The Doctrine of Sanctification: An Exegetical Examination, with Application, in Historic Baptist Perspective, to which is Appended a Historical, Exegetical, and Elenctic Evaluation of Influential Errors, Particularly the Keswick Theology

NOTE: This is a WORK IN PROGRESS. It is NOT yet completed, but the author felt it was important enough that he wanted to make it available now.

I. Summary of the Significance of Romans 6:6

II. Exegetical Justification for the Significance Assigned

A. Crucifixion with Christ Does Not Mean That Sin Is Already Utterly Destroyed In The Christian Life

B. The Ethically Sinful Portion Of The Regenerate Is Already Legally And Judicially Dead, But In Practical Sanctification What Is Legally Dead Must Still Be Put To Death, A Work That Continues Until And Is Consummated In Glorification

C. The Significance Of And Relationships Between The Old Man, The Body Of Sin, And The Flesh, How These Are To Be Mortified, And The Nature Of Mortification

D. The Nature And Means Of Vivification, The Positive Converse of Mortification

I. The Nature of Vivification

1.) Vivification as Quickening

2.) Vivification as Growth

3.) Vivification as Building Up

4.) Vivification as Strengthening

5.) Vivification as Transformation

6.) Vivification as Perfecting

7.) Vivification as Renewal Sourced in Regeneration

II. The Prerequisites for Vivification

1.) Be Right With God

2.)

III. The Means of Vivification

1.) Vivification Comes By "Exercise"

E. The Body of Sin Is Indeed Destroyed, Not Merely Counteracted

F. Gradual Deliverance From The Power Of Sin Is Consistent With the Aorist Subjunctive Of "To Destroy" (*katargeo*) In Romans 6:6

G. How Does God Make Believers More Holy in Progressive Sanctification?

I. The Distinction Between Those Right With God And The Backslidden Believer
III. The Certainty of Practical Sanctification For All The Regenerate
A. Scripture Clearly Teaches That All Saved People Will Be Changed
B. 1 John Teaches That All Saved People Are And Will Be Different
IV. Exegetical and Historical Excurses Relevant to Sanctification
C. Excursus I: Does Colossians 2:6-7 Teach Sanctification by Faith Alone?
D. Excursus II: Romans 7:14-25: A Depiction of Part of the Normal Christian Life
E. Excursus III: Does Galatians 2:20, Or Any Other Text of Scripture, Teach that Christ Lives the Christian Life Instead of the Believer?
F. Excursus IV: Hebrews 3-4 As An Alleged Evidence For Perpetually Sinning Christians
G. Excursus V: "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit" (Ephesians 5:18)
H. Excursus VI: Is Fallen Man's Obligation To Obey God Limited To His Ability To Do So?
I. Excursus VII: Are All Believers Disciples?
J. Excursus VIII: What Does It Mean To Abide in Christ?
K. Excursus IX: Regeneration and Sanctification Are Connected with the Renewal of the Whole Person, Body, Soul, and Spirit—Not with the Spirit Alone
L. Excursus X: Hannah Whitall Smith: Higher Life Writer, Speaker on Sanctification, Developer of the Keswick Theology, Quaker Quietist and Universalist Heretic
M. Excursus XI: An Analysis and Critique of Keswick Theology as Set Forth Particularly In *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention,* by Steven Barabas
N. Excursus XII: Do Keswick Critics Routinely Misrepresent Keswick Theology?
V. A Concluding Exhortation
VI. Classic Documents That Relate To Crucifixion With Christ And Sanctification In General
A. 2nd London Baptist Confession of Faith (1677) / Philadelphia Baptist Confession of Faith (1689/1720), Article 13, Of Sanctification
B. *An Orthodox Creed* (1678), Article 26, Of Sanctification and Good Works
C. "The Means Of Sanctification," James Petigru Boyce.
D. An Excerpt from *A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*, John Owen.
E. An Excerpt from *The Method of Grace: How the Spirit Works*, John Flavel.

F. The Nature of True Holiness Explained, John Brine

G. The Old Man Crucified, Charles H. Spurgeon.

H. The Old And The New Man In Believers, Thomas Boston.

VII. Bibliography

I. Summary of the Significance of the Verse

Romans 6:6 promises that the believer's "old man," the pre-conversion person dominated by sin, the person "in Adam," "is crucified with" Christ. It is judicially dead, having been judicially destroyed at the time of the crucifixion of Christ. The "body of sin," the body dominated by sin when the Christian was still unconverted, has been judicially destroyed. This destruction is associated with positional sanctification.[1] In

---

[1] "Sanctification [is one] of the privileges bestowed upon the people of God, as the result of their union with Christ. . . .[J]ustify . . . means simply to declare just, or to treat as just; sanctify means to make holy. The usage of Scripture is as clear in this case as in that. The word 'holy' in Scripture has, however, various meanings. It is sometimes applied to things, and not to persons only.

1.) It is used in the sense of that which is set apart or dedicated to an especial use. Thus, God threatens that instruments of vengeance will be 'prepared' (sanctified) against 'the king's house of Judah,' Jeremiah 22:7. But the dedication is most frequently for some holy use. Thus, 'holy' is applied to the Sabbath day (Exodus 31:14); and to the house of God (Leviticus 16:33); and to the water (Numbers 5:17); and to the vessels of the young men (1 Samuel 21:5).

2.) Things are also called holy from their connection with holy persons. Thus, the 'place' on which Moses stood was proclaimed 'holy' on account of its connection with Jehovah (Exodus 3:5); likewise the Mount of Transfiguration (2 Peter 1:18).

3.) As descriptive of an act free from sin, and performed with holy motives. Thus, the kiss of Christian salutation, called in 1 Peter 5:14 a kiss of charity, is in several other places called a 'holy kiss.' 1 Corinthians 16:20; 2 Corinthians 13:12; 1 Thessalonians 5:26.

4.) 'Holy,' as tending to produce holiness; as 'most holy faith' (Jude 20).

5.) It is most generally used as descriptive of personal character, whether the holiness be perfect, as in God, or angels, or glorified saints; or partial, as seen in his people on earth. A few of the many instances of its application to this last class are 1 Samuel 2:9; Acts 9:13; Romans 15:25, 26; Philippians 4:21; Ephesians 1:1; Colossians 1:2; Revelation 18:24.

The doctrine of sanctification has reference to the first and last of these usages of 'holy;' to the last more especially, as including the character of holiness produced by the continuous working of the Holy Ghost through the word of truth; but also to the first, as involving that dedication of person and life to God, which constitutes that 'living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God,' which is the believer's 'reasonable service.' Romans 12:1. Christian holiness includes both character and life. 'Sanctification' is the process by which these are accomplished. The 'sanctified' are those who are thus made holy. To 'sanctify' is to make them thus holy" (pgs. 1-2, Chapter 37, "Sanctification," *Abstract of Systematic Theology*, James Petigru Boyce. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006).

"[Progressive] [s]anctification is not synonymous with holiness—it is not the state of one who is made holy—but it is the act by which such a state is produced. It is . . . the work of God . . . the work of each Person in the Godhead in particular. . . . But, while we regard it as the work of God, it is important in another view that we should regard it as the work of man. The subject of it is a rational and responsible agent. . . . He has a duty to perform and a work to do . . . [i]n prosecuting this work, his reliance for success must be . . . on the Spirit of God working by appointed means. He must be active, and yet he must not depend on himself. . . . [His] encouragement to be active in the use of means . . . rest[s] upon [his] knowledge of the interposition and the agency of God" (pgs. 13-15, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*, W. D. Snodgrass).

"[Progressive] [s]anctification may be defined as that operation of the Holy Spirit, involving man's responsible participation, by which he renews man's nature and enables him to live to the praise of God. Sanctification, therefore, is both the work of God and the task of man" (pg. 8, *Created In God's Image*, Anthony A. Hoekema).

"Sanctification is that continuous operation of the Holy Spirit, by which the holy disposition

terms of progressive sanctification, the flesh, the ethically sinful "body of sin," has received its death blow, and its ultimate destruction at glorification is certain, as a man who is on a cross is certain of ultimate death, although he still can struggle and fight within certain limits.[2] The flesh within the believer is certain of utter destruction at death or the return of Christ, but during this life, although crucified and growing weaker, it can still influence the Christian to sin. These remnants of sin in the believer are to be mortified, put to death, to bring the legal and judicial truth and the ultimate certainty of glorification closer to practical reality in this life. This crucifixion with Christ in the believer has the result "that the body of sin might be destroyed." This destruction, judicially completed at the time of Christ's crucifixion, and positionally and legally declared for the believer at the moment of his regeneration, will take place ultimately at glorification, when the remnants of sin in the Christian are entirely removed, finally and

---

imparted in regeneration is maintained and strengthened. . . . [It] consists *negatively* in the removal of the penal consequences of sin from the moral nature and *positively* in the progressive implanting and growth of a new principle of life. . . . Although in regeneration the governing disposition of the soul is made holy, there still remain tendencies to evil which are not subdued. . . . The existence in the believer of these two opposing principles gives rise to a conflict which lasts through life. . . . In this conflict the Holy Spirit enables the Christian, through increasing faith, to more fully and consciously appropriate Christ, and thus progressively to make conquest of the remaining sinfulness of his nature. . . . The Christian is "crucified with Christ" (Galatians 2:20), but the crucified man does not die at once. Yet he is as good as dead. Even after the old man is crucified we are still to mortify him or put him to death (Romans 8:13; Colossians 3:5). . . . [I]n the genuine believer, the old does little by little die and the new takes its place. . . . Sanctification does not always proceed in regular and unbroken course, and it is never complete in this life . . . [but] in the life to come . . . sanctification . . . of the soul . . . is completed . . . at death . . . and of the body of the believer . . . at the resurrection" (pgs. 169-179, Section 3: "The Application of Christ's Redemption in its Continuation: Sanctification," in *Systematic Theology*, Augustus Strong. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006).

[2] "Christ, by his expiatory sufferings and death, redeemed his people from the curse, brought them under grace, and procured for them the blessing of the Spirit, who creates in them the new man, and dwelling in them, supports the new man against the old man, and gives complete victory over him at last. . . . Christ . . . left . . . sin nailed fast to the cross, crucified, and hard bound, in order to final destruction. The virtue of his cross reaching in due time his people in their own persons, they are justified, delivered from the curse, brought under grace; and they are to consider the old man in them as crucified; in order to his death, and total extinction. . . . [W]e may [also] consider crucifixion as representing . . . the condition in which the old man, sin and the lusts thereof, do remain in the believer; not, as some time, at full liberty, and in full force and prevalence, but, though alive, living in pain, checked, resisted, repressed, and mortified. His efforts, as of one in desperate condition, may be with considerable force, and too often with ill effect to the slothful, unwatchful Christian. Yet at last, like what happened outwardly to the crucified thieves, this malefactor, the old man, will, in the end of the day, be slain by one blow of almighty grace. . . . The expression, however, in this first clause, is not, that the old man is put to death. Persons might live a considerable while, yea some days, on the cross. Crucifixion is not a state of death, but a state of pain, and torment, tending to death. . . . [T]his old man, by a power superior to that of the new man in us, even by the power and virtue of the cross of Christ, is adjudged to death, crucified, and bound fast, as to Christ's cross; so that as surely as the cross of Christ exists in virtue and efficacy, so surely shall he die; and the present effect of this his crucifixion is that this old man . . . is deprived of its force and reigning power, is enervated and enfeebled; so that from henceforth we are not in servitude to it or under its dominion, though it remaineth in us" (pgs. 60-61, 65-66, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification,* James Fraser).

completely destroyed. However, the beginnings of this utter destruction are already set in motion, even as the crucifixion of the old man with Christ, which took place legally at the time of the Savior's own crucifixion and begins experientially in the life of the elect at the point of their regeneration, progressively removes the life and strength from the old man, the body of sin. The negative aspects of the progressive mortification of sin in this life, is the converse to the vivification, the progressive cleansing, sanctification of the believer, and growth of the new man, produced by the Triune God and especially the Holy Spirit[3] through the Scriptures. This vivification culminates in glorification,[4] when the Christian will be entirely without spot or wrinkle (Ephesians 5:26-27). Since the old man is already judicially crucified and dead, and experientially and progressively crucified and dying, on its way to certain destruction, the believer "henceforth . . . should not serve sin." Freedom from service to sin in this life and the elimination of its reigning power (Romans 6:14) is immediately received at the moment of regeneration. Progressive deliverance from sin, the progressive destruction and progressive weakening of the strength of the old man, are the saint's current portion, and final and ultimate deliverance from all service to sin, and the final and complete destruction of the old man in heaven are his certain inheritance. Regeneration shatters the dominance of sin in the

---

[3] The Author of sanctification . . . is God. . . . The work is attributed to God without reference to any distinction of persons. 1Thessalonians 4:3; 5:23. It is also ascribed to the Father, John 17:17; Hebrews 13:21; and to Christ, Ephesians 5:26; Titus 2:14.

But it is the especial work of the Holy Spirit, who is the author of the process of Sanctification, as he is also the act of Regeneration. 1 Corinthians 6:11; 2 Corinthians 3:18; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 1:2.

1.) He enlightens the mind. John 14:26; 1Corinthians 2:9-16; Ephesians 1:18; 3:18, 19; 1 John 2:20, 27. On this account he is called "the Spirit of truth," John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; and the "Spirit of wisdom." Ephesians 1:17.

2.) He gives spiritual strength (Ephesians 3:16), lusting against the flesh (Galatians 5:17), enabling the believer to mortify the deeds of the body (Romans 8:13), leading the sons of God (Romans 8:14), and enabling them to purify their souls in obeying the truth. 1 Peter 1:22.

3.) Inasmuch as he dwells within them (Rom. 8: 9), so that they are his temple (1 Corinthians 3:16), with whom they are sealed as the earnest of their inheritance (Ephesians 1:13, 14), so, also, does he bear witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, and, removing the spirit of bondage to fear, bestows on them the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry Abba, Father. Romans 8:15, 16.

4.) The fruit of this indwelling Spirit is declared to be "in all goodness and righteousness and truth." Ephesians 5:9. It is specifically stated to be "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Galatians 5:22. . . .

[W]hile there is such need of a divine author of sanctification, it is a work in which the believer is passively a recipient, but one in which he actively cooperates. (pgs. 6-7, Chapter 37, "Sanctification," *Abstract of Systematic Theology*, James Petigru Boyce. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006)

[4] "Glory, therefore, is Grace in its full Maturity, or our spiritual Knowledge of spiritual Things grown up to its intended Perfection. A most pleasing Thought this, and it is what may very justly be considered as a most persuasive Motive, diligently to study . . . sacred Truths" (pg. 19, "The Nature of True Holiness Explained In a Discourse [on Hebrews 12:14], Delivered at a Monthy Exercise of Prayer, with a Sermon, on the Twentieth of April, 1749," John Brine).

believer and imparts a new nature, progressive sanctification brings the growth of the new nature and the progressive dying of indwelling sin, and glorification completes the work of sanctification as indwelling sin is forever extirpated and the believer enjoys perfect holiness in the presence of God. These are the purposes of God in and results of the saint's crucifixion with Christ.

II. Exegetical Justification for the Significance Assigned

A. Crucifixion with Christ Does Not Mean That Sin is Already Utterly Destroyed in The Christian Life

Crucifixion with Christ does not mean that the motions of the sinful remnants within the saint are entirely unable to do anything anymore in practice and are already entirely destroyed.[5] The uses of "crucified with," *sustaurao* (συσταυρόω) in the gospels, where the word is employed of the thieves crucified with the Lord, certainly do not indicate that those crucified with Christ were already dead in practice (Matthew 27:44; Mark 15:32; John 19:32). A man who is literally condemned to death on a cross is legally dead, his future actual bodily death is certain, and he grows progressively weaker over time. In addition to his future death being certain, he had certain definite limitations imposed upon him from his crucifixion. His arms and legs were immobilized, and their actings were thus subscribed to a certain limited sphere, although not entirely eliminated—a man who has not been crucified can walk and act in a much wider sphere than one who is nailed to a cross. His fleshly struggles against his coming death were more violent at one time than at another, but overall through time grew progressively weaker until he finally died, although his body, his flesh, was still able to perform various

---

[5] "The depravity or corruption of nature is total. . . . Genesis 6:5, 'God saw that every imagination of the thoughts of man was only evil continually.' There can be but a single dominant inclination in the will at one and the same time; though with it there may be *remnants* of a previously dominant inclination. Adam began a new sinful inclination. This expelled the prior holy inclination. He was therefore totally depraved, because there were no *remainders* of original righteousness left after apostasy, as there are remainders of original sin left after regeneration. This is proved by the fact that there is no struggle between sin and holiness, in the natural man, like that in the spiritual man. In the regenerate, 'the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh,' Galatians 5:17. Holiness and sin are in a conflict that causes the regenerate to 'groan within themselves,' Romans 8:23. But there is no such conflict and groaning in the natural man. Apostasy was the fall of the human will, with no remnants of original righteousness. Regeneration is the recovery of the human will, with some remnants of original sin." (pg. 64, Chapter 5, "Original Sin," *Dogmatic Theology: Anthropology,* William G. T. Shedd. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006).

actions and exert vigor until the time of its final passing.[6] So the sin within a believer is legally judged dead already, its reign is shattered, it is certain of a coming utter destruction, it is confined within certain limits beyond which it cannot pass (cf. 1 Corinthians 6:9-11; Galatians 5:18-24),[7] and it is growing weaker as through time the believer mortifies it, but it is not yet entirely motionless or its vigor entirely eliminated.

The verb *crucify*[8] is employed quite a number of times in the gospels for those who have had the sentence of death passed upon them legally, yet are not yet literally dead (Matthew 27:35, 38; 28:5; Mark 15:24, 25, 27; Luke 23:33; John 19:18, 23), just as *cocrucify/crucify with* is clearly employed in this sense (Matthew 27:34; Mark 15:34; John 19:32). Indeed, no text in Scripture clearly makes *crucify* and *die* absolute synonyms, although crucifixion unquestionably leads to literal death, so that one who has been crucified eventually dies as a result (Matthew 20:19; 23:34; John 19:10, etc.). This, however, does not mean that the two words are identical any more than the fact that someone dies from terminal cancer means that *to have cancer* is a synonym with *to die*, or the fact that starvation leads to death means that *to starve* is a synonym with *to die*. Nor does the fact that the Christian is both crucified with Christ and dead with Christ prove the two terms are synonyms—believers are also buried with and risen with Christ, but nobody would argue that since believers are crucified with Christ and risen with Him *crucified* and *risen* are synonyms. Crucifixion brings one to the point of literal death, but only after a drawn-out and painful process of gradual dying. The metaphor of crucifixion with Christ (Romans 6:6; Galatians 2:20) should be interpreted in the same sense,[9] where

---

6 Note that the two thieves crucified with Christ had their drawn out process of dying ended suddenly (John 19:32), as the gradual process of progressive sanctification and mortification is suddenly and entirely completed at the return of Christ or the death of the beleiver.

7 Note section III, "The Certainty of Practical Sanctification For All The Regenerate," below.

8 The forty-two instances of the verb in the NT are: Matthew 20:19; 23:34; 26:2; 27:22-23, 26, 31, 35, 38; 28:5; Mark 15:13-15, 20, 24-25, 27; 16:6; Luke 23:21, 23, 33; 24:7, 20; John 19:6, 10, 15-16, 18, 20, 23, 41; Acts 2:36; 4:10; 1 Corinthians 1:13, 23; 2:2, 8; 2 Corinthians 13:4; Galatians 3:1; 5:24; 6:14; Revelation 11:8.

9 John Murray argues against this view, stating: "[T]he idea that crucifixion is a slow death and therefore to be conceived of as a process by which the old man is progressively mortified until he is finally put to death is to go flatly counter to Paul's terms. . . . Exegetically speaking it is no easier to think of the old man as in process of crucifixion or mortification than it is to think of the resurrected Lord as being still in process of crucifixion" (pg. 213, *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics*). Murray admits that one "could plead the analogy of Paul's usage in connection with other terms. In Paul's thought believers died to sin once for all (Romans 6:2) and yet sin lives in the believer (Romans 7:14-25) . . . Paul in the one case dealing with the definitive breach with sin and the flesh, in the other case with the fact that the believer is not yet perfect. Hence *pari passu* we might think of him as applying the same kind of distinction to the old man, in the one case his definitive crucifixion, in the other his continuing life and activity." Nonetheless, Murray concludes that a conclusive "objection to this reasoning is that it finds no support in the usage of the apostle [Paul]" (pg. 218, *ibid*). However, Murray's conclusions are incorrect.

the ultimate and final death to sin takes place with the utter destruction of the ethically sinful flesh at glorification and the gradual process of dying to sin occurs in progressive sanctification throughout life as a product of the crucifixion with Christ and legal sentence of death that took place at the moment of regeneration. That is, the believer becomes legally dead to sin at the moment of his regeneration, progressively is dying to sin throughout his life of progressive sanctification, and is ultimately and finally dead to sin at the time of his glorification. While Christians do grow more dead to sin as they grow more holy, they do not, in progressive sanctification, become more crucified—at regeneration Christians are, once and for all, crucified with Christ. Nevertheless, as the unregenerate grow more inwardly and outwardly wicked (2 Timothy 3:13),[10] the

---

First, the fact that crucifixion is a slow death, and hence, while judicially and legally the old man is dead in the Christian, the old men still progressively dies as the Christian grows in grace, is not an affirmation that the "old man [is] in process of crucifixion." The believer's cocrucifixion took place at the moment of his regeneration and is not a process, but the full results of that crucifixion appear progressively. Murray does not accurately state the position he opposes.

Second, the Bible indicates that both the *old man* and its corollary, the *outward man*, progressively decay, while the *new* or *inward* man is progressively renewed (cf. 2 Corinthians 4:16a, ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται; Ephesians 4:22, τὸν παλαιόν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν φθειρόμενον; 2 Corinthians 4:16b, ὁ ἔσωθεν ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ; Colossians 3:10, τὸν νέον, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον).

Third, not only does Scripture in general regularly and indisputably speaks of *crucifixion* for those who are legally or judicially dead but still progressively dying (cf. Matthew 27:35, 38, 44; Mark 15:27, 32)—and even speaks of actions which accelerate the arrival of literal death for those crucified but still alive (John 19:32)—but Paul specifically employs crucifixion metaphorically in connection with indwelling sin that is legally dead but practically still present. The Apostle stated: "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. . . . God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Galatians 5:24; 6:14, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. . . . ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· δι᾽ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ.). Believers have had their flesh crucified (Galatians 5:24), but they still have the ethically sinful flesh (Romans 6:19; 7:18, 25; 13:14). Believers have had their sinful lusts crucified (Galatians 5:24, ἐπιθυμία), but they still possess such lusts after regeneration (Romans 6:12; 13:14; Galatians 5:16-17; Ephesians 4:22; Colossians 3:5; 2 Timothy 2:22). Believers have been crucified to the world (Galatians 6:14), but the way of the world is something they must still battle (Colossians 2:20). The idea of progressive, practical death in sanctification based upon an already completed crucifixion with Christ appears abundantly in Scripture.

Thus, Scripture contains abundant evidence that the metaphor of crucifixion with Christ is properly interpreted in association with literal crucifixion, where elements of judicial death, progressive dying, and ultimate and final death parallel regeneration, progressive sanctification, and glorification.

[10] The wicked, Paul predicts in 2 Timothy 3:13, "wax worse and worse," προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον; they "advance in their worseness," and proceed or advance in folly (2 Timothy 3:9) as they are deceived and deceive others and themselves all the more (πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι), even as certain sins "increase unto more ungodliness" (ἐπὶ πλεῖον γὰρ προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας, 2 Timothy 2:16), or a child increases in his bodily, psychical, and spiritual capacity (Luke 2:52). Thus, the old man is in a state of progressively worsening corruption (Ephesians 4:22, φθειρόμενον; cf. Jude 10), being hardened by the deceitfulness of sin (Hebrews 3:13), as creatures progressively weaken and die and the fallen creation itself decays under "the bondage of corruption" (τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς, Romans 8:21; cf. 2 Peter 2:12), while in the believer the new man is progressively renewed (Ephesians 4:23, ἀνανεοῦσθαι). In the unregenrerate, imputed sin leads to progressively worsening sinning and growing depravity: "Actual sin

regenerate grow inwardly more holy and less sinful, and consequently act more like their sanctifying God, as their new nature is strengthened and their indwelling sin eradicated by the power of the Spirit. The gradual weakening of the body of sin and the remnants of sin in the Christian are a result of his already completed cocrucifixion.

B. The Ethically Sinful Portion Of The Regenerate Is Already Legally and Judicially Dead, But In Practical Sanctification What Is Legally Dead Must Still Be Put To Death, A Work That Continues Until And Is Consummated In Glorification

The connection between cocrucifixion (Romans 6:6) and death in Romans 6:6-11 is significant. One who is crucified is already legally dead, although he may not, in practice, yet have in every sense of the word actually physically died. So the believer is legally both crucified and dead—the saint, as identified with Christ, was crucified when Christ was crucified, died when He died, and rose when He rose from the grave. Furthermore, at the moment of regeneration, the believer died in that he was freed from the legal dominion and reigning power of sin (Romans 6:14). As a consequence, in progressive sanctification, he is to put do death or mortify more and more of the deeds of the flesh, and more and more weaken the sin principle in him by the Spirit, and more and more become holy in his nature, habits, and actions, as he is more and more renewed into the image of Christ. This progressive process is entirely completed in actuality at glorification.

The legal sentence of death, with its resultant freedom from the reign of sin, is emphasized in the use of cocrucified, *sustaurao*, in Galatians 2:19-21. The perfect tense of *cocrucified* in Galatians 2:20 emphasizes the results of the point action of crucifixion with Christ experientially received at regeneration. Judicially, the believer's ethically sinful flesh is already destroyed and dead, having died on the cross. In the purpose of God, glorification is already a certainty for the saint as well, as is perfect conformity to the image of Christ (Romans 8:29-30). Practically in this life, progressive renewal into

---

not only springs forth from the pollution involved in original sin, it also intensifies the pollution . . . the pollution involved in original sin is both the mother and the daughter of sin" (pg. 173, *Created in God's Image*, Hoekema). While all the lost are totally depraved, they grow progressively more depraved as sin hardens them, for "[t]otal depravity means the entire absence of holiness, not the highest intensity of sin. A totally depraved man is not as bad as he can be, but he has no holiness, that is, no supreme love of God. He worships and loves the creature rather than the creator, Romans 1:25" (pg. 64, Chapter 5, "Original Sin," *Systematic Theology: Anthropology,* William G. T. Shedd. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies*). In contrast, the regenerate grow progressively more holy.

the image of God[11] and progressive destruction of the principle of sin in saints takes place. At the point of conversion, the believer crucifies the sinful flesh and its ways: "[T]hey that are Christ's have crucified [*estaurosan,* ἐσταύρωσαν, aorist active indicative] the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Galatians 5:24), so that the believer can say that in his Christian life, "by . . . our Lord Jesus Christ . . . the world is crucified [*estauromai*, ἐσταύρωται, perfect passive indicative] unto me, and I unto the world" (Galatians 6:14). However, while the legal sentence of death has been passed on the sinful flesh, its future actual destruction is certain, the flesh is progressively weakening on account of its crucifixion, and its actings are subscribed within certain definite limits, the flesh is still able to act in the Christian. No Christian experiences sinless perfection in this life (1 John 1:8-10).[12] The crucified flesh is, in practice, dying, but not yet absolutely

---

[11] The image of God has a broader and narrower sense. The distinction between the two is one between "substance and quality, nature and grace, creation and redemption. . . . the image of God in the broader or structural sense [is] . . . the entire endowment of gifts and capacities that enable man to function as he should in his various relationships and callings . . . in all of these capacities man is like God, and therefore images him. [The broader sense of image includes] . . . man's intellectual and rational powers . . . moral sensitivity . . . conscience . . . responsibility . . . volitional powers . . . [and] aesthetic sense . . . this list [could be] much longer. . . . [T]he image of God in the narrower, material, or functional sense . . . consist[s] in true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness . . . Colossians 3:10 . . . Ephesians 4:24. . . . Thus, the image of God in the narrower sense means man's proper functioning in harmony with God's will for him. These two aspects of the image of God (broader and narrower, structural and functional, or formal and material) can never be separated. Whenever [one] look[s] at the human person, both aspects must always be taken into account. . . . After man had fallen into sin, however, he retained the image of God in the structural or broader sense [cf. James 3:9] but lost it in the functional or narrower sense. . . . In the process of redemption God by his Spirit renews the image in fallen human beings . . . [and] [a]fter the resurrection of the body, on the new earth, redeemed humanity will once again be able to image God perfectly" (pgs. 70-73, *Created in God's Image,* Anthony A. Hoekema). The narrower aspect of the image of God may be termed the *moral image*.

[12] Commenting on Psalm 37:37, Nathaniel Hardy wrote:

The perfect man, etc. — Divines well distinguish of a double perfection, it is *absoluta* or *comparata.* That is absolutely *perfect,* to which nothing (that it may be accounted truly good) is wanting; and thus He only is *perfectus* who is *infactus;* God, who made all things, and himself is not made, only enjoying an all sufficient perfection, in and of himself. That is comparatively *perfect,* in which, notwithstanding some wants there is a fulness compared with others. Thus every saint is *perfect* in comparison of the wicked among whom he liveth. In this respect it is said of Noah, That he was a perfect man in his generations; his grace compared with the wickedness of the old world well deserving the name of perfection; indeed every upright man is *perfect* in comparison of them who are openly bad, or but openly good; stained with wickedness, or but painted with holiness. Thus one saint may be *perfect* if compared with another, the strong Christian in respect of the weak, whom he outstrips in grace and piety: such saints Paul means when he saith, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect;" that is, such as have attained to greater measures of grace than others. It was said of Benaiah, "He was more honourable than thirty, but he attained not to the first three;" and though no saint can ever attain to the perfections of the *first three,* the blessed Trinity, yet many saints may be honourable amongst *thirty perfect* in comparison of those among whom they live.

We must further distinguish of a double perfection, it is *extrinseca* and *intrinseca.* Extrinsic perfection so called, because by imputation, is that which every believer is partaker of through the perfect righteousness of Christ, whereby all his imperfections are covered; in this respect the author to the Hebrews tells us, "That by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;" and S. Paul tells the

destroyed. The experience of freedom from the service to sin and the destruction of the sinful flesh begins at regeneration and progresses throughout life through mortification, but does not culminate until glorification.

The fact that Christians are "dead to sin" does not deny the gradual nature of mortification. Rather, it is the basis of it. The fundamental idea of *death* is *separation.* Spiritual death is separation from God (Ephesians 2:1-3); physical death is the separation of the body and the soul (Genesis 35:18); and the second death is the everlasting separation of the sinner from God in the lake of fire (Revelation 20:11-15). The believer, then, is dead to sin in the sense that he is separated from it; he is freed from its dominion and control on his body, will, mind, affections, soul, and spirit, free from its predominant influence, and is certain of ultimate absolute freedom from its presence. He no longer lives in the realm of sin's power, and consequently no longer walks in sin (Colossians 3:7). The believer is already legally dead (Romans 7:4; Galatians 2:19) with Christ, and the reign of sin is replaced at regeneration by the reign of grace (Romans 6:2, 10-14). His death to sin in regeneration, however, does not mean that there is yet nothing in him that still desires sin—he must still mortify what is ethically sinful in him.[13] Even though believers "are dead" (Colossians 3:3), they still have sinful "members which are upon the earth" (3:5, 2) to which they must not yield (Romans 6:10-14). Similarly, believers are

---

Colossians that they were "complete in him," meaning Christ. Indeed *omnia Dei mandata tune facta deptutantua, quando id quod non fit ignoscitur:* divine commands are then in God's account fulfilled when our defects for Christ's sake are pardoned; and the evangelical perfection of a Christian consists not *in perfectione virtutum, sed remissions vitiorum,* in the completion of our graces, but remission of our sins.

Intrinsical perfection, so called because by inhesion, is no less rationally than usually thus distinguished, there is *perfectio partium et graduum*. He is said to be *perfect, cui nihil deest eorum quae ad statum salutis necessaria*, who wants no graces that accompany salvation; or he is perfect, *cui nihil deest in gradibus gratiarum et virtutum;* who is not defective in the measures of those graces; both these are frequently and fitly illustrated by the resemblance of a child, and a grown man; the one whereof hath all the essential and integral parts of a man, the other a complete use and measure of those parts" (Nathaniel Hardy, cited in the *Treasury of David*, by Charles Spurgeon. Elec. acc. in Hamel, Ken, *The Online Bible for Mac,* version 3.0).

[13] In the words of John Owen, at the moment of conversion and regeneration "by this change of the will do we become 'dead to sin,' Romans 6:2; that is, whatever remains of lust and corruption there may be in us, yet the will of sinning is taken away" (pg. 26, comment on Hebrews 6:1-2, from Owen's commentary on Hebrews) so that believers are "dead to sin by profession; dead to sin by obligation to be so; dead to sin by participation of virtue and power for the killing of it; dead to sin by union and interest in Christ, in and by whom it is killed: all taken from the death of Christ [as explained in Romans 6]." (pg. 104, *The Mortification of Sin in Believers*). Nevertheless, Owen writes: "Indwelling sin always *abides* whilst we are in this world; therefore it is always to be mortified. The vain, foolish, and ignorant disputes of men about perfect keeping the commands of God, of perfection in this life, of being wholly and perfectly dead to sin, I meddle not now with. It is more than probable that the men of those abominations never knew what belonged to the keeping of any one of God's commands, and are so much below perfection of degrees, that they never attained to a perfection of parts in obedience or universal obedience in sincerity" (pg. 16, *Mortification of Sin*).

already quickened with Christ (Ephesians 2:5),[14] but they can properly pray, "quicken me" (Psalm 119:40, 88, 107), and since they are risen with Christ, they are to seek after heavenly things (Colossians 3:1). Thus, the believer, by the power of the Spirit, must continue to put to death the practices of the body of sin (Romans 8:13, *thanatoute,* θανατοῦτε, a present indicative). As Colossians 3:1-17 explains, believers are already "risen with Christ" (v. 1) (*sunegerthete to Christo,* συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ), and "are dead" (*apethanete,* ἀπεθάνετε), v. 3. They formerly "walked" (*periepatesate*, περιεπατήσατε), v. 7 in sins, when, before their conversion, they "lived in them" (*edzete en autois,* ἐζῆτε ἐν αὐτοῖς), v. 7, but now it is not so. Because they are already dead to sin, they are to "set [their] affection on things above, not on things of the earth" (*ta ano phroneite, me ta epi tes ges,* τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), v. 2, and "mortify [their] members which are upon the earth" (*nekrosate oun ta mele humon ta epi tes ges,* νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), v. 5, that is, put to death those parts within them that still incline to the sorts of sins which they no longer live in as regenerated people (v. 5-7). Since believers are legally and judicially dead to sin, they

---

[14] Note that the doctrine of union with the Messiah in His death and resurrection is taught in the Old Testament in Hosea 6:2. "[A]ntitypically the language [of the verse] is so framed as to refer in its *full accuracy* only to Messiah, the ideal Israel (Isaiah 49:3; compare Matthew 2:15 with Hosea 11:1), raised on the third day (John 2:19; 1 Corinthians 15:4; compare Isaiah 53:10). 'He shall *prolong* His *days*.' Compare the similar use of Israel's political resurrection as the type of the . . . resurrection of which 'Christ is the first-fruits' (Isaiah 26:19; Ezekiel 37:1–14; Daniel 12:2)." (*Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible,* Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, & David Brown (1871), on Hosea 6:2, elec. acc. *Logos Bible Software*).

"[Hosea 6:2] . . . foreshadows Christ's resurrection on the third day. . . . The New Testament does not explicitly cite this verse, but 1 Cor 15:4 asserts that Christ arose on the third day 'in accordance with the Scriptures,' and no other text speaks of the third day in the fashion that Hosea 6:2 does. It is clear that in its original context this passage describes the restoration of Israel, the people of God; and for many interpreters this is proof enough that the resurrection of Christ is not in view here. Such interpretation, however, understands messianic prophecy too narrowly . . . the prophets . . . couched prophecy in typological patterns in which the works of God proceed along identifiable themes. Furthermore, Christ in his life and ministry embodied Israel or recapitulated the sojourn of Israel. Thus, for example, Christ's forty days in the wilderness paralleled Israel's forty years of wandering, and his giving of his Torah on a mountain (Matthew 5–7) paralleled the Sinai experience. Another great event in Israel's history was its restoration after captivity, an event that was almost a bringing of the nation back from the dead. Ezekiel develops this concept in his dry bones vision (Ezekiel 37:1–14). . . . [T]he use of the verbs חיה and קום here has a strong parallel in Ezekiel 37 . . . From this we can conclude that Christ's resurrection, in addition to its profound soteriological aspects, was a typological embodiment of the 'resurrection' of Israel in its restoration . . . follow[ing] the established pattern of the parallel between the history of Israel and the life of Christ. Furthermore, as so often happens in texts of this kind, the details of the passage work themselves out in different ways. The 'two days' are for Israel metaphorical for a relatively short captivity but have a literal fulfillment in the resurrection of Christ. Similarly, the raising to life is literal in the case of Christ, but in the case of Israel it is a metaphor for restoration. On the other hand, there is also a literal fulfillment for the Israel of God, when [they] shall be raised at his coming (1 Thessalonians 4:13–17)" (*The New American Commentary, vol 19A: Hosea, Joel*, Duane A. Garrett (1997), note on Hosea 6:2, elec. acc. *Logos Bible Software*).

are, by the Spirit, to put to death or mortify the remnants of the sin principle in them (Colossians 3:5) and its outward manifestations (Romans 8:13). At the moment of repentance, faith, and regeneration, they "put off the old man with his deeds" (Colossians 3:9) and "put on the new man" (v. 10). They are therefore daily to "put off" sins like anger, wrath, and malice (Colossians 3:8), as their "new man" is gradually "renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him" (v. 10; note the present participle, the progressive action of the new man being renewed, in *ton neon, ton anakainoumenon eis epignosin kat eikona tou ktisantos auton,* τὸν νέον, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ᾽ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν). Ephesians 4 expresses similar truth to Colossians 3—since believers have already "learned Christ . . . have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus," they are to in practice "put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of [their] mind; and . . . put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Ephesians 4:20-24). The only noteworthy difference is that Colossians 3:9-10 indicates that the old man was put off and the new man put on at regeneration, while Ephesians 4:20-24 speaks of practically putting off the old man and putting on the new man in the Christian life. This practical putting off/putting on, a consequence of the end of the dominance of the old man in Adam, union with Christ, and putting on of the new man in regeneration, appears as saints put away lying and put on truth (Ephesians 4:25), put away stealing and put on useful labor (4:28), put away corrupt communication and put on edifying speech (4:29), put away bitterness, wrath, anger, and such like sins, and put on kindness, tenderheartedness, and forgiveness (4:31-32). This progressive putting off and putting on is how sin is mortified and the believer is renewed more and more into the moral image of Christ.

As the Spirit works to lead believers to will[15] and do of God's good pleasure (Philippians 2:13),[16] they become more conformed to Christ in their practical death to sin

---

15 "While the power which regenerates and sanctifies must ever be partly incomprehensible to us, the comprehension of the effect is so far easy, that the new birth reverses the moral habitus of the believer's will, prevalently, but not at first absolutely, and that the work of progressive sanctification carries on this change, thus omnipotently begun, towards that absolute completeness which we must possess on entering heaven. In the carnal state, the habitus of the sinner's will is absolutely and exclusively godless. In the regenerate state it is prevalently but not completely godly. In the glorified state it is absolutely and exclusively godly. This statement implies that the believer's motives, in the militant state, are complex; and that while the subjective motives usually dominant are godly, yet there is a mixture of carnal motives, no longer dominant, but not annihilated, which carnal motives enter as part cause even into the renewed soul's holy volitions. And this complex of subjective motives, of which one part may be morally diverse from another, may result in a single act of volition — the volition strictly one, while the motives prompting it are mingled. Thus it is that an act may be . . . formally right in shape and prevalently right in intention, and yet

(Philippians 3:10), more conformed to Christ in positive inward holiness (Galatians 4:19), and more conformed to Christ in their progressive restoration into the moral image of God, the "divine nature" (2 Peter 1:4), into which they are transformed as they grow in experiential knowledge of Jesus Christ (2 Peter 1:3), knowledge which leads them to abound in all holy practices, godliness, virtue, and love (2 Peter 1:5-8). Christians are new men, new in body, soul, and spirit, all of which are progressively sanctified[17] and are

---

not perfectly holy before God. And here is the explanation of that strife between the "law of the mind and the law in our members," of which every Christian is conscious, and to which the apostle points in the 7th of Romans. Now in this prevalently sanctified, but imperfect character, there is a sense in which we may say the carnality and the godliness are complementary the one to the other. As sanctification eliminates the former, the latter extends. Or to speak more accurately, the extension of the principles of godliness is the corresponding exclusion of the principles of carnality, just as spreading light is the gradualremoval of darkness, its opposite — a safe Bible similitude (Acts 26:18)" (pg. 24, "Theology of the Plymouth Brethren," Robert L. Dabney. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006. Orig. pub. *The Southern Presbyterian Review,* January, 1872, as part of a review of *God's Way of Peace*, H. Bonar, *Müller's Life of Trust*, ed. Wayland, *Notes on Genesis,* by C. H. M., *Scripture Testimony*, ed. Charles Campbell, *A Word to Young Believers*, W. B., *The Return of the Lord Jesus*, J. G. Bellet, *Waymarks in the Wilderness*. New York: Inglis & Colles. 8 vol, *The Witness,* and *Who are the Plymouth Brethren?* H. Grattan Guinness). "[S]in *dwells* in a believer, but it *reigns* in an unbeliever. . . . Subordinate volition in the Christian is not always determined in character by the fundamental choice; eddies in the stream sometimes run counter to the general course of the current" (pgs. 170-171, Section 3: "The Application of Christ's Redemption in its Continuation: Sanctification," in *Systematic Theology*, Augustus Strong.).

The change in the predominant inclination of the will in regeneration from unholiness to holiness makes it certain that the believer will act differently. "The real will of the man is in the central inclination or self determination to [righteousness in the regenerate and evil in the unregenerate], and not in the superficial choice of the means of attaining [the one or the other, that is, the volition]. [T]his inclination is . . . the self-motion of the entire will to this one end, in which it is absorbed with an intense energy and interest that opposes and precludes a contrary self-motion. The person in inclining cannot incline or disincline to the end with the same facility that he can choose or refuse the means. . . . The distinction between the will's *inclination* [its predominant bent], and its *volition* [particular single actions], is of the highest importance in both psychology and theology" (*Dogmatic Theology: Anthropology,* William G. T. Shedd, Chapter 3, "The Human Will," & Supp. Help #31. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006). In relation to the will, "progressive sanctification is the continuation of that holy self-determination of the human will which begins in its regeneration by the Holy Spirit, [while] the progressive depravation of the natural man is the continuation of that sinful self-determination of the human will which began in Adam's transgression" (pg. 27, Chapter 5, "Original Sin," *Dogmatic Theology: Anthropology,* William G. T. Shedd, *ibid*.).

[16] Since in sanctification "it is God which worketh in [the believer] both to will and to do of *his* good pleasure," sanctification is not sourced in a believer's actions or works. The works of a believer are a result of God's progressive sanctifying work in him, changing him inwardly and outwardly. The believer is to mortify, put off, put on, etc. but he does so only "through the Spirit" (Romans 8:13). This does not, however, prevent Scripture from employing expressions such as "sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy" (Leviticus 11:44) or "sanctify yourselves . . . and be ye holy" (Leviticus 20:7; cf. 1 Peter 1:15-16) or "let us cleanse ourselves . . . perfecting holiness" (2 Corinthians 7:1). God gets all the glory, and all the ability comes from Him, yet the believer can still be said to sanctify or make himself holy.

It is noteworthy that the doctrine taught in Philippians 2:13 is not exclusively found in the New Testament—believers in the Old Testament also knew that it was God who worked in them both to will and to do. "LORD, thou wilt ordain peace for us: for thou also hast wrought all our works in us" (Isaiah 26:12).

[17] "[Concerning] the extent of sanctification, or the parts of the human person affected by it . . . we are renewed in the whole man. In 1 Thessalonians 5:23, the Apostle expresses the same idea of

certain of complete transformation at glorification. Their entire persons are being sanctified now (1 Thessalonians 5:23-24; cf. the practical outworkings of this inward transformation in vv. 16-22) as the Lord makes them increase and abound in love and holiness, a process that will culminate in perfect sinlessness when they are glorified at the coming of Christ (1 Thessalonians 3:12-13).[18]

As stated in Colossians three, Ephesians four, and other texts, Romans six similarly explains the significance of being dead to sin. One who is so dead can no longer live in it (6:2). As pictured[19] in baptism, the Christian is now dead to sin and both

---

completeness[.] . . . Now . . . in strictness of speech, the true seat of sanctification is the will: the human soul in that class of its actings expressed in Scripture by the word heart. But the . . . emotional and voluntary capacity of the soul is not a different member, or department of it, from the intellectual. It is the one indivisible unit, acting in different modes. It is the soul which is sanctified, and not a faculty thereof. . . . [S]anctification . . . in its results . . . modifies every acting of the soul, whether through intellect, appetite, or corporeal volition. Every one would consider that he was speaking with sufficient accuracy in using the words 'a wicked thought.' Now, in the same sense in which a thought can be wicked, in that sense the power of thinking can be sanctified. What is that sense? A thought is wicked, not because the faculty of thinking, or pure intellection, is the seat of moral quality, abstractly considered; but because the soul that thinks, gives to that thought, by the concurrence of its active or emotional, or voluntary power, a complex character, in which complex there is a wrong moral element. To sanctify the intellect, then, is to sanctify the soul in such a way that in its complex acts, the moral element shall be right instead of wrong. So we speak, with entire propriety, of a 'wicked blow.' The bones, skin, and muscles, which corporeally inflicted it, are the unreasoning and passive implement of the soul that emitted the volition to strike. But our members are sanctified, when the volitions which move them are holy; and when the impressions of sense and appetite, of which they are the inlets, become the occasions of no wrong feelings or volitions.

The sanctification of our bodies consists, therefore, not in the ascetic mortification of our nerves, muscles, glands, &c., but in the employment of the members as the implements of none but holy volitions, and in such management and regulations of the senses, that they shall be the inlets of no objective, or occasional causes of wrong feeling. This will imply, of course; strict temperance, continence, and avoidance of temptation to the sinful awakening of appetite, as well as the preservation of muscular vigour, and healthy activity, by self denial and bodily hardihood. See 1 Corinthians 9:27; 2 Peter 2:14; James 3:2. . . . [T]he body is . . . indirectly holy or unholy, as it is the tool of the soul. The whole delusion [of asceticism], so far as it has sought a Scriptural support, rests on the mistake of the meaning of the word "flesh," "caro," "σάρξ," which the sacred writers use to mean depraved human nature; not the body [as inherently sinful]. What those fleshly members are, which sanctification mortifies, may be seen in Colossians 3:5; Galatians 5:19-21." (Robert Louis Dabney, *Systematic and Polemical Theology*, Lecture 56, "Sanctification and Good Works." Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.)

[18] "In . . . 1 Thessalonians 5:23 . . . 3:12-13 . . . the sanctification of the whole man . . . is to be found accomplished at the coming of Christ[.] . . . Paul says, "May the God of peace himself sanctify you throughout." *You*, not *some* of you; the whole of the Church, not a part of it. And he adds, 'Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.' His prayer was that God would sanctify them wholly; and that prayer he was certain the Lord would answer—doubtless because he knew it was God's plan and purpose to keep his own, and render them perfect before the day of Christ" (pg. 76-78, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, by Alvah Hovey).

[19] Baptism does not create or effect the believer's death to sin. It is merely a picture of the regenerating work of God, previously received by repentant faith alone. See *Heaven Only For the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ vs. Baptismal Regeneration*, Thomas Ross. Elec. acc. http://sites.google.com/site/thross7. In the words of Andrew Broaddus:

> We maintain that there is a spiritual regeneration — a Divine birth — a real change of principles — effected by Divine influence, through the instrumentality of the word of truth; the subject "being born again, of

free to live and certain of a new life (6:3-5). The statement that "like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life"[20] no more implies uncertainty about the saint's new walk than the similar *houto kai* (οὕτω καί) + aorist subjunctive construction in Romans 5:21, "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."[21] The Divine purposes fulfill their result. As surely as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so sure is the saint's walking in newness of life. The new walk is as sure as is the existence of the reign of grace by Jesus Christ.[22] The new resurrected walk is as sure as the saint's death and burial with Christ in regeneration (6:4-6). Death with Christ means that the old man has been crucified with Him (6:6). The Christian has received deliverance from sin's bondage (6:6), legal freedom from sin's service (6:7), freedom from death's dominion (6:9) the ability to live for God (6:10-11), and freedom from the dominion of sin and the beginning of the reign of grace (6:14). The culmination of these blessings in this life is future absolute destruction of the body of sin (6:6) and glorification with Christ (6:8). All these are the believer's inheritance. Romans 5:21 sets the stage for the discourse of Romans 6—the believer is free from the reign of sin, and now grace reigns in him through righteousness, by means of Jesus Christ, with the result of eternal life. Nevertheless, until glorification, sin still remains within the believer (Romans 6:6, 10-23).

Romans six does not thus define the death to sin that the believer possesses as absolute freedom from all influence from sin, but as freedom from its reigning power. Paul argues that since the believer is free, he is not to let sin reign in his members. The believer is already legally dead, buried, and risen with Christ, and this legal deliverance guarantees his sanctification now and future bodily glorification. He is consequently to reckon, consider, and believe that this is so (6:11), not allow sin to reign in his mortal

---

> incorruptible seed by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." That by Christ "all who *believe* are justified from all things;" and that "being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." That holiness of heart is generated "through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." That *internally* we "put on Christ" by faith as well as by the cultivation of every gracious temper of heart; and are "in Christ" by a living union, as the branches are in the vine; while *externally* we put him on by baptism, and a conformity of life to his holy example and injunctions; and thus, that a person is *really* Christ's when his heart is yielded up to him; though not *formally* recognized as his, till he has been "baptized into Christ." (pg. 226, *Virginia Baptist Ministers,* 2nd series, James B. Taylor. New York, NY: Sheldon & Co., 1860. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.)

Broaddus (1770-1848) was a prominent American Baptist pastor and author in his day.

[20] ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν.

[21] ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτω καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

[22] Note section III. "The Certainty of Practical Sanctification For All The Regenerate," below.

body (6:12) and consequently obey its lusts, or present his members to sin and put them at its disposal (6:13), but rather he is to yield himself to God and yield his members as instruments of righteousness (6:13), knowing that, since he is not under the legal control of the law, but under grace, he has the promise that sin will not have dominion over him (6:14), but God will certainly effectually work in him to sanctify him and bring him to ultimate glorification. He can rejoice that 6:14 is a promise, not a possibility, and consequently yield himself to God, present his members to Him, and put sin to death, knowing that victory over sin is certain.

C. The Significance Of And Relationships Between The Old Man, The Body Of Sin, And The Flesh, How These Are To Be Mortified, And The Nature Of Mortification

The "old man," the person dominated by the ethically sinful flesh,[23] expresses an idea closely related to "the body of sin," the body as dominated by sin. The body of sin is the portion of the old man (who is body, soul, and spirit)[24] that controls the

---

[23] "The old man is human nature in so far as it is controlled by sin" (pg. 533, *Systematic Theology,* Louis Berkhof). "[W]hat . . . in . . . the Christian . . . is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts [Ephesians 4:22] . . . is the old man . . . as that in him, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness [Ephesians 4:24], is the new man. . . . [T]he old man . . . signifies the corruption of nature . . . the principle of sin, with all its various lusts, which possess and influence a man's faculties, and powers; and that so far as it remains in the true Christian who is renewed by grace, and in whom is the new man: by virtue of, and in comparison with which in him, and in him only, the former is the old man. In persons unregenerate this evil principle is not the old man ; but continues young, in full strength and vigour. It is the old man only in persons regenerate; in true Christians" (pgs. 57-59, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*, James Fraser). "'Old man' is a designation of the person in his unity as dominated by the flesh and sin . . . [it represents] what we are by nature: slaves to sin. . . . After the analogy of . . . the old man . . . the new man . . . must mean the person in his unity ruled by the Holy Spirit" (pg. 25, *Created in God's Image*, Anthony A. Hoekema. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994).

