Men that count it pleasure to revel in the day time, revelling in their deceivings while they feast with you. Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; enticing unsteadfast souls: having a heart exercised in covetousness" (vv. 13 and 14).

Jude described them as "wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame . . . walking after their own lusts, and their mouth speaking great swelling words" (vv. 13-16).

When these vile teachers were urged by the holy apostles to repent, they replied that they did not need to repent. When urged to give up their vile sins, they replied that they had no sins and never had any. This awful delusion that sprang from heathen philosophy, akin to Christian Science of to-day, which also denies the existence of sin, was sweeping the churches from their moorings of faith.

When these false teachers were told that Jesus had a body and was holy, they then taught that Christ had only a phantom body, and therefore His atoning death was an unreality. This heresy, unless met vigorously, would wipe Christianity out of existence. So John wrote his First Epistle to meet this error and to give believers the true grounds of assurance. He says (I. John ii. 26), "These things have I written unto you con-

cerning them that seduce you"; and iii. 7, "Little children, let no man deceive you."

Now, with this introduction concerning this heresy in mind, let us read the first chapter of John and a few verses in the second and third, and we shall be able to understand why the apostle wrote as he did and what he meant to teach. At the opening he says in substance: We know that Jesus was no phantom man, for we have *heard Him* with our ears, and *seen Him* with our eyes, and *handled Him* with our hands. We ate, and drank, and walked, and talked, and slept with Jesus for more than three years, and saw Him die on the Cross for our sins, and saw Him many times after He was risen, and we know that He was a real man and no phantom ghost.

Now, the next six verses, beginning with the fifth, are written in pairs; the first verse of each pair, viz., the 5th, 7th, and 9th verses, are the Christian truth of full salvation. But the contrasted—6th, 8th, and 10th verses—are blows at the conduct and doctrine of the seducers of the churches. Notice them.

Verse 5. *Christian truth*: "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all."

Verse 6. *A blow at the seducers*: "If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness (as these seducers say and do), we lie, and do not the truth."

Verse 7. *Christian truth about full salvation*: "But if we walk in the light as He is