[24] The fact that the believer must still put off the old man and put on the new (Ephesians 4:22-24), while both the old and new man refer to the entirety of the person, body, soul, and spirit, does not mean that the believer has two bodies, two souls, and two spirits, and is two separate and different men, one old and one new. Rather, it means that his one entire person, body, soul, and spirit, is no longer totally in darkness, as before his regeneration, but now is a mixture of the holy and the unholy, of light and darkness. "In order that no one may suppose that, whereas he speaks of old and new, he is introducing a different person, observe his expression, 'That ye be renewed.' [Ephesians 4:23] To be renewed is, when the selfsame thing which has grown old is renewed, changed from one thing into the other" (*Homilies on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, Homily XIII,* John Chrysostom, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series*, elec. acc.); the same single person is commanded to put off, be renewed, and put on. Similarly, Paul in his regenerate state can identify himself with both sin (Romans 7:14, 20a, 25c) and with righteousness (Romans 7:17a, 20b, 25b), but the Apostle is still a unified person. As the "God of peace sanctif[ies] [the Christian] wholly . . . spirit and soul and body" (1 Thessalonians 5:23) over the course of his earthly pilgrimage, the believer becomes more and more holy and less sinful in his entire person. The old man progressively perishes, and the inward new man is progressively renewed day by day (2 Corinthians 4:16). If regeneration is the end of night and the dawning of a new day in the believer, progressive sanctification is the increase of light as the sun rises, and glorification the absolute abolition of darkness (cf. Acts 26:18). The believer progressively leaves the likeness of fallen Adam and the fallen creation to grow morally into

unregenerate individual, that is, his ethically sinful flesh, which is related to his physical body,[25] although the "body of sin," like the old man and the ethically sinful flesh, are psycho-somatic, referring to man in his entire being.[26]

Both the "old man" and "the body of sin" are dead and are crucified, yet are still extant and still in need of mortification, in a different sense. The "old man" and his ungodly deeds are "put off" and the new man and holy actions "put on"[27] at the moment of faith and regeneration in purpose and profession (Colossians 3:9-10) and the dominion of sin is shattered, yet, as already indicated, the old man still is to be constantly and progressively put off in practice as the saint is constantly "renewed in the spirit of [his] mind" and the "new man" constantly "put on" (Ephesians 4:21-24),[28] a process which

---

the image of the second Adam, the Head of the new creation (1 Corinthians 15:22, 45-49). Thus, Ephesians 4 teaches:

> [B]elievers have "put off" Adam in order to "put on" Christ. That is, they have severed their connection with the first federal head, in order to enter into a connection with the second federal head. . . . the moral, rather than the forensic, effects of the two covenants are here in view of the apostle's mind. We forsake Adam's "conversation, corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," and adopt Christ's conversation, who was "created after God in righteousness and true holiness," thus sharing the same new creation. . . . How very far is all this from teaching it that depravity remains after the new birth a "real man," unchanged, coexistent with a new, holy nature superadded thereto, which is also a "real man"! (pgs. 26-27, "Theology of the Plymouth Brethren," Robert L. Dabney)

The new man is fully complete when the Christian is fully like Christ, seeing Him as He is (1 John 3:2), at which time the old man is finally and absolutely extirpated; in progressive sanctification the Christian is only incompletely like Christ, seeing Him with less clarity than he will in glory, but, as he comes to see Him more clearly, he becomes more like Him (2 Corinthians 3:18). Thus, the saint on earth is not yet fully renewed, but he remains a mixture of the old and the new. How necessary, then, it is for the believer to see the Lord Jesus, and commune with Him because of his union with Him!

[25] While the ethically sinful flesh expresses itself in the human body (and in the spiritual part of man), nonetheless it is important to remember that "sin has no independent existence. . . . [it is not] something essential and substantial . . . [but] should be thought of as a defect in something that is good. . . . a depravation of the good and . . . also active rebellion against God. . . . The fact that sin is not part of the essence of [human] nature made it possible for Christ to assume a human nature that was not totally other than that of fallen man and still to be without sin. . . . [S]in has not changed [man's] essence but has changed the direction in which [he] is moving. . . . Sin, therefore, is not something physical but something ethical. It was not given with creation but came after creation; it is a deformation of what is" (pgs. 168-169, *Created in God's Image,* Hoekema).

[26] When the *flesh*, the *sarx*, in the "New Testament . . . [refers to] flesh as the tendency within fallen man to disobey God in every area of life . . . we must not restrict the meaning of *sarx* so as to refer only to what we commonly call 'fleshly sins' (sins of the body); rather, we should understand it as referring to sins committed by the whole person. In the list of 'works of the flesh' . . . in Galatians 5:19-21, only five out of the fifteen concern bodily sins; the rest are what we would call 'sins of the spirit'—such as hatred, discord, jealousy, and the like" (pg. 216, *Created in God's Image,* Hoekema).

[27] Sanctification as the putting off of evil and the putting on of good is already found in the Old Testament (Job 29:14; Psalm 132:9, etc.

[28] The aorist infinitive for the old man being "put off" in Ephesians 4:22 (ἀποθέσθαι) and the new man being "put on" (ἐνδύσασθαι) in 4:24 convey an imperatival idea similar to the way that the aorist participle ἀποθέμενοι, connected with the present imperative λαλεῖτε, does so for the putting away of lying in v. 25, followed by the imperative forms in v. 26ff., including the aorist imperative to put away (ἀρθήτω) all bitterness, wrath, anger, clamor, and evil speaking and be kind, tenderhearted, and forgiving instead (v. 30-31). Ephesians 4:22-24 does indeed speak of putting off the old man and putting on the new

man in progressive sanctification. Against this view, various writers argue that in Ephesians 4 only the putting off and putting on of regeneration is spoken of. For example:

> "[The] Ephesians [were taught] 'that ye [did, when saved,] put off … the old man.' The form of the verb places this putting off as a complete past action. You were taught, the Apostle says, the truth about being in Christ and that by so much your 'old man' was laid aside. The former Adamic standing is in view, and with it its corrupt practices which are no longer in order. At that time, also, ye did put on the new man" (*Systematic Theology*, Lewis Sperry Chafer, vol. 4, pg. 95; cf. vol. 6, pg. 270. Elec. acc. *Logos Bible Software*).
>
> "Paul, [in] Ephesians 4:22-24 . . . seem[s] [to be] exhorting believers 'to put off according to the former manner of life the old man' and 'to put on the new man.'. . . [C]onsiderations of grammar would not . . . be violated if this interpretation were adopted. . . . [both] the infinitive . . . with imperative force . . . [and the] infinitive of result . . . [would] be appropriate . . . if believers are conceived of as progressively putting off the old man and putting on the new. . . . But exegetical considerations and the analogy of Paul's teaching elsewhere point to the entirely different conclusion, namely, that when Paul speaks of putting off the old man and putting on the new man he is thinking in terms of result rather than in terms of exhortation. The passage should therefore be rendered as . . . ['so that ye have put off . . . the old man . . . and have put on the new man'" (pgs. 214-215, *Principles of Conduct,* John Murray).

While the truth that, in one sense, the believer puts off the old man and puts on the new man in regeneration is not in dispute (Colossians 3:9-10), the Greek text of Ephesians 4:22-24 is properly interpreted to refer to a continuing putting on and putting off connected with progressive sanctification, as it does in the English of the Authorized Version (and ancient versions such as the Latin Vulgate).

First, one cannot conclude that ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι refer to a point action simply because they are aorists rather than in the present tense. Every time ἀποτίθημι appears in the NT the verb is in the aorist (Acts 7:58; Romans 13:12; Ephesians 4:22, 25; Colossians 3:8; Hebrews 12:1; James 1:21; 1 Peter 2:1), and in the LXX the verb only appears in the aorist (Exodus 16:34; Leviticus 24:12; Numbers 15:34; 17:22, 25; Joshua 4:8; 2 Chronicles 18:26; Joel 1:18; 1 Esdras 6:18; 1 Maccabees 1:35; 4:46; 2 Maccabees 8:35; MSS of Tobit 6:4) and the future (Exodus 16:33; Leviticus 16:23; Numbers 19:9; Joel 1:18). While the present tense of the verb did exist in the Koiné (e. g., Shepherd 93:3), it was much rarer than the present tense. The aorist of ἀποτίθημι is what Paul would naturally use in Ephesians 4:22 to describe the decisive rejection of the old man God requires of the regenerate in progressive sanctification. Similarly, the large majority of instances of ἐνδύω in the NT are in the aorist (Matthew 6:25; 27:31; Mark 6:9; 15:17, 20; Luke 12:22; 15:22; 24:49; Acts 12:21; Romans 13:12, 14; 1 Corinthians 15:53–54; 2 Corinthians 5:3; Galatians 3:27; Ephesians 4:24; 6:11, 14; Colossians 3:10, 12; 1 Thessalonians 5:8; there are a few perfects: Matthew 22:11; Mark 1:6; Revelation 1:13; 15:6; 19:14; and one present: Mark 15:17—probably a historical present, thus with its aspectual value suppressed), and in the LXX there are 55 instances of the verb in the aorist (Genesis 3:21; 27:15; 38:19; 41:42; Leviticus 8:7, 13; 21:10; Numbers 20:26, 28; Deuteronomy 22:5; Judges 6:34; 1 Samuel 17:38; 2 Samuel 14:2; 1 Kings 22:30; 1 Chronicles 12:19; 2 Chronicles 6:41; 18:29; 24:20; 28:15; Esther 4:1; Psalm 34:26; 64:14; 92:1; 103:1; 108:18, 29; Proverbs 31:26; Song 5:3; Job 10:11; 39:19; Jonah 3:5; Zechariah 3:4; Isaiah 51:9; 52:1; 59:17; 61:10; Jerermiah 26:4; Baruch 4:20; 5:1; Ezekiel 16:10; Daniel 5:29; Esther 14:1; Judith 10:3; 1 Maccabees 1:28; 3:3; 10:21, 62; 14:9; Sirach 17:3; 45:8, 13; Solomon 11:7), a variety of instances of other tenses (future: Exodus 28:41, 29:5, 8, 30; 40:13, 14; Leviticus 6:3, 4; 16:4, 24, 32; Deuteronomy 22:11; Psalm 131:9, 16, 18; Proverbs 23:21; Job 8:22; Isaiah 22:21; 49:18; 50:3; Jeremiah 10:9; Ezekiel 7:27; 42:14; 44:17, 19; Wisdom 5:18; Sirach 6:31; 27:8; 43:20; perfect: 1 Samuel 17:5; 2 Samuel 6:14; 2 Chronicles 5:12; 18:9; Zephaniah 1:8; Zechariah 3:3; 13:4; Ezekiel 9:2, 3, 11; 10:2, 6, 7; 23:6, 12; 38:4; Daniel 6:4; 10:5; 1 Esdras 5:40; pluperfect: Leviticus 16:23; Job 29:14; Esther 15:6; Judith 9:1; 10:3; imperfect: Psalm 34:13), but only one instance of the present (Baruch 6:32). Furthermore, the aorist is at times employed for actions that are actually durative (e. g., Proverbs 31:26). It is, therefore, reasonable that Paul employs an aorist of ἐνδύω in Ephesians 4:24, rather than a present tense, to express what is in actuality a lifelong putting off and putting on. The aorists in Romans 13:12-14; 1 Thessalonians 5:8; Ephesians 6:11 are also instructive.

Second, an imperatival resultant sense for the infinitives ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι in Ephesians 4:22, 24 is evident because of their dependence upon the ἐδιδάχθητε of v. 21, as an imperatival sense attaches itself to the infinitive περιπατεῖν in 4:17 because of its connection to a didactic λέγω (cf. also Ephesians 3:8). As in v. 17 Paul instructs, "I say . . . that ye walk not," so in 4:21-24 the Apostle tells the church: "ye have been taught . . . that ye put off . . . that ye put on." Because of this teaching, the Ephesians were to be speaking truth, putting away lying (ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν, 4:25), and obeying the series of commands in 4:29-32, including the command to "put away" (ἀρθήτω)

will continue until the Christian, in future glory, has become a "perfect man," having reached the complete moral "measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Ephesians 4:13). The product ("wherefore," 4:25) of this continuing and progressive mortification of the old man and vivification or strengthening of the new man is that specific sins are put off and holy actions are put on (Ephesians 4:25-29).[29]

The "body of sin" (Romans 6:6) is the "body of this death" (Romans 7:24), the "body of the sins of the flesh" (Colossians 2:11), and "the body" the "deeds" of which one is to "mortify" (Romans 8:13; cf. also Romans 8:10, 11, 23; Philippians 3:21). This body is put off, just like the old man, at the moment of regeneration, for "the circumcision made without hands" involves the "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ"[30] (Colossians 2:11). Nevertheless, the body of sin is still present in another sense, for the apostle Paul, although obviously already regenerate, nonetheless complains, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Romans 7:24).[31] Thus, Scripture teaches that the body of sin in believers has been permanently put off in regeneration, but, in another sense, it is still present.

Likewise, believers are no longer in the flesh (Romans 7:5), and everyone who is still in the flesh is unconverted and unregenerate (Romans 8:8-9), yet in another sense

---

various sins in 4:31. The following context therefore supports the imperatival sense of v. 22-24. Furthermore, ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι are aorist infinitives in indirect discourse, and in the over 150 other instances of aorist infinitives in indirect discourse in the NT (cf. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, pg. 605), none of them represent an aorist indicative in the underlying direct discourse ("have put off/have put on") rather than an aorist imperative ("put off/put on"). "There is apparently no instance in the New Testament of the Aorist Infinitive in indirect discourse representing the Aorist Indicative of the direct form" (pgs. 52-53 (§ 114), *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek,* E. Burton). Context and syntax syntax support an imperatival idea for the infinitives in Ephesians 4:22, 24.

While Colossians 3:9-10 refers to the a decisive putting off of the old man and putting on of the new man in regeneration, Ephesians 4:22-24 speaks of putting off the old man and putting on the new man as a part of progressive sanctification.

[29] "The 'old man' cannot continue unmodified in the presence of the 'new man,' because the one principle is the opposite and is exclusive of the other. To die unto sin is to live unto righteousness. The increment of light is the diminution of darkness. The waxing of the "new man" is the waning of the "old man" Hence (and this is the Bible view) if any professed believer has the "old man" as strong and lively as ever, it is proof positive that the "new man" has never entered at all; his faith is vain; he is yet in his sins. (Jam. 2:22, etc.) And if any professed believer finds the old carnal principle reviving, it is proof positive that his spiritual life is proportionally going backward at that time[.] . . . [T]here is another reason why, for those who do not die immediately after conversion, progressive sanctification is still imperative. The principle of holiness, if genuine, is incapable of tolerating indwelling sin in peace. The struggle is inevitable in a true Christian, and as 'he that is with us is more than he that is against us,' gradual conquests, at least over indwelling sin, are the general rule of every genuine Christian life" (pgs. 25-26, "Theology of the Plymouth Brethren," Robert L. Dabney).

[30] ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[31] The fact that Romans 7:14-25 describes the Christian life is defended in "Excursus II: Romans 7:14-25: A Depiction of Part of the Normal Christian Life."

Christians still possess the ethically sinful flesh (Romans 6:19; 7:18, 25), although they no longer characteristically walk according to the flesh (Romans 8:1-14). Thus, the old man is "put off" (Colossians 3:9) and the body of sin is "put off" (Colossians 2:11) in regeneration, and all the regenerate are no longer in the flesh (Romans 7:5), yet the old man, the body of sin, and the flesh are still present.

The "body of sin" expresses itself in its parts, its "members." That is, "when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death" (Romans 7:5). These "members" constitute, together, the entirety of the person (1 Corinthians 12:14-27), from the "head to the feet" (12:21). In the sense in which the old man and the body of sin are still present and active, the believer must "mortify . . . [his] members which are upon the earth" (Colossians 3:5). He is commanded: "Neither yield ye your members *as* instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members *as* instruments of righteousness unto God" (Romans 6:13). That is, "as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield[32] your members servants to righteousness unto holiness" (Romans 6:19). The Christian must mortify his sinful members because he can say, with Paul, "I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members" (Romans 7:23), since he still has "lusts that war in [his] members" (James 4:1; cf. 3:5-6) that seek to "defil[e] the whole body, and . . . [are] set on fire of hell" (James 3:6). Nonetheless, as new men, believers' "bodies are the members of Christ" (1 Corinthians 6:15). As an unconverted person continues to sin, yielding his members to uncleanness and to iniquity, his lesser sins lead on to even greater ones, "iniquity unto iniquity." (Romans 6:19; cf. 1:21-32). Likewise, as the believer yields his members to righteousness, his "righteousness [is] unto holiness" (*te dikaiosune eis hagiasmon,* τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν), that is, progressive yielding

---

[32] If someone wished to conclude from the fact that the verb "yield" in Romans 6:19 is an aorist imperative (παραστήσατε) that the verse speaks solely of a decision that one makes only once in his entire life, he would, it seems, also have to conclude that in their unregenerate life the Roman Christians only yielded themselves to sin once in their life, because Romans 6:19 describes their past life of yieldedness to sin with an aorist (παρεστήσατε). Somehow the unsaved would, it seems, have to yield themselves to sin only once, and permanently, for their whole lives. All of the members of the church at Rome would have engaged in this once-for-all yielding to sin. They then would have to have made this permanent yielding to sin temporary when they were converted and turned from their sins. The clear fact of the matter is that the proponents of the argument that the aorist imperative "yield" in Romans 6:19 must refer solely to a once-for-a-lifetime yielding are reading very greatly into the verse and ignoring the plain requirements of the immediate context. Concluding that the aorist requires a once-for-life action also is clearly more than is required by the Greek syntax (cf. pgs. 719-721, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996). This is not to deny, of course, that a believer holding on to sin is required to make a clean and immediate break with it.

of his members to righteousness leads to progressive growth in holiness within him as a person. The mortification of the remnants of sin within the believer takes place as the believer opposes, by the Spirit, the various members of the body of sin that still remain within him.

Romans 8:13 states, "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit[33] do mortify (*thanatoute,* θανατοῦτε, present active indicative) the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Colossians 3:5 states, "Mortify (*nekrosate,* νεκρώσατε, aorist active imperative) therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry." These two texts, the ones that speak specifically of the Christian duty of mortification, employ two different Greek verbs, *thanatoo* (θανατόω) in Romans 8:13, and *nekroo* (νεκρόω) in Colossians 3:5. The "deeds of the body" are put to death or mortified with *thanatao*, and the "members which are upon the earth" are mortified with *nekroo*. While there is doubtless a significant amount of overlap[34] in the semantic domain of the two verbs, it appears that the use of *thanatoo* indicates that the deeds of the body

---

[33] "The agency of the Spirit of God, is that operation of Divine power which either renews the sinner in the image of God, or afterwards produces in him divine conformity to that image. It is the *effectual* operations of God's spirit, of which we intend to treat, in distinction from that operation which attended Saul among the prophets, or Judas among the apostles. We speak of that powerful operation which renews the heart of the dead sinner, translates him out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, and carries on the work begun by this change until it be consummated in glory. The person who is the subject of these effectual operations . . . [has his] stony heart . . . taken away, and a heart of flesh . . . given[.] [T]he captive soul is released, and a new song is put into his mouth, a new language flows from his lips, a new conduct appears in his life; — in a word all things are become new. . . . The agency of God's spirit carries on the salvation of the sinner from regeneration to glory; it is all of God. But the *renewing* and *sanctifying* influences are capable of a distinction; the former implant a principle of life; the latter invigorate the principle implanted. In the *first*, the spirit makes no use of the faculties of the soul; in the *last*, the rational faculties are used, and become subservient to the work. The subject of the sanctifying operations of the spirit, has *every* faculty of soul rendered attentive to the things of God. He "with open face beholds as in a glass the glory of the Lord, and is changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the spirit of the Lord." By these transforming discoveries, progressive conformity to God is carried on in his soul. While he sees in the glass of God's word, the REDEEMER'S beauty and his own frightful deformity, he abhors the one, and loves the other. He longs to be delivered from sin; he pants after God, the living God. Thus the whole work of sanctification is carried on by clear, and soul-effecting views of the beauty of holiness and the deformity of sin; whilst the Holy Ghost, hovering over the soul, creates in it that desire after the one, and aversion from the other, which leads a man to cleanse himself from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord" (Circular Letter of the Shaftsbury Baptist Association, 1794, on the "Agency of the Holy Spirit," by Isaac Webb, cited from pgs. 38-39, *History of the Shaftsbury Baptist Association from 1781 to 1853,* Stephen Wright. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005).

[34] For example, one notes that, despite the apparently valid distinction between the putting to death of "deeds" in Romans 8:13 and "members" in Colossians 3:5, a list of specific sinful acts follows the command to mortify members in Colossians 3:5.

are to be entirely eliminated, caused to cease, and put to death.[35] The earthly members are to become as good as dead (*nekroo*), that is, progressively weakened, although the earthly members are never totally extirpated in this life. *Thanatoo* appears[36] with relatively greater frequency than *nekroo* in the New Testament; the only texts containing *nekroo* besides Colossians 3:5 are Romans 4:19 and Hebrews 11:12.[37] Both Romans 4:19 and Hebrews 11:12 refer to a person who is still alive, but weak and "good as dead" because of his age. In light of the parallel texts, the command to the Christian to mortify his earthly members in Colossians 3:5 indicates that he is to progressively weaken them so that they are "as good as dead."[38] The *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*[39] states concerning *nekroo*: "Among physicians it denotes the atrophy of a part of the body through sickness." *Thayer's Greek Lexicon*[40] gives as definition #3 for *nekroo*, "to deprive of power, destroy the strength of." Thus, Romans 8:13 and Colossians 3:5 indicate that the deeds of the sinful body are to be put to death, caused to cease, and eliminated, while the earthly members themselves are to be made as good as dead,[41]

---

35 Thus, BDAG lists as the second definition of *thanatoo*, "to cause total cessation of an activity, put to death, extirpate." This does not mean, of course, that the believer ever eliminates every single manifestation of sin from his life, but he does gain absolute victory over a course of continued sin and has the ability, by the Spirit, to entirely defeat the outward appearance of specific sins.

36 The complete list of references is Matthew 10:21; 26:59; 27:1; Mark 13:12; 14:55; Luke 21:16; Romans 7:4; 8:13, 36; 2 Corinthians 6:9; 1 Peter 3:18.

37 And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sara's womb: καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει, οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη νενεκρωμένον (ἑκατονταέτης που ὑπάρχων), καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας· (Romans 4:19); Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, *so many* as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable. διὸ καὶ ἀφ᾽ ἑνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει, καὶ ὡσεὶ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀναρίθμητος (Hebrews 11:12).

38 Note also the use of the related noun νέκρωσις in Romans 4:19 for the "deadness" of Sarah's womb. Her womb was still extant, and that part of her body was still literally, but it was as good as dead, for (apart from the miraculous intervention of God) she was not going to bear any children. The only other use of the noun νέκρωσις in the New Testament (2 Corinthians 4:10) refers to the physical persecutions suffered by Paul on account of his identification with Christ, his being "troubled on every side . . . perplexed . . . persecuted . . . cast down [and being] alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake" (2 Corinthians 4:8-11). This passage also illustrates the "death as process" (BDAG on νέκρωσις) idea for mortification with *nekroo*—Paul was not absolutely and in every way literally dead, but death was working in him (2 Corinthians 4:12). As Paul was experiencing *nekrosis* in his physical body on account of persecution, but he was not "distressed . . . perplexed . . . forsaken . . . [or] destroyed" (2 Corinthians 4:8-12), so while the Christian mortifies (*nekroo*) his earthly members (Colossians 3:5) they are not entirely destroyed and absolutely eliminated before progressive sanctification is consummated in glorification.

39 *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,* ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. & ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 4. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967.

40 *Thayer's Greek Lexicon,* Henry Thayer. Elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*, Ken Hamel.

41 The idea of becoming as good as dead is illustrated in Josephus, *Antiquties of the Jews* 6:306 (6.13.8.306): When David had said this, he dismissed the woman. But when she came home and found her husband feasting with a great company, and oppressed with wine, she said nothing to him then about what

although they will always remain present in this life. The believer is to progressively put to death the sin principle within him by the power of the Holy Spirit.[42] By the Spirit, he

---

had happened; but on the next day, when he was sober, she told him all the particulars, and made his whole body to appear like that of a dead man by her words, and by that grief which arose from them; so Nabal survived ten days, and no more, and then died.

Ταῦτ᾽ εἰπὼν ἀπολύει τὴν γυναῖκα ἡ δ᾽ εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἐλθοῦσα καὶ καταλαβοῦσα τὸν ἄνδρα μετὰ πολλῶν εὐωχούμενον καὶ κεκαρωμένον ἤδη τότε μὲν οὐδὲν τῶν γεγενημένων διεσάφει τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ νήφοντι ἅπαντα δηλώσασα παρεθῆναι καὶ πᾶν αὐτῷ νεκρωθῆναι τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων καὶ τῆς ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς λύπης ἐποίησε καὶ δέκα οὐ πλείους ἐπιζήσας ἡμέρας τὸν βίον κατέστρεψεν ὁ Νάβαλος.

Another relevant illustration is in Philo, *On The Eternity of the World* 125:

But we must now proceed to consider the question which we postponed till the present time. What sort of a part of the earth is that, that we may begin from this, whether it is greater or less, that is not dissolved by time? Do not the very hardest and strongest stones become hard and decayed through the weakness of their conformation (and this conformation is a sort of course of a highly strained spirit, a bond not indissoluble, but only very difficult to unloose), in consequence of which they are broken up and made fluid, so that they are dissolved first of all into a thin dust, and afterwards are wholly wasted away and destroyed? Again, if the water were never agitated by the winds, but were left immoveable for ever, would it not from inaction and tranquillity become dead? at all events it is changed by such stagnation, and becomes very foetid and foul-smelling, like an animal deprived of life.

ὃ δ᾽ ὑπερεθέμεθα, νῦν ἐπισκεπτέον. ποῖον μέρος τῆς γῆς, ἵνα ἀπὸ ταύτης ἀρξώμεθα, μεῖζον ἢ ἔλαττον, οὐ χρόνῳ διαλύεται; λίθων οἱ κραταιότατοι ἆρ᾽ οὐ μυδῶσι καὶ σήπονται καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἕξεως ἀσθένειαν ἡ δ᾽ ἐστὶ πνευματικὸς τόνος, δεσμὸς οὐκ ἄρρηκτος ἀλλὰ μόνον δυσδιάλυτος θρυπτόμενοι καὶ ῥέοντες εἰς λεπτὴν τὸ πρῶτον ἀναλύονται κόνιν, εἶθ᾽ ὕστερον δαπανηθέντες ἐξαναλοῦνται; τί δ᾽, εἰ μὴ πρὸς ἀνέμων ῥιπίζοιτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἀκίνητον ἐαθὲν οὐχ ὑφ᾽ ἡσυχίας νεκροῦται; μεταβάλλει γοῦν καὶ δυσωδέστατον γίνεται, οἷα ψυχὴν ἀφῃρημένον ζῷον.

[42] The truth that believers are to progressively mortify indwelling sin is clearly Scriptural, but 1 Corinthians 15:31, "I die daily," does not increase the exegetical support for this conclusion, as the death spoken of in the verse is physical; when the Apostle Paul stated that he died daily, he meant that that he was in constant danger of physical death because of his preaching the gospel. Any use of the text to support daily mortification must be, consequently, only a conclusion drawn from the fact that Paul's ability to serve in the light of the physical danger he was in would require special spiritual strength from Christ. 1 Corinthians 15:30-31 reads: "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily," τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν; καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκω, νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, ἣν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. Paul's daily death is clearly connected with his physical "jeopardy every hour," as even the conjunction of the phrases in the Greek text demonstrates (κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν; καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκω). The death of 1 Corinthians 15:31 is physical death, just like the reference to death in 1 Corinthians 15:32.

BDAG notes that the verb "to die," ἀποθνῄσκω, can mean:

> **the prospect of death or realization of mortality** ***be about to die, face death, be mortal*** (Phalaris, Ep. 52 ἀποθνῄσκοντες=be in danger of death; Philosoph. Max 495, 125 ὁ τῶν ἀσώτων βίος ὥσπερ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκων ἐκφέρεται; Athen. 12, 552b καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκειν; Seneca, Ep. 24, 20 (cotidie morimur); Philo, In Flacc. 175; PGiss 17, 9 ἀποθνῄσκομεν ὅτι οὐ βλέπομέν σε καθ᾽ ἡμέραν) καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀ. *I face death every day* 1 Cor 15:31 (cp. Ps 43:23). ὡς ἀποθνῄσκοντες καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν 2 Cor 6:9. ἀποθνῄσκοντες ἄνθρωποι *mortal people* Hb 7:8.

Indeed, ἀποθνῄσκω is employed for physical death, not spiritual mortification, in all of its uses in Paul's letters to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 8:11; 9:15; 15:3, 22, 31–32, 36; 2 Corinthians 5:14–15; 6:9). Paul would "die daily" because he he was "in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft" (2 Corinthians 11:23); he and his companions could testify that they were "as unknown, and *yet* well known; as dying, [yet], behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed" (2 Corinthians 6:9). They could declare: "For [Christ's] sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter" (Romans 8:36). They endured tremendous "tribulation . . . sufferings . . . [and] afflict[ion]," so that on occasion the

is to assault and weaken the strength of the body of sin within him by putting to death both the sinful deeds and the earthly members that are the manifestations of his indwelling sin.[43]

While the believer is commanded to *mortify*, it is essential to remember that he does so only "through the Spirit" (Romans 8:13). The entirety of sanctification, including both mortification and vivification, is a product of the supernatural working of the Holy Spirit within the Christian. As mortification is only "through the Spirit," likewise vivification comes from the Holy Ghost. Ephesians 3:16 (cf. Colossians 1:11)[44] indicates that God "grants . . . by his Spirit" that the believer's inner man is strengthened. All aspects of "sanctification" are "of the Spirit" (1 Peter 1:2; 1 Corinthians 6:11; 2 Thessalonians 2:13). The believer's holy affections and resultant holy actions are the "fruit of the Spirit" (Galatians 5:22; Ephesians 5:9), spiritual fruit produced by the Holy Spirit because of the union the Christian has with Christ (Romans 8:2; 1 Corinthians 1:30; Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 1:3), the Author of spiritual strength (Philippians 4:13) along with the Father (Hebrews 13:20-21; 1 Thessalonians 5:23) and the Holy Ghost. Apart from Christ, the believer can do nothing good (John 15:4). In sanctification, the believer is unquestionably active, but his holiness is nonetheless a Divine product.[45]

Apostle and his missionary team were "pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life . . .[and] we had the sentence of death in ourselves" (2 Corinthians 1:3-11).

Nonetheless, while Paul's "I die daily" is certainly a reference to physical death, not spiritual mortification, because "we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake," such physical persecution and danger resulted in the spiritual "life also of Jesus [being] made manifest in our mortal flesh" (2 Corinthians 4:11). The Apostle and his companions could testify that "as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ" (2 Corinthians 1:5).

[43] "Original sin is to be distinguished from indwelling sin. The latter is the remainder of original sin in the regenerate. Its workings are described in Romans 7:14-8:27. . . . It is not, like original sin, a dominant and increasing principle in the believer, but a subjugated and diminishing one. Indwelling sin is the minuendo movement of sin. "It hath a dying fall." Original sin is the crescendo movement. 'Original sin does not remain in the same manner after regeneration as it remained before; for there are two remarkable differences. In the unregenerate, it occupies all the faculties of the soul *peaceably,* and *rules* in their mind, will, and affections; but in the regenerate, it neither dwells peaceably, because grace from above is infused into them, which daily opposes this disease, and more and more expels it from every faculty of the soul; nor does it rule over them, because grace prevailing and predominating restrains it and sends it as it were under the yoke. The other difference is, that in the unregenerate it has the guilt of eternal death annexed to it; but in the regenerate it is absolved from this fruit, for the sake of Christ the mediator.' (Davenant: Justification, XV). . . . Indwelling sin is denominated 'the law in (not *of*) the members,' Romans 7:23; original sin is denominated 'the law of sin and death,' Romans 8:2" (pg. 33, Chapter 5, "Original Sin," *Dogmatic Theology: Anthropology*, William G. T. Shedd).

[44] God is the subject of the passive participle "strengthened" (δυναμούμενοι, 1:11a). He strengthens believers spiritually "according to his glorious power" (1:11b), with the result that they act differently (1:11c-12).

[45] "Some have the mistaken notion that sanctification consists merely in the drawing out of the new life, implanted in the soul by regeneration, in a persuasive way by presenting motives to the will. But this is not true. It consists fundamentally and primarily in a divine operation in the soul, whereby the holy

Christians can testify, therefore, in spiritual growth, as in the providential ordering of circumstances in their life, that "we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead" (2 Corinthians 1:9).

Arthur Pink comments well on the use of the word "body" in Romans 6:6, rather than what might be expected, "flesh":[46]

> But why "mortify the deeds of the body"? In view of the studied balancing of the several clauses in this antithetical sentence, we had expected it to read "mortify the flesh." In the seventh chapter and the opening verses of the eighth the apostle had treated of indwelling sin as the fount of all evil actions; and here he insists on the mortifying of both the root and the branches of corruption, referring to the duty under the name of the fruits it bears. The "deeds of the body" must not be restricted to mere outward works, but be understood as including also the springs from which they issue. As Owen rightly said, "The axe must be laid to the root of the tree." In our judgment "the body" here has a twofold reference.
>
> First, to the evil nature or indwelling sin, which in Romans 6:6, and 7:24, is likened unto a body, namely "the body of the sins of the flesh" (Colossians 2:11). It is a body of corruption which compasses the soul: hence we read of "your members which are upon the earth" (Colossians 3:5). The "deeds of the body" are the works which corrupt nature produces, namely our sins. Thus the "body" is here used objectively of "the flesh."
>
> Second, the "body" here includes the house in which the soul now dwells. It is specified to denote the degrading malignity which there is in sin, reducing its slaves to live as though they had no souls. It is mentioned to import the tendency of indwelling sin, namely to please and pamper the baser part of our being, the soul being made the drudge of the outward man. The body is here referred to for the purpose of informing us that though the soul be the original abode of "the flesh" the physical frame is the main instrument of its actions. Our corruptions are principally manifested in our external members: it is there that indwelling sin is chiefly found and felt. Sins are denominated "the deeds of the body" not only because they are what the lusts of the flesh tend to produce, but also because they are executed by the body (Romans 6:12). Our task then is not to transform and transmute "the flesh," but to slay it: to refuse its impulses, to deny its aspirations, to put to death its appetites.

---

disposition born in regeneration is strengthened and its holy exercises are increased. It is essentially a work of God, though in so far as He employs means, man can and is expected to cooperate by the proper use of these means. . . . It should never be represented as a merely natural process in the spiritual development of man, nor brought down to the level of a mere human achievement, as is done in a great deal of modern liberal theology. . . . When it is said that man takes part in the work of sanctification, this does not mean that man is an independent agent in the work, so as to make it partly the work of God and partly the work of man; but merely, that God effects the work in part through the instrumentality of man as a rational being, by requiring of him prayerful and intelligent cooperation with the Spirit. . . . [T]he believer must be diligent in the employment of the means at his command for the moral and spiritual improvement of his life, Micah 6:8; John 15:2, 8, 16; Romans 8:12, 13; 12:1-2,17; Galatians 6:7-8, 15. . . . [I]t is necessary to stress the fact over and over again that sanctification is the fruit of justification, that the former is simply impossible without the latter, and that both are the fruits of the grace of God in the redemption of sinners. Though man is privileged to cooperate with the Spirit of God, he can do this only in virtue of the strength which the Spirit imparts to him from day to day. The spiritual development of man is not a human achievement, but a work of divine grace. Man deserves no credit whatsoever for that which he contributes to it instrumentally. . . . [S]anctification takes place in the subconcious life . . . effected by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit . . . [and] as a work in the concious life of believers it is wrought by several means, which the Holy Spirit employs." (pg. 532-535, *Systematic Theology,* Berkhof).

[46] *Practical Christianity,* chap. 7, pgs. 214-216. Elec. acc. AGES Digital Library, Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Rio, WI: 2006. Note that although Pink is specifically explaining Romans 8:13, ("if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live"), the ethically sinful flesh is the matter of discussion in both 8:13 and 6:6.

> But who is sufficient for such a task—a task which is not a work of nature but wholly a spiritual one? It is far beyond the unaided powers of the believer. Means and ordinances cannot of themselves effect it. It is beyond the province and ability of the preacher: omnipotence must have the main share in the work. "If ye through the Spirit do mortify," that is "the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ" of Romans 8:9—the Holy Spirit; for He is not only the Spirit of holiness in His nature, but in His operations too. He is the principal efficient cause of mortification. Let us marvel at and adore the Divine grace which has provided such a Helper for us! Let us recognize and realize that we are as truly indebted to and dependent upon the Spirit's operations as we are upon the Father's electing and the Son's redeeming us. Though grace be wrought in the hearts of the regenerate, yet it lies not in their power to act it. He who imparted the grace must renew, excite, and direct it.
>
> Believers may employ the aids of inward discipline and rigor, and practice outward moderation and abstinence, and while they may for a time check and suppress their evil habits, unless the Spirit puts forth His power in them there will be no true mortification. And how does He operate in this particular work? In many different ways. First, at the new birth He gives us a new nature. Then by nourishing and preserving that nature. In strengthening us with His might in the inner man. In granting fresh supplies of grace from day to day. By working in us a loathing of sin, a mourning over it, a turning from it. By pressing upon us the claims of Christ, making us willing to take up our cross and follow Him. By bringing some precept or warning to our mind. By sealing a promise upon the heart. By moving us to pray.
>
> Yet let it be carefully noted that our text does not say, "If the Spirit do mortify," or even "If the Spirit through you do mortify," but, instead, "If ye through the Spirit": the believer is not passive in this work, but active. It must not be supposed that the Spirit will help us without our concurrence, as well while we are asleep as waking, whether or not we maintain a close watch over our thoughts and works, and exercise nothing but a slight wish or sluggish prayer for the mortification of our sins. Believers are required to set themselves seriously to the task. If on the one hand we cannot discharge this duty without the Spirit's enablement, on the other hand He will not assist if we be too indolent to put forth earnest endeavors. Then let not the lazy Christian imagine he will ever get the victory over his lusts.

The *old man*, the *body of sin*, and the *flesh* all relate to remnants of sin within the believer that are legally dead at regeneration, progressively weakened in the Christian life through mortification, and utterly abolished at glorification. However, they emphasize different aspects of indwelling sin. The term *old man* refers to the entirety of the unconverted person, body, soul, and spirit. The *body of sin* is the body as dominated or controlled by sin, and the *flesh* in the ethically sinful sense is the seat of indwelling sin in the believer that controlled him in his unregenerate state.

D. The Nature And Means Of Vivification, The Positive Converse of Mortification

I. The Nature of Vivification

1.) Vivification as Quickening

As mortification involves the putting to death of the members of the old man and his deeds, so vivification is the work of God in the progressive strengthening and growth

of the new man and his deeds, in an increase in the spiritual strength and power of the gracious nature and principles bestowed in regeneration.

The Old Testament psalmist, praising that Word which is the Spirit's instrument in sanctification (Psalm 119:50, 93; John 17:17),[47] prayed:

> My soul cleaveth unto the dust: quicken[48] thou me according to thy word. . . . Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity; *and* quicken thou me in thy way. . . . Behold, I have longed after thy precepts: quicken me in thy righteousness. . . . This *is* my comfort in my affliction: for thy word hath quickened me. . . . Quicken me after thy lovingkindness; so shall I keep the testimony of thy mouth. . . . I will never forget thy precepts: for with them thou hast quickened me. . . . I am afflicted very much: quicken me, O LORD, according unto thy word. . . . Hear my voice according unto thy lovingkindness: O LORD, quicken me according to thy judgment. . . . Plead my cause, and deliver me: quicken me according to thy word. . . . Great *are* thy tender mercies, O LORD: quicken me according to thy judgments. . . . Consider how I love thy precepts: quicken me, O LORD, according to thy lovingkindness" (Psalm 119:25, 37, 40, 50, 88, 93, 107, 149, 154, 156, 159).

The Psalmist recognized Jehovah as the great Giver and Renewer of spiritual life, as He is of physical life (Deuteronomy 32:39; 1 Samuel 2:6; Job 33:4)—he did not quicken himself, but sought the Lord, praying, "quicken me." While Divinely bestowed spiritual life leads the saint to walk "in [God's] way" (Psalm 119:37), the believer himself is strengthened in spiritual life—the Psalmist's prayer is not concerning his actions only, but he prays that he himself would be vivified ("quicken *me*") with holy actions as a result. Other Old Testament texts likewise indicate that a work of God vivifying the believer himself is the cause of holy actions on his part: "quicken us, and we will call upon thy name. Turn us again, O LORD God of hosts" (Psalm 80:18-19). Outward holy

---

47 "Sanctification . . . is carried forward by the influence of the Holy Spirit and of Christian truth upon the hearts of believers. . . . [John 17:17] ascribes the work of sanctification to God acting by his Spirit, but recognizes the Word of God as the element in which the work is to be accomplished. Accordingly believers are sanctified, not by the Spirit dwelling alone in the soul, and cleansing by his simple energy the susceptibilities and affections, regarded as the springs of moral life, but by the Spirit dwelling in the soul, and disposing it to seek and welcome the truth as it is in Jesus, by the Spirit revealing through the Word the things of Christ to the mind and heart. . . . "The words which I have spoken to you, they are spirit and are life.' . . . [T]he work of the Spirit in sanctification . . . [involves] opening the heart to receive that truth, in helping it recall the part of that truth which is most needed at any given moment for the soul's good, in moving it to plead with God for holy impulse to do his will, and in giving by direct action and the power of suggested truth that impulse to service" (pgs. 133-135, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, Alvah Hovey).

48 Each of the references in Psalm 119 to the word *quicken* involve the verb חיה in the Piel with a singular suffix ("me"). Compare the uses of the Qal and Piel in 2 Kings 7:4 for physical life: "If we say, We will enter into the city, then the famine *is* in the city, and we shall die there: and if we sit still here, we die also. Now therefore come, and let us fall unto the host of the Syrians: if they save us alive, we shall live [אִם־יְחַיֵּנוּ נִחְיֶה]; and if they kill us, we shall but die."

actions are the product of the gracious inward renewal worked by God in His people. "Wilt thou not revive [same form as *quicken*—which contributes to a Biblical understanding of the nature of revival; cf. also Psalm 138:7; Hosea 14:7; Habakkuk 3:2] us again: that thy people may rejoice in thee?" (Psalm 85:6).

The New Testament employs the verb *quicken* (ζῳοποιέω) for the coming bodily resurrection from the dead (Romans 8:11; 1 Corinthians 15:22) and the related verb *quicken with* (συζωοποιέω) for the believer's current spiritual resurrection as a result of his union with Christ that is associated with his regeneration (Ephesians 2:5; Colossians 2:13), but does not specifically employ *quickening* terminology for the strengthening of the spiritual life of the saint in progressive sanctification; rather, the inspired Greek Testament expresses the progressive spriritual vivification of the believer with other terminology. Nevertheless, the fact that *quickening* terminology is employed in Scripture for the spiritual life bestowed in regeneration by means of union with Christ (Ephesians 2:5), the spiritual growth of the believer on earth (Psalm 119:25) and the glorification of the believer in the future at the time of his bodily resurrection (Romans 8:11) illustrates the continuity between regeneration, progressive vivification during the saint's lifetime, and the consummation of that process in eternity.

2.) Vivification as Growth

The New Testament expresses the development of the new nature within the believer with terminology of growth. 2 Peter 3:18 commands believers: "[G]row in grace, and *in* the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.) Spiritual growth is progressive renewal into the moral image of God, into Christlikeness. Christ placed spiritual leaders in the church to bring about certain results:

> 11 And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; 12 For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: 13 Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: 14 That we *henceforth* be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, *and* cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; 15 But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, *even* Christ: 16 From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the

measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love. (Ephesians 4:11-16)[49]

The saints are perfected and edified by Christ through church leadership (v. 11-12) with the result that they progress towards unity in the faith and experiential knowledge of or communion with the Son of God (v. 13) with the result that each believer becomes more like "a perfect man," that is, he becomes closer to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (v. 13), no longer being a spiritual child that can easily waver (v. 14), but instead "grow[ing] up into [Christ] in all things" (v. 15) as the Lord Jesus, the head of His spiritual body, supplies grace and strength to each member of it (v. 16). Progressive sanctification renews the whole person into the image of the God-Man, Jesus Christ, a process culminated when in glorification the saint is perfectly like Him (1 John 3:2).[50] The believer's old man grows weaker and dies and his new man grows stronger and more powerful. The growth of the new man is compared to the physical growth[51] of an infant through childhood to a mature man (Ephesians 4:14-16; Hebrews 5:12-14; 1 Peter 2:2[52]).

---

[49] 11 καὶ αὐτός ἔδωκε τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους 12 πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων, εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, εἰς οἰκοδομήν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· 13 μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· 14 ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐν πανουργίᾳ, πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης· 15 ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, ὁ Χριστός, 16 ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας, κατ᾽ ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου μέρους, τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιειται εἰς οἰκοδομήν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

[50] "All [the] loss [from the fall of Adam] is redemptively restored, and more than restored, in Christ, the true Image, in whom man's full stature is achieved and his eternal destiny secured, and to whose image the redeemed are being progressively conformed until at last they are brought to 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,' which is the perfection of their humanity (Ephesians 4:12f.; 2 Corinthians 3:18; Jude 24; 1 John 3:2-3; 1 Peter 5:10)" (pg. 113, *The True Image*, Philip E. Hughes).

[51] The verb αὐξάνω is used for physical growth in Matthew 6:28 ("lilies of the field . . . grow"); 13:31-32 ("a grain of mustard seed . . . when it is grown . . . it . . . becometh a tree"; Luke 1:80 ("the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit"); 2:40 ("the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him."); 12:27 ("the lilies . . . grow"); 13:19 ("a grain of mustand seed . . . grew"). The verb is also used for population growth ("the people grew and multiplied in Egypt," Acts 7:17), for the spread of the Word of God as people are converted, Christians grow, and new churches are established and built up (Acts 6:7; 12:24); in these ways "the word of God gr[ows] and multiplie[s]" (Acts 12:24), and for the increase in Christ's ministry as John the Baptist's preparatory work faded into the background in comparison (John 3:30).

[52] 1 Peter 2:2 reads, "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby" (ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη, τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε). While all believers, even very mature ones, are to desire the milk of the word in the same way that newborn babes desire milk, 1 Peter 2:2 nonetheless provides some support for the image of spiritual growth as development from infancy to mature adulthood, since many similar texts with ὡς in 1 Peter do not just make an analogy ("in the way infants desire milk, so desire the Word") but describe the actual nature of Peter's audience. Thus, note: "as obedient children [ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς] . . . be ye holy" (1 Peter 1:14-15); "ye also, as lively stones, are built up" (καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικός, 1 Peter 2:5); "Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from

As God renews His children in their entire new man into the image of Christ (Ephesians 4:13-15), they grow in the knowledge of God (Colossians 1:10) and of Christ (2 Peter 3:18), in grace (2 Peter 3:18; 2 Corinthians 9:14) and in faith (2 Corinthians 10:15), and, as a result, in every good work and fruit of righteousness (2 Corinthians 9:8-14).

The source of spiritual growth is God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who alone "giveth the increase" (1 Corinthians 3:5-7; cf. Ephesians 4:11-16) and gets the glory for it (1 Corinthians 3:7) both by giving the lost faith and regeneration (1 Corinthians 3:5) and producing spiritual growth in those He saves. The instrumentality of growth is the Word of God, by which sinners are born again and then grow into maturity (1 Peter 1:23; 2:2; Mark 4:8, 14). Both church leadership (Ephesians 4:11; 1 Corinthians 3:6-7) and every individual member of the church (Ephesians 4:16) use the Word as the human means God employs to produce growth His people. The growth and development of the new man constitutes a central aspect of the doctrine of vivification.

3.) Vivification as Building Up

Scripture employs the *oikodomeo* word group, which speaks of *building* or *building up*,[53] to describe progressive sanctification. The verb *to build* (οἰκοδομέω) refers to the literal building of houses (Matthew 7:24), towers (Matthew 21:33), tombs (Matthew 23:39), temples (Matthew 26:61), cities (Luke 4:29), synagogues (Luke 7:5), barns (Luke 12:18), and other items in general (Luke 17:28). Those who build are

---

fleshly lusts" (Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους, ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, 1 Peter 2:11); "ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men . . . as free, and . . . as the servants of God" (φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν . . . ὡς ἐλεύθεροι . . . ὡς δοῦλοι Θεοῦ, 1 Peter 2:15-16). While every construction with ὡς does not function in this way in the epistle (e. g., 1 Peter 3:6-7), it is reasonable to conclude that those in Peter's audience who were newly born again (1 Peter 1:23) were to desire the Word because they were newborn babes (1 Peter 2:2) without excluding the fact that all believers are to desire Scripture in the same manner. (ὡς is found in 1 Peter in 1:14, 19, 24; 2:2, 5, 11-14, 16, 25; 3:6-7, 16; 4:10-12, 15-16, 19; 5:3, 8, 12).

Furthermore, 1 Peter 2:2 is correctly renders τὸ λογικὸν as the milk "of the word"; cf. the comment on the verse in *1 Peter, Hermeneia*, P. J. Achtemeir & E. J. Epp.

[53] The relevant New Testament words are οἰκοδομή (Matthew 24:1; Mark 13:1–2; Romans 14:19; 15:2; 1 Corinthians 3:9; 14:3, 5, 12, 26; 2 Corinthians 5:1; 10:8; 12:19; 13:10; Ephesians 2:21; 4:12, 16, 29), οἰκοδομία (1 Timothy 1:4), οἰκοδομέω (Matthew 7:24, 26; 16:18; 21:33, 42; 23:29; 26:61; 27:40; Mark 12:1, 10; 14:58; 15:29; Luke 4:29; 6:48–49; 7:5; 11:47–48; 12:18; 14:28, 30; 17:28; 20:17; John 2:20; Acts 4:11; 7:47, 49; 9:31; Romans 15:20; 1 Corinthians 8:1, 10; 10:23; 14:4, 17; Galatians 2:18; 1 Thessalonians 5:11; 1 Peter 2:5, 7), ἀνοικοδομέω (Acts 15:16), ἐποικοδομέω (Acts 20:32; 1 Corinthians 3:10, 12, 14; Ephesians 2:20; Colossians 2:7; Jude 20), and συνοικοδομέω (Ephesians 2:22). The word οἰκοδόμος is in the critical Greek text in Acts 4:11, but it is not found in the preserved Word of God. The New Testament texts where this word group is employed in a manner that relates to spiritual building are: Matthew 16:18; Acts 9:31; 15:16; 20:32; Romans 14:19; 15:2, 20; 1 Corinthians 3:9–10, 12, 14; 8:1, 10; 10:23; 14:3–5, 12, 17, 26; 2 Corinthians 5:1; 10:8; 12:19; 13:10; Galatians 2:18; Ephesians 2:20–22; 4:12, 16, 29; Colossians 2:7; 1 Thessalonians 5:11; 1 Timothy 1:4; 1 Peter 2:5, 7; Jude 20.

builders (Matthew 21:42), and they build up (ἐποικοδομέω, 1 Corinthians 3:10-14, cf. συνοικοδομέω, Ephesians 2:22) buildings (οικοδομή, Matthew 24:1), and build up again or rebuild (ἀνοικοδομέω, Acts 15:16) ones that have fallen down or that need restoration. The literal construction of buildings underlies the Scriptural metaphor for progressive sanctification as *building* or *building up*.

As an *edifice* is a building, so, when spiritual building up is in view, *oikodomeo* is translated *to edify* (Acts 9:31; 1 Corinthians 10:23) as well as *to build* (1 Peter 2:5). A believer's gradual growth in holiness is compared to the construction of a building; construction begins at regeneration, laid upon the foundation of Christ, the chief cornerstone (1 Corinthians 3:11), and upon the foundational revelation of the Word of God given through the apostles and prophets (Ephesians 2:20; 3:5).[54] The metaphorical

---

[54] The *foundation* word group (θεμέλιος, θεμέλιον, θεμελιόω) supports the metaphor for sanctification as the construction of a building. A literal building had a literal foundation (θεμέλιος), as cities and walls, and even the earth, have foundations (Hebrews 11:10; Revelation 21:14, 19; Hebrews 1:10). The Lord Jesus Christ and His gospel are the enduring foundation upon which the believer's justification, sanctification, and glorification rest (Luke 6:48-49; Matthew 7:25), and the Lord Jesus is the foundation of the church as well (1 Corinthians 3:10-15; note also Romans 15:20). The *foundation* metaphor is also employed in Scripture in association with other spiritual truths upon which other subsequent or higher level superstructures are "built" (Luke 14:29; 1 Timothy 6:19; 2 Timothy 2:19; Hebrews 6:1; 11:10); the description of the apostles and prophets, the vehicle for the inspiration of the Scriptures, as a *foundation* fits within such a category of usage (Ephesians 2:20; Revelation 21:14, 19). Furthermore, sanctification leads the believer to be more firmly "founded" or established; his building, which was permanently settled upon its foundation at regeneration (note the perfect and pluperfect tenses for θεμέλιοω in Matthew 7:25; Luke 6:48; Ephesians 3:17; Colossians 1:23), is made progressively more stable and firm by God (1 Peter 5:10), so that both the Christian individually and the corporate assembly of the regenerate grows less liable to fall into sin or false doctrine (Ephesians 3:17; Colossians 1:23; 1 Peter 5:10).

The description of Christ as the "chief corner stone" (ἀκρογωνιαῖος, Ephesians 2:20; 1 Peter 2:6) and "head of the corner" (κεφαλὴ γωνίας, Matthew 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7; cf. Isaiah 28:16, "Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner *stone*, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste," לָכֵן כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה הִנְנִי יִסַּד בְּצִיּוֹן אֶבֶן אֶבֶן בֹּחַן פִּנַּת יְקָרַת מוּסָד מוּסָּד הַמַּאֲמִין לֹא יָחִישׁ׃ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως λέγει κύριος ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιων λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ.) also develops the "building" metaphor. The Son of God is the ultimate foundation without whom no spiritual building of Christian or congregation is possible, but founded upon Him, the believer will not be ashamed by having to flee in haste or alarm from God's coming judgment, but will be delivered as he waits in faith on God and the Messiah (Isaiah 8:17; 25:9; 26:8; 30:15, 18; 32:17; 33:2; cf. the Targum on Isaiah 28:16: וְאֵימְתָן אִתְקְפִינֵיה וְאַחסְנֵיה אְמַר נְבִיָא וְצַדִיקָיָא דְהֵימִינוּ בְאֵלִין בְמֵיתֵי עָקָא לָא יְזַדעְזעוּן׃ בְכֵין כִדנָן אְמַר יוי אֱלֹהִים הָאֲנָא מְמַנֵי בְצִיוֹן מַלַך מַלַך תַקִיף גִיבָר). Note also Genesis 49:24; Psalm 118:22; Daniel 2:45; Zechariah 3:9. Along these lines, Christ is the πέτρα, the Rock, the "bedrock or massive rock formatio[n]" (BDAG) upon which the individual believer and the church are founded (Matthew 7:24-25; 16:18; Luke 6:48; Romans 9:33; 1 Corinthians 10:4; 1 Peter 2:8; cf. the literal use for bedrock in Matthew 27:51, 60; Mark 15:46; Luke 8:6, 13; Revelation 6:15-16). The word πέτρα is specifically distinguished from πέτρος ὁ, *a stone,*" so that "[t]here is no example, in good authors, of πέτρα in the sense of πέτρος, a stone" (cf. πέτρα & πέτρος, Liddell-Scott). The metaphor for Christ as the ἀκρογωνιαῖος alludes to the cornerstone in the Jewish Temple (cf. Louw-Nida, 7.44; the lexicon also correctly indicates that the ἀκρογωνιαῖος does not refer to a capstone, but a cornerstone), thus associating

building of the believer proceeds throughout life at whatever rate he is growing spiritually, and is completed at glorification. The building metaphor is also used for the spiritual development of Christ's congregation; in the Lord Jesus "all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord . . . builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Ephesians 2:21-22).

The Triune God is the ultimate cause of the believer being built up spiritually. The church and her individual members are "God's building" (1 Corinthians 3:9)[55] because He is the source and producer of spiritual growth and progressive sanctification,[56] as He is the one who will perfectly sanctify His saints and give them holy glorified bodies at their resurrection (2 Corinthians 5:1). Jehovah spiritually revives and rebuilds His people when they have fallen into spiritual ruin (Acts 15:16-17).[57] Believers are "rooted and built up in" Christ (Colossians 2:7), for Christ builds up the members of His churches individually and builds and multiplies His congregations corporately (Matthew 16:18; Acts 9:31). The church and her individual members are built up in Christ and by the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 2:19-22).[58] The saints, as living stones, "are built up a spiritual house" (1 Peter 2:5) through the power of God (1 Peter 1:5), including the election, regenerating decree, and calling of the Father (1 Peter 1:2-3, 15-17, 20), the

---

the *building* and *foundation* metaphors with the structure of the Jewish Temple, which therefore provides background for the temple building metaphor for the individual believer (1 Corinthians 6:15-20; 1 Peter 2:5) and for the church (1 Corinthians 3:11-15; 1 Timothy 3:15; cf. also 1 Kings 6:37; 7:12; 1 Chronicles 22:2; Ezra 3:9; Matthew 12:4; Hebrews 10:21; 1 Peter 4:17).

Associated with the *foundation* and *building* metaphors in sanctification is the *root* metaphor (note the connection in both texts with ῥιζόω; "being rooted and grounded in love," ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι, Ephesians 3:17; "rooted and built up in him," ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ, Colossians 2:7. A proper root (ῥίζα)—Christ Himself, savingly received by repentant faith—is the essential prerequisite to sanctification, and all who possess this root produce spiritual fruit, while all those rooted in anything else (cf. 1 Timothy 6:10; Hebrews 12:15) will be damned (Matthew 3:10; 13:6, 21; Mark 4:6, 17; Luke 3:9, 8:13; Romans 11:16-18).

55 Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε.

56 The source and production ideas in the Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή of 1 Corinthians 3:9 are clearly validated by the context of 3:5-15; "God . . . giveth the increase" (1 Corinthians 3:6-7, ὁ Θεὸς ηὔξανεν/ὁ αὐξάνων Θεός), and the congregation is God's field which He causes to grow (Θεοῦ γεώργιον), as the ultimate Worker of spiritual growth who uses human instruments as coworkers (Θεοῦ . . . συνεργοί).

57 The rebuilding discussed in Acts 15:16-17 will take place in the Millennial kingdom when the Lord rebuilds the institutions of the physical Jewish worship, Amos 9:11-12, yet in both the Old Testament and New Testament texts it is evident that the restoration is not merely physical, but also spiritual.

The verb ἀνορθόω, employed in Acts 15:16 for the setting up of the tabernacle of David, can also be used metaphorically in connection with Christian growth; cf. Hebrews 12:12 & the literal use, howbeit with spiritual implications, in Luke 13:13, and the spiritual use of ὀρθός in Hebrews 12:13, with a corresponding literal use with spiritual implications in Acts 14:10. Note also ὀρθῶς in Luke 20:21 (elsewhere in the NT in Mark 7:35; Luke 7:43; 10:28), ὀρθοποδέω in Galatians 2:14, and even ὀρθοτομέω in 2 Timothy 2:15.

58 Note, however, that both the relationship to the Son and to the Spirit use the same preposition; the church experiences ἐποικοδομέω both ἐν Κυρίῳ and ἐν Πνεύματι.

redemptive suffering, blood, death, resurrection, and mediatorial office of the Son (1 Peter 1:2-3, 11, 18-21), and the effectual application of regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Ghost (1 Peter 1:3, 12, 22), through the instrumentality of the Word of God (1 Peter 1:10-11, 23-25, 2:1-3).

While God is the ultimate source of spiritual edification, He uses His Word and His people as secondary instrumentalities in the building up of the saints. Thus, both "God" and "the word of His grace" "build . . . up" believers[59] and give them an inheritance among the sanctified (Acts 20:32). Furthermore, the Lord gives people the power to be secondary causes of edification as they minister to one another (2 Corinthians 13:10) using the Word; thus, "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification" (1 Corinthians 14:3-5). The saints are commanded to "edify one another" (1 Thessalonians 5:11). Christ "maketh increase of the body," but He does so as He leads the "whole body" to be "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part," so that it is appropriate to speak of the church body itself producing spiritual building, the "edifying of itself in love" (Ephesians 4:16). The ascended Savior gave spiritual leadership, that is, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers to the church (Ephesians 4:11) so that through the corporate ministry of the Word and through individual exhortation the saints might be perfected and the body of Christ edified (Ephesians 4:12; 2 Corinthians 10:8; 13:10). As the Lord uses evangelists to start new churches, as people are converted and added to the church through baptism, those who evangelize add new Christians, spiritual stones built upon the foundation of Jesus Christ (Romans 15:20), to the church, the corporate assembly of regenerate and immersed believers. Others spiritual leaders use the Word to build up existing churches numerically and spiritually upon Christ, the foundation (1 Corinthians 3:5-15). Indeed, all the spiritual gifts the Lord gives His people are for the edification of the church (1 Corinthians 14:12), and are to be used "unto edifying" (1 Corinthians 14:26), as in general "all things" are to be done "for . . . edifying" (2 Corinthians 12:19). Individual saints must "edify . . . one . . . another" (Romans 14:19), and "please" each other "for . . . good to edification" (Romans 15:2). Even the ability to lead in corporate prayer must be used for edification (1 Corinthians 14:15-17). Saints also build each other up as they use their spiritual liberties (1 Corinthians 8:2-13) with charity (1 Corinthians 8:1), while by the misuse of liberty they can uncharitably (Romans 14:15) tear down weaker brothers, that is, build them up in sin

[59] Note the agreement in case, number, and gender in Acts 20:32's τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, τῷ δυναμένῳ ἐποικοδομῆσαι.

(1 Corinthians 8:10). Believers must, therefore, avoid even what is lawful if it will be unprofitable (1 Corinthians 6:12) and lead others to stumble instead of being built up (1 Corinthians 10:23). Individual believers must not rebuild the sin and spiritual bondage that was torn down at the moment of their regeneration (Galatians 2:18), but must seek their own and others edification in all that they do. They must keep themselves in the love of God by praying in the Holy Ghost and building themselves up on their most holy faith (Jude 20-21). Likewise, believers are not to heed false doctrine (1 Timothy 1:3) or "give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions," but rather to consider "godly edifying which is in faith" (1 Timothy 1:4). Godly speech is "good to the use of edifying" as it is the instrument through which God gives grace to those who hear it (Ephesians 4:29). The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit build up the saints individually and corporately through the power of sanctifying grace given instrumentally through the Word and other believers in the church.

4.) Vivification as Strengthening

Vivification is often expressed with Scriptural words designating *strengthening*.[60] Building to spiritual truth from instances where this group of words is employed in the

---

[60] The following words are included in this group (related NT forms that are not employed in connection with progressive sanctification are excluded): στηρίζω (Luke 9:51; 16:26; 22:32; Romans 1:11; 16:25; 1 Thessalonians 3:2, 13; 2 Thessalonians 2:17; 3:3; James 5:8; 1 Peter 5:10; 2 Peter 1:12; Revelation 3:2); ἐπιστηρίζω (Acts 14:22; 15:32, 41; 18:23); στερεόω (Acts 3:7, 16; 16:5); στερεός (2 Timothy 2:19; Hebrews 5:12, 14; 1 Peter 5:9); στερέωμα (Colossians 2:5); στηριγμός (2 Peter 3:17); σθενόω (1 Peter 5:10); δυναμόω (Colossians 1:11); ἐνδυναμόω (Acts 9:22; Romans 4:20; Ephesians 6:10; Philippians 4:13; 1 Timothy 1:12; 2 Timothy 2:1; 4:17; Hebrews 11:34); βεβαιόω (Mark 16:20; Romans 15:8; 1 Corinthians 1:6, 8; 2 Corinthians 1:21; Colossians 2:7; Hebrews 2:3; 13:9).

The Old Testament provides some evidence for progressive sanctification as strengthening. Psalm 119:28 reads: "My soul melteth for heaviness: strengthen thou me (קַיְּמֵנִי; LXX βεβαίωσόν με) according unto thy word." While the text unquestionably alludes to physical strengthening, spiritual refreshing is not absent. However, no other texts with קום clearly speak of spiritual strengthening, although the sense of spiritual strengthening in Psalm 119:28 may be illuminated by the uses of קום in Deuteronomy 27:26; 28:9; 1 Kings 11:14, 23; Hosea 6:2; Job 4:4. The verb חזק is used for God strengthening His people to accomplish specific tasks for His glory and for being courageous for His sake and in His cause, as well as for the people of God strengthening one another for specific spiritual tasks (cf. Numbers 13:20; Deuteronomy 1:38; 3:28; 11:8; 31:6–7, 23; Joshua 1:6–7, 9, 18; 10:25; 23:6; Judges 20:22; 1 Samuel 23:16; 30:6; 1 Kings 2:2; Isaiah 35:3–4; Ezekiel 34:4, 16; Zechariah 8:9, 13; Psalm 27:14; 31:24; Job 4:3; Ezra 6:22; 7:28; 10:4; Nehemiah 2:18; 6:9; 10:29; 1 Chronicles 22:13; 28:10, 20; 29:12; 2 Chronicles 1:1; 15:7–8; 19:11; 31:4; 32:7; 35:2). The believer is made courageous and strong "to keep and to do all that is written in the book of the law of Moses . . . [and] turn not aside therefrom *to* the right hand or *to* the left" (Joshua 23:6). A few references refer to the believer himself being strengthened, rather than his possessing strength to perform a specific task: "And Jonathan Saul's son arose, and went to David into the wood, and strengthened [David's] hand in God" (1 Samuel 23:16). "And David was greatly distressed; for the people spake of stoning him, because the soul of all the people was grieved, every man for his sons

physical world (e. g., Acts 3:7, 16; 16:5; Hebrews 5:12, 14; 1 Peter 5:9), *strengthening* texts illuminate important aspects of the work of God in sanctifying His people.

Progressive sanctification strengthens or establishes a believer's heart and soul (Acts 14:22) unblameable in holiness before God the Father, a process only completed at the coming of Christ (1 Thessalonians 3:13). God progressively perfects, establishes, strengthens, and settles believers until they become perfectly holy in eternal glory (1 Peter 5:10). As the Triune God, and especially the incarnate Son, strengthens believers (cf. Ephesians 6:10; Philippians 4:13;[61] 1 Timothy 1:12; 2 Timothy 4:7) according to His glorious power[62] and grace (2 Timothy 2:1), Christians are filled with spiritual knowledge and understanding as well as holy attitudes and actions (Colossians 1:9-12). They grow stronger in their knowledge of and ability to rightly teach the Word (Acts 9:22), grow stronger in faith (Romans 4:20), and grow in their ability to fight and win spiritual victories (2 Timothy 4:17; Hebrews 11:34). Believers are not only strengthened individually, but churches, assemblies of the saints, are likewise corporately strengthened (Acts 15:41; 16:5). Strengthening leads the saints to hold fast to the Word and to practice "every good word and work" (1 Thessalonians 2:15-17) as God keeps them from evil (1 Thessalonians 3:3) and the error of the wicked (2 Peter 3:17) and they are established in the truth (2 Peter 1:12). When the "heart [is] established [or strengthened] with grace," the saint is not "carried about with divers and strange doctrines" (Hebrews 13:9). As

---

and for his daughters: but David encouraged himself [וַיִּתְחַזֵּק] in the LORD his God" (1 Samuel 30:6). See also Isaiah 35:4; Ezekiel 34:4, 6. The verb חזק is used in many other ways associated with strength but not with sanctification (e. g., Genesis 48:2). אמץ is also used at times in a way associated with sanctification (Deuteronomy 3:28; 31:6–7, 23; Joshua 1:6–7, 9, 18; 10:25; Isaiah 35:3; 41:10; Psalm 27:14; 31:25; Job 4:4; 1 Chronicles 22:13; 28:20; 2 Chronicles 32:7), and perhaps עֹז (Isaiah 45:24; Psalm 138:3), גְּבוּרָה (Micah 3:8; Daniel 2:23), and כֹּחַ (1 Chronicles 26:8; Isaiah 40:29, 31; 41:1; Micah 3:8) are so used as well.

61 "*I can do all things* (πάντα ἰσχύω). Old verb to have strength (ἰσχύς). *In him that strengtheneth me* (ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με). Late and rare verb (in LXX) from adjective ἐνδύναμος (ἐν, δύναμις). Causative verb to empower, to pour power into one. See [the] same phrase in 1 Timothy 1:12 τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με (aorist tense here). Paul has such strength so long as Jesus keeps on putting power (δύναμις) into him" (*Robertson's Word Pictures*, Philippians 4:13).

62 God's strengthening brings His power or ability for service and spiritual growth. This fact is verified in the ἰσχύω word group: ἰσχύω (Matthew 5:13; 8:28; 9:12; 26:40; Mark 2:17; 5:4; 9:18; 14:37; Luke 6:48; 8:43; 13:24; 14:6, 29–30; 16:3; 20:26; John 21:6; Acts 6:10; 15:10; 19:16, 20; 25:7; 27:16; Galatians 5:6; 6:15; Philippians 4:13; Hebrews 9:17; James 5:16; Revelation 12:8); ἐξισχύω (Ephesians 3:18); κατισχύω (Matthew 16:18; Luke 23:23); and ἰσχύς (Mark 12:30, 33; Luke 10:27; Ephesians 1:19; 6:10; 2 Thessalonians 1:9; 1 Peter 4:11; 2 Peter 2:11; Revelation 5:12; 7:12; 18:2). Texts that show the relationship between strengthening and power or ability include 1 Peter 4:11; Ephesians 1:19; 6:10; Galatians 5:6; Philippians 4:13; cf. Matthew 16:18. Similar truth is verified in the δύναμαι/δυνατός/ δύναμις word group; i. e., John 15:4-5; Ephesians 6:11; Jude 24 (δύναμαι); Romans 14:4; 2 Corinthians 9:8; 10:4; 2 Timothy 1:12 (δυνατός); Romans 15:13; 2 Corinthians 12:9; Ephesians 1:19; 3:16; Colossians 1:11; 1:29; 2 Peter 1:3 (δύναμις).

believers are strengthened or established, they become unmoved by trials and temptations (1 Thessalonians 3:2-5) as they stand fast in the Lord (1 Thessalonians 3:8) and in the faith (Acts 14:22; 16:5), as their faith grows stedfast (Colossians 2:5) firm (1 Peter 5:9; cf. 2 Timothy 2:19; Hebrews 5:12, 14), and established (Colossians 2:7). Spiritual strengthening leads believers to fulfill the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20; Acts 16:5). Believers strengthen one another as they themselves are strengthened by Christ (Luke 22:32). They are strengthened through spiritual gifts and the faith of other saints (Romans 1:11-12). As God strengthens believers through the gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ (Romans 16:25; Acts 15:32), so likewise spiritual leaders strengthen and establish other believers (1 Thessalonians 3:2-3; Acts 18:23) through the instrumentality of the Word. God continues to strengthen, establish or confirm believers to the end, evidencing their eternal security and the certainty of their sanctification (1 Corinthians 1:8; 2 Corinthians 1:21).

In contrast, believers and churches that backslide grow weaker, and are called upon to be "watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die" (Revelation 3:2). Terms for spiritual *weakening*[63] or sickness are derived from terms for physical weakness or sickness (Matthew 8:17; Mark 6:56; John 6:2; 1 Timothy 5:23) in a manner that corresponds to the relationship between physical and spiritual *strengthening*. Spiritual weakness leads the believer to quickly fold under pressure from sin, while the stronger a Christian is the greater ability he has to withstand fiercer assaults by the world,

---

[63] Texts in the *weakening* word group are: ἀσθενέω (Matthew 10:8; 25:36; Mark 6:56; Luke 4:40; 7:10; 9:2; John 4:46; 5:3, 7; 6:2; 11:1–3, 6; Acts 9:37; 19:12; 20:35; Romans 4:19; 8:3; 14:1–2, 21; 1 Corinthians 8:9, 11–12; 2 Corinthians 11:21, 29; 12:10; 13:3–4, 9; Philippians 2:26–27; 2 Timothy 4:20; James 5:14); ἀσθενής (Matthew 25:39, 43–44; 26:41; Mark 14:38; Luke 10:9; Acts 4:9; 5:15–16; Romans 5:6; 1 Corinthians 1:25, 27; 4:10; 8:7, 10; 9:22; 11:30; 12:22; 2 Corinthians 10:10; Galatians 4:9; 1 Thessalonians 5:14; Hebrews 7:18; 1 Peter 3:7); ἀσθένημα (Romans 15:1); and ἀσθένεια (Matthew 8:17; Luke 5:15; 8:2; 13:11–12; John 5:5; 11:4; Acts 28:9; Romans 6:19; 8:26; 1 Corinthians 2:3; 15:43; 2 Corinthians 11:30; 12:5, 9–10; 13:4; Galatians 4:13; 1 Timothy 5:23; Hebrews 4:15; 5:2; 7:28; 11:34).

Believers can grow spiritually weaker and backslide, as they can decay from states of spiritual quickening or liveliness, transformation, and renewal, because the believer's indwelling sin remains within him a tendency to ever greater evil, as in the unregenerate their utter domination by the flesh leads them to ever greater iniquity and corruption of nature (cf. 2 Timothy 3:13). The supernatural power of sanctifying grace working within the saint by the Holy Spirit encounters this fleshly indwelling resistance to holiness that remains within all believers until glorification, and apart from the unceasing supply of spiritual strength given the saint by God, his spiritual life would decay and indeed even be lost, as the natural end result of both physical and spiritual sickness is death (cf. Revelation 3:2; Acts 9:37; 1 Corinthians 11:30; Philippians 2:26-27), in contrast to the natural end of spiritual strengthening, perfection (2 Corinthians 13:9). While spiritual weakness would, left to itself, lead to spritual death, the fact of the believer's eternal security and the effectual character of the High Priestly ministry of Christ (cf. John 17:8, 17, 24; Luke 22:32; Hebrews 4:15) guarantee that neither spiritual life during the Christian's earthly pilgrimage (John 10:27) nor life with God in the eternal state (John 10:28-30) are ever forfeited, as God's faithfulness prevents all of His people from ever losing the entirety of their sanctification or forfeiting a place in heaven.

the flesh, and the devil; weakness is opposed to strength or to power (Hebrews 11:34; 1 Corinthians 15:43; 2 Corinthians 13:4). While a believer is either growing spiritually stronger or weaker, so an all-or-nothing element is present in sanctification, both spiritual strength and weakness, like physical strength and weakness, have degrees.[64] Greater spiritual weakness is associated with greater spiritual inability to perform spiritual good, as the unregenerate are absolutely spiritually weak because of their total inability to please God (Romans 5:6), and physical weakness creates physical inability (Luke 13:11; John 5:3, 7; Acts 4:9; 3:1-8).[65] Believers can become weak in general (Romans 14:21), grow weak in faith (Romans 4:19; 14:1-2), and have a weak conscience (1 Corinthians 8:7, 12), that is, one that does not have the strength to withstand strong temptations (1 Corinthians 8:10). Stronger Christians and spiritual leaders are commanded to "support the weak" (Acts 20:35; 1 Thessalonians 5:14) because of their lack of spiritual strength. The strong must use spiritual liberty in such a way that the weak are not led to stumble (Romans 14:21; 1 Corinthians 8:9-13; 9:22). Paul commands: "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please *his* neighbour for *his* good to edification." (Romans 15:1-2).

Indeed, all believers short of heaven possess sinful "infirmities" (Romans 8:26; Hebrews 5:2, 7:27-28) that Christ their High Priest sympathizes with (Hebrews 4:15) and the Holy Spirit assists them to overcome (Romans 8:26). Despite the willingness and eagerness to obey of his renewed spirit, the believer must constantly watch and pray, because his flesh, his indwelling sin, is weak and ready to lead him into temptation (Matthew 26:41; Mark 14:38). As physical infirmity in the flesh hinders physical ability (Galatians 4:13), so does the spiritual infirmity of the flesh (Romans 6:19) hinder the believer's spiritual progress. Christians must recognize that apart from the grace and power given to them by God, they are spiritually weak; spiritual strength requires recognizing one's autonomous weakness and walking in the Spirit's power instead (2 Corinthians 11:30; 12:5, 9, 10; cf. Romans 8:3-4). As God strengthens them (1 Peter 5:10) and they strengthen what God has worked in them (Revelation 3:2), believers pass from weakness to ever greater degrees of strength, and grow in their ability to obey the Divine mandate to strengthen their brethren (Luke 22:32).

5.) Vivification as Transformation

---

64 One is consequentely not surprised by the existence and use of comparative forms of the adjective ἀσθενής, 1 Corinthians 12:22; 1 Peter 3:7.

65 Notice that in each of these pericopes the power of Christ proved greater than the human impotence. The Lord Jesus has the power to overcome all spiritual and physical inability.

The progressive restoration of the image of Christ that constitutes vivification in this life and which is consummated in glorification is powerfully set forth in the New Testament language of spiritual transformation with the *morphoo* (μορφόω) word group.[66] The verb *morphoo*[67] appears only in Galatians 4:19, where the word sets forth the progressive sanctification that takes place as "Christ [is] formed in" the believer (Galatians 4:19).[68] The related noun *morphe* (μορφή)[69] indicates that through the process of Galatians 4:19 God works in the regenerate a true likeness to Christ. The word appears in three verses in the New Testament. Mark 16:12[70] refers to the "form" of the resurrected and glorified body in which the Lord Jesus appeared to two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35). Philippians 2:6-7[71] teaches that Christ took the "form of a servant" in the incarnation, thus specifying His true humanity in the same way that His Deity is indicated by His existing (ὑπάρχων) in the "form of God" from all eternity. The Divine work of forming Christ in the believer thus involves the progressive transformation of his entire person into the likeness of the glorified Son of Man. Such transformation is certain for the believer, since God has "predestinate[d] [him] *to be*

---

66 The words in this group are μορφόω, μορφή, μόρφωσις, σύμμορφος, συμμορφόω, and μεταμορφόω. The noun μόρφωσις, which means "the state of being formally structured, *embodiment, formulation, form,*" (BDAG), is not specifically used for progressive sanctification; it appears twice in the New Testament, once in reference to "the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law" and once to "a form of godliness" (παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ·, Romans 2:20; ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι· καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπου, 2 Timothy 3:5).

67 **μορφόω** (μορφή) 1 aor. ptc. μορφώσαντες (Just., A I, 9, 1). Pass.: aor. ἐμορφώθην; pf. ptc. μεμορφωμένος (Philo, Joseph.) (Aratus, Phaen. 375; Nilus: Anth. Pal. 1, 33, 1; Is 44:13 Q in margin and Aq.; Philo, Plant. 3; Ps.-Philo, De Mundo 13; SibOr 4, 182; Jos., Ant. 15, 329; Just., A I, 5, 4 τοῦ λόγου μορφωθέντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου; Ath., R. 3 p. 51, 16) ***to form, shape*** act. PtK 2 p. 14, 13. Pass. *take on form, be formed* (Theophr., CP 5, 6, 7; Diod. S. 3, 51, 3) in imagery as in the formation of an embryo (Galen XIX p. 181 K. ἔμβρυα μεμορφωμένα; Philo, Spec. Leg. 3, 117) μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν *until Christ is formed in you* Gal 4:19 (RHermann, TLZ 80, '55, 713–26).—DELG s.v. μορφή. M-M. TW. (BDAG)

68 My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. Note that "little children" (τεκνίον) is employed for younger Christians in 1 John 2:12-14.

69 **μορφή, ῆς** *f:* the nature or character of something, with emphasis upon both the internal and external form — 'nature, character.' ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων 'he always had the very nature of God' Php 2:6; μορφὴν δούλου λαβών 'he took on the nature of a servant' Php 2:7. (Louw-Nida)

70 After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν περιπατοῦσιν ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ, πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρόν.

71 6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: 7 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:
6 ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, 7 ἀλλ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος·

conformed [*summorphos*, σύμμορφος][72] to the image of his Son" (Romans 8:29). The believer becomes conformed to the holiness of Christ in his life as he is "being made conformable unto his death" (Philippians 3:10)[73] through physically suffering persecution and spiritually mortifying sin,[74] and is both morally and bodily conformed to Christ eschatologically (Philippians 3:21).[75]

The Greek verb *metamorphoo* (μεταμορφόω) provides further glorious truth about the nature of the progressive sanctification. The verb is used twice for the transfiguration of Christ (Matthew 17:2; Mark 9:2) and twice for the spiritual transformation of the believer in sanctification (Romans 12:2; 2 Corinthians 3:18).[76] Romans 12:2 commands, "be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind" (μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ

---

72 **σύμμορφος, ον** ([Ps.-Lucian,] Amor. 39 al.) **pert. to having a similar form, nature, or style, *similar in form*** τινός *as* or *to someth.* (σ. τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ Orig., C. Cels. 2, 69, 16; B-D-F §182, 1; Rob. 504; 528) σύμμ. τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ *like his Son in form* or *appearance* Ro 8:29 (JKürzinger, BZ 2, '58, 294–99). Also w. the dat. (Nicander [II BC], Ther. 321 ed. OSchneider [1856]; Heraclit. Sto. 77 p. 102, 12 σ. τρισὶ θεοῖς of Agamemnon; B-D-F §194, 2; Rob. 528) σύμμ. τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ Phil 3:21.—DELG s.v. μορφή. TW.
Compare also:
συμμορφίζω (only in Christian wr. but=συμμορφόω below) **to cause to be similar in form or style to someth. else, *grant*** or ***invest w. the same form as,*** pass. συμμορφίζεσθαί τινι *be conformed to, take on the same form as* τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ=the style of Christ's death, i.e. to be like Christ in his death Phil 3:10 [a critical text variant—the *Textus Receptus* has συμμορφόω].—DELG s.v. μορφή. M-M. TW.
συμμορφόω 'to give the same form', pass. ***take on the same form*** (s. two prec. entries; Libanius, Descript. 30, 5 vol. VIII 542, 10 F.; Menand. Protector [VI AD]: HGM II p. 67, 8) Phil 3:10 [*TR*]—DELG s.v. μορφή. (BDAG)

73 That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτόν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ, συμμορφούμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. Note that συμμορφούμενος is a present participle which in this text indicates a progressive being made conformable to Christ's death, and that Philippians 3:10 records the only appearance of συμμορφόω in the New Testament.

74 Paul makes a close connection between enduring physical suffering for Christ's sake and spiritual growth. Note 2 Corinthians 4:10-11: "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh" (πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ. ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα διὰ Ἰησοῦν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ φανερωθῇ ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν.). One's soul and spirit become more like Christ as one becomes bodily like Him through enduring physical suffering for His name's sake.

75 Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. ὃς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι ἑαυτῷ τὰ πάντα.

Philippians 3:21 and Romans 8:29 are the only New Testament references to the word σύμμορφος.

76 However, the references to Christ (Matthew 17:2; Mark 9:2) employ the aorist tense, since the transformation was instantaneous, while the references to the transformation of the believer (Romans 12:2; 2 Corinthians 3:18) employ the present tense, since their change is progressive.

μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν).[77] 2 Corinthians 3:18 states, "we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the

---

[77] Trench has some valuable comments on the distinction between συσχηματίζω and μεταμορφόω in Romans 12:2, and upon the μορφή group in general:

[The] words [μορφή & σχῆμα] are none of them of frequent recurrence in the N. T., μορφή occurring there only [thrice] (Mark xvi. 12; Phil. ii. [6-7]); but compare μόρφωσις (Rom. ii. 20; 2 Tim. iii. 5); σχῆμα not oftener (1 Cor. vii. 31; Phil. ii. 8)[.] . . . Μορφή is 'form,' 'forma,' 'gestalt'; σχῆμα is 'fashion,' 'habitus,' 'figur'; ἰδέα, 'appearance,' 'species,' 'erscheinung.' [These words], which, occur not unfrequently together (Plutarch, *Symp*. [Page 262] viii.2.3), are objective; for the 'form' and the 'fashion' of a thing would exist, were it alone in the universe, and whether there were any to behold it or no. . . .

We may best study the distinction between μορφή and σχῆμα, and at the same time estimate its importance, by aid of that great doctrinal passage (Phil. ii. 6-8), in which St. Paul speaks of the Eternal Word before his Incarnation as subsisting "in the *form* of God" (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων), as assuming at his Incarnation "the *form* of a servant" (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών), and after his Incarnation and during his walk upon earth as "being found in *fashion* as a man" (σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος). The Fathers were wont to urge the first phrase, ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, against the Arians (thus Hilary, *De Trin*. viii. 45; Ambrose, *Ep*. 46; Gregory of Nyssa, *Con. Eunom*. 4); and the Lutherans did the same against the Socinians, as a 'dictum probans' of the absolute divinity of the Son of God; that is, μορφή for them was here equivalent to οὐσία or φύσις. . . . Doubtless there does lie in the words a proof of the divinity of Christ, but this implicitly and not explicitly. Μορφή is not οὐσία: at the same time none could be ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ who was not God; as is well put by Bengel: 'Forma Dei non est natura, divina, sed tamen is qui in forma, Dei extabat, Deus est;' and this because μορφή, like the Latin 'forma,' the German 'gestalt,' signifies the form as it is the utterance of the inner life; not 'being,' but 'mode of being,' or better, 'mode of existence'; and only God could have the mode of existence of God. But He who had thus been from eternity ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ (John xvii. 5), took at his Incarnation μορφὴν δούλου. The verity of his Incarnation is herein implied; there was nothing docetic, nothing phantastic about it. His manner of existence was now that of a δοῦλος, that is, of a δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ: for in the midst of all our Lord's humiliations He was never a δοῦλος ἀνθρώπων. Their διάκονος He may have been, and from time to time eminently was (John xiii. 4, 5; Matt. xx. 28); this was part of his ταπείνωσις mentioned in the next verse; but their δοῦλος never; they, on the contrary, his. It was with respect of God He so emptied Himself of his glory, that, from that manner of existence in which He thought it not robbery to be equal with God, He became his servant.

The next clause, "and being found in fashion (σχήματι) as a man," is very instructive for the distinguishing of σχῆμα from μορφή. The verity of the Son's Incarnation was expressed, as we have seen, in the μορφὴν δούλου λαβών. These words which follow do but declare the outward facts which came under the knowledge of his fellow-men, with therefore an emphasis on εὑρεθείς: He was by men found in fashion as a man, the σχῆμα here signifying his whole outward presentation, as Bengel puts it well: 'σχῆμα, habitus, cultus, vestitus, victus, gestus, sermones et actiones.' In none of these did there appear any difference between Him and the other children of men. This superficial character of σχῆμα appears in its association with such words as χρῶμα (Plato, *Gorg*. 20; *Theoetet*. 163b) and ὑπογραφή (*Legg*. v. 737 d); as in the definition of it which Plutarch gives (*De Plac. Phil.* 14): ἐστὶν ἐπιφάνεια καὶ περιγραφὴ κιὰ πέρας σώματος. The two words are used in an instructive antithesis by Justin Martyr (1 *Apol*. 9).

The distinction between them comes out very clearly in the compound verbs μετασχηματίζειν and μεταμορφοῦν. Thus if I were to change a Dutch garden into an Italian, this would be μετασχηματισμός: but if I were to transform a garden into something wholly different; as into a city, this would be μεταμόρφωσις. It is possible for Satan μετασχηματίζειν himself into an angel of light (2 Cor. xi. 14); he can take the whole outward semblance of such. But to any such change of his it would be impossible to apply the μεταμορφοῦσθαι: for this would imply a change not external but internal, not of accidents but of essence, which lies quite beyond his power. How fine and subtle is the variation of words at Rom. xii. 2[.] . . . The Authorized Version is the first which uses 'transformed' here; Wiclif and the Rheims, both following closely the Vulgate, 'transfigured,' and the intermediate Reformed Versions, 'changed into the fashion of.' . . . 'Do not fall in,'says the Apostle, 'with the fleeting fashions of this world, nor be yourselves fashioned to them (μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε), but undergo a deep abiding change (ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθε) by the renewing of your mind, such as the Spirit of God alone can work in you' (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 18). Theodoret, commenting on this verse, calls particular attention to this variation of the word used, a variation which it would task the highest skill of the English scholar adequately to reproduce in his own language. Among much else which is interesting, he says: ἐδίδασκεν ὅσον πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸ διάφορον· ταῦτα γὰρ ἐκάλεσε σχῆμα, τὴν ἀρετὴν δὲ μορφήν· ἡ μορφὴδὲ ἀληθῶν πραγμάτων σημαντική, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα εὐδιάλυτον χρῆμα. . . . For the very different uses of one word and the other, see Plutarch, *Quom. Adul. ab Amie*. 7, where both occur.

At the resurrection Christ shall transfigure (μετασχηματίσει) the bodies of his saints (Phil. iii. 21; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53); on which statement Calov remarks, 'Ille μετασχηματισμός non *substantialem* mutationem, sed *accidentalem*, non ratione *quidditatis* corporis nostri, sed ratione qualitatum, salva quidditatis, importat:' but the changes of heathen deities into wholly other shapes were μεταμορφώσεις. In the μετασχηματισμός there is

transition, but no absolute solution of continuity. The butterfly, prophetic type of man's resurrection, is immeasurably more beautiful than the grub, yet has been duly unfolded from it; but when Proteus transforms himself into a flame, a wild beast, a running stream (Virgil, *Georg*. iv. 442), each of these disconnected with all that went before, there is here a change not of the σχῆμα merely, but of the μορφή (cf. Euripides, *Hec*. 1266; Plato, *Locr*. 104 e). When the Evangelist records that after the resurrection Christ appeared to his disciples ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ (Mark xvi. 12), the words intimate to us how vast the mysterious change to which his body had been submitted, even as they are in keeping with the μετεμορφώθη of Matt. xvii. 2; Mark ix. 2; the transformation upon the Mount being a prophetic anticipation of that which hereafter should be; compare Dan. iv. 33, where Nebuchadnezzar says of himself, ἡ μορφήμου ἐπέστρεψεν εἰς ἐμέ.

The μορφή then, it may be assumed, is of the essence of a thing. We cannot conceive the thing as apart from this its formality, to use 'formality' in the old logical sense; the σχῆμα is its accident, having to do, not with the 'quidditas,' but the 'qualitas,' and, whatever changes it may undergo, leaving the 'quidditas' untouched, the thing itself essentially, or formally, the same as it was before; as one has said, μορφὴφύσεως σχῆμα ἕξεως. Thus σχῆμα βασιλικόν (Lucian, *Pisc*. 35; cf. Sophocles, *Antig*. 1148) is the whole outward array and adornment of a monarch—diadem, tiara, sceptre, robe (cf. Lucian, *Hermot*. 86)—all which he might lay aside, and remain king notwithstanding. It in no sort belongs or adheres to the man as a part of himself. Thus Menander (Meineke, *Fragm. Com*. p.985):

> πρᾶον κακοῦργός σχῆμ᾽ ὑπεισελθὼν ἀνὴρ
> κεκρυμμένη κεῖται παγὶς τοῖς πλησίον

Thus, too, the σχῆμα τοῦ κοσμοῦ passes away (1 Cor. vii. 31), the image being here probably drawn from the shifting scenes of a theatre, but the κόσμος itself abides; there is no τέλος τοῦ κοσμοῦ, but only τοῦ αἰώνος, or τῶν αἰώνων. For some valuable remarks on the distinction between μορφή and σχῆμα see *The Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology,* No. 7, pp. 113, 116, 121; and the same drawn out more fully by Bishop Lightfoot, their author, in his *Commentary on the Philippians*, pp. 125-131.

The use in Latin of 'forma' and 'figura,' so far corresponds with those severally of μορφή and σχῆμα, that while 'figura forme' occurs not rarely ('veterem *formae* servare *figuram'*; cf. Cicero, *Nat. Deor*. 32), 'forma figurae never (see Doderlein, *Latein. Syn.* vol. iii. p. 87). Contrast too in English '*deformed'* and '*disfigured*. ' A hunchback is 'deformed,' a man that has been beaten about the face may be 'disfigured'; the deformity is bound up in the very existence of the one; the disfigurement of the other may in a few days have quite passed away. In 'transformed' and 'transfigured' it is easy to recognize the same distinction.

As Trench mentions, the μορφή/σχῆμα distinction is well set forth in *Apology of Justin* 1:9, Justin Martyr:

Αλλ᾽ οὐδὲ θυσίαις πολλαῖς καὶ πλοκαῖς ἀνθῶν τιμῶμεν οὓς ἄνθρωποι μορφώσαντες, καὶ ἐν ναοῖς ἱδρύσαντες, θεοὺς προσωνόμασαν· ἐπεὶ ἄψυχα καὶ νεκρὰ ταῦτα γινώσκομεν, καὶ Θεοῦ **μορφὴν** μὴ ἔχοντα, (οὐ γὰρ τοιαύτην ἡγούμεθα τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν τὴν **μορφὴν** ἥν φασί τινες εἰς τιμὴν μεμιμῆσθαι·) ἀλλ᾽ ἐκείνων τῶν φανέντων κακῶν δαιμόνων καὶ ὀνόματα καὶ **σχήματα** ἔχειν. Τί γὰρ δεῖ εἰδόσιν ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἃ τὴν ὕλην οἱ τεχνῖται διατιθέασι, ξέοντες καὶ τέμνοντες, καὶ χωνεύοντες καὶ τύπτοντες; καὶ ἐξ ἀτίμων πολλάκις σκευῶν διὰ τέχνης τὸ σχῆμα μόνον ἀλλάξαντες καὶ μορφοποιήσαντες, θεοὺς ἐπονομάζουσιν. Ὅπερ οὐ μόνον ἄλογον ἡγούμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐφ᾽ ὕβρει τοῦ Θεοῦ γίνεσθαι, ὃς ἄρρητον δόξαν καὶ **μορφὴν** ἔχων, ἐπὶ φθαρτοῖς καὶ δεομένοις θεραπείας πράγμασιν ἐπονομάζεται. Καὶ ὅτι οἱ τούτων τεχνῖται ἀσελγεῖς τε, καὶ πᾶσαν κακίαν, ἵνα μὴ καταριθμῶμεν, ἔχουσιν, ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστασθε· καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν παιδίσκας συνεργαζομένας φθείρουσιν. Ὦ τῆς ἐμβροντησίας, ἀνθρώπους ἀκολάστους, θεοὺς εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι πλάσσειν λέγεσθαι, καὶ μεταποιεῖν· καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν, ἔνθα ἀνατίθενται, φύλακας τοιούτους καθιστάναι· μὴ συνορῶντας ἀθέμιτον καὶ τὸ νοεῖν ἢ λέγειν ἀνθρώπους θεῶν εἶναι φύλακας.

And neither do we honor with many sacrifices and garlands of flowers such deities as men have formed and set in shrines and called gods; since we see that these are soulless and dead, and have not the form [*morphe*] of God (for we do not consider that God has such a form [*morphe*] as some say that they imitate to His honor), but have the names and forms [*schema*] of those wicked demons which have appeared. For why need we tell you who already know, into what forms the craftsmen, carving and cutting, casting and hammering, fashion the materials? And often out of vessels of dishonor, by merely changing the form, and making an image of the requisite shape, they make what they call a god; which we consider not only senseless, but to be even insulting to God, who, having ineffable glory and form [*morphe*], thus gets His name attached to things that are corruptible, and require constant service. And that the artificers of these are both intemperate, and, not to enter into particulars, are practised in every vice, you very well know; even their own girls who work along with them they corrupt What infatuation! That dissolute men should be said to fashion and make gods for your worship, and that you should appoint such men the guardians of the

same image from glory to glory, *even* as by the Spirit of the Lord" (ἡμεῖς . . . πάντες, ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτήν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος). All believers ("we all," 2 Corinthians 3:18), are progressively transformed into the image of Christ by the Holy Spirit.[78] They pass "from glory to glory" in this life, becoming more like Christ as the old in them is eliminated and the new grows stronger and stronger, until the transformation is complete when they are "like him . . . [and] see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). As they behold and meditate upon the glory of God revealed in the mirror of the Word[79] their nature is transformed into the likeness of Jesus Christ. The renewal (*anakainosis*, ἀνακαίνωσις) begun by the Spirit in regeneration (Titus 3:5) is carried on by Him in believers now (Romans 12:2) until it is perfected in eternal glory. The inward transformation wrought by the Holy Spirit results in a believer *being* different and therefore *acting* differently.[80]

6.) Vivification as Perfecting

The *katardizo* word group[81] is used in connection with God's vivifying work in "perfecting" His people. In Hebrews 13:20-21, Paul writes: "Now the God of peace, that

---

temples where they are enshrined; not recognizing that it is unlawful even to think or say that men are the guardians of gods.

[78] The believer "is progressing 'from glory to glory' as increasingly he is 'transformed into the same image,' that is to say, as his Christianity advances (2 Corinthians 3:18); for the glory of the Son is the glory of the [true] Image [of God]. The bond of union between [Christ as the] Glory [cf. James 2:1] and the Image is plainly set forth also in Hebrews 1:3, where the Son is in the same breath designated ['the brightness of [God's] glory' and 'the express image of his person]" (pg. 45, *The True Image*, Hughes).

[79] The verb κατοπτρίζω in 2 Corinthians 3:18 means to "look at something as in a mirror, contemplate something . . . the noun κάτοπτρον is the most common term in the papyri for [a] mirror" (BDAG). The New Testament employs the related noun ἔσοπτρον exclusively for the mirror of the Word (1 Corinthians 13:12; James 1:23).

[80] Notice that proving "what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God" (Romans 12:2) is a result of the inward transformation wrought by the Spirit (μεταμορφοῦσθε . . . εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον).

[81] Specifically, the verb καταρτίζω and the nouns κατάρτισις and καταρτισμός. Consider the definitions of the three words in BDAG:

καταρτίζω fut. καταρτίσω; 1 aor. κατήρτισα, mid. κατηρτισάμην, 2 sg. κατηρτίσω. Pass.: aor. κατηρτίσθην LXX; pf. pass. κατήρτισμαι (ἀρτίζω, 'get ready, prepare', s. next entry; Hdt. et al.; ins, pap, LXX; TestSol 5:12 H).

1. to cause to be in a condition to function well, *put in order, restore.*

a. *restore to a former condition, put to rights* (since Hdt. 5, 28; 106; Dionys. Hal. 3, 10) τὶ *someth.* nets (by cleaning, mending, folding together) Mt 4:21; Mk 1:19 (cp. GWynne, Exp. 7th ser., 8, 1909, 282–85). Fig. κ. τινά *restore someone* ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος *in a spirit of gentleness,* i.e. in a gentle manner Gal 6:1. Pass. καταρτίζεσθε *mend your ways* 2 Cor 13:11.

b. *put into proper condition* (cp. Epict. 3, 20, 10 of a trainer who adjusts parts of the body), *adjust, complete, make complete* τὶ *someth.* καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τ. πίστεως ὑμῶν *to fix up any deficiencies in your faith* or *to complete what is lacking in your faith* 1 Th 3:10. τινά *someone:* ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ *make you complete in*

brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen." The text indicates that God, by "working in" believers "that which is wellpleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ" and "through the blood of the everlasting covenant," in such a manner "make[s] [them] perfect"[82] with the Divine purpose and result[83] that believers "do His will" and do "every good work." Similarly, Paul tells the Corinthians, "this also we wish, *even* your perfection" (2 Corinthians 13:9)[84] and exhorts: "Be perfect" (2 Corinthians 13:11).[85] Christ gives the church pastors and teachers "for the perfecting of the saints" (Ephesians 4:12).[86] The "perfection" in view is the restoration of Christlikeness in the believer which results in obedience. Progressive sanctification begins the process, completed only in glorification, whereby although "the disciple is not above his master," nonetheless "every one that is

---

every good thing Hb 13:21. κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοὶ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ *adjusted / made complete in the same mind and the same conviction* 1 Cor 1:10. ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ IEph 2:2. ἐν ἀκινήτῳ πίστει ISm 1:1. Abs. 1 Pt 5:10. κατηρτισμένος *(fully) trained, practiced* (Polyb. 5, 2, 11 τ. εἰρεσίαις κατηρτισμένοι) κ. πᾶς (μαθητὴς) ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ *when fully trained, the pupil will be like the teacher* Lk 6:40. S. Betz, Gal. 297 n. 43.

2. to prepare for a purpose, *prepare, make, create, outfit.*

a. act. and pass., of God (w. ποιεῖν) B 16:6. (W. κτίζειν) τὰ πάντα Hm 1:1. Pass. ὁ κόσμος κατηρτίσθη Hv 2, 4, 1; also οἱ αἰῶνες (s. αἰών 3) ῥήματι θεοῦ Hb 11:3. κατηρτισμένος εἴς τι *made, created for someth.*: σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν *vessels of wrath, designed for destruction* Ro 9:22. ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἕνωσιν κατηρτισμένος *a man set on* (lit. *made for*) *unity* IPhld 8:1.

b. mid. (PGM 4, 1147) καταρτίζεσθαί τί τινι *prepare someth. for someone* σῶμα Hb 10:5 (Ps 39:7 codd.: BSA). W. reflexive mng.: *for oneself* κατηρτίσω αἶνον *you prepared praise for yourself* Mt 21:16 (Ps 8:3).—DELG s.v. ἀραρίσκω. M-M. TW. Spicq.

κατάρτισις, εως, ἡ (s. prec. entry; Plut., Alex. 667 [7, 1] 'training'; cp. idem, κατάρτυσις Them. 112 [2, 7] w. παιδεία) **the process of perfecting, *maturation*** εὐχόμεθα τὴν ὑμῶν κ. *we pray for your maturation* (*for the perfecting of your characters* Goodsp.) 2 Cor 13:9.—DELG s.v. ἀραρίσκω. TW.

καταρτισμός, οῦ, ὁ (s. prec. two entries; as medical term [Soranus 150, 8]: 'setting of a bone', etc. But more gener. PTebt 33, 12 [112 BC] 'preparation' αὐλῆς; cp. CMRDM 1, 121 s. New Docs 3, 70, no. 42; PRyl 127, 28; Sym. Is 38:12 'restoration') ext. fig. sense (not found in ins or pap) ***equipment, equipping*** εἴς τι *for someth.* πρὸς τὸν κ. τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας *to equip God's people* (lit. 'the holy ones') *for service* Eph 4:12, though *training, discipline* (L-S-J-M) deserve consideration as glosses for κ.—DELG s.v. ἀραρίσκω. M-M. TW.

82 Note that the text does not affirm that their works are made "perfect," but that the believers themselves are made perfect ("make <u>you</u> perfect," καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς). The person is made perfect "in every good work."

83 εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ. The structure of εἰς τὸ + infinitive gives the result, for even if the structure is classified as indicating purpose, the Divine purpose is accomplished with the result of doing God's will.

84 τοῦτο δὲ καὶ εὐχόμεθα, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν.

85 καταρτίζεσθε. Thee present imperative appears to be customary, like the ones that follow in the verse (παρακαλεῖσθε, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε, εἰρηνεύετε).

86 πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων.

perfect shall be as his master" (Luke 6:40).[87] A believer who is "overtaken in a fault" must be "restore[d]" (*katartidzo*) from his status of being buffeted and led into sin (Galatians 6:1).[88] Peter's prayer that God would "make . . . perfect" his audience is explained as the saints being established, strengthened, and settled (1 Peter 5:10).[89] On the other hand, the death-grip of sin upon the unconverted makes them into "vessels of wrath fitted [*katartidzo*] to destruction" (Romans 9:22).[90] In contexts not closely related to progressive sanctification, the verb *katartidzo* is used for nets being mended (Matthew 4:21; Mark 1:19), for praise being perfected (Matthew 21:16), and for Christ's body (Hebrews 10:5) and the universe (Hebrews 11:3) being framed and perfectly fitted together. As believers are perfected in their persons, "that which is lacking in [their] faith" is likewise "perfect[ed]" (1 Thessalonians 3:10). Similarly, saints in the church are brought into unity, becoming "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" with "no divisions" among them (1 Corinthians 1:10).

As a saint is perfected (*katartismos*, Ephesians 4:12), he grows towards becoming a "perfect (*teleios*) man," having "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Ephesians 4:13). The *teleios* word-group[91] provides important data about the work of God in "perfecting" the saints. Trench[92] provides helpful information on the significance of *teleios* as "perfect," as specifically compared to "perfection" as *holokleros* and *artios*:

---

87 οὐκ ἐστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον αὐτου· κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ. Note the perfect passive participle.

88 Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Αδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προληφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἔν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραότητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς. Note the use of the present, not the aorist, imperative—not the beginning point of restoration alone is in view, but also the status of the person restored after those who are spiritual bring him back from sin.

89 But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle *you*. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς πάσης χάριτος, ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὀλίγον παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς, στηρίξαι, σθενώσαι, θεμελιώσαι.

90 σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν. Note that God is not expressed as the agent in the fitting of the lost to destruction, as He is in the perfecting and preparation of the saints, both in the context of Romans 9:22-23 and in other καταρτίζω texts in the New Testament.

91 τέλειος, τελειόω, τελείωσις, τελειότης, τελείως, τελειωτής. The words found with some frequency in the New Testament, τέλειος and τελειόω, are discussed below in their own paragraphs. The noun τελείωσις is found only in Luke 1:45 and Hebrews 7:11, the latter text being the only one dealing with progressive sanctification. Similary, τελειότης appears in only two verses (Colossians 3:14; Hebrews 6:1), both of which deal with sanctification. The adverb τελείως appears only in 1 Peter 1:13, while the noun τελειωτής only in Hebrews 12:2. The conclusions reached from the more common τέλειος and τελειόω, and affirmed by the study of Trench (cf. the following footnote), are supported by the less common words in the group.

92 § xxii. ὁλόκληρος, τέλειος, ἄρτιος. *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Richard Chenevix Trench. Elec. acc. *Accordance Bible Software*.

Ὁλόκληρος and τέλειος occur together, though their order is reversed, at Jam. i. 4, — "perfect and entire" (cf. Philo, *De Sac. Ab. e Cain*. 33: ἔμπλεα καὶ ὁλόκληρα καὶτέλεια: Dio Chrysostom, *Oral*. 12, p. 203); ἔμπλεα καὶ ὁλόκληρα καὶ τέλεια· besides in the N. T. (1 Thess. v. 23); ὁλόκληρία, also, but in a physical or an ethical sense, once (Acts iii. 16; cf. Isai. i. 6). Ὁλόκληρος signifies first, as its etymology declares, that which retains all which was allotted to it at the first (Ezek xv. 5), being thus whole and entire in all its parts (ὁλόκληρος καὶ παντελής, Philo, *De Mere. Meret*. 1); with nothing necessary for its completeness wanting. Thus Darius would have been well pleased not to have taken Babylon if only Zopyrus, who had maimed himself to carry out the stratagem by which it fell, were ὁλόκληρος still (Plutarch, *Reg. et Imper. Apoph.*). Again, unhewn stones, as having lost nothing in the process of shaping and polishing, are ὁλόκληροι (Dent. xxvii. 6; 1Macc. iv. 47); perfect weeks are ἑβδομάδες ὁλόκληροι (Lev. xxiii. 15); and a man ἐν ὁλοκλήρῳ δέρματι, is 'in a whole skin' (Lucian, *Philops*. 8). We next find ὁλόκληρος expressing that integrity of body, with nothing redundant, nothing deficient (cf. Lev. xxi. 17-23), which was required of the Levitical priests as a condition of their ministering at the altar, which also might not be wanting in the sacrifices they offered. In both these senses Josephus uses it (*Ant*. iii. 12:2); as does Philo continually. It is with him the standing word for this integrity of the priests and of the sacrifice, to the necessity of which he often recurs, seeing in it, and rightly, a mystical significance, and that these are ὁλόκληροι θυσίαι ὁλοκλήρῳ θεῷ (*De Vict*. 2; *De Vict. Off*. I, ὁλόκληρον καὶ παντελῶς μέμων ἀμέτοχον: *De Agricul*. 29; *De Cherub*. 28; cf. Plato, *Legg*. vi. 759 c). Τέλεις is used by Homer (*Il.* 1. 66) in the same sense.

It is not long before ὁλόκληρος and ὁλοκληρία, like the Latin 'integer' and 'integritas,' are transferred from bodily to mental and moral entireness (Suetonius, *Claud*. 4). The only approach to this in the Apocrypha is Wisd. xv. 3, ὁλόκληρα δικαιοσύνη: but in an interesting and important passage in the *Phaedrus* of Plato (250 c; cf. *Tim*. c), ὁλόκληρος expresses the perfection of man before the Fall; I mean, of course, the Fall as Plato contemplated it; when to men, as yet ὁλόκληροι καὶ ἀπαθεῖς κακῶν, were vouchsafed ὁλόκληρος φάσματα, as contrasted with those weak partial glimpses of the Eternal Beauty, which are all that to most men are now vouchsafed. That person then or thing is ὁλόκληρος, which is 'omnibus numeris absolutus,' or ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενος, as St. James himself (i.4) explains the word.

The various applications of τέλειος are all referable to the τέλος, which is its ground. In a natural sense the τέλειοι are the adult, who, having attained the full limits of stature, strength, and mental power within their reach, have in these respects attained their τέλος, as distinguished from the νέοι or παῖδες, young men or boys (Plato, *Legg*. xi.929 c; Xenophon, *Cyr*. viii. 7. 6; Polybius, v. 29. 2). This image of full completed growth, as contrasted with infancy and childhood, underlies the ethical use of τέλειοι by St. Paul, he setting these over against the νήπιοι ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Cor. ii. 6; xiv. 20; Ephes. iv. 13, 14; Phil. iii. 15; Heb. v. 14; cf. Philo, *De Agricul*. 2); they correspond in fact to the πατέρες of 1 John ii. 13, 14, as distinct from the νεανίσκοι and παιδία. Nor is this ethical use of τέλειος confined to Scripture. The Stoics distinguished the τέλειος in philosophy from the προκόπτων, just as at 1 Chron. xxv. 8 the τέλειοι are set over against the μανθάνοντες. With the heathen, those also were τέλειοι who had been initiated into the mysteries; for just as the Lord's Supper was called τὸ τέλειον (Bingham, *Christ. Antiquities*, i. 4. 3), because there was nothing beyond it, no privilege into which the Christian has not entered, so these τέλειοι of heathen initiation obtained their name as having been now introduced into the latest and crowning mysteries of all.

It will be seen that there is a certain ambiguity in our word 'perfect,' which, indeed, it shares with τέλειος itself; this, namely, that they are both employed now in a relative,

now in an absolute sense; for only so could our Lord have said, "Be ye therefore *perfect* (τέλειοι), as your Heavenly Father is *perfect*" (τέλειος), Matt. v. 48; cf. xix. 21. The Christian shall be 'perfect,' yet not in the sense in which some of the sects preach the doctrine of perfection, who, as soon as their words are looked into, are found either to mean nothing which they could not have expressed by a word less liable to misunderstanding; or to mean something which no man in this life shall attain, and which he who affirms he has attained is deceiving himself, or others, or both. The faithful man shall be 'perfect,' that is, aiming by the grace of God to be fully furnished and firmly established in the knowledge and practice of the things of God (Jam. iii. 2; Col. iv. 12: τέλειος καὶ πεπληροφορημένος); not a babe in Christ to the end, 'not always employed in the elements, and infant proposition and practices of religion, but doing noble actions, well skilled in the deepest mysteries of faith and holiness.'[93] In this sense St. Paul claimed to be τέλειος, even while almost in the same breath he disclaimed the being τετελειωμένος (Phil. iii. 12, 15).

The distinction then is plain. The ὁλόκληρος is one who has preserved, or who, having once lost, as now regained, his *completeness*: the τέλειος is one who has attained his moral *end*, that for which he was intended, namely, to be a man in Christ; however it may be true that, having reached this, other and higher ends will open out before him, to have Christ formed in him more and more.[94] In the ὁλόκληρος no grace which ought to be in a Christian man is deficient; in the τέλειος no grace is merely in its weak imperfect beginnings, but all have reached a certain ripeness and maturity. Ὁλοτελής, occurring once in the N. T. (1 Thess. v. 23; cf. Plutarch, *De Plac. Phil*. v. 21), forms a connecting link between the two, holding on to ὁλόκληρος in its first half, to τέλειος in it second.

Ἄρτιος, occurring only once in the N. T. (2 Tim. iii. 17), and there presently explained more fully as ἐξηρτισμένος, approximates in meaning more closely to ὁλόκληρος, with which we find it joined by Philo (*De Plant*. 29), than to τέλειος. It is explained by Calvin, 'in quo nihil est mutilum,' —see further the quotation from Theodoret in Suicer, s.v., —and is found opposed to χωλός (Chrysostom), to κολοβός (Olympiodorus), to ἀνάπηρος (Theodoret). Vulcan in Lucian (*Sacrif*. 6) is οὐκ ἄρτιος τὼ πόδε. If we ask ourselves under what special aspects completeness is contemplated in ἄρτιος, it would be safe to answer that it is not as the presence only of all the parts which are necessary for that completeness, but involves further the adaptation and aptitude of these parts for the ends which they were designed to serve. The man of God, St. Paul would say (2Tim. iii. 17), should be furnished and accomplished with all which is necessary for the carrying out of the work to which he is appointed.

The conclusions of Trench are validated by an examination of the specific words in the *teleios* group.

The verb *teleioo* (τελειόω)[95] is employed in Christ's High Priestly prayer for Christ being perfectly formed within the believer (John 17:23, ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν). Christ indwells the saint at the moment of

---

93 On the sense in which 'perfection' is demanded of the Christian, there is a discussion at large by Jeremy Taylor, *Doctrine and Practice of Repentance* i.3. 40-56, from which this quotation is drawn.

94 Seneca (Ep. 120) says of one, 'Habebat perfectum animum, ad summam sui adductus.'

95 The complete list of refences in the New Testament is: Luke 2:43; 13:32; John 4:34; 5:36; 17:4, 23; 19:28; Acts 20:24; 2 Corinthians 12:9; Philippians 3:12; Hebrews 2:10; 5:9; 7:19, 28; 9:9; 10:1, 14; 11:40; 12:23; James 2:22; 1 John 2:5; 4:12, 17-18. An examination of these texts supports the views set forth by Trench.

his conversion and regeneration, and through progressive sanctification the "Christ in you" (Colossians 1:27) relation develops and deepens until the moral image of God is fully restored in the believer's complete Christlikeness at glorification (John 17:17-24). On the basis of Christ's High Priestly mediation, the Father sanctifies believers through the Word and the Spirit (John 16:13; 17:17) and Christ declares to them the name of the Father, that is, reveals to them His Person and nature (John 17:26) resulting in a deepening unity[96] of the believer with, likeness to, and love for his Triune Sanctifier,[97] which brings with it a greater unity of the saint with and love for all the rest of those the Father has chosen out of the world and given to His beloved Son from the foundation of the world (John 17:21-23). This progressive perfection of the elect on earth in love and

---

[96] A number of texts demonstrate that the indwelling of God in the saint is not static, but deepens as he is sanctified. In addition to the context of John 17:17-23, John's gospel presents this truth in 14:23, where the abode of the Father and the Son in the believer is associated with keeping God's Words and growth in love by those who are already saved (14:22; cf. also 14:21, where the manifestation of God to the already justified is likewise associated with love and commandment keeping). Deeper abiding of the Son in the saint takes place as he eats Christ's flesh and drinks His blood by faith (6:56; cf. 6:63). All believers already have the Trinity in them (Romans 8:8-10). Nevertheless, Paul wrote to the already regenerate members of the church at Ephesus: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith [κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν] . . . that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God [ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ]" (Ephesians 3:14-19).

In considering the development or growth of the Divine indwelling in the believer, one must keep a number of facts in mind. The Trinity is already omnipresent, so the fact of indwelling refers to the special presence of God in the Christian, in a manner similar to the fact that "Our Father which art in heaven" (Matthew 6:9) establishes the special presence of God in heaven, without in any way denying His omnipresence (or His special presence in the Old Testament tabernacle and temple, in the New Testament church, etc.). All believers have the special presence of the Father (John 14:23), Son (Colossians 1:27), and Holy Spirit (Romans 8:9) in them. A development or deepening of indwelling would thus involve a greater degree of special presence, as God's special presence is in heaven in a greater degree than it is in the meetings of the church on earth, although His special presence in the congregation is clearly Scriptural (cf. 1 Corinthians 3:16-19; Ephesians 1:23; Revelation 1:13). This greater degree of special presence would also be associated with a control of the believer's inner being that is greater in both extent and degree, leading to greater obedience. The difference can be illustrated by the different levels of control and obedience in a natural man who is merely under the sovereign control of God and thus does His will, in a babe in Christ who is freed from the dominion of sin and thus does God's will in a greater way than can any unbeliever, in a mature Christian whose obedience is greater in extent and degree than it was when he was newly regenerate, and in a saint in heaven who obedience in extent and degree is perfect, as he is as conformed to God to the absolute maximum level possible for a creature.

[97] Certain writers on sanctification affirm that the indwelling of God in the believer refers only to the Holy Spirit. However, the Bible is very clear that the entire Trinity (which is, in any case, necessarily undivided in essence) dwells within the believer. In John 14:23 the Son, speaking concerning Himself and the Person of the Father, states, "we will come unto [the believer], and make our abode with him." There is no reason to change statements such as "Christ liveth in me" (Galatians 2:20) into affirmations about the Holy Spirit living within believers (as He certainly does as well, Romans 8:9). In some texts (e. g., John 17:23, "I in them," in the context of John 17—Christ alone, not the Father or the Holy Ghost, is the High Priest for the elect) switching the Son's indwelling to that of the Spirit is impossible. Indeed, some statements that have been made that confound the indwelling of the Holy Ghost with that of the Son have been dangerously modalistic (e. g., Watchman Nee—see Excursus V).

holiness manifests to the world that Jesus Christ is the truth (17:21-23). The perfecting of the believer on the basis of Christ's revelation of the Father to him (17:26) by the Word and Spirit, which begins at regeneration and continues throughout the saint's time on earth, is completed when all the positionally and practically sanctified are with Christ in the eternal state and behold His glory (17:24). Therefore Paul affirmed that he was not yet perfect as he would be when he saw Christ in glory (Philippians 3:12, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect," οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, ἢ ἤδη τετελείωμαι). Nonetheless, he was no longer a baby Christian, but was spiritually mature and already "perfect" (*teleios*, τέλειος, Philippians 3:15) in that sense. Christ in the gospel perfects (*teleioo,* τελειόω) His people in a way the Law was powerless to do in the Old Testament (Hebrews 7:19). By His one offering He positionally perfects His people forever (Hebrews 10:14; cf. 10:1), He perfects them in their conscience during their lifetime (Hebrews 9:9), and He presents them to Himself absolutely perfect in the New Jerusalem (Hebrews 12:23; cf. also 11:40). Also, the faith and love of believers is perfected as they produce obedience (James 2:22; 1 John 2:5), Christlikeness and fearless separation from the world (1 John 4:17-18) and love for the brethren (1 John 4:12). The verb *teleioo* sets forth these glorious truths concerning the believer's current and coming "perfection."

The adjective *teleios* (τέλειος)[98] is used for the absolutely perfect holiness of God Himself (Matthew 5:48b), which He requires of all men in His law (Matthew 5:48a; cf. 19:21), and which is completely legally imputed to the believer in justification (Matthew 6:33) but not completely inwardly imparted until glorification. It is likewise used for the absolute perfection of God's will (Romans 12:2) and gifts (James 1:17), of the inspired text of (James 1:25) and complete canon of Scripture (1 Corinthians 13:10),[99] and of the believer in glory whose complete Christlikeness is the completion of his progressive sanctification (Ephesians 4:13; Colossians 1:28; 4:12; James 3:2). The word is also used for the relative perfection of Christian maturity, specifically contrasting an immature Christian understanding with a mature, adult Christian understanding (1 Corinthians 14:20). Some Christians are "perfect" (*teleios*) in this sense, while others are not (Philippians 3:15; 1 Corinthians 2:6; Colossians 4:12). Christians who are *teleioi* "are of full age, *even* those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil" (Hebrews 5:14). A new born infant (cf. 1 Peter 2:2) has a soul and a

---

[98] The complete list of NT references is: Matthew 5:48; 19:21; Romans 12:2; 1 Corinthians 2:6; 13:10; 14:20; Eph 4:13; Phil 3:15; Col 1:28; 4:12; Heb 5:14; 9:11; James 1:4, 17, 25; 3:2; 1John 4:18.

[99] Compare 1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts," R. Bruce Compton. *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 (2004) 97-144.

body, and all its human members, but he is still far from bodily maturity; likewise the regenerate have been made new in their entire being, but are not yet perfect in the degree of their holiness. Through trials, Christians become "perfect [*teleios*] and entire, wanting nothing" as they allow "patience [to have] her perfect [*teleios*] work" (James 3:1). Since this perfection can be relative, it is not surprising that a comparative form of the adjective *teleios*, "more perfect" (Hebrews 9:14),[100] is found in the New Testament. Believers have already "received" the truth about how they "ought to walk and to please God," and consequently they are to "abound more and more" (1 Thessalonians 4:1). Furthermore, since the absolute sinlessness of glorification is the culmination of the inward renewal already taking place in the believer on earth, numbers of texts contain within them the transition of *teleios* from the believer's current relative and maturing perfection to his coming absolute perfection (cf. Ephesians 4:13; Colossians 1:28; 4:12; James 3:2; 1 John 4:18).

The *teleios* word group demonstrates that Christians can attain a relative perfection of mature growth during this life and a complete perfection of sinless Christlikeness in glory. With that absolute perfection as their goal, they are to strive, by God's grace, to reach as closely as possible on earth to that full and perfect perfection they will all attain when they enter the presence of their Lord.

Several less common words closely connected to the *teleios* group deserve examination. As explained above by Trench, the Christian is *holokleros* (ὁλόκληρος)[101] who is complete in all his parts, with nothing missing. The idea of completeness in all parts is supported by the related noun *holokleria* (ὁλόκληρία), a *hapax legomenon* found only in Acts 3:16[102] and referring to the complete bodily wholeness of the man who had

---

100 Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως. Of course, in this passage the word refers to "a greater and more perfect tabernacle," not to the Christian's progress in sanctification. Nevertheless, it provides a definite exegetical basis for the existence of degrees of the τέλειος sort of perfection.

101 **ὁλόκληρος, ον** (ὅλος, κλῆρος; Pla.; Polyb. 18, 45, 9; Ps.-Lucian, Macrob. 2; Epict. 3, 26, 7; 25; 4, 1, 66; 151; OGI 519, 14; SIG 1009, 10; 1012, 9 al., s. New Docs 4, 161f; PLond III, 935, 7 p. 30 [216/17 AD]; POxy 57, 13; LXX; Philo, Abr. 47, Spec. Leg. 1, 283; Jos., Ant. 3, 228; 278; 14, 366; Just., D. 69, 7) **pert. to being complete and meeting all expectations,** ***with integrity, whole, complete, undamaged, intact, blameless*** πίστις *undiminished faith* Hm 5, 2, 3; GJs 16:2. In an ethical sense: ὁλ. ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα . . . τηρηθείη *may your spirit . . . be preserved complete* or *sound* 1 Th 5:23 (PGM 7, 590 **{p. 704}** διαφύλασσέ μου τὸ σῶμα, τὴν ψυχὴν ὁλόκληρον.—PvanStempvoort, NTS 7, '60/61, 262–65: connects πνεῦμα and ἁγιάσαι in 1 Th 5:23). W. τέλειος Js 1:4.—B. 919. DELG s.v. ὅλο. M-M. TW. Spicq. Sv. (BDAG)

102 And his name through faith in his name hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know: yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all. καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, τοῦτον ὃν θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἴδατε ἐστερέωσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν. BDAG

been lame from birth but was healed by Peter. When believers "let patience have *her* perfect [*teleios*] work," they become "perfect [*teleios*] and entire [*holokleros*], wanting nothing" (James 1:4). Because of the faithfulness of God, every Christian is being sanctified in his entire (*holokleros*) being, spirit and soul and body: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and *I pray God* your whole [*holokleros*] spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless[103] unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful *is* he that calleth you, who also will do *it*" (1 Thessalonians 5:23-24).[104] No part of the Christian is left unchanged by the renewal, the vivification, of progressive sanctification, although no part of the Christian attains absolute perfection in this life.[105] Trench likewise noted that the word *holoteles* (ὁλοτελής), a New Testament *hapax legomenon* found in 1 Thessalonians 5:23a ("sanctify you wholly"), "forms a connecting link between the two [words *holokleros* and *teleios*], holding on to [the former] in its first

---

states that the word refers to a "state of soundness or well-being in all parts, *wholeness, completeness*" and that it occurs as a variant reading in the LXX of Isaiah 1:6 ("From the sole of the foot even unto the head *there is* no soundness in it; *but* wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment.").

103 The word "blameless" (ἀμέμπτως) in 1 Thessalonians 5:23 does not indicate absolute sinlessness, as its only other appearance in the New Testament, 1 Thessalonians 2:10, indicates: "Ye *are* witnesses, and God *also*, how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe" (ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ Θεός ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν). Certainly the apostle Paul and his associates behaved themselves in a holy, unblameable or blameless (ἀμέμπτως) manner, but not a one of them were sinlessly perfect. The New Testament usage is consistent with that found in 1 Clement for church leaders "who have ministered to the flock of Christ blamelessly [ἀμέμπτως], humbly, peaceably, and unselfishly, and for a long time have been well-spoken of by all" (44:3; cf. 44:4, 6; also 63:3, "trustworthy and prudent men who from youth to old age have lived blameless lives among us, ἄνδρας πιστοὺς καὶ σώφρονας ἀπὸ νεότητος ἀναστραφέντας ἕως γήρους ἀμέμπτως ἐν ἡμῖν). BDAG indicates that ἀμέμπτως was used "used especially in the Greco-Roman. world of people of extraordinary civic consciousness," thus meaning "*blamelessly* (with ὁσίως and δικαίως)." The fact that God's faithfulness (1 Thessalonians 5:24) leads to all earthly saints being "blameless" (1 Thessalonians 5:23) does not mean that even one of them will be sinlessly perfect—but it does mean that they will all grow to be evidently, genuinely, and markedly different, both on the inside and on the outside (spirit, soul, and body). Of course, the completion of this sanctification takes place only at the moment of glorification, and not all believers attain to the same level of holiness.

104 Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς· καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη. πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ ποιήσει.

105 "[M]any [verses] contemplate the perfect holiness . . . of believers in common[.] . . . The work is begun here, and carried on, under different circumstances, as well as with various degrees of rapidity. Ere long it will be completed [in heaven]. . . . [P]rayers for perfection in holiness are scriptural and proper. . . . [A]ll such prayers, if offered in sincerity[,] will be answered. . . . [God] has begun to answer them, [although] the set time for answering them fully, has not yet arrived. . . . [On earth, Christian] desires [for perfect holiness] are fulfilled in part. The work has been commenced and is going forward. The period of the fulfillment is in progress . . . [believers] are enabled, by the grace of God, more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness. And, ere long, their triumph over sin and its influences will be complete . . . [at] the termination of the present life" (pgs. 56-62, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*, W. D. Snodgrass).

half, to [the latter] in it second." Progressive sanctification affects all parts of the believer, leaving nothing missing—it is *holokleros*. It grows toward the end or goal (*telos*, τέλος) of a relative perfection (*teleios*) in this life and to absolute perfection (*teleios*) in the life to come. Finally, Trench's analysis of *artios* (ἄρτιος),[106] the word *perfect* in 2 Timothy 3:17,[107] is accurate and well-stated. The verse explains the *perfection* in question as being "throughly furnished" or completely equipped (ἐξαρτίζω)[108] "unto all good works." As Trench affirms, the man of God is *artios*, "perfect," when he has "not . . . the presence only of all the parts which are necessary for that completeness, but . . . [also the] adaptation and aptitude of these parts for the ends which they were designed to serve. The man of God, St. Paul would say (2Tim. iii. 17), [is *artios* when he is] furnished and accomplished with all which is necessary for the carrying out of the work to which he is appointed."

The vivification of the believer appears in the words employed in the New Testament for the Christian's progress toward perfection. The *katardizo* word group demonstrates that God perfects believers in their nature as He restores Christlikeness in them, resulting in their greater love, faith, and obedience. Their persons become more like Christ's sinless humanity, and their actions become more like His perfectly holy actions. Similarly, the *teleios* word group illuminates the developing relative perfection of the believer as he grows more and more spiritually mature, until at length his relative perfection passes into the absolute perfection of the future glorified state. The Christian is spiritually renewed, vivified, and perfected as he communes with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as they are revealed to him through the Word of God and by the Spirit of

---

[106] **ἄρτιος, ία, ον** (Hom.+; Epict. 1, 28, 3; IG XIV, 889, 7 ἄ. εἴς τι; TestAbr A 8 p. 85, 12 [Stone p. 18]; Ath., R. 77, 4 ἀρτίως; Philo) **pert. to being well fitted for some function, *complete, capable, proficient*=**able to meet all demands 2 Ti 3:17.—DELG s.v. ἄρτι. M-M. TW. (BDAG)

[107] All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works. πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· 17 ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος. (2 Timothy 3:16-17)

[108] **ἐξαρτίζω** (s. ἄρτιος) 1 aor. ἐξήρτισα; pf. pass. ptc. ἐξηρτισμένος (late; Ex 28:7 v.l.).

1. to bring someth. to an end, *finish, complete* (IG XII/2, 538; POxy 296, 7 [I AD] of documents; Jos., Ant. 3, 139) ἐ. ἡμᾶς τ. ἡμέρας *our time was up* Ac 21:5 (cp. Hippocr., Epid. 2, 180 ἀπαρτίζειν τὴν ὀκτάμηνον).

2. to make ready for service, *equip, furnish* (Diod. S. 14, 19, 5 Vogel v.l.; Lucian; Arrian; Jos., Ant. 3, 43 v.l.; CIG II, 420, 13; Mitt-Wilck. I/2, 176, 10 [I AD]; pap, e.g. PAmh 93, 8; PTebt 342, 17) πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος *for every good deed* 2 Ti 3:17 (with ἐξηρτισμένος πρός τι cp. Diod. S. 19, 77, 3 ναῦς ἐξηρτισμένας πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον πρὸς τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθέρωσιν).—DELG s.v. ἀραρίσκω, s. also ἄρτι. M-M. TW. Spicq. (BDAG)

The word is derived from ἀρτίζω, "to get ready, prepare" (Lidell-Scott). The meaning of 2 Timothy 3:16 is listed in the Louw-Nida lexicon as "to make someone completely adequate or sufficient for something — 'to make adequate, to furnish completely, to cause to be fully qualified, adequacy.'

God. He is sanctified in every part of his being (*holokleros*), grows toward being perfectly equipped (*artios*) to practice all good works, and progresses toward being wholly sanctified (*holoteles*). God makes the believer gradually "more perfect" as He leads him toward the holy end (*telos*) of the greatest possible earthly perfection and Christian maturity, and His faithfulness makes certain the believer's attainment of the absolute perfection of the world to come.

7.) Vivification as Renewal Sourced in Regeneration

Titus 3:4-7 indicates that salvation involves both the washing of regeneration (παλιγγενεσία) and the renewal (ἀνακαίνωσις)[109] of the Holy Ghost. The noun *renewal* appears, outside of Titus 3:5, only in Romans 12:2, where spiritual transformation[110] takes place by means of[111] "the renewing of [the saint's] mind," both for the purpose of and with the result that[112] the believer "may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God." The related verb for *renewal*, ἀνακαινόω,[113] appears in 2 Corinthians 4:16[114] and Colossians 3:10.[115] These texts indicate that God, the Creator of the new[116] spiritual principle within the believer[117] and Author and Source of

---

109 **ἀνακαίνωσις, εως, ἡ** ἀνακαινόω s. also ἀνακαινίζω; not found outside Christian lit.; Nägeli 52.—καίνωσις Jos., Ant. 18, 230, ***renewal;*** of a person's spiritual rebirth μεταμορφοῦσθαι τῇ ἀ. τοῦ νοός *be changed by the renewal of your minds* Ro 12:2. λουτρὸν ἀ. πνεύματος ἁγίου *washing of renewal through the Holy Spirit* (w. παλιγγενεσία) Tit 3:5. ἀ. τῶν πνευμάτων ὑμῶν *the renewal of your spirit* of the imparting of a new spirit Hv 3, 8, 9.—TW.

110 See the section "Vivification as Transformation" above.

111 τῇ ἀνακαινώσει is an instrumental dative of means.

112 εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν. ""Boyer . . . suggests, as [Daniel Wallace has] for the corresponding ἵνα-clause, that the [εἰς το + inf. structure] might do double duty [as purpose and result] at times. . . . [with] infinitives after prepositions, many . . . can go either way [as purpose or result]" (Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, pgs. 592-593).

113 **ἀνακαινόω** (καινόω 'make new'; act. Orig., C. Cels. 4, 20; mid. Heliod. Philos., In EN 221, 13) ***renew*** only in Paul, in pass., and fig. of the spiritual rebirth of the Christian (opp. διαφθείρειν) ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν (ἄνθρωπος) ἀνακαινοῦται *our inner* (spiritual) *person is being renewed* 2 Cor 4:16. ἀ. εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν *renew for full knowledge* Col 3:10.—DELG s.v. καινός. M-M. TW.

114 For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward *man* is renewed day by day. Διὸ οὐκ ἐκκακοῦμεν· ἀλλ᾽ εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ ἔσωθεν ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ.

115 And have put on the new *man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him. καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ᾽ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.

116 Both the νεόω and καινόω word families are employed to designate the newness of the people of God. Note the νέος of Colossians 3:10; the ἀνανεόω of Ephesians 4:23; the καινός of Ephesians 2:15; 4:24; the καινότης of Romans 6:4; 7:6; and the ἀνακαίνωσις or ἀνακαινόω in Romans 12:2; Titus 3:5; 2 Corinthians 4:16; Colossians 3:10.

all spiritual growth, progressively and daily renews the believer's inward man[118] into His image.[119] Scripture emphasizes the mind (νοῦς, Romans 12:2) and knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις, Colossians 3:10) in the believer's renewal. Thus, the command "be renewed [ἀνανεοῦσθαι][120] in the spirit of your mind" (Ephesians 4:23)[121] closely

---

117 God is τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν . . . τὸν νέον, the Creator of the new man, Colossians 3:10. Psalm 51:10 ("Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me"; נָכוֹן חַדֵּשׁ בְּקִרְבִּי׃ לֵב טָהוֹר בְּרָא־לִי אֱלֹהִים וְרוּחַ) connects the Divine work of creation of holiness within the believer with spiritual renewal (cf. Psalm 104:30; 2 Chronicles 24:12) in those already children of God—creative power is not limited to the impartation of new life at the moment of regeneration. Note that "בָּרָא in the Kal is always used only of the divine production. The heart is the central organ of the whole religious moral life[.] . . . Steadfast (נכון) the spirit is called so far as it does not hesitate between good and evil" (pg. 443, "On The Biblical Notion of Renewal," Warfield, citing Baethgen). Both the Old and the New Testaments indicate that inner spiritual renewal, a product of the creative power of the Almighty Jehovah, is part of God's work of sanctifying His people, of progressively delivering them from the power of sin.

118 "In Titus 3:5, Paul asserts . . . [that] 'renewing' signifies a gradual, protracted work of sanctification, ending only with life . . . a process by which . . . regeneration . . . is completed. . . . [T]his interpretation of [Paul's] words to Titus is favored by [2] Corinthians 4:16, which [refers to] . . . a process of renewal . . . the process of sanctification . . . a growth 'day by day,' month by month, year by year, till the body is laid aside by death. This, too, [is taught in 2 Corinthians] 3:18 . . . [believers are] inwardly transformed from one degree of glory, or likeness to Christ, to another; and this progressive sanctification, through the truth of the gospel, [is] wrought by the Lord, the Spirit. . . . In obvious agreement with these passages is the language of Paul in Colossians 3:9-10 . . . the 'renewal' [is] conceived of by the apostle as continuous, progressive, and therefore incomplete in all those whom he was addressing" (pgs. 21-25, *The Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With The Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, Alvah Hovey).

119 Both the verb ἀνακαινοῦται in 2 Corinthians 4:16 and the participle ἀνακαινούμενον in Colossians 3:10 are passive—the believer does not renew Himself, but God renews the believer's inward man. Both the verb and the participle are present tense, because God renews His people inwardly "day by day." BDAG notes that "ἡμέρα . . . [i]n the dative [is] answering the question, when? . . . The Hebrew has also furnished the expression ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ *day after day* (Esther 3:4 יוֹם וְיוֹם=LXX καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ἡμέραν; יוֹם יוֹם Psalm 68:20=LXX 67:20 ἡμέραν καθ᾽ ἡμέραν) 2 Corinthians 4:16; Gospel of James 6:1." The Lord renews His people daily in the same way that Jehovah, God of salvation, daily loads His people with benefits (Psalm 68:19, 68:20, Heb.) and the same way that Mordecai was harassed daily about his refusal to bow to Haman (Esther 3:4). The Koiné parallel to a child growing physically stronger day by day (*Gospel of James 6:1*, Ἡμέρᾳ δὲ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκραταιοῦτο ἡ παῖς) is also noteworthy.

120 **ἀνανεόω** fut. 3 sg. ἀνανεώσει Job 33:24; 1 aor. ἀνενέωσα, mid. ἀνενεωσάμην LXX; aor. pass. ptc. gen. pl. ἀνανεωθέντων Ath., R. 58, 20 (ἀνα-, νέος, s. ἀνανέωσις; trag. et al.; ins [e.g. OGI 90, 35 (II BC); ÖJh 64, 1995, p. 72 (III AD)]; pap, LXX; TestBenj 9:1; Apc4Esdr fgm. d [mid.]; Jos., Ant. 12, 321; Ath., R. 58, 20).

1. trans. ***renew.*** The act. is not found very oft. w. this mng. (in a dedication to Aristonous of Corinth [III BC] fgm. 2b Diehl2 [AnthLG II, 6 p. 139] Δελφοὶ ἀνενέωσαν τὰν πάτριον προξενίαν; M. Ant. 4, 3, 3 σεαυτόν; 6, 15, 1; Herm. Wr. 9, 6; ins; pap; Job 33:24; 1 Macc 12:1; Iren., 3, 3, 3 [Harv. II 11, 1]) ἀ. τὴν ζωήν (of the angel of repentance) *restore life* Hs 9, 14, 3. Much more freq. (since Thu. 7, 33, 4) is the mid. (Diod. S. 33, 28a, 3 Dind.; 37, 15, 2; Chion, Ep. 16, 8; Appian, Maced. 11 §6; SIG 721, 13; 475, 10; 554, 6; 591, 53, cp. index; OGI 90, 35; Esth 3:13b; 1 Macc 12:3, 10, 16 al.; Jos., Bell. 1, 283, Ant. 1, 290), which seems not to have the reflexive sense 'renew oneself'. Hence ἀνανεοῦσθαι τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοός is better taken as a pass. *be renewed=(let yourselves) be renewed in the spirit of your minds* Eph 4:23 (on the figure Cornutus 33 p. 70, 10 ἀνανεάζειν ἐκ τῶν νόσων καὶ ἐκδύεσθαι τὸ γῆρας). ἀνανεοῦται τὸ πνεῦμα *his spirit is renewed* Hv 3, 12, 2; 3, 13, 2, cp. 3, 12, 3.

2. intr. ***become young again*** μηκέτι ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα τοῦ ἀνανεῶσαι Hv 3, 11, 3.—New Docs 3, 61f. DELG s.v. νέος. M-M. TW. Sv. (BDAG)

parallels Romans 12:2's "be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind." God progressively renews[122] the believer's mind[123] in association with the old man being put off and the new being put on (Ephesians 4:22-24). While regeneration is the work of an instant, renewal begins with regeneration (Titus 3:5; Hebrews 6:6[124]) but continues throughout life until it is completed at glorification.[125]

---

[121] ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν.

[122] Thus, the imperative ἀνανεοῦσθαι in Ephesians 4:23 is present passive—the renewal is progressive and God is the agent of it.

[123] In the New Testament, ἀνανεόω is also a *hapax legomenon*, and the emphasis upon the mind is validated by parallel texts such as Romans 12:2, by the etymology of the word, and, obviously, from the specific addition of τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς. However, the LXX demonstrates that the verb ἀνανεόω on its own was not limited to mental renewal (Esther 13:2; 1 Maccabees 12:1, 3, 10, 16; 14:18, 22; 15:17; 4 Maccabees 18:4; Job 33:24—peace, friendship, brotherhood, and even the body is renewed with ἀνανεόω). The *Shepherd of Hermas* employs the verb for God renewing the spirit when it employs the passive voice, but employs the active for the restoration of youth or life (19:3; 20:2–3; 21:2; 91:3). Somewhat later Irenaeus employs the active of ἀνανεόω for faith being renewed (*Against Heresies,* 3:3:3) and the passive for the renewal of man to incorruptibility in association with the the new heavens and earth (5:36:1), while Athenagoras uses the passsive for the renewal of human bodies in the resurrection (*On the Resurrection* 10).

[124] Hebrews 6:6 employs the related verb, ἀνακαινίζω for *renew*, speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit that brings an unconverted individual to repentance and salvation. Specifically, the verse indicates that a lost man who deliberately turns from the truth after coming to the place of maximum revelation and Spirit-produced conviction (cf. John 16:8-11) spoken of in Hebrews 6:4-8 will never thereafter be brought by God the Holy Ghost to the point where he can repent and be saved. Thus, Hebrews 6:6 adds to the evidence of Titus 3:5 that renewal begins at the same temporal instance as repentance, faith, regeneration, and justification. The fact that ἀνακαινίζειν in Hebrews 6:6 is a present infinitive seems to indicate that the verb includes the convicting and drawing working of the Spirit that leads a lost man to seek Christ (cf. Luke 13:24; Matthew 7:13-14; John 7:17) and temporally precedes the Spirit's giving the responding sinner repentance and faith. Compare Lamentations 5:21, LXX: ἐπίστρεψον ἡμᾶς κύριε πρὸς σέ καὶ ἐπιστραφησόμεθα καὶ ἀνακαίνισον ἡμέρας ἡμῶν καθὼς ἔμπροσθεν, Turn us, O Lord, to thee, and we shall be turned; and renew our days as before.

[125] "[R]egeneration . . . differs from sanctification as the beginning of a thing differs from its continuance. And the relation of one to the other is clearly set forth by an apostle, when he says, 'He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ' [Philippians 1:6]. The author of the work is the same in all its parts. He who begins it is the same agent who carries it on; and we have no reason to suppose that the influence which is exerted in its progress is different from that which operates at the commencement. It is one work, and the efficient power which is concerned in producing it is one, but it consists of different stages or degrees. It is not perfect at once, but passes from an [incomplete] state to one which is more perfect. It is not instantaneous, but progressive" (pgs. 11-12, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*, W. D. Snodgrass). In the words of Arthur Pink (pgs. 75-76, *Doctrine of Sanctification*):

> [I]n one sense, the relation between regeneration and sanctification is that of the infant to the adult. . . . In likening the connection between regeneration and sanctification to the relation between an infant and an adult, it should be pointed out that we have in mind our practical and progressive sanctification, and not our objective and absolute sanctification. Our absolute sanctification, so far as our state before God is concerned, is simultaneous with our regeneration. The essential thing in our regeneration is the Spirit's quickening of us into newness of life; the essential thing in our sanctification is that thenceforth we are an habitation of God, through the indwelling of the Spirit, and from that standpoint all the subsequent progressive advances in the spiritual life are but the effects, fruits, and manifestations of that initial consecration or anointing. The consecration of the tabernacle, and later of the temple, was a single act, done once and for all; after, there were many evidences of its continuance or perpetuity. But it is with the experimental aspect we would here treat.

B. B. Warfield comments helpfully on the nature of Biblical renewal:

The terms "renew," "renewing," are not of frequent occurrence in our English Bible. In the New Testament they do not occur at all in the Gospels, but only in the Epistles [of Paul], where they stand, respectively, for the Greek terms ἀνακαινόω (2 Corinthians 4:16; Colossians 3:10) with its cognates, ἀνακαινίζω (Hebrews 6:6) and ἀνανεόομαι (Ephesians 4:23), and ἀνακαίνωσις (Romans 12:2; Titus 3:5). . . . [A] definite theological conception is embodied in these terms. This conception is that salvation in Christ involves a radical and complete transformation wrought in the soul (Romans 12:2; Ephesians 4:23) by God the Holy Spirit (Titus 3:5; Ephesians 4:24), by virtue of which we become "new men" (Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10), no longer conformed to this world (Romans 12:2; Ephesians 4:22; Colossians 3:9), but in knowledge and holiness of the truth created after the image of God (Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10; Romans 12:2). The conception, it will be seen, is a wide one, inclusive of all that is comprehended in what we now technically speak of as regeneration, renovation and sanctification. It embraces, in fact, the entire subjective side of salvation, which it represents as a work of God, issuing in a wholly new creation (2 Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15; Ephesians 2:10). . . .

[W]e observe two groups of terms standing over against one another, describing, respectively, from the manward and from the Godward side, the great change experienced by him who is translated from the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of God's love (Colossians 1:13). And within the limits of each of these groups, we observe also certain distinctions in the usage of the several terms which make it up. In the one group are such terms as μετανοεῖν with its substantive μετάνοια, and its cognate μεταμέλεσθαι, and ἐπιστρέφειν and its substantive ἐπιστροφή. These tell us what part man takes in the change. The other group includes such terms as γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν or ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ or ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, παλινγενεσία, ἀναγεννᾶν, ἀποκυεῖσθαι, ανανεοῦσθαι, ἀνακαινοῦσθαι, ἀνακαίνωσις. These tell what part God takes in the change. Man repents, makes amendment, and turns to God. But it is by God that men are renewed, brought forth, born again into newness of life. The

---

At regeneration a principle of holiness is communicated to us; practical sanctification is the exercise of that principle in living to God. In regeneration the Spirit imparts saving grace; in His work of sanctification, He strengthens and develops the same. As "original sin" or that indwelling corruption which is in us at our natural birth, contains within it the seeds of all sin, so that grace which is imparted to us at the new birth contains within it the seeds of all spiritual graces; and as the one develops and manifests itself as we grow, so it is with the other.

"Sanctification is a constant, progressive renewing of the whole man, whereby the new creature doth daily more and more die unto sin and live unto God. Regeneration is the birth, sanctification is the growth of this babe in grace. In regeneration, the sun of holiness rises; in sanctification it keepeth its course, and shineth brighter and brighter unto the perfect day (Proverbs 4:18). The former is a specifical change from nature to grace (Ephesians 5:8); the latter is a gradual change from one degree of grace to another (Psalm 84:7), whereby the Christian goeth from strength to strength till he appear before God in Zion" (George Swinnock, 1660).

Thus, the foundation of sanctification is laid in regeneration, in that a holy principle is then first formed in us. That holy principle evidences itself in conversion, which is a turning away from sin to holiness, from Satan to Christ, from the world to God. It continues to evidence itself under the constant work of mortification and vivification, or the practical putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new; and is completed at glorification. The great difference then between regeneration and experimental and practical sanctification is that the former is a Divine act, done once and for all; while the latter is a Divine work of God's grace, wherein He sustains and develops, continues and perfects the work He then began. The one is a birth, the other a growth. The making of us practically holy is the design which God has in view when He quickens us: it is the necessary means to this end, for sanctification is the crown of the whole process of salvation.

One of the chief defects of modern teaching on this subject has been in regarding the new birth as the summum bonum of the spiritual life of the believer. Instead of being the end, it is . . . a means to the end. Regeneration must be supplemented by sanctification, or otherwise the soul would remain at a standstill—if such a thing were possible: for it seems to be an unchanging law in every realm that where there is no progression, there must be retrogression. That spiritual growth which is so essential lies in progressive sanctification, wherein all the faculties of the soul are more and more brought under the purifying and regulating influence of the principle of holiness which is implanted at the new birth, for thus alone do we grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ" (Ephesians 4:15).

> transformation which to human vision manifests itself as a change of life (ἐπιστροφή) resting upon a radical change of mind (μετάνοια), to Him who searches the heart and understands all the movements of the human soul is known to be a creation (κτίζειν) of God, beginning in a new birth from the Spirit (γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος) and issuing in a new divine product (ποίημα), created in Christ Jesus, into good works prepared by God beforehand that they may be walked in (Ephesians 2:10).
>
> There is certainly synergism here; but it is a synergism of such character that not only is the initiative taken by God (for "all things are of God," 2 Corinthians 5:18, cf. Hebrews 6:6), but the Divine action is in the exceeding greatness of God's power, according to the working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead (Ephesians 1:19). The "new man" which is the result of this change is therefore one who can be described no otherwise than as "created" κτισθέντα) in righteousness and holiness of truth (Ephesians 4:24), after the image of God significantly described as "He who created him" (τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, Colossians 3:10), — that is not He who made him a man, but He who has made him by an equally creative efflux of power this new man which he has become. The exhortation that we shall "put on" this new man (Ephesians 4:24; cf. 3:9, 10), therefore does not imply that either the initiation or the completion of the process by which the "new creation" (καινὴ κτίσις; 2 Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15) is wrought lies in our own power; but only urges us to that diligent cooperation with God in the work of our salvation, to which He calls us in all departments of life (1 Corinthians 3:9), and the classical expression of which in this particular department is found in the great exhortation of Philippians 2:12, 13 where we are encouraged to work out our own salvation thoroughly to the end, with fear and trembling, on the express ground that it is God who works in us both the willing and doing for His good pleasure. The express inclusion of "renewal" in the exhortation (Ephesians 4:23 ἀνανεοῦσθαι; Romans 12: μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει) is indication enough that this "renewal" is a process wide enough to include in itself the whole synergistic "working out" of salvation (κατεργάζεσθε, Philippians 2:12). But it has no tendency to throw doubt upon the underlying fact that this "working out" is both set in motion (τὸ θέλειν) and given effect (τὸ ἐνεργεῖν), only by the energizing of God (ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν), so that all (τὰ πάντα) is from God (ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 2 Corinthians 5:18). . . . [T]he essence of the New Testament representation certainly is that the renewal which is wrought upon him who is by faith in Christ, is the work of the Spirit of Christ, who dwells within His children as a power not themselves making for righteousness, and gradually but surely transforms after the image of God, not the stream of their activities merely, but themselves in the very centre of their being. . . . [S]alvation consists in its substance of a radical subjective change wrought by the Holy Spirit, by virtue of which the native tendencies to evil are progressively eradicated and holy dispositions are implanted, nourished and perfected.[126]

As believers' minds and persons are renewed by the Spirit through the Word, they become more Christlike and more separate from sin in their natures, actions, and attitudes, the moral image of God being restored in them.[127]

---

[126] Pgs. 439, 450-452, 459-460, "On The Biblical Notion of Renewal," Benjamin B. Warfield, in *Biblical Doctrines,* vol. 2 of *Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003; reprint of 1932 Oxford ed. Article orig. pub. *The Princeton Theological Review*, v. ix, 1911, pgs. 242-267.

[127] Philip E. Hughes (pgs. 27-28, *The True Image: The Origin and Destiny of Man in Christ*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001) wrote: "[I]n Christ . . . [t]he image marred by our fallenness is renewed in him who is the Image of God in which we were first formed. From the beginning he has been the key and the guarantee to a destiny more glorious than the beginning. The renewal of our humanity after the image of its Creator is already complete in the triumphant and glorious exaltation of the incarnate Son who is the Lord our Righteousness (Jeremiah 23:6; 1 Corinthians 1:30), and during the course of this earthly pilgrimage it is progressively taking place within us as with the Holy Spirit's aid we increase in Christlikeness (2 Corinthians 3:18; Ephesians 4:12, 16)."

As already indicated, renewal begins with the Divine work of regeneration (παλιγγενεσία, Titus 3:5). Regeneration, the instantaneous impartation of spiritual life and a new nature, is also described as being "born again" or "born from above" (γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν,[128] John 3:3),[129] begotten by God's will (βουληθεὶς ἀποκεῖσθαι,[130] James 1:18)[131] and born or begotten again (ἀναγεννᾶν,[132] 1 Peter 1:3, 23). The Holy Spirit imparts the new birth through the instrumentality of both "the word of God" (1 Peter 1:23)[133] which is "the word of truth" (James 1:18) and the sinner's faith

---

128 **ἄνωθεν** adv. of place . . . **1. in extension from a source that is above, *from above*** . . . Esp. *from heaven* . . . **4. at a subsequent point of time involving repetition, *again, anew*** . . . ἀ. γεννηθῆναι *be born again* J 3:3, 7 (ἄ. γεννᾶσθαι in the physical sense Artem. 1, 13) is designedly ambiguous and suggests also a transcendent experience *born from above*. (BDAG)

129 As noted by a variety of writers (e. g., Buchsel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 1:671; gen. ed. G. Kittel & G Friedrich, 10 vol. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), in John γεννηθῆναι is always used with a reference to the point of origin. Note ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ and ἐξ αὐτοῦ (1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; John 1:13); ἐκ Πνεύματος (John 3:5, 6, 8); ἐξ ὕδατος (3:5); ἐκ τῆς σαρκός (3:6); ἐκ θελήματος (ἀνδρός/Θεοῦ 1:13); ἄνωθεν (3:3, 7).

130 **ἀποκυέω** 1 aor. ἀπεκύησα (because the aor. is found in this form [not ἀπέκυσα] Js 1:18, W-H. Vog. M. in 1:15 accent ἀποκυεῖ; s. W-S. §15 p. 129); aor. pass. ἀπεκυήθη (Just., A I, 32, 14; 46, 5). (κυέω or κύω 'to be pregnant'; Aristot., fgm. 76 Rose; Dionys. Hal. 1, 70 [interpol.]; Plut., Sull. 475 [37, 7]; Lucian, D. Mar. 10, 1; Aelian, VH 5, 4 et al.; Herm. Wr. 1, 16; BGU 665 II, 19 [I AD]; APF 3, 1906, 370 II, 4; Sb 6611, 15; PFamTebt 20, 15; 20; 22; 4 Macc 15:17; Philo, Ebr. 30 al.) ***give birth to***

a. of delivery of that with which one has been pregnant, w. ἀπό retaining its force *give birth to,* ὃς ἐ[κ]υοφορήθη|[. . .. . .]. ὑπ᾽ αὐτῆς ὡς ἀποκυῆσε (=ἕως ἀποκυῆσαι) αὐτήν, καὶ γεννῆσαι [Ἰησοῦν] τὸν Χριστόν *who was carried (in the womb) by her (Mary) until she gave birth and bore [Jesus] the Messiah* AcPl Ha 8, 27f.

b. otherwise in our lit. only fig., ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀ. θάνατον *sin gives birth to* (i.e. *brings forth*) *death* Js 1:15. But the term is not confined to the human female faculty (cp. Herm. Wr. 1, 9); of God (s. γεννάω) ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας *gave birth to us (brought us into being) through the word of truth* Js 1:18.—C-MEdsman, Schöpferwille u. Geburt Jk 1:18: ZNW 38, '39, 11–44.—DELG s.v. κυέω I. M-M. TW. Spicq. (BDAG)

131 James draws a striking contrast with ἀποκυέω—in those who are not begotten of God (ἀπεκύησεν, 1:18), sin is bringing forth death (ἀποκύει, 1:15).

132 **ἀναγεννάω** 1 aor. ἀνεγέννησα; pass. ἀνεγεννήθην (Just., Tat.); pf. pass. ptc. ἀναγεγεννημένος (Philod., Ira p. 18 W.; Sir Prol. ln. 28 v.l.) ***beget again, cause to be born again*** fig. of the spiritual rebirth of Christians.—Of God ὁ ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν *who has given us a new birth for a living hope* 1 Pt 1:3. ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς *born again not of perishable seed* vs. 23 (in Herm. Wr. 13, 1 Sc. ἀγνοῶ, ὦ τρισμέγιστε, ἐξ οἵας μήτρας ἄνθρωπος ἀναγεννηθείη ἄν, σπορᾶς δὲ ποίας the rdg. ἀναγ. is not certain, but Sallust. 4 p. 8, 24=FPhGr III, 33, col. 2, 6 uses the word in describing mysteries γάλακτος τροφή, ὥσπερ ἀναγεννωμένων).—Cp. RPerdelwitz, D. Mysterienreligion u. d. Problem des 1 Pt 1911, 37ff; HWindisch, Hdb. Exc. on 1 Pt 2:2 and the entry παλιγγενεσία.—DELG s.v. γίγνομαι 222. M-M. TW. Sv. (BDAG)

133 The fact that both the new birth (James 1:18) and spiritual growth (John 17:17; 1 Peter 2:2) take place through the instrumentality of the incorruptible Word of God (1 Peter 1:23) means that those who employ corrupt Bible versions that are based on Hebrew and Greek texts other than the Old and New Testament *Textus Receptus*, literally and accurately translated (as they are in the King James Version), will have more difficulty both being converted and growing spiritually. The power of God, a product of the breath of God (θεόπνευστος) that remains upon the Word both accurately copied and (in a derivative sense) translated (cf. "Are Accurate Copies and Translations of Scripture Inspired? A Study of 2 Timothy

in Christ (John 3:3, 14-18), itself a product of the Spirit and the Word (1 Peter 1:22-23; Romans 10:17). Matthew 19:28,[134] the only text other than Titus 3:5 which employs the word *regeneration*, provides striking illumination on the nature of the new birth.[135] The cosmic regeneration spoken of by the Lord in Matthew 19 parallels the individual regeneration under consideration in Titus 3:5.[136] In individual regeneration, as in the

---

3:16, by Thomas Ross; faithsaves.net/Bibliology) without which both regeneration and sanctification are impossible, will be absent from a Bible version to whatever extent it is corrupt.

134 And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι, ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθήσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

135 Compare the parallel drawn between cosmic and individual redemption in Romans 8:19-23.

136 Philip Hughes powerfully develops the relationship between individual and cosmic regeneration, and their mutual connection to the Lord Jesus Christ:

> It is important to understand that what happened to the incarnate Son happened to our human nature. . . . His resurrection and his exaltation demonstrate to us that death has been swallowed up in victory, *his* victory, and assure us that God gives us this same victory through our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Corinthians 15:54-57).
>
> In him, moreover, our human nature is exalted and brought to perfection. . . . Thus what Psalm 8 affirms about man generically is attained specifically in Christ Jesus. . . . The point that must not be missed is this, that Jesus is in absolute reality the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, of all God's purposes for mankind and for creation (cf. Revelation 1:8; 21:6; 22:13). What God started in creation he not only started in the Son, who is the Image after whom man is formed, but he also completed in the Son, who is the Image to whom all the redeemed are being conformed (Romans 8:29; 2 Corinthians 3:18). . . . So real is this exaltation of our redeemed human nature in Christ, so complete is the reconciling and glorifying work performed for us, so genuine is the union of the believer with the incarnate Lord on high, that there is an authentic identity between the Redeemer and the redeemed. . . . The key expression in the communication of this truth is that which defines the existence of the believer as being *in Christ*, with its corollary that he is therefore *with Christ*—revitalized with Christ, raised with Christ, enthroned with Christ. Christ has always been the concentration point of God's age-old purposes, before creation, at creation, and in the restoration of all things. . . .
>
> In the teaching of the apostles the resurrection of Jesus is strikingly proclaimed as signalizing the rebirth of our humanity. It is in him, the conqueror of death and Satan, that the new creation comes into being. . . . The resurrection of Jesus, then, is the sign to the world (cf. Matthew 12:38-40) that declares the reality of the new beginning of the human race in Christ. The regeneration it proclaims is of such significance that it [leads to] the new heavens and the new earth (2 Peter 3:13; Revelation 21:1), which is the restoration of all things (Acts 3:21). As with the original creation, this is the work of God, who in Christ makes all things new (Revelation 21:5; cf. Genesis 1:1). It is the dynamic internalization of the creation principle, for God, who in the original creation said, "Let light shine out of darkness," now dispels the darkness of ungodliness by causing the light of the knowledge of his glory revealed in Christ to shine in the believing heart (2 Corinthians 4:6). Hence the description of the person who is in Christ as *a new creation* (2 Corinthians 5:17), and the instruction that those who are thus reborn are "God's workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus* for good works, which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them" (Ephesians 2:10). In this the continuity that relates the new to the original creation is evident, as also in the assertion that "the new man" or "the new humanity" put on by the Christian "is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its Creator" (Colossians 3:10), which betokens the recovery of the first principle of man's creation, namely, his formation after the image of God, which, again, is after Christ who is the Image of God. Likeness to Christ, Christiformity, is the whole sum and purpose of man's creation.
>
> The reconciliation of man to God achieves also the reconciliation of all things, the reconciliation not only of man to God but also of man to man and of all creation. Through Christ, St. Paul says, God reconciles to himself "all things, whether on earth or in heaven, having made peace by the blood of his cross" (Colossians 1:20). In the crucified, risen, and glorified Savior there is the healing of all enmity and incompatibility, personal, racial, and indeed of every kind; for Christ "is our peace, who . . . has broken down the dividing wall of hostility . . . *that he might create in himself one new man* [i. e., one new reborn

Millennial earth, a radical difference takes place that mightily alters previous conditions. Satan is the ruler of this present world-system (2 Corinthians 4:4) and the unregenerate individual (Ephesians 2:1-3), but Christ will rule the Millennial earth and He currently rules both the individual regenerate man and the corporate body of the saints, the church. Nevertheless, neither in the saint, the church on earth, or the Millennial kingdom is sin absolutely and finally abolished—the final complete victory for the individual does not take place until his glorification, and the final victory over sin in the universe does not take place until the eternal state, the cosmic parallel to individual glorification.[137] Sin is not yet absolutely abolished in either individual or cosmic regeneration, but the shattered dominion of evil and predominant rule of Christ in the regenerate individual and earth are a foretaste and harbinger of certain ultimate victory in both spheres. Matthew 19:28 further demonstrates that cosmic regeneration transforms the entire creation—no portion of the universe is exempt from the radically different conditions (Isaiah 11; 65:20-25, etc.) that will exist during Christ's thousand-year reign. So individual regeneration affects the entire person, spirit, soul, and body.[138] Nevertheless, the entire Millennial cosmos, although changed in all its parts, still evidences the existence and deleterious

---

> humanity] . . . in one body through the cross, thereby bringing hostility to an end" (Ephesians 2:13-16). The restoration of harmony between man and God and between man and man inevitably effects the recovery of the harmony of all things. While the focus of the regeneration accomplished through the redeeming work of the incarnate Son is upon man as the head of the created order, the scope of this regeneration is in the end creation-wide. This expectation is altogether logical. Man's fall, apart from its disasterous results for himself, has subjected the creation as a whole to futility—not, however, without hope; for, St. Paul explains, "the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God," when, at the return of the Son himself in glory, "the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Romans 8:19ff.). Man's rebellion, in Adam, against his Creator led to his rebellious abuse and perversion of the dominion with which he had been entrusted over the earth; but the renewal of man, in Christ, leads to the renewal of the cosmos, and the glorification of man brings with it the glorification of that order of which he is the chief part. The actuality of rebirth which flows from the resurrection of the Crucified One from the dead therefore exerts a regenerative power that is cosmic as well as human in its comprehensiveness, as in Christ, through whom all things were created, the divine purpose in the creation of man and the world is brought to its glorious fulfilment. (pgs. 380-385, *The True Image*)

137 A confusion of categories would be involved in the conclusion, reasoning from the parallel between cosmic and individual regeneration, that progressive sanctification does not involve the Spirit eradicating indwelling sinfulness and imparting inward holiness because in the Millennium all those who enter the earthly kingdom are regenerate but by the end of the thousand year reign the many unconverted people who will have been born will rebel against Christ, so that greater human holiness is not present at the conclusion of the Millennial reign (Revelation 20:1-10). Even apart from the fact that there doubtless will be a vast number of glorious spiritual achievements and wonderful progress made in innumerable areas during the thousand years of Christ's reign from Jerusalem, Matthew 19:28 and Titus 3:5 do not present a parallel with individual renewal, but with individual regeneration. The contrast between the present age under Satan's rule and the Millennial kingdom under Christ's rule teaches much about the nature of individual regeneration, but nothing about the nature of progressive renewal during the Christian life. No text of the Bible draws an explicit parallel between the unfolding events of Christ's future earthly kingdom and the unfolding events of individual renewal in progressive personal sanctification.

138 See "Excursus V: Regeneration and Sanctification Are Connected with the Renewal of the Whole Person, Body, Soul, and Spirit—Not, as Watchman Nee Affirmed, with the Human Spirit Alone," below. **This excursus has been changed.**

affects of sin in every portion; so no part of the regenerate individual is yet entirely free from sin.[139] Furthermore, entrance into both the personally regenerate state and the coming Millennial state is based upon union with the Lord Jesus Christ. Matthew 19:28 illustrates the truth that individual regeneration is an instanteous and supernatural work that makes a man new in all parts, although not completely new in any part; it is the impartation of a new nature that grows and develops through the renewal of progressive sanctification until God eradicates the final remnants of indwelling sin at glorification.[140]

---

139 Regeneration affects all the faculties of the soul; that is, intellect, will, and affections, as well as all the members of the body which are appointed to be instruments of righteousness. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor 5:17). Everything is changed. The change is such that it is as if a dead person became alive and arose from the dead, as if a blind person received vision, as if a deaf person received hearing, and as if a crippled person walked. Nothing is changed perfectly, however, for the old nature remains, together with its motions and operations. This results in a battle between the flesh and the Spirit (cf. Gal 5:17; Rom 7:23).

Question: How is it to be understood that within one person there can simultaneously be an old and a new nature, light and darkness, life and death? Does each occupy or consist of a different portion of this man? Does each protect this part as its own and strive to evict the other from its part?

Answer: They do not each function independently, but are completely intertwined, as is true of light and darkness during dusk, or of cold and heat in lukewarm water. . . . Such is likewise the case here. Two things which are opposite to each other cannot exist equally to the highest degree within one subject. This is possible, however, when each party is in a mediate position. This will not be a peaceful coexistence, however, for the one will seek to drive out the other. One must thus not deduce his regeneration from the degree of perfection of this new life, nor from the measure in which it manifests itself, but rather from its genuineness. If genuine spiritual life, light, and faith are present, then one is regenerate. Let the old man be as strong as it may be, where there is life it will remain; and wherever there is inner life, it will manifest itself in these and similar fruits. (pgs. 250-251, *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, vol. 2, Wilhelmus á Brakel)

140 "The spiritual life implanted in regeneration is similar to the natural life in that it must be nourished and strengthened for it to expand and grow. In other ways there is a great difference between them, of course, inasmuch as the spiritual life originates in God as Savior, is acquired by the resurrection of Christ, and is eternal life that can neither sin nor die. Nevertheless regenerate persons continually need to be 'strengthened in their inner being with power through God's Spirit' (cf. Eph. 3:16). This strengthening of the spiritual life, like its beginning, originates with God and the riches of his grace. The life of spiritual persons, also after its origination, cannot for a moment be separated from God and his fellowship; in the same strict and particular sense in which this life is from God, it also is through and for him. It is he who nourishes and maintains it, never abandons it, prompts it to engage in certain activities, and not only bestows the capacity but also the willing and the working according to his good pleasure (Phil. 2:13; 2 Cor. 3:5). It is a life in communion with Christ. . . . [B]elievers are united with Christ, both in his death and in his resurrection (Rom. 6:5). They are in Christ, and Christ lives in them (2 Cor. 13:5; Gal. 2:20). They cannot do anything if they do not remain in him as branches in the vine (John 15:4–5). They can only become strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might (Eph. 6:10) by the Spirit of Christ and in communion with him (Rom. 8:13, 26; 2 Cor. 13:13; Eph. 3:16). But in the case of the regenerate, that Spirit works from the center of their being to the circumference. This is both possible and proper since the 'new person' is not immediately perfected in 'degrees' but in 'parts.' In regeneration the whole person is, in principle, re-created. A person's self dies and lives again in and by the power of Christ (Gal. 2:20). From the very start it is a new human (καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, kainos anthrōpos) who is created in Christ (Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10), a creation that, though small and delicate, is nevertheless complete in all its parts. The Holy Spirit, accordingly, works at various aspects to make the new person grow evenly and proportionately in all one's parts. He works as the Spirit of wisdom, holiness, and glory, and adorns believers with an array of

The cosmic parallel to the process beginning at regeneration whereby God makes the individual believer holy is explicitly extended through glorification in Isaiah 65:17 and 66:22, where God indicates that His creation of new heavens and a new earth takes place in connection with the Millennium,[141] while 2 Peter 3:13 and Revelation 21:1 (cf. Revelation 20:11; 21:5) identify the new heaven and new earth as the ultimate consummation of the eternal state, after the thousand-year reign of Christ. The Millennial kingdom is a new cosmos, a new heaven and earth—it is new in all its parts, but not new to the uttermost extent—total newness and absolute freedom from sin awaits the eternal state.

Trench commented with insight on the distinction between regeneration (παλιγγενεσία) and renewal (ἀνακαίνωσις):

> [F]irst[,] it is worth observing that while the word παλιγγενεσία is drawn from the realm of nature, ἀνακαίνωσις derives from that of art. A word peculiar to the Greek of the N. T., it occurs there only twice—once in connexion with παλιγγενεσία (Tit. iii. 5), and again at Rom. xii. 2; but we have the verb ἀνακαινόω, which also is exclusively a N. T. form, at 2 Cor. iv. 16; Col. iii. 10; and the more classical ἀνακαινίζω, Heb. vi. 6, from which the nouns, frequent in the Greek [theologians], ἀνακαινισμός and ἀνακαίνισις are more immediately drawn; we have also ἀνανεόω at Ephes. iv. 23; all in similar uses. . . . Our Collect . . . expresses excellently well the relation in which the παλιγγενεσία and the ἀνακαίνωσις stand to each other; we there pray, 'that we being regenerate,' in other words, having been already made the subjects of the παλιγγενεσία, 'may daily be renewed by the Holy Spirit,' may continually know the ἀνακαίνωσις Πνεύματος Ἁγίου. In this Collect, uttering, as do so many, profound theological truth in forms at once the simplest and the most accurate, the new-birth is contemplated as already past, as having found place once for all, while the 'renewal' or 'renovation' is daily proceeding—being as it is that gradual restoration of the Divine image, which is ever going forward in him who, through the new-birth, has come under the transforming powers of the world to come. It is called 'the renewal of the Holy Ghost,' inasmuch as He is the efficient cause, by whom alone this putting on of the new man, and putting off the old, is brought about.
>
> These two then are bound by closest ties to one another; the second the following up, the consequence, the consummation of the first. The παλιγγενεσία is that free act of God's mercy and Power, whereby He causes the sinner to pass out of the kingdom of darkness into that of light, out of death into life; it is the ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, of John iii. 3; the γεννηθῆναι ἐκ θεοῦ of 1 John v. 4; the θεογενεσία of Dionysius the Areopagite and other Greek theologians; the γεννηθῆναι ἐκ σπορᾶς ἀφθάρτου of 1 Pet. i. 23; in it that glorious word begins to be fulfilled, ἰδοὺ καινὰ [πάντα ποιῶ] (Rev. xxi. 5). In it—not in the preparations for it, but in the act itself—the subject of it is passive, even as the child has nothing to do with its own birth. With the ἀνακαίνωσις, it is otherwise. This is the gradual conforming of the man more and more to that

---

powers and gifts and virtues (Rom. 15:13; 1 Cor. 12:3ff.; Gal. 5:2–3)" (pg. 98, *Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 4, Herman Bavinck).

[141] Note the use of participles for God's work of the creation of the new heaven and earth in both Isaiah 65:17-18 (הִנְנִי בוֹרֵא שָׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים וָאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה . . . אֲנִי בוֹרֵא) and 66:22 (כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר הַשָּׁמַיִם הַחֲדָשִׁים וְהָאָרֶץ הַחֲדָשָׁה אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה)—both texts thus employ forms expected for an action involving a process rather than one completed at a single instant in time (cf. Isaiah 66:22 (LXX), ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινή ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, and 65:18, ἐγὼ ποιῶ). Note that Isaiah 66:22 also connects the certainty that the people of God will not be cast away with the certainty that the renewed cosmos will not be cast away. From the moment God's renewing power enables a sinner to take the water of life freely until the ultimate consummation in the New Jerusalem, the Triune Jehovah can truly testify, Ἰδού, καινὰ πάντα ποιῶ, "Behold, I make all things new" (Revelation 21:5; cf. 21:1-7).

new spiritual world into which he has been introduced, and in which he now lives and moves; the restoration of the Divine image; and in all this, so far from being passive, he must be a fellow-worker with God. That was 'regeneratio,' this is 'renovatio;' which two must not be separated, but as little may be confounded, as Gerhard (*Locc. Theoll.* xxi. 7. 113) has well declared: 'Renovatio, licet a regeneratione proprie et specialiter accepta distinguatur, individuo tamen et perpetuo nexu cum ea est conjuncta.' What infinite perplexities, conflicts, scandals, obscurations of God's truth on this side and on that, have arisen now from the confusing, and now from the separating, of these two![142]

Commenting on the same distinction between regeneration and renewal, B. B. Warfield wrote:

> [I]t seems tolerably clear that over against the broader "renewal" expressed by ἀνακαινοῦσθαι and its cognates . . . ἀναγεννᾶν (1 Peter 1:23) and with it, its synonym ἀποκεῖσθαι (James 1:18) are of narrower connotation. We have, says Peter, in God's great mercy been rebegotten, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by means of the Word of the living and abiding God. It is in accordance with His own determination, says James, that we have been brought forth by the Father of Lights, from whom every good gift and every perfect boon comes, by means of the Word of truth. We have here an effect, the efficient agent in working which is God in His unbounded mercy, while the instrument by means of which it is wrought is "the word of good-tidings which has been preached" to us, that is to say, briefly, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The issue is, equally briefly, just salvation. This salvation is characteristically described by Peter as awaiting its consummation in the future, while yet it is entered upon here and now not only [1 Peter 1:4ff.] as a "living hope" which shall not be put to shame (because it is reserved in heaven for us, and we meanwhile are guarded through faith for it by the power of God), but also in an accordant life of purity as children of obedience who would fain be like their Father and as He is holy be also ourselves holy in all manner of living. James intimates that those who have been thus brought forth by the will of God may justly be called "first fruits of His creatures," where the reference assuredly is not to the first but to the second creation, that is to say, they who have already been brought forth by the word of truth are themselves the product of God's creative energy and are the promise of the completed new creation when all that is shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God (Romans 8:19*sq*., Matthew 19:28).
>
> The new birth thus brought before us is related to the broader idea of "renewal" (ἀνακαίνωσις) as the initial stage to the whole process. . . . The notion of the new birth is confined even more closely still to its initial step in our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus, recorded in the opening verses of the third chapter of John's Gospel. Here the whole emphasis is thrown upon the necessity of the new birth and its provision by the Holy Spirit. No one can see the Kingdom of God unless he be born again; and this new birth is wrought by the Spirit. . . . The new birth appears to be brought before us in this discussion in the purity of its conception; and we are made to perceive that at the root of the whole process of "renewal" there lies an immediate act of God the Holy Spirit upon the soul by virtue of which it is that the renewed man bears the great name of son of God. Begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God (John 1:13), his new life will necessarily bear the lineaments of his new parentage (1 John 3:9, 10; 5:4, 18): kept by Him who was in an even higher sense still begotten of God, he overcomes the world by faith, defies the evil one (who cannot touch him), and manifests in his righteousness and love the heritage which is his (1 John 2:29, 4:7, 5:1). Undoubtedly the Spirit is active throughout the whole process of "renewal"; but it is doubtless the peculiarly immediate and radical nature of his operation at this initial point which gives to the product of His renewing activities its best right to be called a new creation (2 Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15), a quickening (John 5:21; Ephesians 2:5), a making alive from the dead (Galatians 3:21). . . . At the basis of all there lies an enabling act from God, by virtue of which alone the spiritual activities of man are liberated for their work (Romans 6:22, 8:2). From that moment of the first divine contact the work of the Spirit never ceases: while man is changing his mind and reforming his life, it is

142 *Synonyms of the New Testament,* Richard Chenevix Trench. Section xviii, pgs. 64-66.

> ever God who is renewing him in true righteousness. . . . It is the entirety of this process, viewed as the work of God on the soul, which the Scriptures designate "renewal."[143]

Spiritual renewal thus encompasses both the initial bestowal of a new nature by God in regeneration and the believer's growth in Christlikeness and holiness through the mortification of indwelling sin and vivification of Divinely imparted new life. God progressively renews His people into the image of Christ throughout the entirety of their earthly Christian pilgrimage until their indwelling sin is finally utterly extirpated through their glorification.

Applicatons.

To lost sinners:

1.) Have you been regenerated? Are you different the way the Millennial earth is different from this earth? When did it happen? This is what the new birth is—and without the new birth, you will never enter heaven.

2.) You must *want* to be different the way that the Millennial earth is different. You must want Jesus Christ to be your Lord, to have a new heart, to be holy. It is not enough that you don't want hell. When you receive Christ, you are united to Him and get all that He is, and you must want this.

3.) You cannot just wait to be saved until whenever you want. *GOD* renews you unto repentance. You are saved when God permits, Hebrews 6:3. If you put off repentance and faith, you are in severe danger of being cast off forever by God and never being renewed unto repentance.

4.) Why will you cling to this fading world, instead of having all that we discussed in this message?

To saints:

1.) Ephesians 1:18-19: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, And what *is* the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power,

2.) Renewal, as regeneration, is a supernatural work of God. Do not think that you renew yourself, or take any glory to yourself in this work; ascribe it all to God.

3.) Expect God to renew you completely, body, soul, and spirit, as you cooperate with Him. Low views of what God does in you will hinder your sanctification. If you think

---

143 "On The Biblical Notion of Renewal," Benjamin B. Warfield, pgs. 454-457.

God does not actually make you any more holy, but leaves you unchanged from the time you are saved until glory, you are not going to be renewed as you ought. Expect God to renew you and cooperate with Him by using the means of sanctification.

2.) Understand, treasure, and glory in the greatness of Jesus Christ, the One who brings all this to pass. See how all of the created universe, all redeemed humanity, this creation, the new creation, all, all centers in Him. How do you treat Jesus Christ? Are you brazen enough to not keep His commandments, but hold on to sin? Will you not love and serve this One, Jesus Christ?

3.) Has He brought you into union with Himself, bringing you into this glorious redemption that is centered in Him in such a great way? Will you not then fulfill His purposes for you?

4.) Will you choose this world and sin over Him? Will you choose to not further this work of renewal in you in the greatest possible way? Why will you choose dust that will perish over renewal by Jesus Christ?

II. The Prerequisites for Vivification

Scripture presents certain prerequsites for effective progress[144] in mortification and vivification. While God never ceases to work in a variety of ways in the lives of His people, the Christian's fulfillment of certain conditions prepares the way for much greater progress in holiness than they would otherwise experience. Effective use of the means of mortification and vivification require that the Christian is, first, right with God.

1.) Be Right With God

In important conjunction with the progressive and incomplete ethical eradication of indwelling sinfulness in the believer through progressive sanctification is the clear Biblical distinction between the believer who is right with God and the one who is

[144] Since, as is demonstrated in the section "The Certainty of Practical Sanctification For All The Regenerate," God has ordained that He will sanctify all the justified, even in this life, all believers experience some degree of progress in the mortification of sin and growth in holiness. Since God ordains both His intended ends and the means to His ends (Ephesians 1:11), all Christians will, to some extent, embrace the prerequisites and means to vivification explicated in the following sections of this treatise.

backslidden. Progressive sanctification contains both an aspect of a continuum of growth and an aspect that is either entirely present or not. No believer on earth has reached the endpoint of the entire elimination of indwelling sin and perfect renewal of the image of Christ within him; the saints on earth are all at various stages of growth, having within them differing ethical elements of light and darkness. However, Scripture likewise teaches a clear distinction between those believers who are right with God and those who are not.

> Every Christian . . . has a "pure" heart in [that he is regenerate and has the new heart that is the possession of all who enter heaven, Psalm 24:3-4; Matthew 5:8; Hebrews 8:8-12]. But every Christian does not have a "clean" heart (Psalm 51:10) [in another sense].[145] That which pollutes the heart of a Christian is *unjudged sin*. Whenever sin is *allowed* by us, communion with God is broken, and pollution can only be removed, and communion restored, by genuine repentance—a condemning of ourselves, a mourning over the sin, and unsparing confession of the same, accompanied by a fervent desire and sincere resolution not to be overtaken by it again. The willing allowance and indulgence of any known sin cannot exist with a clean heart. [Such] . . . repentance . . . is as necessary [to] the continuance of spiritual life, as faith itself[.] After the repentance and confession, there must be a fresh (and constant) recourse unto that Fountain which has been "opened for sin and for uncleanness," a fresh application by faith of the cleansing blood of Christ: pleading its merits and efficacy before God.[146]

The Biblical description of sanctification as "building up"[147] illustrates both the aspects of continunity and of total possession or absence in spiritual life. A building that is progressively being built is not an all-or-nothing proposition—the edifice grows gradually. However, buildings may be built at a faster or slower rate, or even begin to decay or be actively dismantled. The believer who is right with God is being built up as a spiritual building—a growth that can happen at different rates—but the backslider, the believer who is not right with God, is contributing to the decay of his building through

---

145 The distinction Pink affirms, that some believers are right with God and others are not, while all believers are righteous before the Lord in another sense, is certainly valid—however, an absolute distinction between the ue of the English words "clean" and "pure" with reference to the heart is not consistently maintained in Scripture. Thus, the "clean heart" (לֵב טָהוֹר) of only the repentant believer (Psalm 51:10) is also called "pureness of heart" (טְהוֹר־לֵב, Proverbs 22:11).

146 Pg. 54, *Doctrine of Sanctification*, Arthur W. Pink. Pink helpfully further explicated the "right with God" distinction as follows:

> It is not every man, nor even every Christian, who obtains definite answers to his prayers. Far from it! A "righteous man" [in one sense of the term] is one who is right with God in a practical way: one whose conduct is pleasing in His sight, one who keeps his garments unspotted from the world, who is in separation from religious evil . . . Such a one has the ear of Heaven, for there is no moral barrier between his soul and a sin hating God. (*Life of Elijah*, Chapter 3, "The Brook Cherith.")
>
> When we have sinned away our peace there is a strangeness and distance between the soul and the Holy One. When our inward monitor convicts and condemns us, the heart grows shy of God, so that we cannot so comfortably look Him in the face. It is only when everything is made right with God, by contrite confession and faith's appropriation of the cleansing blood of Christ, that we can approach the throne of grace with boldness. (*Exposition of Hebrews*, vol. 3, Arthur Pink, Chapter 122, "Praying for Ministers.")

147 See "Vivification as Building Up" above.

neglect or is actively taking his building down. Rather than achieving ever greater progress, he is sliding backwards, progressively falling away from God. While the completion of a building is a process, any particular structure is either in the process of being built up or being taken down—building, in this sense, is an all-or-nothing proposition. In this sense, particular believers are either making spiritual progress or they are in decline; they are either right with God or are backsliding. Either their new nature or their indwelling sin is growing stronger; they either have a clear conscience or they do not have one; they are either wilfully holding on to sin or they are not doing so. Progress in sanctification requires that the believer be right with God.

The distinction between the clean or pure-hearted[148] Christian and the backslider is clear throughout the canon. The history of Israel demonstrates that the question "Is thine heart right[?]" could be put to the godly, with the appropriate answer being "It is" (2 Kings 10:15).[149] A right or upright heart,[150] which is a gift of grace given by God (1 Chronicles 29:19), was manifested in "zeal for the LORD" (2 Kings 10:16) and His worship and institutions (cf. 2 Kings 10:15-16, 27-28, 30; Psalm 111:1), and a heart that was conformed to God's heart (10:30). The "upright in heart . . . follow . . . righteousness" (Psalm 94:15; cf. 97:11). Their "words [are of] the uprightness of [their] heart: and [their] lips . . . utter knowledge" (Job 33:3), as their "uprightness of heart" is a product of "hav[ing] learned [God's] righteous judgments," the content of Scripture (Psalm 119:7). Their worship is also in the "uprightness of [their] heart" as they "willingly offe[r]" to the Lord (1 Chronicles 29:17). "David, who kept [God's] commandments, and who followed [Him] with all his heart, to do *that* only *which was* right in [His] eyes" (1 Kings 14:8), had such an upright heart. While David was no sinless man, but one who prayed: "Who can understand *his* errors? cleanse thou me from secret *faults*" (Psalm 19:12), nonetheless he did not willfully and deliberately turn away from God to iniquity, except in his adultery with Uriah's wife Bathsheba and the events associated with it—hence Scripture states: "David did *that which was* right in the eyes of the LORD, and turned not aside from any *thing* that he commanded him all the days of his life, save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite" (1 Kings 15:5). Thus, with the

---

148 טָהוֹר, Psalm 51:10; Proverbs 22:11.

149 יֵשׁ . . . הֲיֵשׁ אֶת־לְבָבְךָ יָשָׁר The legitimacy of the question is not undermined by the fact that Jehu's heart was not actually right when he spoke to Jonadab; Jonadab's zeal or holy jealousy for Jehovah (קַנְאָה לַיהוָה 2 Kings 10:16) and hatred of the idolatrous Baal worship Jehu was extirpating was genuine—Jonadab's heart was truly right, and he truly had the zeal that Jehu merely professed. Note that the Lord blessed Jonadab's zeal for the Lord, rejection of worldliness, and abstinence from wine with a godly seed (Jeremiah 35).

150 לֵבָב/לֵב יָשָׁר/יֹשֶׁר (cf. יָשַׁר

exception of "the matter of Uriah the Hittite," the heart of "David . . . was . . . perfect[151] with the LORD his God" (1 Kings 15:3). Having a right heart was not a matter of absolute sinlessness, but of "uprightness" (1 Kings 9:4), of not wilfully holding on to any sin—the right-hearted determine to follow God's ways rather than willfully turning aside after iniquity, but it would still be appropriate for them to say, in every prayer they make, "forgive us our sins" (Luke 11:4; Matthew 6:12). The believer who is right with God can state: "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear *me*: *But* verily God hath heard *me*; he hath attended to the voice of my prayer" (Psalm 66:18-19). A necessary condition to the answer of prayer is being right with God, not regarding iniquity in one's heart, that is, not seeing iniqutity with pleasure, or aiming at, designing, or having iniquity in one's eye[152]—nonetheless, the saint who is right with God still receives answers to prayer only because of "mercy" (Psalm 66:20), not merit. In contrast to David's determination in every inward and outward area to obey God, one could do "*that which was* right in the sight of the LORD" in an outward way, "but not with a perfect heart" (2 Chronicles 25:2), and certain people could be "more upright in heart to sanctify themselves"[153] (2 Chronicles 29:34) than others. Although they are not free from indwelling sin (cf. Deuteronomy 9:5), those who are "upright in heart" (Psalm 11:2; 32:11; 36:10; 64:10) are "good" (Psalm 125:4) in that they are walking uprightly and with a godly understanding (Proverbs 15:21), not willfully clinging to sin. They trust in the Lord and have no "iniquity in [their] hands," so they can pray: "judge me, O LORD, according to my righteousness, and according to mine integrity *that is* in me" (Psalm 7:10, 1, 3-4, 8; cf. Psalm 26:1).

---

151 שָׁלֵם, a word discussed in more depth in the next paragraph—the reference is placed here because of the insight to the nature of an upright or perfect heart manifested by David's life. A right heart is upright, honest, and straight rather than crooked (יָשָׁר), and is also well-rounded, complete, and under God's authority in every area of life (שָׁלֵם).

152 The condition in Psalm 66:18 is: אָוֶן אִם־רָאִיתִי בְלִבִּי לֹא יִשְׁמַע׀ אֲדֹנָי׃. Compare the sense of רָאָה in Psalm 37:37, "Mark the perfect *man*, and behold the upright: for the end of *that* man *is* peace," שְׁמֹר־תָּם וּרְאֵה יָשָׁר כִּי־אַחֲרִית לְאִישׁ שָׁלוֹם׃, and Genesis 20:10, מָה רָאִיתָ, and ἀδικίαν εἰ ἐθεώρουν ἐν καρδίᾳ μου μὴ εἰσακουσάτω κύριος, Iniquitatem si aspexi in corde meo, non exaudiet Dominus (LXX & Vulgate). Declarations similar in idea to Psalm 66:18 occur in Psalm 17:1-7; 18:20-27; 26:1–7. John Gill commented: "There was iniquity in [David's] heart, as there is in every good man's heart, and a great deal too; it is full of it; and it should be regarded in some sense, so as to guard against it, and pray to be kept from it, that it may not break forth into action; and so as to loath it, abhor it, and be humbled for it; but not so as to nourish and cherish it, to take delight and pleasure in it: [thus, the passage could be rendered] 'if I look upon it' . . . that is, with approbation of it, and satisfaction in it, and ordered his conversation according to it; or acted the deceitful and hypocritical part in prayer; or had any evil intention in his petitions, to consume on his lusts what he asked for[.]"

153 The situation of the Levites rather than the priests in the text—לֵבָב לְהִתְקַדֵּשׁ מֵהַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם יִשְׁרֵי.

Similarly, those with a "perfect heart"[154] "walk in [the LORD's] statutes, and . . . keep his commandments" (1 Kings 8:61). "Asa's heart was perfect with the LORD all his days" (1 Kings 15:14), in that his life was characterized by well-rounded[155] and sincere obedience,[156] although he certainly sinned, indeed, on particular occasions seriously (2 Chronicles 16). Hezekiah could honestly pray: "I beseech thee, O LORD, remember now how I have walked[157] before thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done *that which is* good in thy sight" (2 Kings 20:3; Isaiah 38:3). The service of a "perfect heart and . . . a willing mind"[158] (1 Chronicles 28:9) were associated, for a "perfect heart" was one of sincerity—thus, when the "men of war . . . came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king over all Israel" (1 Chronicles 12:38), they were not sinless, but they were free from duplicity in their intention to set up David as king. Worship with "a perfect heart" is associated with "offer[ing] willingly"[159] (1 Chronicles 29:9). A believer can have a perfect heart during one period of his life but not in another; "Solomon loved the LORD, walking in the statutes of David his father" (1 Kings 3:3) in the early part of his reign, walking humbly (1 Kings 3:6-10; 8:22-66) before Jehovah his God (1 Kings 5:4-5), so that the Lord gave him "wise and an understanding heart" (3:12; cf. 4:29-34; 10:23-24) above all other men and used the king to inspire portions of the canon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes); however, "when Solomon was old . . . his wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the LORD his God, as *was* the heart of David his father. And Solomon did evil in the sight of the LORD, and went not fully after the LORD, as *did* David his father. . . . And the LORD was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the LORD God of Israel . . . [and he no

---

154 לֵבָב/לֵב שָׁלֵם

155 Compare the idea of שָׁלֵם as *completeness* or *intactness* (KB).

156 Note that the "high places" of 1 Kings 15:14a refer to unauthorized altars to Jehovah, not to places where false gods were worshipped; cf. 1 Kings 22:43 (Heb. 22:44); 2 Kings 12:3; 14:4; 15:4, 35; 2 Chronicles 15:17; 20:33. Asa did destroy the places where idols were worshipped (2 Chronicles 14:3-5; cf. 17:6).

157 הָלַךְ in the Hithpael, the conjugation regularly employed for believers who walk with God, and indicating that they walked about, went to and fro, with Him in an iterative way (cf. Genesis 13:17; Exodus 21:19; Joshua 18:4, 8; Judges 21:24; 1 Samuel 12:2; 23:13; 30:31; 2 Samuel 11:2; 1 Chronicles 16:20; 21:4; Esther 2:11; Job 1:7; 2:2; 18:8; 22:14; 38:16; Psalm 12:8; 35:14; 39:6; 43:2; 58:7; 68:21; 77:17; 82:5; 101:2; 105:13; 119:45; Proverbs 6:22; 20:7; 23:31; 24:34 Ezekiel 1:13; 19:6; 28:14; Zechariah 1:10, 11; 6:7; 10:12), that is, they communed with Him and fellowshipped with Him (Genesis 3:8; 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15; Leviticus 26:12; Deuteronomy 23:15; 1 Samuel 2:30, 35; 2 Samuel 7:6–7; 2 Kings 20:3; 1 Chronicles 17:6; Psalm 56:14; 116:9; Isaiah 38:3; also see KB & BDB, and the references to human fellowship in 1 Samuel 25:15, 27; also see Psalm 26:3).

158 נֶפֶשׁ חֶפְצָה; service with willingness and desire (cf. 1 Kings 13:33; 21:6; 1 Chronicles 28:9; Nehemiah 1:11; Micah 7:18; Malachi 3:1; Psalm 5:5; 34:13; 35:27; 40:15; 70:3; 111:2) from the soul.

159 The Hithpael of נָדַב; "to make a voluntary decision . . . a voluntary contribution" (KB).

longer] kept [the LORD's] covenant and . . . statutes" (1 Kings 11:4-11).[160] Instead of his heart being "incline[d]"[161] to the LORD (1 Kings 8:58), his heart was now "turned away" (1 Kings 11:2, 4) after other supreme loves and thus "his heart was turned from the LORD God of Israel" (1 Kings 11:9), to do evil (1 Kings 11:6-7) and no longer go fully after Him (1 Kings 11:6). Thus, while sometimes the upright or perfect in heart are all those who "trust . . . in the LORD" and are "righteous" by the imputation of Christ's righteousness as their legal standing and the impartation of inward holiness, and as such are contrasted with the "wicked" who will dwell eternally in "fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest" (Psalm 11; cf. Psalm 32:11, 1-10; 36:10; 125:1-5), and so in one sense all the people of God have upright hearts, in another sense believers can fall into sin and lose their upright hearts.[162]

Job was by no means sinless and perfect like God his Father was (Job 40:4; 42:6), yet he was "perfect" in that he was "upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil" (Job 1:1; cf. 1:8-9),[163] one who in spite of exceedingly difficult trials "sinned not, nor charged God foolishly" (1:22) but, as concerning His tribulations, "did not . . . sin with his lips" (2:10), but instead "retain[ed] [his] integrity" (2:9).[164] His relationship to God, his heart, and his life were characterized by completeness, soundness, and wholeness towards holiness and the Holy One, by sincerity, integrity, and honesty, by freedom from sinful blemishes[165] in heart towards Him[166]—Job was not intentionally acting in wilful disobedience in any area. Consequently, Job's prayers and worship were acceptable to God (42:9-10), and the Lord blessed him (42:12). Had Job given in to temptation, he

---

160 Note that the warning that marriages to pagan women "will turn away your heart after their gods" (2 Kings 11:2) refers to the Deuteronomic warning "they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods" (Deuteronomy 7:4), closely connecting the direction of the heart and the act of following.

161 נָטָה in the Hiphil, as is "turn away" in 1 Kings 11:2, 4; 11:9 contains the Qal.

162 In certain texts it is not immediately obvious whether the upright in heart are saints who are walking in integrity or the entire body of the saints; nonetheless, the Scriptural evidence for both sorts of uprightness is clear. Texts that are less immediately clear, as well as verses that clearly speak of the one sort of uprightness of heart or the other, nonetheless can illuminate characteristics of the uprightness both of all the elect and of those believers who are not holding on to known sin.

163 The LXX states that Ιωβ . . . ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ἀληθινός ἄμεμπτος δίκαιος θεοσεβής ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος (1:1; "Job . . . was true, blameless, righteous, *and* godly, abstaining from everything evil."). The Targum states that Job was ועדי מן בישׁ׃ שׁלים ותריץ דחיל מן־קדם ייי.

For the idea in the description of sinful earthly saints as "perfect," see the section "Vivification as Perfecting" above.

164 מַחֲזִיק בְּתֻמָּתֶךָ; Job kept hold of, seized, or grasped his perfectness.

165 Compare the use of תְּמִים for blemish-free sacrifical animals, Exodus 12:5; 29:1; etc.

166 Thus, by תְּמִים/תֻּמָּה/תֹּם/תָּם/תמם.

would have fallen from his state of uprightness and integrity to no longer be right with God. He who has a right or "perfect" heart is "undefiled" (Song 5:2), walks in "integrity of heart, and in uprightness" (1 Kings 9:4; Psalm 78:72), in "the integrity of [his] heart and innocency of [his] hands" (Genesis 20:5-6), free from intentional and wilful sin, although not sinless (Genesis 20:3-9). He behaves wisely, desires communion with Jehovah, and maintains purity in his household so he can maintain a perfect heart there (Psalm 101:2). He sets or deliberately places before him no wicked thing, but hates wickedness and the wicked and is determined that they will be separated from him (101:3-5, 7-8), especially in what pertains to the worship of the Lord (101:8), choosing rather as his companions the faithful who walk "in a perfect way" (101:6). His heart is not froward, crooked, or twisted, but he is upright in his way (Proverbs 11:20). His "heart [is] sound in [God's] statutes" (Psalm 119:80). His walk is upright, his heart is truthful, and his actions righteous (Psalm 15:2; cf. 15:3-5). His all-around sincerity and desire for the literal perfection of the holy character of God is his submissive response to the command: "Thou shalt be perfect with the LORD thy God" (Deuteronomy 15:13).

The heart that is right with God is also "prepare[d] . . . unto the LORD" (1 Samuel 7:3).[167] Sinning believers must turn from whatever they idolatrously regard as more important than God, "return unto the LORD with all [their] hearts . . . prepare [their] hearts unto the LORD, and serve him only" (1 Samuel 7:3). Job 11:13-14 describes repentance as preparing of the heart: "If thou prepare thine heart, and stretch out thine hands toward [God]; if iniquity *be* in thine hand, put it far away, and let not wickedness dwell in thy tabernacles." Such a preparation or establishment of the heart is a gift of Divine grace; thus, the desire and prayer of the humble is that Jehovah would prepare and perfect their heart and the heart of others (1 Chronicles 29:18-19; Psalm 10:17), for a "clean heart" and a "right spirit," prepared for fellowship with the Lord, are the product of a supernatural creative act[168] of God in His people (Psalm 51:10).[169] If God does not

---

[167] כון and לֵבָב/לֵב. A distinction is present between כון in the Niphal and Hiphil; the heart is established or steadfast and caused to be established or steadfast, that is, prepared or fixed. Also, as with other combinations of words for the right with God, the "prepared heart" is both spoken of as the possesion of the believer who is in fellowship with the Lord and, at times, as a description of all the people of God in general as distinguished from the wicked and hell-bound and in settings where those who were heaven-bound but backslidden and those who were still hell-bound are grouped together (cf. Psalm 11:2; 78:8, 37), although in general the "prepared heart" is descriptive of the progressing believer in contrast with one who is regressing.

[168] Thus, Psalm 51:10 employs בָּרָא.

[169] Psalm 51 is a model for the type of prayer of repentance that is appropriate for a backslidden saint who wishes to again be right with God. Note that David knew that he did not lose his salvation as a result of his sin; his prayer in 51:11b, "take not thy holy spirit from me," refers to his desire not to lose the theocratic enduement with the Holy Spirit that he had received as the king over Israel, an empowerment he

sustain His people by His grace, their indwelling sin will lead them to fall (2 Chronicles 32:31), with terrible consequences (2 Chronicles 32:25-26; 2 Kings 20:12-18). The "fixed" or established heart "will sing and give praise" (Psalm 57:7; 108:1). One who "is stablished . . . cannot be moved" easily into rebellion and sin (cf. Psalm 93:1; 112:6-8); "his heart is fixed, trusting in the LORD" (Psalm 112:7). He can have God powerfully working in his life and ministry, as Ezra had "the good hand of his God upon him[,] [f]or [he] had prepared his heart to seek the law of the LORD, and to do *it*, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments" (Ezra 7:9-10; cf. 2 Chronicles 19:13). Indeed, while outward nonconformity to Divine standards are sinful and in need of pardon (2 Chronicles 30:18-20), the Lord is merciful to "every one *that* prepareth his heart to seek God, the LORD God of his fathers, though *he be* not *cleansed*" outwardly as he ought (2 Chronicles 30:19), indicating that one can have a heart that is right with God and sincere before Him while he yet lacks a great deal of knowledge of Biblical precepts and is not outwardly obedient because of a lack of instruction. On the other hand, a man will do "evil, because he prepare[s] not his heart to seek the LORD" (2 Chronicles 12:14), and righteous deeds are hindered (2 Chronicles 20:33a) because "people ha[ve] not prepared their hearts unto the God of their fathers" (2 Chronicles 20:33b). Those who do not establish their hearts, who "set not their heart aright, and whose spirit [is] not stedfast with God," are "stubborn and rebellious," and "their heart [is] not right with [God]" (Psalm 78:8, 37). The Lord blesses[170] those among His people who have upright, clean, and prepared hearts for Him, and withholds His full blessing from those of His own who do not.

Those among the people of God who are not right with God are "backsliding"[171] (Hosea 4:16)—they are in wilful and deliberate sin, stubbornly and rebelliously[172]

---

had received upon being anointed to his office (1 Samuel 16:13), as Saul had received it upon his anointing (1 Samuel 10:1-11). Saul had lost this theocratic enduement when he was rejected as king for his disobedience and David was anointed (1 Samuel 16:1-14). This sort of theocratic rejection was what David prayed to be spared from in Psalm 51:11.

170 A phrase used for Jehovah's blessing in Ezra and Nehemiah is to have God's hand upon one who belongs to Him or to have His good hand upon a believer or group of His people for good (Ezra 7:6, 9, 28; 8:18, 22, 31; Nehemiah 2:8, 18; note that God is specified in these texts as "my" God, "our" God, or "his" God, the God of the person or group who have His hand upon him or them, and the phrase is often employed in association with the covenant name *Jehovah*). Only those believers who are right with God can have His hand upon them for good in the way Ezra and Nehemiah did.

171 סָרַר.

172 Thus, the verb סָרַר, which is the "backsliding" of Hosea 4:16, means "to be stubborn" (KB), a way the verb is translated in Deuteronomy 21:18, 20; Psalm 78:8; Proverbs 7:11. The verb is rendered as "rebellious" in Psalm 66:7; 68:6, 19; Isaiah 1:23; 30:1; 65:2, and as "revolting," in a state of revolt, in Jeremiah 5:23; 6:28; Hosea 9:15. It "lays stress on attitude, whereas the synonymous *mārad* emphasizes rebellious actions" (*TWOT*, סָרַר).

holding on to iniquity, and consequently those who "set not their heart aright" (Psalm 78:8),[173] and are spiritually decaying and becoming weaker. Backsliding[174] is refusing to hearken to God as He speaks in His Word, instead acting like a stubborn ox that will not allow a yoke on its neck and obey its master (Nehemiah 9:29; Hosea 4:16; Zechariah 7:11). Since such rebellion against God is characteristic of the unconverted, the "backsliding" are regularly lost people (Isaiah 65:2),[175] those who "believed not in God, and trusted not in his salvation" (Psalm 78:8, 22) and are in need of saving conversion (Psalm 78:7a) even if they are outwardly identified with the Lord (Psalm 78:35).[176] However, as Scripture both speaks of all the saints as those who are right with God, and identifies only those who are walking uprightly among His own as right with God in another sense, so while the backsliding or rebellious are regularly the unsaved, at times those who are truly converted are spoken of as backsliding.[177] Thus, while the unsaved

---

[173] Thus, those who are backsliding, a דּוֹר סוֹרֵר וּמֹרֶה דּוֹר, are those who are not upright in heart, לֹא־הֵכִין לִבּוֹ.

[174] The complete list of references to the English "backsliding" are: Proverbs 14:14; Jeremiah 2:19; 3:6, 8, 11–12, 14, 22; 5:6; 8:5; 14:7; 31:22; 49:4; Hosea 4:16; 11:7; 14:4; the Hebrew words involved are: סרר, סוג, מְשׁוּבָה, and שׁוֹבָב.

[175] Thus, Isaiah 65:2 does not just contextually refer to idolatrous and unconverted Israelites (65:2-7), but is employed by Paul of the unregenerate Jews who reject the gospel (Romans 10:21), in contrast with those Gentiles who believe it (Isaiah 65:1; Romans 10:20). Note that it is clearly erroneous to assume that because Israel was, in a national sense, the people of God, that therefore every passage in which the Lord addresses His chosen nation refers to those who truly belong to Him, and that consequently texts warning sinning Israel must refer to the saved who are not living as they ought instead of to the unconverted (cf. Romans 9). Many of the texts employing the verb for "backsliding" in Hosea 4:16 refer to the lost (note the complete list of texts: Deuteronomy 21:18, 20; Nehemiah 9:29; Psalm 66:7; 68:7, 19; 78:8; Proverbs 7:11; Isaiah 1:23; 30:1; 65:2; Jeremiah 5:23; 6:28; Hosea 4:16; 9:15; Zechariah 7:11); indeed, none of the passages with סָרַר clearly and definitively refer to a disobedient saved person, although a reference to both the lost and disobedient saved is possible in several references.

[176] Compare the Psalm 78 texts and the status of Israel in the wilderness to "Excursus IV: Hebrews 3-4 As An Alleged Evidence For Perpetually Sinning Christians" below.

[177] The description of those who "seek" (בקשׁ) Jehovah is comparable. In addition to seeking the Lord in relation to specific requests (2 Samuel l2:16; 21:1; Ezra 8:21-23; Daniel 8:15; 9:3), some texts indicate that all believers seek Him (Zephaniah 1:4-6; Psalm 83:16—cf. the specific seeking after the Messiah, Malachi 3:1), other texts identify believers who are right with God, rather than backslidden believers, as those who seek Him (2 Chronicles 7:14; 15:2-4), and in many instances both the conversion of unsaved individuals and the restoration of those who already are the spiritual people of God can be in view (cf. the complete list of relevant verses: Exodus 10:11; 33:7; Deuteronomy 4:29; 2 Samuel 12:16; 21:1; 1 Chronicles 16:10–11; 2 Chronicles 7:14; 15:4, 15; 20:4; 22:9; Ezra 8:21–23; Psalm 27:8; 40:16; 69:6; 83:16; 105:3–4; Proverbs 2:4; 14:6; 15:14; 28:5; Isaiah 45:19; 51:1; 65:1; Jeremiah 29:13; 50:4; Daniel 8:15; 9:3; Hosea 3:5; 5:6, 15; 7:10; Zephaniah 1:6; 2:3; Zechariah 8:21–22; Malachi 3:1).

While a higher percentage of texts where people "seek" (דרשׁ) Jehovah refer to specific tasks (Genesis 25:22; Exodus 18:15, etc.) than do the references with the verb בקשׁ, with דרשׁ also certain texts indicate that all those who are saved seek God (Psalm 10:4; 14:2; 53:2; Isaiah 55:6; 65:1, 10; note also saved Gentiles seeking the Messiah, Isaiah 11:10), while others demonstrate that not all the redeemed seek after the Lord as they ought to (1 Chronicles 15:13; 2 Chronicles 16:12; 26:5). Note the complete list of relevant texts: Genesis 25:22; Exodus 18:15; Deuteronomy 4:29; 12:5; 1 Kings 22:5, 7–8; 2 Kings 1:3, 6,

will backslide or "go back" from God (Psalm 53:3; Zephaniah 1:6),[178] and will reap the evil eternal consequences of their sin, since "the backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways" (Proverbs 14:14),[179] nonetheless believers can likewise backslide (Psalm 80:18).[180] Indeed, the saints, because of their indwelling sin, would certainly be turned back[181] were they not the recipients of sustaining grace from Jehovah; their flesh is bent to backsliding (Hosea 11:7; Isaiah 57:17), so they appropriately pray, "quicken us, and we will call upon thy name. Turn us again, O LORD God of hosts, cause thy face to shine; and we shall be saved" (Psalm 80:18b-19). Because God quickens them, turns them, and causes His face to shine upon them, they can say, "so will not we go back from thee" (Psalm 80:18a). Further, all of the supernatural power of God exerted upon His people to keep them from backsliding is only bestowed upon the saints for Christ's sake—thus, they pray: "Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man[182] *whom* thou madest strong for thyself. So will not we go back from thee" (Psalm

---

16; 3:11; 8:8; 22:13, 18; 1 Chronicles 10:14; 13:3; 15:13; 16:11; 21:30; 22:19; 28:8–9; 2 Chronicles 1:5; 12:14; 14:4, 7; 15:2, 12–13; 16:12; 17:3–4; 18:4, 6–7; 19:3; 20:3; 22:9; 30:19; 31:21; 32:31; 34:3, 21, 26; Ezra 4:2; 6:21; 7:10; Job 5:8; Psalm 9:10; 10:4; 14:2; 22:26; 34:4, 10; 53:2; 69:32; 77:2; 78:34; 105:4; 119:2, 10; Is 8:19; 9:13; 11:10; 31:1; 55:6; 58:2; 65:1, 10; Jerermiah 10:21; 21:2; 29:13; 37:7; Lamentations 3:25; Ezekiel 14:3, 7, 10; 20:1, 3, 31; 36:37; Hosea 10:12; Amos 5:4–6, 14; Zephaniah 1:6. Note also the verses that employ both בקשׁ and דרשׁ, often in parallelism: Deuteronomy 4:29; Judges 6:29; 1 Samuel 28:7; Isaiah 65:1; Jerermiah 29:13; Ezekiel 34:6; Zephaniah 1:6; Psalm 24:6; 38:13; 105:4; Job 10:6; Proverbs 11:27; 1 Chronicles 16:11; 2 Chronicles 22:9.

[178] The verb סוג is employed. The immediate context of both Psalm 53:3 and Zephaniah 1:6 make it clear that the backslider is unconverted in these passages (cf. also Romans 3:12). The complete list of סוג texts is: Deuteronomy 19:14; 27:17; 2 Samuel 1:22; Psalm 35:4; 40:14; 44:18; 53:3; 70:2; 78:57; 80:18; 129:5; Proverbs 14:14; 22:28; 23:10; Isaiah 42:17; 50:5; 59:13–14; Jeremiah 38:22; 46:5; Hosea 5:10; Micah 2:6; 6:14; Zephaniah 1:6. The verb is related to סִיג, "dross" (Psalm 119:119; Proverbs 25:4; 26:23; Isaiah 1:22, 25; Ezekiel 22:18–19), as dross is that which is turned away or cast aside in the process of refining metal; cf. כִּי־שִׁיג לֹו, 1 Kings 18:27.

[179] מִדְּרָכָיו יִשְׂבַּע סוֹג לֵב וּמֵעָלָיו אִישׁ טוֹב׃

[180] The verb סוג is also employed here; it is in the Qal both in Psalm 80:18 and in Psalm 53:3. The Qal also appears in Proverbs 14:14, where the passive participle סוג is translated "the backslider." In the Hiphil the verb means "to cause something to go back" or "to remove" (Deuteronomy 19:14; 27:27; Proverbs 22:28; 23:10; Hosea 5:10; Micah 6:14); compare the Hophal in Isaiah 59:14.

[181] Compare סוג in the Niphal in 2 Samuel 1:22; Psalm 35:4; 40:14; 44:18; 70:2; 78:57; 129:5; Isaiah 42:17; 59:13; Jeremiah 38:22; 46:5; Micah 2:6; Zephaniah 1:6. Note that in Jeremiah 38:22; 46:5 a literal turning back is in view (cf. also Psalm 35:4; 40:14; 70:2; 78:57; 129:5).

[182] The mediatorial Son of Man (בֶּן־אָדָם) of Psalm 80:17 is God's Anointed, His Messiah, the מְשִׁיחוֹ of Psalm 20:6, who is the "man of Thy right hand" (אִישׁ יְמִינֶךָ) in Psalm 80:17 in that He is the One who sits at Jehovah's right hand as Prophet, Priest, and King (cf. Psalm 110:1), and He is that Son of Man, the בֶּן־אָדָם, the second Adam through whom the dominion of man over the earth will be restored according to Psalm 8:4 (cf. Hebrews 2:6-9), and the One foreseen in Daniel 7:13: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, *one* like the Son of man [כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ] came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him."

80:17-18a). As God quickens His own for the sake of Christ, they also can follow the example of the incarnate Messiah, who said: "The Lord GOD hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back" (Isaiah 50:5).[183] Strengthened by God to remain right with Him, His obedient people consequently say: "[W]e [have] not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falsely in thy covenant. Our heart is not turned back,[184] neither have our steps declined from thy way" (Psalm 44:17-18).

Those without spiritual strength backslide[185] (Proverbs 1:32). Backsliding can increase (Jeremiah 5:6) in degree, becoming worse and worse (Jeremiah 14:7) as one slides backwards further and further, until it is "perpetual" as one continually "refuse[s] to return" (Jeremiah 8:5). Israel's backsliding was "wickedness . . . an evil *thing* and bitter," a result of having "forsaken the LORD thy God" and of not having His "fear . . . in thee" (Jeremiah 2:19). It is a rejection of God's call and a refusal to exalt Him (Hosea 11:7), holding fast to deceit instead of to the Lord (Jeremiah 8:5). Backsliding is spiritual infidelity (Jeremiah 3:6) that leads to the commission of outward wickedness. It contains within itself the seeds of judgment and evil for the one or the group that engages in it (Jeremiah 2:19). The backslidden saint will lose his closeness and communion with his God, the backsliding professor without Christ is in danger of having his rejection of grace eternally confirmed to him, and the backsliding church is in danger of ceasing to be the place of the special presence of God (Revelation 2:5), as the northern kingdom of Israel and the southern kingdom of Judah were rejected by God, and finally, in connection with the inaguration of the dispensation of grace, Israel as a whole was rejected for the church (Jeremiah 3:8-11; Romans 11). Backsliding brings the unstable believer chastisement and the lost destruction (Proverbs 1:32).

The backsliding of the nation of Israel presents a pattern for the nature of backsliding and restoration into a state of being right with God.[186] Backsliding requires that one fall from a previously present condition of some sort of unity with Jehovah,

---

183 אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה פָּתַח־לִי אֹזֶן וְאָנֹכִי לֹא מָרִיתִי אָחוֹר לֹא נָסוֹגְתִּי׃. Jehovah is the Speaker in v. 5 (cf. Isaiah 50:1), yet He is sent by a distinct Person who is also Jehovah (v. 4-5) and becomes incarnate to suffer the scorn of men and bring them salvation (v. 6-9) as the servant of Jehovah (v. 10; cf. Isaiah 52:13-53:12).

184 לֹא־נָסוֹג אָחוֹר לִבֵּנוּ

185 The texts examined below generally speak of backsliding with the word מְשׁוּבָה (Proverbs 1:32; Jeremiah 2:19; 3:6, 8, 11–12, 22; 5:6; 8:5; 14:7; Hosea 11:7; 14:5).

186 Texts speaking of the backsliding of Israel also illustrate that not individuals alone, but also the entirety of God's institution of public worship may be backslidden (cf. Jeremiah 2:19); thus, one can appropriately speak of the entire nation of Israel as backslidden at various times in the Old Testament and as right with God at other times (cf. Judges 10:6-16, etc.); likewise one can appropriately refer to a church in the dispensation of grace as right with God (Revelation 2:8-11; 3:7-13) or as backslidden (Revelation 2:1-7).

whether from the state of genuine fellowship with the Lord possessed by the justified who are right with God, or from the state of outward or civil union with God that the unconverted but formally obedient Israelite possessed through his circumcision and formal conformity to his national covenant, or from some other state of connection with God that is renounced.[187] Israel was restored from a backslidden condition by the repentance of the true people of God within the nation and the evangelical conversion or at least the restored civil conformity to the Law by the unsaved in Israel. Restoration from a backslidden state is a gift of God's grace, given to the people of God for His name's sake, not because they deserve restoration (Jeremiah 14:7). God determines, "I will heal their backsliding," not because of their merit, but because "I will love them freely" (Hosea 14:4). He "heals their backsliding" because His "anger is turned away" (Hosea 14:4) from them—free love and a removal of Divine anger is the cause of the gracious work of the Lord to heal the backsliding of His own. Jehovah says, "I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger . . . for I *am* God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee," and therefore He says of His own, "They shall walk after the LORD" (Hosea 11:9-10; cf. Jeremiah 3:19). The saints do not first return to God, and then have Him love them, but their return is the result of sovereign and free love that draws them to repentance while they are yet in their rebellious and backslidden state. They hear the Lord call to them: "[T]hou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to me, saith the LORD" (Jeremiah 3:1). They recognize the magnitude of their sin and the justice of their God's chastisement of them (Jeremiah 3:2-3, 6ff.). They turn to God, not "feignedly," but "with [their] whole heart" (Jeremiah 3:10); the fact of God's continuing love for and goodness towards them while in their sin overwhelms them with shame at their iniquity and draws them to return to Him, in accordance with God's supernaturally working within them to lead them to freely and wholeheartedly turn to Him. Jehovah calls, "Turn, O backsliding[188] children . . . for I am married unto you. . . . Return, ye backsliding children, *and* I will heal your backslidings," and they respond, "Behold, we come unto thee; for thou *art* the LORD our God" (Jeremiah 3:14, 22).

The New Testament maintains the distinction between the believer who is right with God and the one who is backsliding[189] that is taught in the Old Testament, while also following the Old Testament in affirming that, in another sense, all believers are

---

187 Psalm 53:3 is an instance in which all men, by virtue of their fall in Adam, have backslidden (סוג) from their former state of rectitude in the loins of their progenitor, racial representative, and federal head.

188 שׁוֹבָב; בָּנִים שׁוֹבָבִים is also employed for backsliding in Jeremiah 3:22; 50:6; Isaiah 57:17.

189 Compare, for a New Testament doctrine of backsliding, the discussion of terms relating to spiritual *weakness* in the section "Vivification as Strengthening" above.

right with God, while those who are not right are unconverted. Peter warned Simon the sorceror, "thy heart is not right in the sight of God,"[190] and consequently Simon was going to "perish . . . in the bond of iniquity" unless he repented and was truly converted (Acts 8:20-23). Simon, and all the unregenerate, are warned that they are not right with God and are set in contrast to all who are born again. On the other hand, all believers are "washed" and "clean every whit," but they still need to wash their feet (John 13:10). All believers are pure in heart[191] and will see God (Matthew 5:8; Titus 1:15) and all have "good"[192] hearts because they are "good men" (Matthew 12:35; Luke 6:45), for God purified their hearts at the moment of their faith and regeneration (Acts 15:9).[193] Nevertheless, not all, in another sense, have a pure heart (1 Timothy 1:5; cf. 1 Peter 1:22[194]). A believer's heart can be "hardened," hindering his spiritual understanding

---

190 ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεῖα ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ; Simon's heart was not "straight, direct . . . in moral sense, *straightforward* . . . opp[osite] σκολιός" (*LSJ*), that is, his heart was not "proper, right" but "morally bent or twisted" (BDAG, εὐθύς, σκολιός). The εὐθύς/σκολιός contrast is only employed in the New Testament of the contrast between the regenerate and the unregenerate (cf. Acts 13:10; 2 Peter 2:15 with Acts 2:40; Philippians 2:15; 1 Peter 2:18; the literal references to the words appear in Matthew 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4–5 (εὐθύς) and Luke 3:5, σκολιός). Compare also εὐθύνω (John 1:23; James 3:4). On the other hand, not all believers faithfully make "straight paths" for their feet (τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς, Hebrews 12:13; cf. Acts 14:10 for the only other use of ὀρθός).

191 καθαρός.

192 ἀγαθός.

193 Acts 15:7-9 reads: And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men *and* brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as *he did* unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης ἀναστὰς Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο, διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ πιστεῦσαι. καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης Θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς, δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν· καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινε μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν. The passage clearly refers in context to the definitive cleansing that takes place at the moment of faith and regeneration, not to progressive sanctification (as erroneously affirmed, among others, by Robert Pearsall Smith; see, e. g., pg. 92, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875; also, pg. 71, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Charles Harford: "Faith in sanctification . . . is precisely the same faculty as that exercised in receiving remission, and its exercise is quite as simple as then; but it now takes another direction. And this direction figures very largely in the Scriptures in the matter of the Christian's victory over sin, or deliverance from it . . . see e.g. Acts xv. 9[.]"). At the same moment, the Gentiles heard (ἀκοῦσαι), believed (πιστεῦσαι), were witnessed to or attested to by God (ἐμαρτύρησεν) by being given (δοὺς) the Holy Ghost, had no difference put (διέκρινε) between them and the Jews, and had their hearts purified (καθαρίσας), namely, at the moment of faith, the faith whereby they came to trust in Christ, not faith wherein they were to live their Christian lives. Note the aorist tense of all the verbs. The Gentiles received an inward evangelical purification at the time of their conversion, a purification which the Old Testament ceremony of circumcision could only symbolize and point towards.

194 One could paraphrase the verse: "Since you have purified your soul by being born again, love with a pure heart." τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ Πνεύματος εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον, ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς·

(Mark 6:52; 8:17),[195] so that he is "slow of heart" to believe and receive truth (Luke 24:25),[196] but a strong believer can be a man after God's own heart (Acts 13:22), one who has greatly set apart or sanctified the Lord in his heart (1 Peter 3:15). The believer's heart can either convict him as guilty or not condemn him (1 John 3:20-21),[197] based on his manifestation of inward and outward Christlikeness (1 John 3:18-22). Double-minded and sinning believers are consequently commanded to cleanse their hands and purify their hearts (James 4:8), and walk in the light in order to experience continued cleansing from the blood of Christ (1 John 1:7).[198] Some believers are filled with the Spirit, others are not (Ephesians 5:18). The Old Testament doctrine that backsliders may be either unconverted persons or sinning believers appears in the New Testament fact that he who is placed under church discipline is treated as a heathen man and a publican (Matthew 18:15-20), that is, he is treated like an unregenerate person, although he may

---

[195] πωρόω is employed both for the hardness of the believer's heart as a result of his remaining indwelling sin and for the unchangeably dominant (although it can grow stronger through more active rebellion to God) inclination of the unregenerate man's heart; note the complete list of New Testament texts: Mark 6:52; 8:17; John 12:40; Romans 11:7; 2 Corinthians 3:14. In contrast, the verb σκληρύνω is employed only of the hard-heartedness of the unregenerate in the New Testament (Acts 19:9; Romans 9:18; Hebrews 3:8, 13, 15; 4:7; however, note the uses of σκληροκαρδία, Matthew 19:8; Mark 10:5; 16:14).

[196] While a definite right with God/not right with God distinction is taught in many passages that speak about the heart (καρδία), there are likewise many texts that associate the "heart" with the progressive aspect of sanctification; for example, while Christ is already in all believer's hearts (Romans 8:10; 2 Corinthians 13:5), progressive sanctification results in an increase in His special presence in the heart (Ephesians 3:17), just as it results in a greater measure of grace in the heart (Colossians 3:16) and progressive establishment of the believer's heart in unblameable holiness (1 Thessalonians 3:13; cf. Hebrews 13:9).

[197] ὅτι ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία, ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γινώσκει πάντα. ἀγαπητοί, ἐὰν ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν, παρρησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. The verb καταγινώσκω, to "lay a charge against, convict, condemn" (see *LSJ*), is employed only in 1 John 3:20-21 and Galatians 2:11, where κατεγνωσμένος ἦν is translated "he was to be blamed."

[198] Note the distinction between the present tense of καθαρίζω for the cleansing that accompanies a continued walk in the light in 1 John 1:7 (καθαρίζει) and the aorist tense of in 1 John 1:9 (καθαρίσῃ) for the cleansing of sins that are in particular confessed. But note also: "[W]e would advert to a flagrant misapplication of a text in [1 John], which occurs in almost every [of the Keswick and Higher Life] books before us: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." We have often of late been pained to hear this precious text misquoted and misapplied by a different class of men from those with whom we are now dealing. The contextual condition being overlooked, and the all-important personal pronoun *us* being omitted, the text is frequently used by evangelists as if it taught the immediate pardon of all the sins of the sinner, on his acceptance fo Christ as his Saviour. This is a wrong use of the text, but still a use of it in support of a great truth of which the Bible is full. But the [Higher Life] writers . . . pervert it utterly when they make it refer to their perfection of sanctification, or to sanctification at all. It does not teach the justification of the sinner, neither does it teach the sanctification of the believer, but it teaches the continuous acceptance of the saint, notwithstanding the imperfection of his holiness. Instead of teaching the [Keswick] doctrine in support of which it is so often quoted, it so distinctly implies the opposite, that it would have no meaning if that doctrine were true, unless, indeed, there be meaning in cleansing the clean" (pg. 274, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280).

not in fact be unconverted, so that repentance and restoration can restore a disciplined member to the church body without a second call to new birth (1 Corinthians 5:1-13; 2 Corinthians 2:5-8). Some believers can fail to be right with God, partake of the Lord's Supper "unworthily"[199] (1 Corinthians 11:27, 29) and so bring judgment and chastisement upon themselves (1 Corinthians 11:29-32), having failed to properly examine[200] themselves (1 Corinthians 11:28) and act upon what they were enabled to discover, while other believers, those who are right with God, are, through Divine grace, worthy partakers. Some believers are counted worthy[201] (2 Thessalonians 1:11) in certain areas of spiritual life, and others are not. Not all the saints "walk worthy"[202] of their heavenly vocation to the same degree (Ephesians 4:1; Colossians 1:10; 1 Thessalonians 2:12), or conduct their lifestyle in a worthy way (Philippians 1:27) even though God has foreordained that all believers have a holy walk (Ephesians 2:10), so some degree of the worthiness that is appropriate to the saints of God (Romans 16:2; 3 John 6) will appear in the lives of all the elect. Believers who are wilfully allowing inward or outward sin[203] to fester do not have the "true heart" that is required for acceptable worship (Hebrews 10:22),[204] unlike believers who are upright and sincere before God in all areas of life and strive after the universal mortification of their sin. Furthermore, as in the Old Testament restoration from backsliding is a fruit of supernatural, preceding, sovereign grace, not a mere self-creation of the human will, so in the New Testament the restoration of saints from a backsliding condition, as their wider preservation and perseverence, is a fruit of the preceding, unmerited, free love and grace of Jesus Christ, their High Priest and effectual Mediator (John 17; Luke 22:32[205]).

---

199 ἀναξίως. Compare 1 Corinthians 6:2, ἀνάξιος.

200 δοκιμάζω. Such examination should be done with reference to an upright Christian walk, and being right with God in such a sense (1 Corinthians 11:28), and with reference to one's particular works as a believer (Galatians 6:4; Ephesians 5:10; 1 Thessalonians 5:21). Examination should also be undertaken with reference to one's state as regenerate or unregenerate, and thus to being right with God as opposed to being an object of His wrath (2 Corinthians 13:5), and to the claims of spiritual leaders (1 John 4:1).

201 ἀξιόω. Compare the other references to the verb in the NT in Luke 7:7; Acts 15:38; 28:22; 1 Timothy 5:17; Hebrews 3:3; 10:29. All believers, in a different sense, are worthy (καταξιόω); see Luke 20:35; 21:36; this sense also likely appears in Acts 5:41; 2 Thessalonians 1:5.

202 ἀξίως, here with περιπατέω, as in Ephesians 2:10. Exhortations with περιπατέω (4:1, 17; 5:2, 8, 15) form the divisions of the half of Ephesians devoted to application, chapters 4-6, and they build from the statement in 2:10, which itself is placed in contrast with the περιπατέω of the unregenerate in 2:2. Compare Colossians 1:10; 2:6; 3:7; 4:5.

203 That is, in terms of Hebrews 10:22, when their hearts are not sprinkled from an evil concscience, and their bodies washed in pure water.

204 Cf. *Exposition of Hebrews*, John Owen, on Hebrews 10:22.

205 In Luke 22:31-32, Christ says: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired *to have* you, that he may sift *you* as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren" (Σίμων, Σίμων, ἰδού, ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς, τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν

While all unregenerate men have a defiled conscience[206] (Titus 1:15), they can nonetheless either be condemned (John 8:9) or acquitted by their conscience (Acts 23:1; Romans 2:15; 2 Timothy 1:3) as they either meet or fall short of its standard, something they can do to the point that they cauterize their conscience (1 Timothy 4:2). Comparably, while believers cannot sear their consciences, and they all have a conscience that has been cleansed by Christ (Titus 1:15), they can nonetheless either have a clear (Acts 23:1; 24:16; Romans 9:1; 2 Timothy 1:3) or a condemning conscience (1 Corinthians 8:7-12;[207] Romans 14:20-23) for either specific acts (Romans 9:1; 13:5; 1 Corinthians 8:7-12; 10:25-29; 1 Peter 2:19) or for their overall state (Acts 24:16) as being upright before God or backsliding. Thus, all believers have a "good" or "pure" conscience in the same sense that all believers are right with God, but all the saints do not all have a "good" or "pure" conscience in that some believers are growing and others are backsliding (1 Timothy 1:5, 19; 3:9; 2 Timothy 1:3; Hebrews 13:18; 1 Peter 3:16, 21). A pure conscience marks all believers who are right with God; all upright Christians, all who seek for a universal, unexceptioned mortification of their sin, possess such a clean conscience, while all who are willfully holding on to or permitting sin in their lives have lost their clear conscience and have fallen from the state of being right with God. Believers who are right with God, and therefore have a clear conscience, can "rejoic[e] [in] . . . the testimony of [their] conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, [they] have had [their] conversation in the world, and more abundantly" towards other believers (2 Corinthians 1:12). In that they are not consciously and wilfully holding on to sin, they have "no more conscience of sins" as none come to their "remembrance"; their conscience is "clean"[208] rather than being an "evil conscience" (Hebrews 9:9, 14; 10:2-3; 22).[209]

σῖτον· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπῃ ἡ πίστις σου· καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.). The fact that Peter's faith would not fail was due to the intercession of Christ, and his turning again from a backslidden state was not an "if," but a "when," also as a result of the intercession of his Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous (1 John 2:1). Compare Christ's intercession for those who literally placed Him on the cross (Luke 23:34) and their coming to faith (Luke 23:47; Matthew 27:54; Mark 15:39).

206 συνείδησις; see John 8:9; Acts 23:1; 24:16; Romans 2:15; 9:1; 13:5; 1 Corinthians 8:7, 10, 12; 10:25, 27–29; 2 Corinthians 1:12; 4:2; 5:11; 1 Timothy 1:5, 19; 3:9; 4:2; 2 Timothy 1:3; Titus 1:15; Hebrews 9:9, 14; 10:2, 22; 13:18; 1 Peter 2:19; 3:16, 21.

207 The "brother" of 1 Corinthians 8:7-12 could either be a genuine Christian or a mere professing "brother" (cf. Acts 1:16; 2:29, 37; 3:17; 13:26; Hebrews 3:12, etc. for "brethren" referring to fellow Jews, or mere professors, rather than specifically to true believers), as evidenced by 8:11.

208 καθαρίζω, Hebrews 9:14; cf. 1 John 1:7, 9.

209 While Hebrews 9-10 specifically contrasts the conscience of those in the Mosaic dispensation with those in the dispensation of grace, so that the repeated animal sacrifices constantly brought sin to remembrance for those in the Old Testament, unlike those who have their sin removed once and for all

Baptists have historically accepted the existence of both the Biblical distinction between believers who are right with God and those who are not and the distinction between those who, as God's people, are eternally right with God, in contrast to the unregenerate, who abide in death.[210] In the recognition that only believers who are free

---

through the sacrifice of Christ, the point about the individual conscience of the New Testament saint who is right with God being clean, free from the remembrance of sin, is still valid, although one could well say that all believers in the New Testament have had their conscience purged by the blood of Christ in the sense that they have all been justified, positionally sanctified, and legally "perfected forever" (Hebrews 10:10-14).

[210] For example, Jesse Mercer, in an 1806 Circular for the Georgia Baptist Association, spoke of "[t]hat restraint which a Christian[,] when right with God, places on the passions and propensities of the carnal heart, by which he subdues and maintains the victory over them; and secondly, that government which he exercises over the members of his body, by which he sanctifies them for, and employs them[,] in the service of God." (*History of the Georgia Baptist Association*, by Jesse Mercer, Part 3, "Circular Letters," Circular #10. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection CD*). In the seventeeth century, Baptist preacher Thomas Patient prayed that his fellow Christian (Oliver Cromwell here in particular) would continue in a state of uprightness or rightness before God:

> My constant prayers are at the throne of grace for you, that you may be kept upright with God, and in nothing left to sin and dishonour God; his name being so much concerned in it. Therefore, as God hath formerly given you the experience of the benefit of a humble walking with God, I beseech you in the bowels of Christ, still keep a close watch over your own heart, and labour to walk under the sense of that body of death and your daily infirmities, and to see a need of godly repentance daily, and humiliation, and fresh strength from Christ by faith, by which you may be kept and preserved in a fresh, sweet, and comfortable communion with God; for his presence will be all your happiness. Be sure to prize God's holy word, and all the rest of God's holy ordinances, and in so much as may be, neglect not to practise them, that you by your constant godly example may provoke others to holiness and to the fear of the Lord. And remember that the apostle bids, "*Exhort one another daily*, *lest any be hardened through the deceitfullness of sin*." Though you have ancient acquaintance with God and with your own heart, yet, say as David saith; *Lord*, *leave me not when I am old and grey headed*. Rest not in grace received, nor too much on former experiences, so as to neglect your future growth and progress in the ways of God. Apply that promise in Job 17; where God saith; *The righteous shall grow stronger and stronger*, *and he that hath clean hands shall hold on his way*. And know, it must be a special power of God that must keep you up to the will of God, to his honour and your comfort. And this, in the simplicity of my very heart, I desire may be in my own heart, and yours, and all that love God in sincerity and truth. ("Thomas Patient to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Chief General if the Parliament's forces in Scotland, From Kilkenny, April 15, 1650, in *Confessions of Faith and Other Public Documents*, Underhill, Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection CD;* cf. J. M. Cramp, *Baptist History*, Chapter 4, "The Troublous Period," (1567-1688).)

John Bunyan, in his 1675 Catechism, wrote: "Is there any other whose prayer God refuseth?-A. Yes; 'If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me' (Psa 66:18)" (pg. 687, *Instructions for the Ignorant*, John Bunyan, vol. 2) to which Bunyan's editor correctly noted, "That our prayers may be heard, the heart should be right with God, and our souls at peace with him through the Son of his love" (footnote #18, *ibid*).

Baptists likewise employed "right with God" terminology to contrast the regenerate and the unregenerate, a different sort of distinction from that between the upright and backslidden believer, but certainly a legitimate one. For instance, the famous nineteenth century Baptist pastor Charles Spurgeon preached: "Get right with God; confess thy sin; believe in Jesus Christ, the appointed Savior; be reconciled to God by the death of his Son; then all will be right between thee and the Father in heaven. We cannot bring men to this, apart from the Spirit of God" ("Is God In The Camp?" Sermon #2239, delivered at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Newington, April 9, 1891). While Spurgeon usually spoke of being right with God as a result of conversion, he also declared: "Brethren, let us look well to our own steadfastness in the faith, our own holy walking with God. . . . [A] sane and practical love of others . . . leads us to be mindful of our own spiritual state. Desiring to do its level best, and to use its own self in the highest degree to God's glory, the true heart seeks to be in all things right with God" (*An All-Around Ministry: Addresses to Ministers and Students*, section "What Would We Be?" elec. acc. *Charles Spurgeon Collection* CD Library, AGES Digital Software).

from allowed and willful sin are, in one sense, right with God, they are generally followed[211] by advocates of Keswick theology and certain other Higher Life theologies of sanctification,[212] whose proponents typically emphasize the Scriptural fact of the difference between believers who are walking in fellowship with the Lord and those who are not, as well as the necessity of calling the backsliding to a crisis of repentance and restoration of conscious and close fellowship with God. Unfortunately, Higher Life advocates tend to emphasize the contrast between the believer who is right with God and the one who is not but minimize the progressive transformation of the entire person of the Christian through progressive sanctification. In contrast, many proponents of Reformed theology, especially paedobaptists, tend to emphasize the progressive transformation involved in sanctification but restrict the term "right with God" to a contrast between the saved and the lost,[213] neglecting the clearly Biblical distinction between the upright and backslidden believer and thus seriously hindering spiritual growth. Sound Baptist theology has recognized the Biblical fact emphasized by the Reformed that all the justified are legally and perfectly right with God because of the imputed righteousness of Christ, while all are at different stages in the progressive transformation of their entire person into the moral likeness of Christ. Baptists have also recognized the Biblical fact that, as emphasized by Keswick and some other Higher Life theology, in another sense

---

211 The language itself is employed historically all the way back to the Ante-Nicene period, so that, for example, in the early third century, Hippolytus could write: "He who knows the wisdom of God, receives from Him also instruction, and learns by it the mysteries of the Word; and they who know the true heavenly wisdom will easily understand the words of these mysteries . . . for things spoken in strange language by the Holy Spirit become intelligible to those who have their hearts right with God" (*On Proverbs*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 5, ed. Schaff).

212 For example, Lewis Sperry Chafer wrote: "Spirituality is not a future ideal; it is to be experienced *now*. The vital question is, 'Am I walking in the Spirit now?' . . . Much of everyone's life will be lived in the uneventful commonplace; but even there the believer should have conviction that he is right with God and in His unbroken fellowship" (*Systematic Theology*, vol. 6, pg. 295).

213 For example, the *Heidelberg Catechism*, Q/A 21, states: "True faith is not only a knowledge and conviction that everything God reveals in his Word is true. It is also a deep-rooted assurance, created in me by the Holy Spirit through the gospel, that, out of sheer grace, earned for us by Christ, not only others, but I too have had my sins forgiven, have been made forever right with God, and have been granted salvation." At the moment of regeneration, the *Catechism* affirms that the believer is made "forever right with God." A reference to this catechectical statement is the only reference to being "right with God" in a theology such as Herman Bavinck's massive *Reformed Dogmatics* (see vol. 4, *Holy Spirit, Church, and New Creation*, pg. 114, footnote #45). Andrew Naselli, in his doctoral dissertation *Keswick Theology: A Historical and Theological Survey and Analysis of the Doctrine of Sanctification in the Early Keswick Movement, 1875-1920* (Bob Jones University, 1996), attacking the Keswick theology from within a Reformed theological trajectory, never affirms the existence of the "right with God" distinction, and even goes so far as to claim that Keswick "errs primarily by emphasizing a crisis of consecration and Spirit-filling" (pg. 240, *ibid*), when the fact that not all believers are filled with the Spirit and backslidden believers need to consecrate themselves anew to God are clearly Scriptural, and Naselli errs when he claims that the preaching of consecration and of Spirit-filling requires "a theologically errant premise that chronologically separates justification and sanctification" (pg. 240, *ibid*).

only some believers are right with God, walking before Him in uprightness and free from presumptuous and wilful disobedience.

However, the Biblical and Baptist doctrine of being right with God differs from the Keswick doctrine of full surrender, for both the requirement for and the results promised for those right with God in Scripture differ from those affirmed by the Keswick theology.[214] The Biblical requirement for being right with God is a sincere, universal, unexceptioned seeking after the mortification of all sin, so that the believer is not deliberately allowing or holding on to sin in his life. The results of being right with God are the Spirit's work of continued progress in the eradication of indwelling sin and strengthening of inner holiness, resulting in progressively greater closeness to, fellowship with, and likeness to the Lord. Nonetheless, within the believer who is right with God, the flesh still continually lusts after the Spirit, as the Spirit does against the flesh, and the believer recognizes that he has not yet reached the perfect and absolute holiness that he desires and is seeking after (Galatians 5:17; Romans 7:14-25). He humbly recognizes that even his best and most holy actions and desires are defiled by his remaining indwelling sin and require cleansing by the great High Priest who bears the iniquity of even the holy things of His people (Exodus 28:38). He maintains a continued watchfulness against his indwelling sin, humbles himself for it, and strives ever the more to put it to death (Romans 8:13; Colossians 3:5). The Keswick doctrine affirms that after a full surrender, one enters into a higher life that has moved beyond the state described by the Apostle Paul of his Christian life in Romans 7:14-25, so that all struggle with sin is over. Indeed, striving against sin is spiritually dangerous. Being right with God, in the Higher Life theology, brings with it a complete counteraction of the motions of indwelling sin. One must no longer be conscious of any sin within his heart[215]—indeed, one who still feels an inward struggle with sin has not fully surrendered or entered into the blessing of the victorious life. While king David said, "my sin is ever before me" (Psalm 51:3), the Higher Life doctrine frowns upon and seeks to deny the existence of the struggle against indwelling sin that, Scripturally, one grows the more aware of the more

---

214 See "Excursus VIII: An Analysis of Keswick Theology as Set Forth In *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention,* by Steven Barabas" below.

215 E. g., for the Keswick leader Evan Hopkins, "what Scripture denominates *the perfect heart* [is] the heart entirely loyal, so far as it understands itself and apprehends the requirements of the Lord" (pg. 70, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). "The Smiths [Hannah W. & Robert P.] . . . hold that every Christian who takes Christ as his sanctification is kept from all consciousness of sin" (pg. 269, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280; see pgs. 39-40, 65-66 of *Holiness by Faith* by Robert P. Smith, and Thomas Smith's critique on pgs. 269-274 of "Means and Measure of Holiness.").

like the Lord he grows.[216] The faith-based, Christ-dependent strife against sin which characterizes the believer who is Biblically right with od is replaced with a eudaemonistic "perfect rest"[217] that, by discouraging active mortification and striving against sin, seriously harms spiritual progress in the saints by ignoring the activity of the indwelling enemy within and makes their spiritual life shallow. Furthermore, it contributes to spiritual confusion. The believer who adopts the Higher Life doctrine, yet recognizes that Galatians 5:17 is still characteristic of his state after his sincere surrender to the Lord, is made to think that he is not really right with God, forcing him into a morbid introspection to see what he has not truly surrendered. Since he never will, in this life, enter a state when Romans 7:14-25 and Galatians 5:17 become things of the past, he is in great danger of growing spiritually frustrated and hopeless as his repeated attempts at "full surrender" never bring him into the promised state of freedom from all the workings of indwelling sin. On the other hand, a believer who convinces himself that he has truly entered into a state where indwelling sin is entirely counteracted must ignore the reality and effects of his sinful flesh, which continue to lust against the Spirit despite his erroneous affirmation to the contrary, which both gives the flesh greater opportunity to work and lends itself to a sinful pride. Thankfully, the believer who has met the Biblical requirements can have confidence that he is indeed right with God, rejoice in the Biblical promise of progressive victory over indwelling corruption and all its manifestations, and not trouble himself about the chimera of the Higher Life. The Bible-believing Baptist should reject both the Reformed and Higher Life errors on being right with God, and wholeheartedly embrace the Biblical truth that the upright and sincere Christian, one who is not willfully allowing and tolerating sin, is right with God and can make tremendous progress spiritually as the Holy Spirit supernaturally produces spiritual growth within him as he walks with the Lord and strives against sin.

Application of the Doctrine of Being Right with God

---

216 John Owen, speaking of communion with Christ, properly noted:

> [Believers must] continually keep alive upon their hearts a *sense of the guilt* and evil of sin; even then when they are under some comfortable persuasions of their personal acceptance with God. Sense of pardon takes away the horror and fear, but not a due sense of the guilt of sin. It is the daily exercise of the saints of God, to consider the great provocation that is in sin,—their sins, the sin of their nature and lives; to render themselves vile in their own hearts and thoughts on that account; to compare it with the terror of the Lord; and to judge themselves continually. This they do in general. "My sin is ever before me," says David. They set sin before them, not to terrify and affright their souls with it, but that a due sense of the evil of it may be kept alive upon their hearts. ("How the saints hold communion with Christ as to their acceptation with God," Chapter 8 in *Of Communion with God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost*, John Owen)

217 E. g., "[H]e abides in utter unconcern and perfect rest . . . perfect abandonment of ease and comfort . . . the Higher Christian Life" (Chapter 3, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*, Hannah W. Smith).

The question, then, arises: are you right with God? "[T]hus saith the LORD of hosts; Consider your ways" (Haggai 1:5, 7).[218] Consider closely your way in general. Are you allowing sin to flourish in your life? Consider your particular courses of action. Do you live an upright Christian life at home, at work, at church, in your family, and in all other relations? Would those who know you best say you are right with God, or not? Have you chosen sin over righteousness, the way of the devil instead of the way of God? Is sin a pleasant thing to you, or do you love and desire pureness of heart?

If you are not right with God, but are backsliding, why do you persist in such vile rebellion? Why will you allow sin to fester and grow in your life? Will you deliberately set your affection upon that which is the greatest evil in the world, sin, rather than upon what is the greatest good in the universe, God, and what is of the greatest value to you, holiness? Will you prefer the image of the devil to the image of God? What sort of idolatry is this? Will you be doubleminded, and halt between two opinions, about whether you prefer to grow in wickedness or Christlikeness? Do you not see how vile and abominable is anything less than wholehearted, devoted, entire consecration to God? Why will you hesitate?

Consider some of the evils that will come on you for your refusal to be right with God.

1.) Such rebellion brings upon you severe chastisement. Physical scourging is a very painful and awful experience; will you, then, bring upon yourself a terrible scourging by the Omnipotent Holy One (Hebrews 12:6)?

2.) Sin has its own awful consequences built into it. Its pleasures are but for a short season, while the sorrow and regret it brings are eternal.

3.) Allowing sin to control your life is utterly foolish. People do many things that evidence a serious lack of intelligence. Tolerating and choosing sin, however, makes you a greater fool than all the people who manifest their lack of intelligence in the affairs of this life. Esau was a fool when he traded the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant for a bowl of soup (Genesis 25:29-34), a fact he recognized later with bitter tears, to no avail (Hebrews 12:17). When you choose to forsake eternal, ineffably great blessings from the God of heaven to hold onto your sin, you place yourself among the greatest of all fools.

4.) Your toleration of sin brings you into a terrible blindness, as you do not recognize what awful evil and terrible defilement you are bringing yourself into.

---

[218] That is, "Set your heart on your ways" (KJV margin; שִׂימוּ לְבַבְכֶם עַל־דַּרְכֵיכֶם׃).

5.) Your rejection of being right with God eliminates your fellowship with God and your ability to pray and have your prayers answered. God wishes to give you more good things than you can ask or think in answer to prayer, but you will refuse all of your Father's good gifts, considering, instead, your sin the greater value. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name *is* Holy; I dwell in the high and holy *place*, with him also *that is* of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones" (Isaiah 57:15). Will you persist in your pride and ungodliness, or humble yourself and return to fellowship with that Holy One who has placed a love for and desire to seek for Himself within you?

6.) Your backsliding harms others as well. You are not able to minister to others spiritually. You will be accountable at Christ's judgment seat for the blood of the souls you did not win because you were not right with God. You will be accountable for the spiritual shipwreck in the lives of many of God's dear children who were influenced by your hypocricy and bad example. You should expect an ungodly seed, since you cannot, like Jonadab, trust the Lord for a godly seed that will be a joy to you in later years (2 Kings 10:15; Jeremiah 35:19; Proverbs 22:6).

7.) In summary, your backsliding brings upon you everything that is evil, and withholds from you everything that is good.

It is unnatural for a believer not to be right with God; that is the natural state of the enemies of God, and those who fall back are to be treated like unconverted persons. God has established a covenant with you, to give you a new heart and a new spirit. He has chosen you out of the world that you might be like His Son. Why should an heir of heaven act like an heir of hell? If you abide for some time in this state, you should fear your Father's chastisement. If you can persistently abide in a state of rebellion, unchastised, you are an empty professor, not one of the Father's children. Fear, then, fear greatly, the avenging Justice of God, who will destroy both your soul and your body in hell. The worst for you, worst by far, is yet to come, for the smoke of your torment will ascend for ever and ever, and you will have no rest day or night, but experience the full weight of the fierceness and fury of your Almighty enemy. Repent, and believe the gospel! Do not delay, for you do not have inherent ability to respond favorably to the Lord. Yes, you will only come to Christ if God permits (Hebrews 6:3).

Indeed, just as an unregenerate person can only come to Christ if the Father draws him (John 6:44), so for the backsliding believer the restoration of a right heart is a supernatural product of God's Almighty grace (Psalm 51:10). Therefore, the time for you to get right with God is *now*, not later. Do not presume upon the grace of God, for ability to get right is from Him, comes from His supernatural energy working in you. If

He leaves you to yourself, you will fall, 2 Chronicles 32:31. If even a righteous man like Hezekiah, when not right with God, had as his punishment that his sons would be eunuchs and all that he and his fathers had stored up would be taken away, what will happen to you if you are not right with God?

Learn also from Hezekiah's example, oh Christian who is right with God, how much you must beware of pride when God especially manifests His grace to you or uses you, for Hezekiah's pride and fall took place after an astonishing Divine miracle in response to his prayer, where not only was marvelously healed from a deadly sickness, but the day itself was lengthened. "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation" (Matthew 26:41), especially when God has in a particular way manifested Himself to you. Do not let pride well up within your heart. Remember that it is a law that, when you would in particular seek to do good, then evil is present with you (Romans 7:21).[219]

Most importantly, oh backsliding Christian, meditate upon the fact that not having a right heart greatly dishonors your Redeemer. The Father has had your holiness on His heart from eternity, predestinating you to it; He sent His Son to die for you; He has given you His Spirit to sanctify you. Why will you resist Him? Will you sin, and thus identify yourself with those who crucified Christ, since sin is the reason for His death? When the Father has been so gracious as to adopt you into His family; when Christ has condescended to such an extent that He would leave His everlasting glory and unite His Divine Person to a human nature identical to yours, sin only excepted, and then drink to the dregs the cup of wrath that you had earned at the hand of Divine Justice; when the Holy Spirit has made you, a poor wretched sinner, into His holy temple, so that your body is as the holy inner sanctum of the Old Testament tabernacle, how can you permit sin to grow unresisted in your members? What wretched ingratitude is this! Will not the goodness of God move you to repentance? Will you not humble yourself greatly before God, and in tears turn from your backsliding? Consider that your Father, from whom you are running, loves you with an infinite, eternal, unchangeable, love still—yes, that He loves you, unholy as you are, as He loves His spotlessly holy incarnate Son (John 17:23).[220] Rather than casting you off for your crimes—infinite crimes, the least of which merits ineffably awful wrath in the eyes of the Holy One—Jehovah calls to you, "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the LORD; for I am married unto you. . . . Return, ye

---

[219] See *The Nature, Power, Deceit, and Prevalency of the Remainders of Indwelling Sin in Believers*, John Owen.

[220] The love of John 17:23 is specifically for Christ as the *Theanthropos*, rather than for the eternal Son considered simply as the eternally begotten One in the Godhead. The Father loves the elect as He does that truly human Mediator to whom they have been gloriously united.

backsliding children, *and* I will heal your backslidings." (Jeremiah 3:14, 22a). Respond, then, and say, "Behold, we come unto thee; for thou *art* the LORD our God" (Jeremiah 3:22b). Consider Christ's high priestly ministry—at that very time when you reject Him and sin, He intercedes for you, acts as your Advocate before the Father, and points to His infinitely valuable work on the cross—a cross that you are at that moment justifying—not for your condemnation, but for your pardon (1 John 2:1). You have in Christ One who is infinitely tender, sympathetic to your weaknesses, ready and able to succor you. Oh, what love is this! Will you not come to Him, resolving never to stray any more?

Furthermore, believer who is right with God, magnify the mercy and goodness of Christ, your Redeemer, for only because of the grace He purchased for you at the cost of His life's blood, and because of continual sustainance from Him, can you be right with God. All your strength, support, and ability to walk with God and have an upright heart before Him is only yours for Christ's sake. "Not unto us, O LORD, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy, *and* for thy truth's sake" (Psalm 115:1). Be on guard against the sin which can so easily beset you. Strive to grow faster than you are already growing. You are in fellowship with God—so seek Him all the more. Out of love for His appearing, purify yourself, even as He is pure (1 John 3:3), yet do not rest in your progress, but keep your eye fixed on Christ, the Author and Finisher of your faith, and fight the good fight of faith, depending on Him alone, until the day comes when, at either His coming for all His saints or the end of your own personal race, your battle will be over, and you can sing, forever freed from sin, with the redeemed, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. . . . Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, *be* unto our God for ever and ever. Amen" (Revelation 5:12; 7:12).

II. The Means of Vivification

1.) Vivification By "Exercise"

God vivifies His people in conjunction with their exercise of spiritual graces; as the believer, enabled by the Holy Spirit, exercises faith, hope, love, and all spiritual virtues, as he flees vice, as he practices spiritual discipline and puts in practice all the inward and outward attitudes and actions that characterize the Son of Man, the second Adam, and rejects all the evils of attitude and action that characterize the fallen first Adam, he grows in holiness. The old man is progressively put to death, and the new man grows in strength by means of exercise. By practicing holiness the Christian becomes

more holy; by fighting and mortifying sin he becomes less sinful. This truth is evidenced by an abundance of Biblical terminology.

1.) Vivification by "Exercise"

First, Scripture specifically states that *exercise*[221] produces godliness. Paul commanded Timothy to "refuse" evil and "exercise [himself] *rather* unto godliness" (1 Timothy 4:7).[222] Growth in godliness by means of disciplined spiritual exercise is compared to growth in physical strength by means of physical exercise (1 Timothy 4:8).[223] One develops from being a spiritual baby to one of "full age,"[224] of Christian maturity, "by reason of use[225] . . . [by] exercis[ing] . . . [the] senses . . . to discern both good and evil" (Hebrews 5:11-14).[226] Those who are disciplined or "exercised"[227] by "chastening" see it "yiel[d] the peaceable fruit of righteousness" (Hebrews 12:11). The godly can have their hearts strengthened in righteousness, like the ungodly can grow in their wickedness by means of a "heart . . . exercised with covetous practices" (2 Peter 2:14).[228] "[E]very holy work, of hand, or head, or heart, is a contribution to the formation of holy habits, very much as physical exercises develop the muscles which perform them.

---

[221] The words involved are γυμνάζω (1 Timothy 4:7; Hebrews 5:14; 12:11; 2 Peter 2:14), γυμνασία (1 Timothy 4:8),

[222] τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ. γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν· ἡ γὰρ σωματικὴ γυμνασία πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ὠφέλιμος· ἡ δὲ εὐσέβεια πρὸς πάντα ὠφέλιμος ἐστιν, ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης. (1 Timothy 4:7-8).

[223] Thus, γυμνάζω is "to experience vigorous training and control, with the implication of increased physical and/or moral strength — 'to train, to undergo discipline'" or "to control oneself by thorough discipline — 'to discipline oneself, to keep oneself disciplined'" (Louw-Nida, γυμνάζω, 36.11; 88.88).

[224] τέλειος, "pertaining to being mature, *full-grown, mature, adult* . . . pertaining to being fully developed in a moral sense" (BDAG, def. #2, 4).

[225] ἕξις in Hebrews 5:14 indicates an "acquired habit . . . trained habit, skill" (Liddell-Scott, def. #3), "a repeated activity — 'practice, doing again and again, doing repeatedly'" (Louw-Nida).

[226] The passage specifically states that the mature have their "senses exercised to discern both good and evil . . . by reason of use," in contrast with the immature, without specifically and directly stating that the transition takes place by means of the exercise, but the fact is nonetheless indubitably implied.

[227] The perfect participle γεγυμνασμένοις in Hebrews 12:11 indicates that the resultant state of possessing a spiritually exercised or spiritually strengthened state resulted from the externally presented action of a correct response to chastening.

[228] καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίαις ἔχοντες. The perfect participle indicates the state of a more wicked heart that resulted from the exercise of evil. Such exercise in evil can lead to the unregenerate being all the more unable to "cease from sin" (ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, 2 Peter 2:14), while the opposite sort of exercise by the righteous leads them to progressively greater difficulty sinning and greater ease and higher degrees of obedience.

To such an extent as this there is action and reaction, a holy heart prompting to holy acts, and these again reflecting an influence back upon the heart."[229]

Since holiness is increased by means of spiritual exercise, how necessary it is for the Christian to exercise himself unto godliness! Spiritual laziness will not produce growth, but weakness. Failure to engage in such exercise will certainly hinder your growth in godliness, and as neglect of exercise in the physical realm will certainly weaken you physically, neglect of spiritual exercise will certainly make you spiritually weak. Furthermore, your failure to exercise yourself unto godliness is itself indulgence in sin, and such indulgence will lead to ever-greater spiritual weakness. On the contrary, diligently pursue godliness, engage in right decisions, exercise your spiritual senses to discern good and evil, and patiently, regularly, yea, continuouly exercise and employ the means through which the Holy Spirit strengthens your inner man. View seasons of trial and tribulation as occasions in which you can, in a particular way, strengthen your spiritual life as your heavenly Father puts you under special strain so that you might come out all the stronger. For as through physical exercise God will certainly strengthen your physical body, so through diligent spiritual exercise God will certainly strengthen your inner man spiritually and renew you ever the more into the image of Christ.

2.) Vivification By "Striving"

Growth in holiness and progressive weakening of indwelling sin takes place as the believer strives against and fights sin, depending upon his sanctifying God for victory. Spiritual life increases as the believer continually[230] "striveth for the mastery" (1 Corinthians 9:25), running spiritually with the perseverence and extreme effort, diligence, and labor of one who wins a competitive athletic race (9:24) or a boxing match (9:26),[231] keeping under (9:27) his indwelling sin and striving against it so that it is weakened and,

---

229 Pg. 267, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280.

230 That is, he is ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος, the present tense conveying the continual action. The "striving" connected with spiritual life in the New Testament is regulary connected with the present tense and conveys continual action (1 Corinthians 9:25; Colossians 1:29; 4:12; 1 Timothy 6:12). A definite difference between ἀγωνίζομαι in the present and in the aorist is apparent in the Koiné; compare, in the LXX, the aorists in 1 Maccabees 7:21; 2 Maccabees 8:16; 13:14; Sirach 4:28 with the present in 2 Maccabees 15:27, or the aorists in 1 Clement 35:4; 2 Clement 7:1–3 and the present tenses in 2 Clement 7:4 & Barnabas 4:11 among the apostolic patristics.

231 Note πυκτεύω, "to fight with fists, box" (BDAG), to "box, spar" (Liddell-Scott); cf. *Testament of Job* 4:10, καὶ ἔσῃ ὡς ἀθλητὴς πυκτεύων καὶ καρτερῶν πόνους καὶ ἐκδεχόμενος τὸν στέφανον, "For you will be like a sparring athlete, enduring pain and receiving the crown," or Philo, *On the Preliminary Studies* 48.

as it were, boxed and pummeled down,[232] given a black eye,[233] and brought into slavish subjection.[234] Strenuous strife, agonizing[235] to defeat sin, must not be self-dependent or independent moralism, but be "labour" that is "striving according to [God's] working," as God "worketh . . . in [the believer] mightily" (Colossians 1:29)—God supernaturally energizes[236] the believer's effort to mortify sin and exercise virtue and thus remains the sole ultimate Agent for all increase in spiritual life and eradiction of sinful tendencies, but the believer must nonetheless "labou[r] fervently" (Colossians 4:12),[237] and "fight" (1 Timothy 6:12; 2 Timothy 4:7). He must fight spiritual battles clothed in spiritual armor (Ephesians 6:10-17) with the sword of the Word of God (Ephesians 6:17; Hebrews 4:12).[238] He must run like one who is determined to win his spiritual race (1 Corinthians 9:24, 26), removing every obstacle that could hinder him (Hebrews 12:1; 2 Thessalonians 3:1; cf. Galatians 2:2; 5:7; Philippians 2:16).[239] He must "resis[t][240] unto blood,

---

232 οὕτω πυκτεύω, ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων· ἀλλ᾽ ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ, 1 Corinthians 9:26-27.

233 The verb ὑπωπιάζω, found in 1 Corinthians 9:27 and Luke 18:5 and translated "keep under" and "weary" in those texts, means "to blacken an eye, *give a black eye, strike in the face*," and by extension "to bring someone to submission by constant annoyance, *wear down*" or "to put under strict discipline, *punish, treat roughly, torment*" (BDAG; cf. Liddell-Scott).

234 Paul brings his body into subjection (1 Corinthians 9:27) with the verb δουλαγωγέω, meaning "enslave, subjugate . . . mak[e] a slave out of" (BDAG), "make a slave, treat as such" (Liddell-Scott), for so vice would not enslave him as it did the unregenerate (*Apology of Justin Martyr* 2:11). One subdues (δουλαγωγέω) men by beheading them, crucifying them, throwing them to wild beasts, and with chains, fire, and all other kinds of torture (Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* 110).

235 The English verb *to agonize* is related etymologically to the Greek verb under discussion, *agonidzomai* (ἀγωνίζομαι).

236 Thus, note the use of ἐνέργεια and ἐνεργέω in Colossians 1:29 for God's supernaturally energizing and working in the believer to will and exert energy to do His good pleasure (Philippians 2:13, ὁ Θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας). Compare the other texts that refer to the energizing and working of the Father (1 Corinthians 12:6; Ephesians 1:3, 19-20, 3:20; Colossians 1:29), the Son (Ephesians 4:16; Philippians 3:21), the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 12:11), and the undifferentiated Trinity (Galatians 2:8; Ephesians 3:7; Colossians 2:12) in believers, and the association of this working with the Word (1 Thessalonians 2:13). The Head of the body, the church, energizes the members of His body to work, and as they work, because of His working in them, individual growth and corporate growth in the congregation takes place (Ephesians 4:15-16).

237 Of course, Colossians 4:12 speaks of Epaphras' fervent labor in prayer for others, not his own labor to grow in grace, but the text nevertheless illustrates the nature of the verb ἀγωνίζομαι, which in other texts is more directly related to one's personal mortification of sin and vivification.

238 The sword (μάχαιρα) of the Word is the Christian's only offensive fighting weapon. It is noteworthy how the abundance of athletic struggle imagery in sanctification contrasts with the paucity of imagery of physical warfare—while the μάχαιρα of the Word appears in Ephesians 6:17; Hebrews 4:12, words like πολεμέω, πόλεμος, μάχομαι, μάχη, or διαμάχομαι, although all present in the New Testament, are not employed of the believer's holy struggle with sin. It appears that the wholesome and profitable nature of bodily exercise (1 Timothy 4:8) made its terms more fit to describe sanctification than terms for the wretched evil of the butchery of men in the warfare of nations.

239 The imagery of "running" (τρέχω) for the Christian life is thus employed in 1 Corinthians 9:24, 26; Galatians 2:2; 5:7; Philippians 2:16; 2 Thessalonians 3:1; Hebrews 12:1.

striving[241] against sin" (Hebrews 12:4) and exert intense effort or "contend"[242] (Jude 3) for the truth. The Christian life is a "fight" or "conflict"[243] like a gladiatorial contest (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:32[244]), a wrestling match (Ephesians 6:12),[245] or a grueling athletic race (Hebrews 12:1) or struggle in other athletic contests.[246] The believer must exert the most intense efforts to defeat his old man and utterly vanquish indwelling sin, and as he does so, God gives him victory and he grows more holy.

By exercise in this manner the Christian is progressively vivified. Do you so exercise yourself to gain mastery over sin? Consider that God admonishes you to exercise yourself like one who is to win a race (1 Corinthians 9:24); thus, you should strive to be the most holy person possible. Mediocrity is not acceptable. You are not to strive to be like the average man of the world, who is yet on his way to eternal damnation (Matthew 7:13-14). You are not to be like the average professor of Christianity, and be satisifed with yourself, rest content and put yourself at ease, if you think you have arrived to equality with them, or with the spiritual level you see in your godly friends and acquaintances. You are not to commend yourself by comparing yourself favorably with others (2 Corinthians 10:12)—indeed, the further along you go, and the more

---

240 ἀντικαθίστημι, "to resist by actively opposing pressure or power" (Louw-Nida).

241 ἀνταγωνίζομαι, "struggle against" (BDAG; Liddell-Scott). The present participle indicates continual striving. The believing Hebrews were already striving against sin, and Paul exhorted them to do so even up to the point of violent death and the shedding of their own blood. They were not to "faint" in this struggle (Hebrews 12:5).

242 ἐπαγωνίζομαι, "to extert intense effort on behalf of something, *contend.* [The verb is] used in athletic imagery[.] . . . The primary semantic component in the use of this verb in Jude 3 is the effort expended by the subject in a noble cause; as such it is the counterpart of the author's πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος and a manifestation of ἀρετή" (BDAG). Philo employs the verb of one who "still strives on, in no way remitting his intense anxiety, but without admitting any excuse, or any hesitation, or vacillation; using all the means in his power to gain his object" (*On the Posterity and Exile of Cain* 13: ὅμως ἐπαγωνιεῖται μηδὲν συντόνου σπουδῆς ἀνιείς, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι τοῖς παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ εἰς τὸ τυχεῖν ἀπροφασίστως καὶ ἀόκνως συγχρώμενος).

243 ἀγών, "contest, race . . . a struggle against opposition, struggle, fight" (BDAG). See Philippians 1:30; Colossians 2:1; 1 Thessalonians 2:2; 1 Timothy 6:12; 2 Timothy 4:7; Hebrews 12:1.

244 θηριομαχέω; compare Josephus, *Antiquities* 16:137 (ἦν οὖν εὐθὺς ἐν καθιερώσει μείζονες ἑορταὶ καὶ παρασκευαὶ πολυτελέσταται κατηγγέλκει μὲν γὰρ ἀγῶνα μουσικῆς καὶ γυμνικῶν ἀθλημάτων παρεσκευάκει δὲ πολὺ πλῆθος μονομάχων καὶ θηρίων ἵππων τε δρόμον καὶ τὰ πολυτελέστερα τῶν ἔν τε τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ παρ᾽ ἄλλοις τισὶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων; There was accordingly a great festival, and most sumptuous preparations made presently, in order to its dedication; for he had appointed a contention in music, and games to be performed naked; he had also gotten ready a great number of those that fight single combats, and of beasts for the like purpose; horse races also, and the most chargeable of such sports and shows as used to be exhibited at Rome, and in other places.).

245 πάλη, Liddell-Scott. Compare the uses in Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 125 and Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 3:190 for Jacob's wrestling (πάλη) with God in Genesis 32, and, Philo alleges, against his passions and for virtue (*On Sobriety* 65; *On the Change of Names* 14).

246 cf. ἀγών, Liddell-Scott; cf. Wisdom 4:2; 2 Maccabees 4:18; 2 Clement 7:1-5.

Christlikeness you have come to, the more lowly you will be in your own eyes,[247] and the higher you will esteem others in comparison with yourself—but to set before you the standard of the perfect holiness of the Man Christ Jesus, and set your face as a flint after that goal, striving, agonizing, after it, pummeling and beating down your indwelling sin, and refraining from resting in this agonzing spiritual battle for even a moment until you reach perfect deliverance at the end of your earthly sojourn. You are also to be "temperate in all things" (1 Corinthians 9:25). Such temperance will affect your spiritual discipline, as you spend focused time in prayer and reading, study, memorization, and meditation on the Scriptures. Short times of prayer and Bible study are hardly evidence of striving—while the Bible never specifies an exact amount of time to spend in spiritual exercises, as such will vary depending upon an innumerable number of circumstances, surely it is far more common for believers to spend too little time than too much. How many hours does a marathon runner spend daily in his training? How many are you spending seeking to win Christlikeness and a heavenly crown? Do you carefully listen to preaching and seek to apply it to yourself the way an Olympic athelete listens to coaching about how to defeat his competition and win the gold medal? Furthermore, are you temperate in your interaction with others in the church and in the world? A haughty spirit that is unwilling to heed rebuke and hardens itself against instruction will never win the prize. Do you run with focused, continuing, passionate diligence, or "as uncertainly," being faithful one day and careless the next? How long would a boxer last in his match if every second round he let down his guard? Do you let down your guard and let sin knock you around, falling, perhaps, for the same wiles time and time again? Beware, for in so doing you are set to be a "castaway" (1 Corinthians 9:27), a spritual loser. Will you, in shame, come in the last place in the only race with eternal value? Can you strive for vanities such as money or approval—or even for necessary things such as the care of your family, but fail to strive in the most important contest of all? You have the constant work of a lifetime ahead of you—strive after that perfect holiness that is the unchangeable and eternal standard of the Holy One and your Redeemer, so that you can say truthfully the words of Paul: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished *my* course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day" (2 Timothy 4:7-8).

---

247 While one can hardly say that these diminutives are exclusive, so that by employing a lesser one Paul would have, if asked, denied the greater, it is noteworthy that, comparing Paul's earlier to his later epistles, as the great saint grows in holiness and thus humility, he designates himself first as "least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle" (1 Corinthians 15:9), then later "less than the least of all saints" (Ephesians 3:8), and finally "chief . . . [of] sinners" (1 Timothy 1:15).

"The just shall live by faith"—
Faith and Salvation in All Its Apects

Faith is associated in Scripture with the receipt of salvation in all its aspects—justification, progressive sanctification, and ultimate glorification are connected to faith. The specific character of the connection between faith and salvific blessings is of tremendous value to the understanding of both the character of Christian conversion and Christian growth in grace.

The first reference to *belief* in the Old Testament—which is also the first reference to *reckoning*, *crediting*, or *imputation*, and the first reference to the adjective *righteousness*,[248] is Genesis 15:6, the paradigmatic statement concerning the father of faith, Abraham: "And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness."[249] Genesis 15, in which the gospel was preached to Abraham (Galatians 3:8), records the patriarch's faith[250] in that God[251] who promised the Seed of the

---

[248] That is, to צְדָקָה; however, in continuity with the example of Abraham, Noah is mentioned as a "just man" (אִישׁ צַדִּיק) because Jehovah could say, "for thee have I seen righteous before me" (צַדִּיק לְפָנַי אֹתְךָ רָאִיתִי) earlier (Genesis 6:9; 7:1) in the first references to the צדק word group in the canon, where Noah was the recipient of undeserved and free grace (Genesis 6:8), was accounted a righteous man on that basis, and therefore became a holy man (Genesis 6:9).

[249] וְהֶאֱמִן בַּיהוָה וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לּוֹ צְדָקָה׃

καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Αβραμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην "And Abram believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness" (LXX).

Credidit Abram Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam. "Abram believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice." (Vulgate)

וְהֵימִין בְּמֵימְרָא דַיוי וְחַשְׁבַהּ לֵיה לְזָכוּ׃ "Then he believed in the Word of the Lord, and he reckoned it to him for merit." (Targum Onkelos)

והיימן אברם בשם ממרא דייי ואתחשבת ליה לזכו׃ "Then Abram believed in the name of the Word of the Lord, and it was reckoned to him for merit." (Targum Neofiti)

והוות ליה הימנותא במימרא דייי וחשבה ליה לזכו דלא אטח לקמיה במילין "Then he had faith in the Word of the Lord, and he reckoned it to him for merit, because he did not speak rebellion before him with words." (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan)

[250] "[T]he believing of which Moses speaks, is not to be restricted to a single clause of the promise here referred to, but embraces the whole; secondly that Abram did not form his estimate of the promised seed from this oracle alone, but also from others, where a special benediction is added. Whence we infer that he did not expect some common or undefined seed, but that in which the world was to be blessed. . . . [T]his promise was not taken by him separately from others. . . . God does not promise to his servant this or the other thing only, as he sometimes grants special benefits to unbelievers, who are without the taste of his paternal love; but he declares, that He will be propitious to him, and confirms him in the confidence of safety, by relying upon His protection and His grace. For he who has God for his inheritance does not exult in fading joy; but, as one already elevated towards heaven, enjoys the solid happiness of eternal life. It is, indeed, to be maintained as an axiom, that all the promises of God, made to the faithful, flow from the free mercy of God, and are evidences of that paternal love, and of that gratuitous adoption, on which their salvation is founded. Therefore, we do not say that Abram was justified because he laid hold on a single

Abrahamic covenant (Genesis 15:2-5), the Christ.[252] Although Abraham failed to perfectly keep the law, as is evident in the rest of Genesis, he was nonetheless accounted righteous because of the work of the Messiah. Genesis 15:6 thus sets a pattern that by faith alone in God and His Messiah sinful men are counted righteous by Jehovah, whether at the moment of initial conversion as those without any inward righteousness at all, as Abram was when an ungodly idolator in Ur of the Chaldees,[253] or at the highest point of sanctification possible to the people of God on earth.[254] While Abraham's

---

word, respecting the offspring to be brought forth, but because he embraced God as his Father" (Calvin, *Commentary on Genesis* 15:6).

[251] Consider that the One communicating with Abraham was Jehovah the Son, for He is the One who revealed the Father (John 1:18) in all the Old Testament theophanies.

[252] John 8:56. Galatians 3:16 is very clear that Abraham's faith had respect to the Christ, who was not only the representative, but the embodiment of the promised race—for this cause the people of Israel typified Christ (cf. Matthew 2:15; Hosea 11:1).

[253] Romans 4:3-5 (Abram was "ungodly" until his conversion by faith in the land of Ur); Joshua 24:2-4; Genesis 15:7; Hebrews 11:8-10; Acts 7:2-4.

[254] Calvin, in his *Commentary on Genesis*, fitly notes:

> Abram was justified by faith many years after he had been called by God; after he had left his country a voluntary exile, rendering himself a remarkable example of patience and of continence; after he had entirely dedicated himself to sanctity and after he had, by exercising himself in the spiritual and external service of God, aspired to a life almost angelical. It therefore follows, that even to the end of life, we are led towards the eternal kingdom of God by the righteousness of faith. On which point many are too grossly deceived. For they grant, indeed, that the righteousness which is freely bestowed upon sinners and offered to the unworthy is received by faith alone; but they restrict this to a moment of time, so that he who at the first obtained justification by faith, may afterwards be justified by good works. By this method, faith is nothing else than the beginning of righteousness, whereas righteousness itself consists in a continual course of works. But they who thus trifle must be altogether insane. For if the angelical uprightness of Abram faithfully cultivated through so many years, in one uniform course, did not prevent him from fleeing to faith, for the sake of obtaining righteousness; where upon earth besides will such perfection be found, as may stand in God's sight? Therefore, by a consideration of the time in which this was said to Abram, we certainly gather, that the righteousness of works is not to be substituted for the righteousness of faith, in any such way, that one should perfect what the other has begun; but that holy men are only justified by faith, as long as they live in the world. If any one object, that Abram previously believed God, when he followed Him at His call, and committed himself to His direction and guardianship, the solution is ready; that we are not here told when Abram first began to be justified, or to believe in God; but that in this one place it is declared, or related, how he had been justified through his whole life. For if Moses had spoken thus immediately on Abram's first vocation, the cavil of which I have spoken would have been more specious; namely, that the righteousness of faith was only *initial* (so to speak) and not perpetual. But now since after such great progress, he is still said to be justified by faith, it thence easily appears that the saints are justified freely even unto death. I confess, indeed, that after the faithful are born again by the Spirit of God, the method of justifying differs, in some respect, from the former. For God reconciles to himself those who are born only of the flesh, and who are destitute of all good; and since he finds nothing in them except a dreadful mass of evils, he counts them just, by imputation. But those to whom he has imparted the Spirit of holiness and righteousness, he embraces with his gifts. Nevertheless, in order that their good works may please God, it is necessary that these works themselves should be justified by gratuitous imputation; [since] some evil is always [naturally] inherent in them. Meanwhile, however, this is a settled point, that men are justified before God by believing not by working; while they obtain grace by faith, because they are unable to deserve a reward by works. Paul also, in hence contending, that Abram did not merit by works the righteousness which he had received before his circumcision, does not impugn the above doctrine. The argument of Paul is of this kind: The circumcision of Abram was posterior to his justification in the order of time, and therefore could not be its cause, for of necessity the cause precedes its effect. . . . Both arguments are therefore of force; first, that the righteousness of Abram cannot be ascribed to the covenant of the law, because it preceded his circumcision; and, secondly, that the righteousness even of the most perfect characters perpetually consists in faith; since Abram, with all the excellency of his virtues, after his daily and even remarkable service of God, was, nevertheless, justified

earthly pilgrimage evidenced that true faith results in a life characterized by faithfulness and obedience, nonetheless the patriarch was judicially righteous before God only through imputed righteousness received by faith alone. The verb employed, *to believe*,[255]

> by faith. For this also is, in the last place, worthy of observation, that what is here related concerning one man, is applicable to all the sons of God. For since he was called the father of the faithful, not without reason; and since further, there is but one method of obtaining salvation; Paul properly teaches, that a real [imputed] and not personal righteousness is in this place described. (*Commentary on Genesis*, 15:6)

As, throughout life, justification is by faith alone, and Genesis 15:6 is an instance of this continuing faith in the patriarch's life as the perpetual and sole instrumentality for his receipt of legal righteousness, something present in him by Divine grace from the point of his initial conversion in Ur of the Chaldees (cf. Hebrews 11:8-11), so one notes that the Hebrew structure of Genesis 15:6 validates that Abraham's faith in Jehovah, as expressed in the verse, was not one that arose afresh at that moment, but had been in exercise in the past, from the moment of his conversion, up to that point in time. The *waw* + *perfect* form that begins the verse, וְהֶאֱמִן, has an "aspect of . . . repeated or durative action," as opposed to the simple perfect or *qatal* form, which has an "aspect . . . of a single and instantaneous action" (pg. 375, 119x, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Paul Joüon & Takamitsu Muraoka, rev. English ed. Leiden: Netherlands Institute of Near Eastern Studies, 2005), so that a "longer or constant continuance in a past state is . . . represented by the perfect with וְ (as a variety of the frequentative perfect with וְ), in Gn 15:6, 34:5, Nu 21:20, Jos 9:12; 22:3*b*, Is 22:14, Jer 3:9" (*GKC*, 112ss). Continuing belief, arising out of a moment where belief began in the past, is in view in the וְהֶאֱמִן of Genesis 15:6, as the same sort of aspectual force is conveyed in the "held his peace" (וְהֶחֱרִשׁ) of Genesis 34:5, the "which looketh" (וְנִשְׁקָפָה) of Numbers 21:20, the "is mouldy" (נִקְדִים וְהָיָה) of Joshua 9:12, the "have kept" (וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם) of Joshua 22:3, the "was revealed" (וְנִגְלָה) of Isaiah 22:14, and the "came to pass" (וְהָיָה) of Jeremiah 3:9; compare also the "did eat" (וְאָכְלוּ) of Genesis 47:22. Furthermore, since the *and he counted it* of Genesis 15:6 (וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ) continues with *waw consecutive* the sequence started by the *and he believed* (וְהֶאֱמִן), and thus continues the aspectual force of the *waw* + *perfect* of *and he believed*, the continued reckoning of the patriarch as righteous from the past point of his conversion until the time of Genesis 15:6, simply through the instrumentality of faith, is also expressed in the verse (compare the continuing defilement and adultery in the וַתִּנְאַף . . . וַתֶּחֱנַף . . . וְהָיָה of Jeremiah 3:9).

[255] אמן. The complete list of texts with the verb is: Genesis 15:6; 42:20; 45:26; Exodus 4:1, 5, 8–9, 31; 14:31; 19:9; Numbers 12:7; 14:11; 20:12; Deuteronomy 1:32; 7:9; 9:23; 28:59, 66; Judges 11:20; 1 Samuel 2:35; 3:20; 22:14; 25:28; 27:12; 2 Samuel 7:16; 1 Kings 8:26; 10:7; 11:38; 2 Kings 17:14; 1 Chronicles 17:23–24; 2 Chronicles 1:9; 6:17; 9:6; 20:20; 32:15; Nehemiah 9:8; 13:13; Psalms 19:8; 27:13; 78:8, 22, 32, 37; 89:29, 38; 93:5; 101:6; 106:12, 24; 111:7; 116:10; 119:66; Job 4:18; 9:16; 12:20; 15:15, 22, 31; 24:22; 29:24; 39:12, 24; Proverbs 11:13; 14:15; 25:13; 26:25; 27:6; Isaiah 1:21, 26; 7:9; 8:2; 22:23, 25; 28:16; 33:16; 43:10; 49:7; 53:1; 55:3; Jeremiah 12:6; 15:18; 40:14; 42:5; Lamentations 4:12; Hosea 5:9; 12:1; Jonah 3:5; Micah 7:5; Habakkuk 1:5. Commenting on a part of the meaning of **אמן** that relates to Genesis 15:6, the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* notes:

> [T]he concept of אמן embraces a twofold relation: recognition and acknowledgment of the relation of claim and reality, and the relation of the validity of this claim for him who says Amen to all its practical consequences. . . . This leads us to the simplest definition of the hiphil הֶאֱמִן ("to believe"), which the LXX renders 45 times by πιστεύειν, 5 by ἐμμιστεύειν, and once each by καταπιστεύειν and πείθεσθαι. It means "to say Amen with all the consequences for both obj. and subj." . . . [T]he use of הֶאֱמִן toward men gives prominence to the total basic attitude along the lines of "to trust." . . . A further point is that the OT uses הֶאֱמִן only for the personal relation, for behind the word which is believed is the man whom one trusts. The hiphil finds an analogous use as an expression for man's relation to God. Here, too, it has declarative rather than causative significance. It means "to declare God נֶאֱמָן," "to say Amen to God." But this does not embrace the whole meaning . . . the mutual relation between God and man is of the very essence of faith . . . God is the true author of the relation between God and man. . . . [T]he setting and origin of the religious use of the stem אמן in the OT tradition is to be sought in the sacral covenant with [Jehovah]. . . . In the relation denoted by הֶאֱמִן the OT saw the special religious attitude of the people of God to [Jehovah]. (pgs. 186-188, 191, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6, Kittel)

signifies *to trust in, to believe in* in the Hebrew form employed in Genesis 15:6,[256] and signifies *to be firm, trustworthy* in its foundational idea and *to prove to be firm, reliable,*

---

[256] The Hiphil + ב. אמן + ב is found in Genesis 15:6; Exodus 14:31; Numbers 14:11; 20:12; Deuteronomy 1:32; 28:66; 1 Samuel 27:12; 2 Kings 17:14; 2 Chronicles 20:20; Job 15:31; 24:22; 39:12; Psalm 27:13; 78:22, 32, 37; 89:38; 106:12; 119:66; Proverbs 26:25; Jeremiah 12:6; Jonah 3:5; Micah 7:5. The definite majority of these texts refer to belief in Jehovah. In all these texts, except Psalm 78:37; 89:28; and one of the three instances of אמן in 2 Chronicles 20:20, where the verb is in the Niphal, אמן is always in the Hiphil. Warfield comments on the Hiphil of אמן:

> Obviously it is a subjective causative, and expresses the acquisition or exhibition of the firmness, security, relability, faithfulness which lies in the root-meaning of the verb, in or with respect to its object. The מַאֲמִין is therefore one whose state of mind is free from faintheartedness (Isaiah 7:9) and anxious haste (Isaiah 28:16), and who stays himself upon the object of his contemplation with confidence and trust. The implication seems to be, not so much that of a passive dependence as of a vigorous active commitment. He who, in the Hebrew sense, exercises faith, is secure, assured, confident (Deuteronomy 28:66; Job 24:22; Psalm 27:13), and lays hold of the object of his confidence with firm trust.
>
> The most common construction of הֶאֱמִין, is with the preposition ב, and in this construction its fundamental meaning seems to be most fully expressed. It is probably never safe to represent this phrase by the simple "believe"; the preposition rather introduces the person or thing in which one believes, or on which one believingly rests as on firm ground. This is true even when the object of the affection is a thing, whether divine words, commandments, or works (Psalm 106:12; 119:66; 78:32), or some earthly force or good (Job 39:12; 15:31; 24:22; Deuteronomy 28:66), It is no less true when the object is a person, human (1 Samuel 27:12; Proverbs 26:25; Jeremiah 12:6; Micah 7:5) or superhuman (Job 4:18; 15:15), or the representative of God, in whom therefore men should place their confidence (Exodus 19:9; 2 Chronicles 20:20). It is above all true, however, when the object of the affection is God Himself, and that indifferently whether or not the special exercise of faith adverted to is rooted in a specific occasion (Genesis 15:6; Exodus 14:31; Numbers 14:11; 20:12; Deuteronomy 1:32; 2 Kings 17:14; 2 Chronicles 20:20; Psalm 78:22; Jonah 3:5). The weaker conception of "believing" seems, on the other hand, to lie in the construction with the preposition ל, which appears to introduce the person or thing, not on which one confidingly rests, but to the testimony of which one assentingly turns. This credence may be given by the simple to every untested word (Proverbs 14:15); it may be withheld until seeing takes the place of believing (1 Kings 10:7; 2 Chronicles 9:6); it is due to words of the Lord and of His messengers, as well as to the signs wrought by them (Psalm 106:24; Isaiah 53:1; Exodus 4:8, 9). It may also be withheld from any human speaker (Genesis 45:26; Exodus 4:1, 8; Jeremiah 40:14; 2 Chronicles 32:15), but is the right of God when He bears witness to His majesty or makes promises to His people (Isaiah 43:10; Deuteronomy 9:23). In this weakened sense of the word the proposition believed is sometimes attached to it by the conjunction כִּי (Exodus 4:5; Job 9:16; Lamentations 4:12). In its construction with the infinitive, however, its deeper meaning comes out more strongly (Judges 11:20; Job 15:22; Psalm 27:13), and the same is true when the verb is used absolutely (Exodus 4:31; Isaiah 7:9; 28:16; Psalm 116:10; Job 29:24; Habakkuk 1:5). In these constructions faith is evidently the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen. . . .
>
> God Himself is the object to which [Old Testament saints] believingly turn, or on whom they rest in assured trust, in some eleven cases. In two of these it is to Him as a faithful witness that faith believingly turns (Deuteronomy 9:23; Isaiah 43:10). In the remainder of them it is upon His very person that faith rests in assured confidence (Genesis 15:6; Exodus 14:31; Numbers 14:11; 20:12; Deuteronomy 1:32; 2 Kings 17:14; 2 Chronicles 20:20; Psalm 78:22; Jonah 3:5). It is in these instances, in which the construction is with ב, together with those in which the word is used absolutely (Exodus 4:31; Isaiah 7:9; 28:16; Psalm 116:10), to which may be added Psalm 27:13 where it is construed with the infinitive, that the conception of religious believing comes to its rights. The typical instance is, of course, the great word of Genesis 15:6, 'And Abram believed in the LORD, and he counted it to him for righteousness'; in which all subsequent believers, Jewish and Christian alike, have found the primary example of faith. The object of Abram's faith, as here set forth, was not the promise which appears as the occasion of its exercise; what it rested on was God Himself, and that not merely as the giver of the promise here recorded, but as His servant's shield and exceeding great reward (xv.1). It is therefore not the assentive but the fiducial element of faith which is here emphasized; in a word, the faith which Abram gave Jehovah when he 'put his trust in God' (ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, LXX), was the same faith which later He sought in vain at the hands of His people (Numbers 14:11; cf. Deuteronomy 1:32; 2 Kings 17:14), and the notion of which the Psalmist explains in the parallel, 'They believed not in God, and trusted not in his salvation' (Psalm 78:22). To believe in God, in the Old Testament sense, is thus not merely to assent to His word, but with firm and unwavering confidence to rest in security and trustfulness

faithful, trustworthy in a different, frequently passive verb form.[257] Faithfulness and trustworthiness arise from faith, and are impossible without it, so that faith, through the initial exercise of which justification was received, may, by continued acts of faith that are a product of a believing new nature,[258] evidence the saint's inward faith and faithfulness in outward fidelity. Thus, the Old Testament teaches that one who believes in God,[259] another person,[260] an event,[261] or a thing,[262] reckons the thing in question, or the person, as one who will continue or endure the same,[263] as trustworthy[264] or

---

upon Him. . . . In the Greek of the Septuagint πιστεύειν takes its place as the regular rendering of הֶאֱמִין, and is very rarely set aside in favour of another word expressing trust (Proverbs 26:25 πείθεσθαι). . . . It was by being thus made the vehicle for expressing the high rfeligous faith of the Old Testament that the word was prepared for its New Testament use ("The Biblical Doctrine of Faith," Warfield, in *Biblical Doctrines*, vol. 2 of *Works*).

257 The Niphal. Note the lexicon:

אמן basic mng. to be firm, trustworthy, safe; MHb., Ph. n.m. אלאמן; Syr. etpe. to occupy oneself constantly with; Hb. hif. > Arm. הֵימִין, Syr. *haimen* → BArm., DISO 17, to believe, > Arb. *haymana* to say Amen :: Arb. *ʾamina* to be safe, *ʾamuna* to be faithful, IV to believe, Soq. to speak the truth, OSArb. *ʾmn*(*t*) security; Eth. Tigr. *ʾam*(*a*)*na* to believe (Leslau 11, Wb. 356a); Eg. *mn* to be firm. . . . **nif**: . . . 1. to prove to be firm**, reliable, faithful** Gn 4220 1K 826 Jr 1518 Ps 788 (אֶת־אֵל to God, of רוּחַ,) 37 8929 (לוֹ concerning him, of בְּרִית) 935 1016 1117 1C 1723f 2C 19 617 2020, to remain faithful to (עִם) Hos 121 (:: Sept.); pt. trustworthy, **faithful** 1S 235 2214 1K 1138 Is 121.26 82 2223.25 3316 Jr 425 Ps 198 8938 Jb 1220 Pr 2513 Neh 98 1313; (of God) Dt 79 Is 497; —to **be permanent**, to **endure**: people Is 79, dynasty 1S 2528 2S 716, tokens of mercy Is 553, God's name 1C 1723f, water Is 3316, illness Dt 2859; נֶאֱמָנָה that which is trustworthy Hos 59, נֶאֱמַן־רוּחַ be faithful Pr 1113, נֶאֱמָן intended to be faithful Pr 276; —3. בְּ נֶאֱמָן entrusted with (alt. proved to be reliable) Nu 127, with לְ appointed 1S 320. . . . **hif**: . . . causative —1. to believe = to **think** (:: 3 !) with inf., that Jb 1522, with כִּי Ps 11610 Jb 916 La 412; with לְ and inf., to be convinced that Ps 2713; —2. to regard something as trustworthy, to **believe in**: a thing Hab 15, a word Ex 48f 1K 107 Is 531 Ps 10624 Pr 1415 2C 96; with בְּ, to (have) trust in Nu 2012 1S 2712 Mi 75 Sir 36 [33]31; with לְ Gn 4526 Ex 41.8 Jr 4014; abs. Ex 45 Jb 2924 (dl. לֹא, alt. as 4); —3. to **have trust in,** to **believe in,** God: with בְּ Gn 156 Ex 1431 (and in Moses) Nu 1411 2012 Dt 132 2K 1714 Jon 35 Ps 7822 2C 2020; with לְ Dt 923 Is 4310; abs. to believe Ex 431 Is 79 2816; → TWNT 6:182ff; RGG 2:1588f; Eichrodt 2:190ff; Pfeiffer ZAW 71:151ff, relation between πίστις and πιστεύειν Ebeling ZThK 55:70ff; —Ju 1120 (trad. to entrust, Sir 4513 hif. or hof.) rd. וַיָּמֵאן; Is 3021 תֵּימִינוּ (: ימן hif); cj. Jb 3924 (usu. keep still) (וְלֹא יַשְׁמִאִיל) יֵימִין (Duhm *Hiob*, Hölscher *Hiob*). (*KB*)

258 While the New Testament teaches more explicitly and apparently the growth of faith in the believer, the Old Testament suggests the possibility of strengthening and development in אמן, rather than a simply static notion, through the uses in 2 Kings 10:1, 5 & Esther 2:7 for supporting, nourishing, or bringing up as related to confirming or strengthening (see *BDB*; cf. τιθηνός in 2 Kings 10:1, 5, LXX & θρεπτός in Esther 2:7).

259 Exodus 14:31; Number 14:11; 20:12; Deuteronomy 1:32; 9:23; 2 Kings 17:14; 2 Chronicles 20:20; Nehemiah 9:8; Psalm 78:8, 22, 32; Isaiah 7:9; 28:16; 43:10; Jonah 3:5. In a text such as Isaiah 7:9 belief in Jehovah and in the message of His prophet are indivisibly connected; cf. Isaiah 53:1.

260 Genesis 45:26; Exodus 4:1, 8, 31; 14:31; 19:9; 1 Samuel 27:12; 2 Chronicles 20:20; 32:15; Proverbs 26:25; Jeremiah 12:6; 40:14; Micah 7:5.

261 Exodus 4:5; Job 15:22; 29:24; 39:24; Psalm 27:13; Lamentations 4:12; Habakkuk 1:5.

262 Exodus 4:9, 31; 1 Kings 10:7; 2 Chronicles 9:6; Job 9:6; 39:12; Psalm 78:37; 106:12, 24; 116:10; 119:66; Proverbs 14:15; Isaiah 7:9; 53:1.

263 Deuteronomy 28:59; Jeremiah 15:18.

264 Genesis 42:20; Judges 11:20; Job 4:18; 12:20; 15:15, 31; Micah 7:5.

faithful,[265] or sure,[266] or confirmed or established,[267] and therefore worthy of assured confidence.[268] Those descendents of Jacob who believe in Jehovah, those who believe and consequently become the faithful, of whom Abraham is the paradigm,[269] are those

---

265 Numbers 12:7; Deuteronomy 7:9; 1 Samuel 2:35; 22:14; Nehemiah 9:8; 13:13; Psalm 101:6; Proverbs 11:13; 25:13; 27:6; Isaiah 1:21, 26; 8:2; 49:7; Jeremiah 42:5; Hosea 11:12.

266 1 Samuel 2:35; 25:28; 1 Kings 11:38; Job 24:22; Psalm 19:7; 93:5; 111:7; Isaiah 22:23, 25; 33:16; 55:3; Hosea 5:9.

267 1 Samuel 3:20; 2 Samuel 7:16; 1 Kings 8:26; 1 Chronicles 17:23-24; 2 Chronicles 1:9; 6:17; 20:20; Psalm 89:28, 37.

268 Deuteronomy 28:66.

269 Genesis 15:6; Nehemiah 9:8. Note that Nehemiah 9:8's נֶאֱמָן לְפָנֶיךָ, with its Niphal of *'aman* with *lamed* following, is different from Genesis 15:6's use of the *Hiphil* + *beth* in וְהֶאֱמִן בַּיהוָה. Faithfulness in the heart is a result of coming to initial faith in Jehovah. Kaiser explains the relationship between faith and faithfulness or obedience in the receipt of the promises by Abraham and his seed:

> The third and climactic element in the promise [of the Abrahamic covenant] was that Abraham and each of the successive sons of promise were to be the source of genuine blessing; indeed, they were to be the touchstone of blessing to all other peoples on the earth. All nations of the world would be blessed by them, for each was the mediator of life to the nations (of Abraham—12:3; 18:18; 22:17–18; of Isaac—26:3–4; and of Jacob—28:13–14).
>
> The apostle Paul would later point to this phrase ("all the peoples on earth will be blessed through you," Ge 12:3), and declare that it was the same "gospel" he preached (Gal 3:8). Simply put, the good news was that "in [the promised seed] all the nations of the earth shall be blessed" (Gal 3:8). Thus the embryo of God's good news could be reduced to the linchpin word "blessing." The one who was blessed was now to be the conduit of blessing of universal proportions to the whole world. In contrast to the nations who sought a "name" merely for themselves, God made Abraham a great name so that he might be the means of blessing all the nations on earth.
>
> But, it might be asked, how were the nations to receive this blessing mediated by Abraham or any of his successive sons? The method must be the same as it was for Abraham. It would be by faith: "Abram believed the LORD, and he credited it to him as righteousness" (Ge 15:6).
>
> The literal rendering of Genesis 15:6 is simply he believed in [Jehovah] (*he'emîn ba YHWH*). This, of course, was more than a vague intellectual assent to a supreme deity in which he decided merely to become a theist. The object of his faith was to be found in the content of the total promise. As such, priority may be given to the oldest, most ancient, and most central part of that promise: the person or the man of promise signified by that male descendant who was to come from the seed (3:15). Indeed, when God first met Abraham, the issue of progeny was not specifically included but only inferred (12:1–3), for the first clause promised to make Abraham into a great nation. His trust, then, was in the Lord—but particularly in the Lord who had promised. . . .
>
> Since the verb "to believe" in Genesis 15:6 is the Hebrew hiphil form (the causative stem) of the verb *'āman* (cf. English "amen"), Geerhardus Vos pointed to the "causative-productive sense" of the verb and to the preposition. Both, in his judgment, showed that faith had its source and its object in the personal [Jehovah]. For Abraham, it meant he had to renounce all his human efforts to secure the promise (as witnessed by his attempting at first to legally adopt Eliezer as his son and the inheritor of his estate, Ge 15:2), and he had to depend on the same divine person who had spoken of the future to work in the present as well as the future, to accomplish what he said he would do. Thus, Abraham possessed the *promises* of God, as yet unrealized, when he possessed the God of the promises and his trustworthy *word*, even though he never got to enjoy the reality of the content of the promise—the land itself—during his lifetime. . . .
>
> In Genesis 22:16–18 Abraham was told, "Because (*kî ya'an ʾašer*) you have done this and have not withheld your son, your only son, I will surely bless you . . . because (*'ēqeb ʾašer*) you have obeyed me." In Genesis 26:5 the blessing is repeated to Isaac "because (*'ēqeb ʾašer*) Abraham obeyed me and did everything I required of him, keeping my commands, my decrees and my instructions." In my judgment, the conditionality was not attached to the promise, but only to the participants who would benefit from these abiding promises. If the condition of faith was not evident, then the patriarch would become a mere transmitter of the blessing without personally inheriting any of its gifts directly. Such faith must be evident also in an obedience that sprang from faith. Certainly, the promise was not initiated in either chapter 22 or 26; that had long since been settled. But each chapter did have a sensitive moment of testing or transition. Furthermore, the election of God had been with a purpose not only of blessing Abraham and the nation

who are redeemed and counted as righteous[270] and will in the last days receive the Promised Land,[271] along with believing Gentiles (Jonah 3:5, 10) who will similarly inherit the Millennial earth and the eternal kingdom. Because of Abraham's faith in the Christ set forth in the Abrahamic covenant, as expressed in Genesis 15:6, God formally ratified that covenant with the patriarch (Genesis 15:7-22) and promised him that his seed would inherit the land. Life in the Promised Land (Genesis 15:18-22) is specified as given, by grace and for Christ's sake,[272] to both Abraham personally and to his seed for ever, and ultimately to Christ as head over them all, as Abraham and his corporate and Messianic seed[273] will possess the Land in the resurrection during the Millennial kingdom

---

(18:18) but also of charging him and his household to "keep the way of the LORD by doing what is right and just, so that (*l*^{e}*ma'an*) the LORD will bring about for Abraham what he has promised him" (v. 19).

The connection is undeniable. The duty of obedience (law, if you wish) was intimately tied up with promise as a desired sequel. Therefore, the transition to the coming time of Mosaic law should not be all that difficult for any who had really adequately listened to the full revelation of the promise in the patriarchal era. But in no way was the promise-plan itself dependent on anyone's obedience; it only insured their participation in the benefits of the promise but not on its maintenance. (pgs. 59-61, *The Promise-Plan of God: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, Walter Kaiser. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008)

270 Genesis 15:6; Isaiah 1:21-27. The "redeemed" (פדה) believing remnant in Zion in Isaiah 1:21-27 result in Jerusalem being the "city of righteousness, the faithful city" (עִיר הַצֶּדֶק קִרְיָה נֶאֱמָנָה).

271 Genesis 15:7. Note that the Lord does not merely promise Abraham's descendants the land of Canaan, but indicates that the patriarch himself will inherit the land (Genesis 13:15, 17; 15:7)—something that will take place after the resurrection in the Millennial kingdom when Abraham will dwell in Canaan with true Israel. Such a resurrection, and the eternal felicity associated with it, is also involved in the fact that Jehovah is truly a God to Abraham (Genesis 17:7; 28:13; Exodus 3:6; Matthew 22:32; Mark 12:26). Abraham's faith led him to look both for the promised kingdom and "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker *is* God" (Hebrews 11:8-10), the New Jerusalem.

272 As eternal salvation is an undeserved gift of grace, so neither Abraham nor any of his fallen physical descendents possessed the Land in their lifetime, or will possess the Land in the eschaton, because of their inherent worthiness—the inheritance is solely procured by grace, Deuteronomy 9:4-6; cf. Romans 10:8 & Deuteronomy 30.

273 Walter Kaiser notes:

When [Jehovah] appeared to Abraham, after the patriarch had arrived at Shechem, that ancient word about a "seed" (3:15) was again revived. Now, however, it was directed to Abraham (Ge 12:7). From there on, the importance of this gift of a child who would inherit the promises and blessings became one of the dominant themes in the patriarchal narrative, appearing, all told, some twenty-eight times. [Genesis 12:7; 13:15, 16 (2C); 15:13, 18; 16:10; 17:7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 19; 21:12; 22:17 (2×), 18; 24:7; 26:3, 4 (3×), 24; 28:13, 14 (2×); 32:12; 35:12; 48:3, 4.] Eve had been promised both a "seed" and a male individual—apparently from that "seed." Now in the progress of revelation, with much greater specification added, the concept was elaborated both on the corporate (all who believed) and representative (Man of promise/"Seed") aspects of this promised heir. It was to encompass so great a number that, in hyperbolic fashion, they would rival the stars of heaven and the sands on the seashore. But this "seed" would also be another "son"—born at first to Abraham, when all hope of his ever having children was lost, and then continued in the one born to his son Isaac, and later to the one born to Isaac's son Jacob. A line of successive representative sons of the patriarchs who were regarded as one with the whole group they represented matched the seminal idea already advocated in Genesis 3:15. Furthermore, in the concept of "seed" were the two aspects: (1) the seed as a future benefit and (2) the seed as the present beneficiaries of God's temporal and spiritual gifts. Consequently, "seed" was always a collective singular noun; few times did it have the meaning of a plural noun (as in "descendants"). Thereby the "seed" was marked as a unit, yet with a flexibility of reference: now referring to the one person, now to the many descendants of that family. This interchange of reference with its implied "corporate solidarity" was more than a cultural phenomena or an accident of careless editing; it was an integral part of its doctrinal intention. . . . Thus, we refer to the "one" and the "many" when we refer to the "seed," or

and eternal state.[274] This promise of life was given to Abraham because he believed in Jehovah, not because of any works that he did, setting a pattern for all those who are of Abraham—for Abraham is the father of believing Jews and Gentiles—to also receive life in the kingdom, spiritual life now and eschatological life, through faith, through which they are accouted righteous (Romans 4). Thus, believers are those who receive salvation,[275] those who are established and prosper, both in having Jehovah bless them and protect them in the Land and in general by having all things work together for good to them (2 Chronicles 20:20). They believe in Jehovah alone and reject any confidence in other gods (Isaiah 43:10). They will be secure and protected by the virgin-born yet Divine Messiah from the temporal and eternal judgments that fall on the wicked.[276] They are the faithful who are saints or holy ones (Hosea 11:12), having been converted and having in this manner become the righteous (Hosea 14:1-9). On the other hand, those who do not believe are those who are the objects of God's wrath and judgment, those who do not inherit the Promised Land[277] but are killed by plagues or the sword, or suffer exile from it as they turn to idolatry and are the objects of the Lord's great anger.[278] They are those who are removed from the Land in their lifetime (cf. Psalm 78) and will not inherit it in the Millennium or the eternal state, but are eternally cut off from true

---

"offspring," but the use of the translation "descendants" limited the reference only to the whole group who believed but did not include the representative of the whole group, the coming Messiah himself. (pgs. 56-57, *The Promise-Plan of God: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, Walter Kaiser. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008)

The recognition of both the individual and corporate aspect of the "seed" continues in the New Testament (cf. Galatians 3:16, 29).

274 Genesis 13:15; 17:8; 28:13.

275 Exodus 14:31-15:2. While the entire nation of Israel received salvation in that they were delivered from slavery in Egypt and from Pharaoh's army, although the entire nation did not believe in an eternally saving fashion, nonetheless Exodus 14:31-15:2 does connect belief and salvation, and both the belief and the salvation received and sung about pass beyond the merely physical and temporal for the Israel of God (Romans 9:6) to encompass all that is involved, both temporally and eternally, in the affirmation "Jehovah . . . is become my salvation: he is my God."

276 Isaiah 28:16; 8:14-15; 7:14; 9:6; Romans 9:33; 10:11.

277 Numbers 14:11-35; 20:12; Deuteronomy 1:32-40; 9:23-24. Numbers 14:11-35 speaks, at least in general, of those who do not believe in Jehovah at all, while Numbers 20:12 speaks of a lack of faith in the Lord in a particular situation by those who are true sons of Israel, namely, Moses and Aaron. The language employed concerning those who do not believe in the Lord at all in Numbers 14:11-35 is much harsher than that in Numbers 20:12, although entrance into the Promised Land is taken from both groups. It is noteworthy that Deuteronomy 1:32-40 indicates that the Lord was angry with Moses because of the larger unbelieving multitude that he led and represented (as, typologically, there is no problem with the Law itself, but because of sin, man is unable to receive eternal life through the Law), those who were rebellious all the time that Moses knew them and consequently did not believe nor hearken to the Lord (Deuteronomy 9:23-24).

278 2 Kings 17:7-23; Deuteronomy 27-28. Contrast the unbelief of 2 Kings 17:14 with Hezekiah's "trust" in 18:5 and the temporal prosperity that was consequent upon it.

Israel,[279] having not set their hope[280] in God, but rejected His covenant, and been rebellious and faithless.[281] They are those who are not established in time or in eternity in the Land because they do not believe in Jehovah and Immanuel, the Posessor and Protector of the promised country,[282] the Stone and sure foundation of Israel,[283] the Servant who would justify many by the offering of Himself.[284] There are no texts where true believers are lost or cast off because of a lack of circumcision, obedience to various commandments, or anything else; in continuity with the New Testament, the Old Testament teaches that all believers receive salvation and all unbelievers receive condemnation.[285] Thus, following the pattern set in Genesis 15:6, believers are those who receive salvation in its temporal and eternal aspects, and unbelievers are those who receive temporal and eternal judgment.

Habakkuk 2:4, the heart of the entire book of Habakkuk, referring back to the statement of Genesis 15:6,[286] and in light of other Old Testament texts that promise salvation to believers,[287] states: "Behold, his soul *which* is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith."[288] The great fact that the just shall live by faith was to

---

279 Exodus 30:33, 38; 31:14; Leviticus 7:20, 21, 25, 27; 17:4, 9; 18:29; 19:8; 20:17, 18; 23:39; Numbers 9:13; 15:30; Deuteronomy 10:16, 30:6; Psalm 125:5; Isaiah 53:8; Jeremiah 4:4; Daniel 9:26; Zechariah 14:2.

280 כֶּסֶל, Psalm 78:7; cf. Job 8:14; 31:24; Proverbs 3:26.

281 Psalm 78; cf. v. 7, 22, 32, 37.

282 Isaiah 53:1; 7:9-14; 8:8; 9:6; Hebrews 11:14.

283 Isaiah 28:16; 8:14; Genesis 49:24; Psalm 118:22; Romans 9:33; 10:11; 1 Peter 2:4-8).

284 Isaiah 52:13-53:12.

285 An affirmation that all true believers receive salvation in the Old Testament, as in the New, does not eliminate the possibility that one could, in Old Testament times, possess a type of spurious "faith" that fell short of the kind of true faith associated with real conversion, just as such spurious "faith" is mentioned in the New Testament (John 2:23-25) while salvation is still set forth as by means of faith alone (John 3:1-21). The Old Testament indicates that one could assent, for example, to the fact that the Word from the Lord was true without having anything more than the "faith" of a hypocrite (Psalm 106:12ff.), while at the same time repeatedly stressing the salvation of all believers (Genesis 15:6).

286 Compare Nehemiah 9:8 also.

287 A goodly number of texts of this sort are found in the Old Testament that do not specifically contain the word *believe*; cf. Deuteronomy 10:16; 30:6-10; Isaiah 55:1-3; Jeremiah 3:22; 4:4; Hosea 14:2, etc. Such an employment of other terms for saving faith and conversion appears in the New Testament also, of course (Matthew 7:13; John 6:37, 57; 10:9; Revelation 22:17, etc.).

288 הִנֵּה עֻפְּלָה לֹא־יָשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ וְצַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה׃
ἐὰν ὑποστείληται οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται (LXX; note that 2:4a is not at all literally translated)
Ecce qui incredulus est, non erit recta anima ejus in semetipso; justus autem in fide sua vivet. "Behold, he that is unbelieving, his soul shall not be right in himself: but the just shall live in his faith." (Vulgate)
הָא רַשִׁיעָא בְלִבְהוֹן אָמְרִין לֵית כָּל אִלֵּין וְצַדִּיקָא עַל קוּשְׁטְהוֹן יִתְקַיְמוּן׃ (Targum Jonathan)

be engraven plainly upon tablets.[289] The ungodly, whether unbelieving Israelites[290] or idolatrous Babylonians,[291] are proud, their souls lifted up; in contrast, the people of God, those who are just, shall live by faith.[292] Habakkuk sets before Israel the example of Abraham—the patriarch was justified by faith alone, and his faith, because of its saving character, produced a life of persevering obedience (cf. Genesis 22). In such a manner, Habakkuk affirms, the people in his day needed to experience true conversion by faith and evidence the reality of that conversion in a life of faithfulness. A life of open rebellion was unacceptable, but one of mere outward rigorism or moralism would also not suffice, for without a root of faith and a renewed heart, all religious and moral actings were vain (Isaiah 1:10-15; Hebrews 11:6). The word *faith*[293] in the verse, a noun related to the verb *believe* in Genesis 15:6, means in Habakkuk 2:4 a *steadfast trust* which results in *faithfulness*,[294] combining the ideas of *faith* and of the *faithfulness* that flows from it.[295]

---

289 Habakkuk 2:2. The word לוּחַ, employed in Habbakuk 2:2 of the tables upon which the message that the just shall live by faith was to be engraved, was also employed of the tables of the ten commandments (Exodus 24:12).

290 Habakkuk 1:5; Acts 13:39-41.

291 Habakkuk 1:6ff.

292 In Habakkuk 2:4b, the accentuation of וְצַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה׃ indicates that the affirmation of Habakkuk is: "the just, by his faith shall live" or "the righteous shall live-by-his-faith," rather than "the just by his faith, shall live" or "the righteous-by-his-faith shall live." That is, the Hebrew accents support the translation of the Authorized Version: "the just shall live by his faith."

293 אֱמוּנָה.

294 Strong evidence that אֱמוּנָה in Habakkuk 2:4 is properly rendered *faith*, and that *faithfulness* is a result of *faith*, is provided in the comment on Habakkuk 2:4 in *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah*, O. P. Robertson, *NICOT*; note also that אֱמוּנָה is translated in the LXX by *pistis* with some frequency. "The context . . . justifies πίστις, even in the sense 'trust' . . . and it was so translated by Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, and in the other Greek versions" (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, on 3:11). Furthermore, the meaning "'belief, trust' . . . [for] אֱמוּנָה . . . seems decidedly to have [been] adopted . . . in the rabbinical Hebrew" (Lightfoot, *Commentary on Galatians*, sec. "The Words Denoting 'Faith'"). Warfield comments:

> The notions of "faith" and "faithfulness" lie close to one another, and are not uncommonly expressed by a single term (so πίστις, *fides*, faith). . . . "[F]aith," in its active sense . . . occurs in the Authorized Version of the Old Testament [in] Deuteronomy 32:20 where it represents the Hebrew אֱמֶן, and Habakkuk 2:4 where it stands for the Hebrew אֱמוּנָה; and it . . . [is] really demanded in . . . Habakkuk 2:4. The very point of this passage . . . is the sharp contrast which is drawn between arrogant self-sufficiency and faithful dependence on God. The purpose of the verse is to give a reply to the prophet's inquiry as to God's righteous dealings with the Chaldæans. Since it is by faith that the righteous man lives, the arrogant Chaldæan, whose soul is puffed up and not straight within him, cannot but be destined to destruction. The whole drift of the broader context bears out this meaning; for throughout this prophecy the Chaldæan is ever exhibited as the type of insolent self-assertion (Habakkuk 1:7, 11, 16), in contrast with which the righteous appear, certainly not as men of integrity and steadfast faithfulness, but as men who look in faith to God and trustingly depend upon His arm. The obvious reminiscence of Genesis 15:6 throws its weight into the same scale, to which may be added the consent of the Jewish expositors of the passage. Here we have, therefore, thrown into a clear light the contrasting characteristics of the wicked, typified by the Chaldæan, and of the righteous: of the one the fundamental trait is self-sufficiency; of the other, faith. This faith, which forms the distinctive feature of the righteous man, and by which he obtains life, is obviously no mere assent. It is a profound and abiding disposition, an ingrained attitude of mind and heart towards God which affects and gives character to all the

It is used for stedfastness and steadiness,[296] God's truthful faithfulness,[297] human faith, truthfulness, and faithfulness,[298] and what is true and faithful in itself.[299] Other words in the *'aman* word group, that of *belief/faith/faithfulness*,[300] mean *faithfulness*,[301] *verily, truly, indeed*,[302] *trusting, faithfulness*,[303] *faith, support*,[304] *constant*,[305] and *firmness,*

---

activities. Here . . . the term . . . in the Old Testament . . . rises to the full height of its most pregnant meaning. ("The Biblical Doctrine of Faith," Warfield, in *Biblical Doctrines*, vol. 2 of *Works*).

In both the Old and New Testament, "[t]he trusting man (מַאֲמִין = πιστεύων) is also the faithful man (נֶאֱמָן = πιστός" (pg. 198, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6, Kittel).

295 "אֱמוּנָה . . . from *'âman,* to be firm, to last[,] [denotes] firmness (Ex. 17:12); then, as an attribute of God, trustworthiness, unchangeable fidelity in the fulfilment of His promises (Deut. 32:4; Ps. 33:4; 89:34); and, as a personal attribute of man, fidelity in word and deed (Jer. 7:28; 9:2; Ps. 37:3); and, in his relation to God, firm attachment to God, an undisturbed confidence in the divine promises of grace, *firma fiducia* and *fides,* so that in *'ĕmūnâh* the primary meanings of *ne'ĕmân* and *he'ĕmīn* are combined. This is also apparent from the fact that Abraham is called *ne'ĕmân* in Neh. 9:8, with reference to the fact that it is affirmed of him in Gen. 15:6 that וְהֶאֱמִן בַּיהוָה, "he trusted, or believed, the Lord;" and still more indisputably from the passage before us, since it is impossible to mistake the reference in בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה וְצַדִּיק to Gen. 15:6, "he believed (*he'ĕmīn*) in Jehovah, and He reckoned it to him *lits^{e}dâqâh*." It is also indisputably evident from the context that our passage treats of the relation between man and God, since the words themselves speak of a waiting (*chikkâh*) for the fulfilment of a promising oracle, which is to be preceded by a period of severe suffering. 'What is more natural than that life or deliverance from destruction should be promised to that faith which adheres faithfully to God, holds fast by the word of promise, and confidently waits for its fulfilment in the midst of tribulation? It is not the sincerity, trustworthiness, or integrity of the righteous man, regarded as being virtues in themselves, which are in danger of being shaken and giving way in such times of tribulation, but, as we may see in the case of the prophet himself, his *faith.* To this, therefore, there is appended the great promise expressed in the one word יִחְיֶה' (Delitzsch). And in addition to this, *'ĕmūnâh* is opposed to the pride of the Chaldaean, to his exaltation of himself above God; and for that very reason it cannot denote integrity in itself, but simply some quality which has for its leading feature humble submission to God, that is to say, faith, or firm reliance upon God. The Jewish expositors, therefore, have unanimously retained this meaning here, and the LXX have rendered the word quite correctly πίστις. . . . The deep meaning of these words has been first fully brought out by the Apostle Paul (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11: see also Heb. 10:38), who . . . makes the declaration ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται the basis of the New Testament doctrine of justification by faith" (Comment on Habakkuk 2:4, *Commentary*, Keil & Delitzsch). That is, "in Habakkuk 2:4, faith was simply an unwavering trust in God's word. In contrast to the overbearing disposition of the wicked, the believer, like Abraham in Genesis 15:6 and Isaiah in Isaiah 28:16; 30:15, put an immovable confidence in the God who had promised his salvation and the coming Man of promise. It was a steadfast, undivided surrender to [Jehovah], a childlike, humble and sincere trust in the credibility of the divine message of salvation" (pg. 196, *The Promise-Plan of God*, Kaiser).

296 Exodus 17:12; Isaiah 33:6.

297 Deuteronomy 32:4; Psalm 33:4; 36:6; 40:10; 88:11; 89:1, 2, 5, 8, 24, 33, 49; 92:2; 96:13; 98:3; 100:5; 119:75, 90; 143:1; Isaiah 25:1; Lamentations 3:23; Hosea 2:20.

298 1 Samuel 26:23; 2 Kings 12:15; 22:7; 2 Chronicles 19:9; 31:12; 34:12; Proverbs 12:22; 28:20; Isaiah 11:5 (the faithfulness of the incarnate Messiah); 59:4; Jeremiah 5:1, 3; 7:28; 9:3; Habakkuk 2:4. Note also 1 Chronicles 9:22, 26, 31; 2 Chronicles 31:15, 18 where those put in office were to be trustworthy or faithful and act in fidelity (cf. KJV margin).

299 Psalm 37:3; 119:30, 86, 138; Proverbs 12:17.

300 See *BDB* for the definitions.

301 אֹמֶן, Isaiah 25:1.

302 אָמֵן, Numbers 5:22; Deuteronomy 27:15–26; 1 Kings 1:36; 1 Chronicles 16:36; Nehemiah 5:13; 8:6; Psalm 41:13; 72:19; 89:52; 106:48; Isaiah 65:16; Jeremiah 11:5; 28:6. Also אָמְנָה, Genesis 20:12;

faithfulness, truth.[306] Thus, as Genesis 15:6 indicates that believers are righteous, Habakkuk 2:4 indicates that those who are just are those who live by faith—and faithfulness is impossible without faith, for those who have, through the instrumentality of faith, embraced Jehovah as their own God and trusted in His promise of redemption through the Seed, will also characteristically trust in God and live their lives as the people of God out of the faith that is the fundamental or radical root of their spiritual life. *Righteousness*, *life*, and *faith*, in both their earthly "already" and their eschatological "not yet," are indissoluably connected.

Those who came to believe in Jehovah and His Messiah, and consequently lived by faith in Him, were those who "trusted[307] in the LORD God of Israel"[308] and in His Word (Psalm 119:42). Such a trust manifested itself in obedience to His Law in the trials of this life,[309] and brought both temporal[310] and eternal deliverance (Psalm 125:1). Trust also led to an acknowledgment of Jehovah in one's practical life (Proverbs 3:5-6). All

---

Joshua 7:20. Also אֱמֶנֶם, Genesis 18:13; Numbers 22:37; 1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chronicles 6:18; Psalm 58:1. Also אָמְנָם, Ruth 3:12; 2 Kings 19:17; Job 9:2; 12:2; 19:4–5; 34:12; 36:4; Isaiah 37:18.

303 אֹמֶן, Deuteronomy 32:20 (unconverted Israelites as "children in whom is no faith"); Proverbs 13:17; 14:5; 20:6; Isaiah 26:2.

304 אֲמָנָה, Nehemiah 9:38; 11:23.

305 אֲמָנָה, Song 4:8; 2 Kings 5:12; the likely significance of the name of the river and of the region from which it flows.

306 אֱמֶת, used of God's faithful truth (Genesis 24:27; 32:10; Exodus 34:6; 2 Chronicles 15:3; Nehemiah 9:33; Psalm 25:5, 10; 26:3; 30:9; 31:5; 40:10, 11; 43:3; 54:5; 57:3, 10; 61:7; 69:13; 71:22; 85:10–11; 86:11, 15; 89:14; 91:4; 108:4; 111:7–8; 115:1; 117:2; 119:43, 142, 151, 160; 132:11; 138:2; 146:6; Isaiah 38:18, 19; 61:8; Jeremiah 4:2; 10:10; 42:5; Daniel 9:13; Zechariah 8:8), of true, faithful, and right things (Genesis 24:48; Deuteronomy 13:14; 17:4; 22:20; Joshua 2:12; 2 Samuel 7:28; 15:20; 1 Kings 10:6; 22:16; 2 Kings 20:19; 2 Chronicles 9:5; 18:15; 31:20; 32:1; Nehemiah 9:13; Esther 9:30; Psalm 19:9; 45:4; 51:6; Proverbs 3:3; 8:7; 11:18; 14:22; 16:6; 20:28; 22:21; 23:23; Ecclesiastes 12:10; Isaiah 39:8; 42:3, 9; 59:14, 15; Jeremiah 14:13; 26:15; Daniel 8:12, 26; 10:1, 21; 11:2; Hosea 4:1; Zechariah 7:9; 8:19; Malachi 2:6), acts (Genesis 24:49; 47:29; Joshua 2:14; 24:14; Judges 9:15, 16, 19; 1 Samuel 12:24; 2 Samuel 2:6; 1 Kings 2:4; 3:6; 17:24; 20:3; Psalm 15:2; 145:18; Proverbs 14:25; 29:14; Isaiah 10:20; 16:5; 38:3; Isaiah 48:1; Jeremiah 9:5; 23:28; 28:9; 32:41; 33:6; Ezekiel 18:8, 9; Micah 7:20; Zechariah 8:16), and individuals or groups of individuals (Genesis 42:16; Exodus 18:21; Nehemiah 7:2; Proverbs 12:19; Jeremiah 2:21; Zechariah 8:3).

307 בטח. The complete list of references in the Old Testament is: Deuteronomy 28:52; Judges 9:26; 18:7, 10, 27; 20:36; 2 Kings 18:5, 19–22, 24, 30; 19:10; 1 Chronicles 5:20; 2 Chronicles 32:10; Job 6:20; 11:18; 39:11; 40:23; Psalm 4:5; 9:10; 13:5; 21:7; 22:4–5, 9; 25:2; 26:1; 27:3; 28:7; 31:6, 14; 32:10; 33:21; 37:3, 5; 40:3; 41:9; 44:6; 49:6; 52:7–8; 55:23; 56:3–4, 11; 62:8, 10; 78:22; 84:12; 86:2; 91:2; 112:7; 115:8–11; 118:8–9; 119:42; 125:1; 135:18; 143:8; 146:3; Proverbs 3:5; 11:15, 28; 14:16; 16:20; 28:1, 25–26; 29:25; 31:11; Isaiah 12:2; 26:3–4; 30:12; 31:1; 32:9–11; 36:4–7, 9, 15; 37:10; 42:17; 47:10; 50:10; 59:4; Jeremiah 5:17; 7:4, 8, 14; 9:4; 12:5; 13:25; 17:5, 7; 28:15; 29:31; 39:18; 46:25; 48:7; 49:4, 11; Ezekiel 16:15; 33:13; Hosea 10:13; Amos 6:1; Micah 7:5; Habakkuk 2:18; Zephaniah 3:2. Note that in Psalm 78:22 בטח and הֶאֱמִין are in synonymous parallelism; compare also 2 Kings 17:14; 18:5.

308 2 Kings 18:5, 22, 30; 19:10; 2 Chronicles 32:10; Isaiah 36:7, 15; 37:10.

309 Psalm 62:8, 10.

310 1 Chronicles 5:20; Jeremiah 39:18.

the nation was called to such a trust (Psalm 115:8-11). The Lord saves and preserves those who trust in Him (Psalm 86:2), so that true Israel can say: "Behold, God *is* my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: for the LORD JEHOVAH *is* my strength and *my* song; he also is become my salvation,"[311] while the ungodly trust in evil deeds or plans,[312] men,[313] false gods (Isaiah 42:17), external ritual (Jeremiah 7:4), or their own righteousness (Ezekiel 33:13) instead of in Jehovah only (Zephaniah 3:2). Those that truly know the Lord trust in Him, and He will not forsake them,[314] nor allow them to be confounded, but deliver them,[315] and surround them with mercies (Psalm 32:10), since they trust in His mercy[316] for ever and ever (Psalm 52:8), and they will dwell in the Land (Psalm 37:3, 5). The Bible contrasts those who trust in Jehovah with those who "believed not in God, and trusted not in his salvation . . . a stubborn and rebellious generation; a generation *that* set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not stedfast with God . . . [that] kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in his law . . . [that] sinned still, and believed not for his wondrous works. For their heart was not right with him, neither were they stedfast in his covenant."[317] In short, trust in the Lord marked the true Israelite,[318] he who was blessed[319] with temporal and eternal salvation.

Other Hebrew forms related to the verb *trust*[320] similarly indicate that temporal and eternal salvation was received by those who trust in Jehovah. Those would be "saved" who placed their "confidence" in Him.[321] Those who "hope" in the Lord rather than placing their "confidence" in any other source are blessed, without any limitation to either this life or that to come.[322] The Old Testament consequently declares: "Blessed *is* that man that maketh the LORD his trust" (Psalm 40:4), for He is the only fit object of "confidence" (Psalm 65:5) or "trust" (Psalm 71:5)—all other objects of "trust" are like a

---

311 Isaiah 12:2; 26:3-4; 50:10.

312 Isaiah 30:12; 47:10.

313 Psalm 56:3, 4, 11; 118:8-9; Proverbs 29:25; Isaiah 31:1; Jeremiah 17:5-7.

314 Psalm 9:10; cf. 4:5.

315 Psalm 22:4-5; cf. 25:2; 26:1; 28:7; 31:6, 14; 33:21; 40:3.

316 חֶסֶד.

317 Psalm 78:22, 8, 10, 32, 37.

318 Psalm 112:7; 143:8.

319 Proverbs 16:20; 28:25, 26.

320 That is, the rest of the בטח word group.

321 בִּטָּחָה in Isaiah 30:15; בִּטָּחוֹן in Isaiah 36:4; 2 Kings 18:19; also Ecclesiastes 9:4.

322 Jeremiah 17:7; 2:37; 48:17; Ezekiel 29:16. מִבְטָח, "trust, reliance" (KB), "confidence . . . 1. *the act* of confiding Pr 21:22, 22:19, 25:19. 2. *the object* of confidence Jb 8:14, 18:14, 31:24, Psalm 40:5, 65:6, 71:5, Je 2:37, 17:7, 48:13, Ez 29:16. 3. the state of confidence, *security* Pr 14:26, Is 32:18" (BDB).

"spider's web."[323] "Confidence in an unfaithful man in time of trouble *is like* a broken tooth, and a foot out of joint,"[324] while those whose "trust" is "in the LORD" find in Him "strong confidence" and a "place of refuge."[325]

Thus, Jehovah is Himself the salvation for the "righteous," those who *take refuge* or *trust*[326] in Him (Psalm 64:10). Believers can say: "God . . . in him will I trust: *he is* my shield, and the horn of my salvation, my high tower, and my refuge, my saviour."[327] To "all them that trust in him" He is a shield and place of safety.[328] "[A]ll those that put their trust in [Him] rejoice . . . because [He] defend[s] them" (Psalm 5:11). They are blessed, now and forever (Psalm 34:8), receiving of the great goodness He has stored up for them (Psalm 31:19). The believer, one who forsakes confidence in men to trust in Jehovah only (Psalm 118:8-9),[329] can say: "O LORD my God, in thee do I put my trust: save me,"[330] while those who trust in false gods (Deuteronomy 32:37), evil men (Judges 9:15), or pagan nations (Isaiah 30:2) are destroyed. Because of His "lovingkindness," believers will "never be ashamed" or "desolate" or "destitute" or "put to confusion" because they "trust in" Him, being rather "deliver[ed]" in His "righteousness" and having their souls "redeemed."[331] The "LORD . . . knoweth them that trust in him" (Nahum 1:7), so those "afflicted and poor people" who "shall trust in the name of the LORD" (Zephaniah 3:12) receive His promise: "he that putteth his trust in me shall possess the land, and shall inherit my holy mountain" (Isaiah 57:13). They will "abide" in His presence "for ever" (Psalm 61:4), and have a refuge and sure hope in death (Proverbs 14:32). Those who "come to trust . . . the LORD God of Israel" will receive a "full reward" (Ruth 2:12), for He will "save them, because they put their trust in him" (Psalm 37:40). Trust in Jehovah is connected with trust in His Son (Proverbs 30:4), the Messiah; all those who repent and trust in the Son of God receive temporal and eternal blessing,

---

323 Job 8:14; 18:14; 31:24.

324 Proverbs 25:19; cf. 21:22.

325 Proverbs 22:19; 14:26; contra 25:19; 21:22.

326 חסה; Cf. in English, Psalm 57:1: "Be merciful unto me, O God, be merciful unto me: for my soul trusteth [Qal perfect חסה] in thee: yea, in the shadow of thy wings will I make my refuge [Qal imperfect חסה], until *these* calamities be overpast." The complete list of references for the verb is: Deuteronomy 32:37; Judges 9:15; Ruth 2:12; 2 Samuel 22:3, 31; Psalm 2:12; 5:11; 7:1; 11:1; 16:1; 17:7; 18:2, 30; 25:20; 31:1, 19; 34:8, 22; 36:7; 37:40; 57:1; 61:4; 64:10; 71:1; 91:4; 118:8–9; 141:8; 144:2; Proverbs 14:32; 30:5; Isaiah 14:32; 30:2; 57:13; Nahum 1:7; Zephaniah 3:12.

327 2 Samuel 22:3; Psalm 144:2.

328 2 Samuel 22:31; cf. Isaiah 14:32; Psalm 61:4; 94:4.

329 Psalm 118:8 is the middle verse in the Bible.

330 Psalm 7:1; 11:1; 16:1; 17:7; 18:2, 30.

331 Psalm 25:20; 31:1; 34:22; 36:7; 71:1; 141:8.

while those who do not will perish under Messianic wrath: "Kiss[332] the Son,[333] lest he be angry, and ye perish *from* the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed *are* all they that put their trust in him" (Psalm 2:12).[334]

In Genesis 15:6, Abraham was *counted* righteous. The verb employed[335] specifies that the patriarch was *accounted* or *reckoned* as righteous; the imputation of righteousness, rather than an infusion of righteousness, is in view. Many texts with the word clearly speak of imputation or accounting,[336] in many others the idea of making,

---

332 נשׁק, also translated "be ruled" in Genesis 41:40.

333 Note the use of the Aramaic form בַּר, elsewhere found in the Hebrew Old Testament only in Proverbs 31:2; the Son of God is set forth in Psalm 2:12 as the Object of faith for the nations.

334 Warfield notes:

> [A]long with an ever more richly expressed corporate hope, there is found also [in the Old Testament] an ever more richly expressed individual trust, which finds natural utterance through an ample body of synonyms bringing out severally the various sides of that perfect commitment to God that constitutes the essence of faith. Thus we read much of trusting in, on, to God, or in His word, His name, His mercy, His salvation (בָּטַח), of seeking and finding refuge in God or in the shadow of His wings (חָסָה), of committing ourselves to God (גָּלַל), setting confidence (כָּסַל) in Him, looking to Him (נִסְמַךְ) relying upon Him (נִשְׁעַן), staying upon Him (נִסְמַךְ), setting or fixing the heart upon Him (חֵכִין לֵב), binding our love on Him (חָשַׁק), cleaving to Him (דָּבַק). So, on the hopeful side of faith, we read much of hoping in God (קָוָה), waiting on God (יָחַל), of longing for Him (חִכָּה), patiently waiting for Him (הִתְחוֹלֵל), and the like.
>
> By the aid of such expressions, it becomes possible to form a somewhat clear notion of the attitude towards Him which was required by Jehovah of His believing people, and which is summed up in the term "faith." It is a reverential (Exodus 14:31; Numbers 14:11, 20:12) and loving faith, which rests on the strong basis of firm and unshaken conviction of the might and grace of the covenant God and of the trustworthiness of all His words, and exhibits itself in confident trust in Jehovah and unwavering expectation of the fulfilment of, no doubt, all His promises, but more especially of His promise of salvation, and in consequent faithful and exclusive adherence to Him. In one word, it consists in an utter commitment of oneself to Jehovah, with confident trust in Him as guide and saviour, and assured expectation of His promised salvation. It therefore stands in contrast, on the one hand, with trust in self or other human help, and on the other with doubt and unbelief, despondency and unfaithfulness. From Jehovah alone is salvation to be looked for, and it comes from His free grace alone (Deuteronomy 7:7, 8:18; 9:5; Amos 3:2; Hosea 13:5; Ezekiel 20:6; Jeremiah 39:18; Malachi 1:2), and to those only who look solely to Him for it (Isaiah 31:1; 57:13; 28:16; 30:15; Jeremiah 17:5; 39:18; Psalm 118:8; 146:3; 20:7; 1 Samuel 17:45; Job 31:24; Psalm 52:9). The reference of faith is accordingly in the Old Testament always distinctly soteriological; its end the Messianic salvation; and its essence a trusting, or rather an entrusting of oneself to the God of salvation, with full assurance of the fulfilment of His gracious purposes and the ultimate realization of His promise of salvation for the people and the individual. Such an attitude towards the God of salvation is identical with the faith of the New Testament, and is not essentially changed by the fuller revelation of God the Redeemer in the person of the promised Messiah. (pgs. 488-490, "The Biblical Doctrine of Faith," Warfield, in *Biblical Doctrines*, vol. 2 of *Works*)

335 חשׁב. The complete list of references in the Old Testament is: Genesis 15:6; 31:15; 38:15; 50:20; Exodus 31:4; 35:32; Leviticus 7:18; 17:4; 25:27, 31, 50, 52; 27:18, 23; Numbers 18:27, 30; 23:9; Deuteronomy 2:11, 20; Joshua 13:3; Esther 8:3; 9:24–25; 1 Samuel 1:13; 18:25; 2 Samuel 4:2; 14:13–14; 19:19; 1 Kings 10:21; 2 Kings 12:15; 22:7; 2 Chronicles 2:14; 9:20; Nehemiah 6:2, 6; 13:13; Job 6:26; 13:24; 18:3; 19:11, 15; 33:10; 35:2; 41:27, 29, 32; Psalm 10:2; 21:11; 32:2; 35:4, 20; 36:4; 40:17; 41:7; 44:22; 52:2; 73:16; 77:5; 88:4; 106:31; 119:59; 140:2, 4; 144:3; Proverbs 16:9, 30; 17:28; 24:8; 27:14; Isaiah 2:22; 5:28; 10:7; 13:17; 29:16–17; 32:15; 33:8; 40:15, 17; 53:3–4; Jeremiah 11:19; 18:8, 11, 18; 23:27; 26:3; 29:11; 36:3; 48:2; 49:20, 30; 50:45; Lamentations 2:8; 4:2; Ezekiel 11:2; 38:10; Daniel 11:24–25; Hosea 7:15; 8:12; Amos 6:5; Jonah 1:4; Micah 2:1, 3; Nahum 1:9, 11; Zechariah 7:10; 8:17; Malachi 3:16.

336 Genesis 31:15; Leviticus 7:18; 17:4; Numbers 18:27, 30; Numbers 23:9; 2 Samuel 19:19; 2 Kings 12:15; 22:7; Job 13:24; 18:3; 19:11, 15; 33:10; Psalm 32:2; 106:31; Proverbs 17:28; Isaiah 29:16-17; 32:15; 40:15, 17; Lamentations 4:2.

transforming, or infusing is evidently impossible,[337] and no passages with the verb in question clearly speak of any kind of infusion. When Phinehas' stand for Jehovah and against Baalpeor was reckoned to him as righteousness (Psalm 106:31),[338] the Divine act was certainly an accounting of Phinehas' act as righteous, rather than infusing goodness into or transforming his act into a good one. Likewise, when Nehemiah made men treasurers because they were "counted faithful" (Nehemiah 13:13),[339] the accounting did not make the men faithful or infuse faithfulness into them, but was an accounting that they were indeed faithful men. Thus, Genesis 15:6 speaks of the legal[340] reckoning of Abraham as righteous. He was reckoned righteous at the judgment bar of God, rather than in the eyes of men, or in some other way, for Jehovah was the One who accounted the patriarch righteous. The opposite of a man having righteousness accounted to him, as in Genesis 15:6, is to have iniquity imputed (2 Samuel 19:19). One who has blood imputed to him is reckoned as being guilty of shedding blood (Leviticus 17:4), while the

---

337 Genesis 38:15; Leviticus 25:27; Deuteronomy 2:11, 20; 1 Samuel 1:13; 18:25; 1 Kings 10:21; 2 Chronicles 9:20; Nehemiah 13:13; Job 13:24; 18:3; 19:11, 15; 33:10; 41:27, 29; Psalm 77:5; 88:4; Proverbs 17:28; Isaiah 13:17; 53:4; Jeremiah 36:3; Hosea 8:12; Zechariah 7:10; 8:17;

338 The syntax of Psalm 106:31 is very similar to that of Genesis 15:6 in its account of reckoning; compare וַתֵּחָשֶׁב לוֹ לִצְדָקָה לְדֹר וָדֹר עַד־עוֹלָם׃ with וְהֶאֱמַן בַּיהוָה וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לוֹ צְדָקָה׃. Concerning Psalm 106:31, John Gill notes:

> *And that was counted unto him for righteousness, &c*. Not for his justifying righteousness before God; for all the works of righteousness done by the best of men cannot justify them before him, much less a single action: but his executing judgment in the manner he did, or slaying the above two persons, was esteemed a righteous action by the Lord himself; who upon it caused the plague to cease, and likewise gave to Phinehas the covenant of an everlasting priesthood, and to his posterity; whereby the action had eternal honour put upon it, and was sufficiently secured from the calumny of men; who might condemn it as a rash action done by a private person, assuming the office of a public magistrate; and as being a cruel one, not giving the criminals time for repentance. But all this is set aside by the testimony of God himself, approving of it; and so it continues to be esteemed, as it is said it should, *unto all generations for evermore*: whenever it is spoken of, it is spoken of with commendation, as a righteous action, as expressive of true zeal for the Lord of hosts.

Likewise, Keil & Delitzsch note:

> This act of zeal for [Jehovah], which compensated for Israel's unfaithfulness, was accounted unto [Phinehas] for righteousness, by his being rewarded for it with the priesthood unto everlasting ages, Num. 25:10–13. This accounting of a work for righteousness is only apparently contradictory to Gen. 15:5f.: it was indeed an act which sprang from a constancy in faith [cf. Psalm 106:24], and one which obtained for him the acceptation of a righteous man for the sake of this upon which it was based, by proving him to be such.

Concerning Psalm 106:31 "we should compare for the expression Genesis 15:6, the only passage where it occurs, and for the subject, Deuteronomy 6:25; 24:13 . . . Psalm 24:5. The language does not refer to the *first* justification, but to the *second*, to the good works of one already in a state of grace, by which he obtains from God, who recompenses every one according to his works, a reward of grace, as Phinehas obtained on the present occasion the priesthood for his family, comp. Numbers 25:13" (Comment on Psalm 106:31, *Commentary on the Psalms*, vol. 3., E. W. Hengstenberg). That is, Phinehas' act could only be accounted as righteous because Phinehas' person had already been accounted righteous through Jehovah's gratuitous justification; Phinehas had Christ as his Mediator, as one who sanctified the iniquity that otherwise would corrupt even the holiest actions of believers and prevent them from being acceptable in the sight of Jehovah (Exodus 28:38).

339 נֶאֱמָנִים נֶחְשָׁבוּ. Note the use of אמן and חשׁב.

340 cf. Leviticus 7:18; 17:4; 25:31; Numbers 18:27, 30; Joshua 13:3; 2 Samuel 4:2; 2 Samuel 19:19; Psalm 32:2;

benefit of sacrificial offering in expiation is imputed when received in the proper manner, but not otherwise (Leviticus 7:18); by imputation one is reckoned as and treated as the possessor of whatever is imputed. Thus, when Abraham was reckoned as righteous in Genesis 15:6, his being accounted righteous, rather than his personal acquisition of inward holiness, is in view. Abraham, and all the righteous from the time of the first announcement of the gospel in Genesis 3:15, acknowledged their need for gratuiously imputed righteousness, and the Divine provision of such in the Messiah, through their offering of animal sacrifices, as ordained by God from the beginning (Genesis 3:20-21; 4:4); the blessed substitution that merited the imputation of an alien righteousness, historically accomplished on the cross, not salvation by personal merit, was manifestly set forth in the sacrifical types. Similarly, David records: "Blessed *is* the man unto whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity,"[341] the man to whom, although sinful in himself, righteousness instead of iniquity is Divinely imputed, whose "transgression *is* forgiven, *whose* sin *is* covered." This man is he who has received David's call to all nations to faith in God's "Son," for "blessed *are* all they that put their trust in him" (Psalm 2:12), even as all are blessed who hope (Psalm 146:5) or trust in Jehovah.[342] Thus, "faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness" (Romans 4:9)[343] in a legal or judicial sense. Genesis 15:6 refers solely to an imputed righteousness. The outward righteousness of those imputed righteous, the outward evidential just character manifested in them, is a consequent that follows from the receipt of imputed righteousness, and faith, not as a meritorious instrument, but because it embraces God and receives all freely from Him, is the root of spiritual life in all the people of God.

Abraham had faith accounted to him for *righteousness*.[344] Jehovah testifies concerning the "servants of the LORD" that "their righteousness *is* of me,"[345] for, rather

---

341 Psalm 32:2; Romans 4:1-8.

342 Psalm 34:8; 84:12.

343 Ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

344 צְדָקָה. The complete list of references is: Genesis 15:6; 18:19; 30:33; Deuteronomy 6:25; 9:4–6; 24:13; 33:21; Judges 5:11; 1 Samuel 12:7; 26:23; 2 Samuel 8:15; 19:28; 22:21, 25; 1 Kings 3:6; 8:32; 10:9; 1 Chronicles 18:14; 2 Chronicles 6:23; 9:8; Nehemiah 2:20; Job 27:6; 33:26; 35:8; 37:23; Psalm 5:8; 11:7; 22:31; 24:5; 31:1; 33:5; 36:6, 10; 40:10; 51:14; 69:27; 71:2, 15–16, 19, 24; 72:1, 3; 88:12; 89:16; 98:2; 99:4; 103:6, 17; 106:3, 31; 111:3; 112:3, 9; 119:40, 142; 143:1, 11; 145:7; Proverbs 8:18, 20; 10:2; 11:4–6, 18–19; 12:28; 13:6; 14:34; 15:9; 16:8, 12, 31; 21:3, 21; Isaiah 1:27; 5:7, 16, 23; 9:7; 10:22; 28:17; 32:16–17; 33:5, 15; 45:8, 23–24; 46:12–13; 48:1, 18; 51:6, 8; 54:14, 17; 56:1; 57:12; 58:2; 59:9, 14, 16–17; 60:17; 61:10–11; 63:1; 64:6; Jeremiah 4:2; 9:24; 22:3, 15; 23:5; 33:15; 51:10; Ezekiel 3:20; 14:14, 20; 18:5, 19–22, 24, 26–27; 33:12–14, 16, 18–19; 45:9; Daniel 9:7, 16, 18; Hosea 10:12; Joel 2:23; Amos 5:7, 24; 6:12; Micah 6:5; 7:9; Zechariah 8:8; Malachi 3:3; 4:2. צֶדֶק appears in: Leviticus 19:15, 36; Deuteronomy 1:16; 16:18, 20; 25:15; 33:19; Job 6:29; 8:3, 6; 29:14; 31:6; 35:2; 36:3; Psalm 4:1, 5; 7:8, 17; 9:4, 8; 15:2; 17:1, 15; 18:20, 24; 23:3; 35:24, 27–28; 37:6; 40:9; 45:4, 7; 48:10; 50:6; 51:19; 52:3; 58:1; 65:5; 72:2; 85:10–11, 13; 89:14; 94:15; 96:13; 97:2, 6; 98:9; 118:19; 119:7, 62, 75, 106, 121, 123, 138, 142, 144, 160, 164, 172;

than having as their judicial standing the filthy rags of their own righteousness (Isaiah 64:6), they can testify: "I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness,[346] as a bridegroom decketh *himself* with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth *herself* with her jewels" (Isaiah 61:10). With Abraham, believing Israel can testify that the Messiah, the "king" who is the "righteous Branch" from "David," is "THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS,"[347] by whom they are "saved" (Jeremiah 23:5-6), for this righteousness of the Messiah who is both Jehovah and the truly human Son of David is imputed to them (Jeremiah 33:16), and they are justified, legally declared righteous, not through their own deeds, or on the ground of faith, faith being only the instrument for the receipt of Divine righteousness,[348] but rather on the ground or basis of the imputation

---

132:9; Proverbs 1:3; 2:9; 8:8, 15; 12:17; 16:13; 25:5; 31:9; Ecclesiastes 3:16; 5:8; 7:15; Isaiah 1:21, 26; 11:4–5; 16:5; 26:9–10; 32:1; 41:2, 10; 42:6, 21; 45:8, 13, 19; 51:1, 5, 7; 58:2, 8; 59:4; 61:3; 62:1–2; 64:5; Jeremiah 11:20; 22:13; 23:6; 31:23; 33:16; 50:7; Ezekiel 3:20; 45:10; Daniel 9:24; Hosea 2:19; 10:12; Zephaniah 2:3. צַדִּיק appears in: Genesis 6:9; 7:1; 18:23–26, 28; 20:4; Exodus 9:27; 23:7–8; Deuteronomy 4:8; 16:19; 25:1; 32:4; 1 Samuel 24:17; 2 Samuel 4:11; 23:3; 1 Kings 2:32; 8:32; 2 Kings 10:9; 2 Chronicles 6:23; 12:6; Ezra 9:15; Neh 9:8, 33; Job 12:4; 17:9; 22:19; 27:17; 32:1; 34:17; 36:7; Psalm 1:5–6; 5:12; 7:9, 11; 11:3, 5, 7; 14:5; 31:18; 32:11–33:1; 34:15, 19, 21; 37:12, 16–17, 21, 25, 29–30, 32, 39; 52:6; 55:22; 58:10–11; 64:10; 68:3; 69:28; 72:7; 75:10; 92:12; 94:21; 97:11–12; 112:4, 6; 116:5; 118:15, 20; 119:137; 125:3; 129:4; 140:13; 141:5; 142:7; 145:17; 146:8; Proverbs 2:20; 3:33; 4:18; 9:9; 10:3, 6–7, 11, 16, 20–21, 24–25, 28, 30–32; 11:8–10, 21, 23, 28, 30–31; 12:3, 5, 7, 10, 12–13, 21, 26; 13:5, 9, 21–22, 25; 14:19, 32; 15:6, 28–29; 17:15, 26; 18:5, 10, 17; 20:7; 21:12, 15, 18, 26; 23:24; 24:15–16, 24; 25:26; 28:1, 12, 28; 29:2, 6–7, 16, 27; Ecclesiastes 3:17; 7:15–16, 20; 8:14; 9:1–2; Isaiah 3:10; 5:23; 24:16; 26:2, 7; 29:21; 41:26; 45:21; 49:24; 53:11; 57:1; 60:21; Jeremiah 12:1; 20:12; 23:5; Lamentations 1:18; 4:13; Ezekiel 3:20–21; 13:22; 18:5, 9, 20, 24, 26; 21:3–4; 23:45; 33:12–13, 18; Daniel 9:14; Hosea 14:9; Amos 2:6; 5:12; Habbakuk 1:4, 13; 2:4; Zephaniah 3:5; Zechariah 9:9; Malachi 3:18. The verb צָדַק appears in: Genesis 38:26; 44:16; Exodus 23:7; Deuteronomy 25:1; 2 Samuel 15:4; 1 Kings 8:32; 2 Chronicles 6:23; Job 4:17; 9:2, 15, 20; 10:15; 11:2; 13:18; 15:14; 22:3; 25:4; 27:5; 32:2; 33:12, 32; 34:5; 35:7; 40:8; Psalm 19:9; 51:4; 82:3; 143:2; Proverbs 17:15; Isaiah 5:23; 43:9, 26; 45:25; 50:8; 53:11; Jeremiah 3:11; Ezekiel 16:51–52; Daniel 8:14; 12:3.

345 Isaiah 54:17: זֹאת נַחֲלַת עַבְדֵי יְהוָה וְצִדְקָתָם מֵאִתִּי נְאֻם־יְהוָה׃

346 שׂוֹשׂ אָשִׂישׂ בַּיהוָה תָּגֵל נַפְשִׁי בֵּאלֹהַי כִּי הִלְבִּישַׁנִי בִּגְדֵי־יֶשַׁע מְעִיל צְדָקָה יְעָטָנִי

347 יְהוָה | צִדְקֵנוּ.

348 Commenting on Genesis 15:6, Calvin notes:

> And truly faith does not justify us for any other reason, than that it reconciles us unto God; and that it does so, not by its own merit; but because we receive the grace offered to us in the promises, and have no doubt of eternal life, being fully persuaded that we are loved by God as sons. Therefore, Paul reasons from contraries, that he to whom faith is imputed for righteousness, has not been justified by works (Romans 4:4). For whosoever obtains righteousness by works, his merits come into the account before God. But we apprehend righteousness by faith, when God freely reconciles us to himself. Whence it follows, that the merit of works ceases when righteousness is sought by faith; for it is necessary that this righteousness should be freely given by God, and offered in his word, in order that any one may possess it by faith. To render this more intelligible, when Moses says that faith was imputed to Abram for righteousness, he does not mean that faith was that first cause of righteousness which is called the *efficient*, but only the *formal* cause; as if he had said, that Abram was therefore justified, because, relying on the paternal loving-kindness of God, he trusted to His mere goodness, and not to himself, nor to his own merits. For it is especially to be observed, that faith borrows a righteousness elsewhere, of which we, in ourselves, are destitute; otherwise it would be in vain for Paul to set faith in opposition to works, when speaking of the mode of obtaining righteousness. Besides, the

of the righteousness of the Messiah alone. Every animal sacrificed by the people of God in the Old Testament, in its foreshadowing of the shedding of Messianic blood (Isaiah 52:15), testified to the fact that neither personal merit, including any alleged merit in the act of faith itself, could be a satisfactory ground for the acceptance of the saint; rather, "it *is* the blood *that* maketh atonement for the soul" (Leviticus 17:11), for "without shedding of blood is no remission" (Hebrews 9:22). Thus, "in the LORD shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory" (Isaiah 45:25), as they look to Him and are saved (Isaiah 45:22) through the merit of Jehovah's "righteous servant" who will "justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities."[349] While it is certain that the people of God in the Old Testament were inwardly transformed because of their relationship to Jehovah (Psalm 1),[350] nonetheless the foundational reason why they were frequently denominated as "just" or "righteous"[351] was imputed righteousness, based on the substitutionary sacrifice of the Messiah they anticipated in expectation, as typified and exhibited in the sacrificial system.

Those who are in this manner[352] *the just*—those who have been received imputed Messianic righteousness as the sole judicial and legal basis for their justification, and at the same moment also been given a principle of holiness that results in obedience in life—receive the promise in Habakkuk 2:4 that they shall not die (Habakkuk 1:12), but *live*.[353] The verb *to live* is used[354] most commonly of life in this world,[355] but it is also

---

mutual relation between the free promise and faith, leaves no doubt upon the subject. (*Commentary on Genesis* 15:6)

Genesis 15:6's statement וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לּוֹ צְדָקָה could be translated, "and He reckoned it to him, [namely], righteousness." The "it" (הָ) is an anticipatory suffix (cf. *GKC* 131m), indicating that what was reckoned was "righteousness" (צְדָקָה)—substituting the feminine noun צְדָקָה for the feminine verbal suffix to which it refers, the sentence would be translated, "and He reckoned righteousness to him." The specific noun *righteousness*, not faith itself or the previous clause וְהֶאֱמִן בַּיהוָה, is the referent of the "it," as in Ezekiel 3:21 the verbal suffix וֹ in הִזְהַרְתּוֹ צַדִּיק "if thou warnest him, the righteous" anticipates the noun צַדִּיק, or in Ecclesiastes 2:21 the וֹ anticipates חֶלְקּוֹ in יִתְּנֶנּוּ חֶלְקּוֹ, "he shall give it, his portion."

349 Isaiah 53:11; cf. 52:13-53:12.

350 This fact is evidenced in the context of vast numbers of passages that speak of the *righteous*. Affirmations equivalent to 1 Corinthians 6:9-11 or Galatians 5:19-21 fill the Old Testament.

351 Genesis 6:9; 7:1; Habakkuk 2:4, etc.

352 *Life*, both in the land during this age and in the eschaton, is also promised to those who are the just by perfect inherent personal righteousness, Leviticus 18:5; Nehemiah 9:29; Ezekiel 20:11, 21; however, only the sinless and virgin-born Servant of the Lord has ever fulfilled the Law by His perfect obedience and so merited life in this manner, while His perfect obedience is imputed to the believing sinner freely through Immanuel's substitutionary death (Isaiah 7:14; 53:12; 55:1-3).

353 חיה. Genesis 3:22; 5:3, 5–7, 9–10, 12–13, 15–16, 18–19, 21, 25–26, 28, 30; 6:19–20; 7:3; 9:28; 11:11–26; 12:12–13; 17:18; 19:19–20, 32, 34; 20:7; 25:7; 27:40; 31:32; 42:2, 18; 43:8; 45:7, 27; 47:19, 25, 28; 50:20, 22; Exodus 1:16–18, 22; 19:13; 22:18; 33:20; Leviticus 18:5; 25:35–36; Numbers 4:19; 14:38; 21:8–9; 22:33; 24:23; 31:15, 18; Deuteronomy 4:1, 33, 42; 5:24, 26, 33; 6:24; 8:1, 3; 16:20; 19:4–5; 20:16; 30:16, 19; 32:39; 33:6; Joshua 2:13; 5:8; 6:17, 25; 9:15, 20–21; 14:10; Judges 8:19; 15:19; 21:14; 1 Samuel

used of living forever,[356] of life through the future resurrection (Isaiah 26:19), and of spiritual life in the walk of the people of God in their current earthly pilgrimage (Deuteronomy 8:3). The noun for *life*[357] possesses a similar range of usage, referring to physical life,[358] spiritual life (Deuteronomy 30:6), resurrected life (Daniel 12:2), and eternal life (Genesis 2:9; 3:22). All these senses of *life* are, in any case, related,[359] as spiritual, physical, and eschatological *death* are related.[360] Those who will receive life in the resurrection of the just, and will inherit the Millennial kingdom and the new heavens and earth, are those who receive the spiritual blessing of eternal life (Ezekiel 37). Those only of the descendants of Jacob who will rise in the resurrection of the just, enjoy life in the Promised Land in the Millennium, and eternal life forever, are those who are true Israel, those who are united to the ultimate Prince of God, the Messiah who rose to new life on the third day.[361] Those who seek Jehovah rather than idols live[362] long in the land

---

2:6; 10:24; 20:31; 27:9, 11; 2 Samuel 1:10; 8:2; 12:3, 22; 16:16; 1 Kings 1:25, 31, 34, 39; 17:22; 18:5; 20:31–32; 2 Kings 1:2; 4:7; 5:7; 7:4; 8:1, 5, 8–10, 14; 10:19; 11:12; 13:21; 14:17; 18:32; 20:1, 7; 1 Chronicles 11:8; 2 Chronicles 23:11; 25:25; Nehemiah 2:3; 4:2; 5:2; 6:11; 9:6, 29; Esther 4:11; Job 7:16; 14:14; 19:25; 21:7; 33:4; 36:6; 42:16; Psalm 22:26, 29; 30:3; 33:19; 41:2; 49:9; 69:32; 71:20; 72:15; 80:18; 85:6; 89:48; 118:17; 119:17, 25, 37, 40, 50, 77, 88, 93, 107, 116, 144, 149, 154, 156, 159, 175; 138:7; 143:11; Proverbs 4:4; 7:2; 9:6; 15:27; Ecclesiastes 6:3, 6; 7:12; 11:8; Isaiah 7:21; 26:14, 19; 38:1, 9, 16, 21; 55:3; 57:15; Jeremiah 21:9; 27:12, 17; 35:7; 38:2, 17, 20; 49:11; Lamentations 4:20; Ezekiel 3:18, 21; 13:18–19, 22; 16:6; 18:9, 13, 17, 19, 21–24, 27–28, 32; 20:11, 13, 21, 25; 33:10–13, 15–16, 19; 37:3, 5–6, 9–10, 14; 47:9; Hosea 6:2; 14:7; Amos 5:4, 6, 14; Habakkuk 2:4; 3:2; Zechariah 1:5; 10:9; 13:3.

354 The division below is not meant to be comprehensive.

355 Genesis 5, 11; 12:13; 19:19; 20:7.

356 Genesis 3:22; Psalm 22:26.

357 חַי. Genesis 2:7, 9; 3:14, 17, 22, 24; 6:17; 7:11, 15, 22; 9:3; 23:1; 25:7, 17; 27:46; 42:15–16; 47:8–9, 28; Exodus 1:14; 6:16, 18, 20; Leviticus 18:18; Numbers 14:21, 28; 16:30, 33; Deuteronomy 4:4, 9–10; 5:3; 6:2; 12:1; 16:3; 17:19; 28:66; 30:6, 15, 19–20; 31:13; 32:40, 47; Joshua 1:5; 4:14; Judges 8:19; 16:30; Ruth 3:13; 1 Samuel 1:11, 26; 7:15; 14:39, 45; 17:55; 19:6; 20:3, 21; 25:26, 29, 34; 26:10, 16; 28:10; 29:6; 2 Samuel 1:23; 2:27; 4:9; 11:11; 12:5, 21; 14:11, 19; 15:21; 18:18; 19:7, 35; 22:47; 1 Kings 1:29; 2:24; 3:22–23, 25–27; 5:1; 8:40; 11:34; 12:6; 15:5–6; 17:1, 12, 23; 18:10, 15; 21:15; 22:14; 2 Kings 2:2, 4, 6; 3:14; 4:30; 5:16, 20; 25:29–30; 2 Chronicles 6:31; 10:6; 18:13; Psalms 7:6; 16:11; 17:14; 18:47; 21:5; 23:6; 26:9; 27:1, 4; 30:6; 31:11; 34:13; 36:10; 38:20; 49:19; 55:16; 56:14; 63:4–5; 64:2; 66:9; 69:29; 88:4; 103:4; 104:33; 116:9; 124:3; 128:5; 133:3; 146:2; Job 3:20; 7:7; 9:21; 10:1, 12; 24:22; 27:2; 33:30; Proverbs 1:12; 2:19; 3:2, 18, 22; 4:10, 13, 22–23; 5:6; 6:23; 8:35; 9:11; 10:11, 16–17; 11:19, 30; 12:28; 13:12, 14; 14:27, 30; 15:4, 24, 31; 16:15, 22; 18:21; 19:23; 21:21; 22:4; 27:27; 31:12; Ecclesiastes 2:3, 17; 3:12; 4:15; 5:17, 19; 6:12; 7:2; 8:15; 9:3–4, 9; 10:19; Isaiah 4:3; 38:12, 16, 20; 49:18; Jeremiah 4:2; 5:2; 8:3; 12:16; 16:14–15; 21:8; 22:24; 23:7–8; 38:16; 44:26; 46:18; 52:33–34; Lamentations 3:53, 58; Ezekiel 5:11; 7:13; 14:16, 18, 20; 16:48; 17:16, 19; 18:3; 20:3, 31, 33; 33:11, 15, 27; 34:8; 35:6, 11; Daniel 12:2, 7; Hosea 4:15; Amos 8:14; Jonah 2:7; 4:3, 8; Zephaniah 2:9; Malachi 2:5.

358 Genesis 2:7; 7:15; Deuteronomy 12:1.

359 Cf. Deuteronomy 30:6, 15, 19-20; Ezekiel 3:18, 21; 18:17-32; 20:11. Compare also Numbers 21:8-9 & John 3:14-16; also Joshua 6:17 & James 2:25; Hebrews 11:31.

360 Cf. Genesis 2:9, 17.

361 Hosea 6:2; 1 Corinthians 15:4; cf. Job 19:25-27.

362 Amos 5:4, 6, 14.

and receive eschatological life, rather than being cast out of the land in Divine judgment in this life and being cast out of the Lord's presence eschatologically to experience everlasting torment. Spiritual life before God, which includes both fellowship with God on earth through the resurrection and in all future ages to eternity, was generally associated in Israel with a long and prosperous physical life and the promise of life in the Millennial kingdom.[363] True Israel, rather than being eschatologically "cut off" from the people of God under Divine judgment,[364] received *life* in all of its physical, spiritual, and eschatological blessings. The *just* partake of physical blessings in this age, spiritual life now, life in the resurrection of the righteous, and life in the Millennial and eternal states.

The New Testament confirms the Old Testament doctrine that, as evidenced in the paradigmatic example of Abraham,[365] the "just shall live by faith."[366] The quotations of Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 in the New Testament emphasize different aspects of the truth taught in the Old Testament text.[367] Before the specific New Testament texts are

---

363 Cf. Deuteronomy 5:33; 6:24; 16:20; Psalm 34:12-14; 41:2; Proverbs 3:2.

364 Cf. Exodus 30:33, 38; 31:14; Leviticus 7:20, 21, 25, 27; 17:4, 9; 18:29; 19:8; 20:17, 18; 23:39; Numbers 9:13; 15:30; Isaiah 53:8; Daniel 9:26; Zechariah 14:2; also Deuteronomy 10:16; 30:6; Jeremiah 4:4; cf. Psalm 125:5.

365 Genesis 15:6; Romans 4:3; Galatians 3:6; James 2:23.

366 Habakkuk 2:4; Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38; Ὁ . . . δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

367 B. B. Warfield notes:

> It lies on the very surface of the New Testament that its writers were not conscious of a chasm between the fundamental principle of the religious life of the saints of the old covenant and the faith by which they themselves lived. To them, too, Abraham is the typical example of a true believer (Romans 4; Galatians 3; Hebrews 11; James 2); and in their apprehension "those who are of faith," that is, "Christians," are by that very fact constituted Abraham's sons (Galatians 3:7; Romans 4:16), and receive their blessing only along with that "believer" (Galatians 3:9) in the steps of whose faith it is that they are walking (Romans 4:12) when they believe on Him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead (Romans 4:24). And not only Abraham, but the whole series of Old Testament heroes are conceived by them to be examples of the same faith which was required of them "unto the gaining of the soul" (Hebrews 11). Wrought in them by the same Spirit (2 Corinthians 4:13), it produced in them the same fruits, and constituted them a "cloud of witnesses" by whose testimony we should be stimulated to run our own race with like patience in dependence on Jesus, "the author and finisher of our faith" (Hebrews 12:2). Nowhere is the demand of faith treated as a novelty of the new covenant, or is there a distinction drawn between the faith of the two covenants; everywhere the sense of continuity is prominent (John 5:24, 46; 12:38, 39, 44; 1 Peter 2:6), and the "proclamation of faith" (Galatians 3:2, 5; Romans 10:16) is conceived as essentially one in both dispensations, under both of which the law reigns that "the just shall live by his faith" (Habakkuk 2:4; Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38). Nor do we need to penetrate beneath the surface of the Old Testament to perceive the justice of this New Testament view. Despite the infrequency of the occurrence on its pages of the terms "faith" [and] "to believe," the religion of the Old Testament is obviously as fundamentally a religion of faith as is that of the New Testament. There is a sense, to be sure, in which all religion presupposes faith (Hebrews 11:6), and in this broad sense the religion of Israel, too, necessarily rested on faith. But the religion of Israel was a religion of faith in a far more specific sense than this; and that not merely because faith was more consciously its foundation, but because its very essence consisted in faith, and this faith was the same radical self-commitment to God, not merely as the highest good of the holy soul, but as the gracious Saviour of the sinner, which meets us as the characteristic feature of the religion of the New Testament. Between the faith of the two Testaments there exists, indeed, no further difference than that which the progress of the historical working out of redemption brought with it.
>
> The hinge of Old Testament religion from the very beginning turns on the facts of man's sin (Genesis 3)

examined, a general overview of New Testament teaching about the *just*, about *life*, and about *faith* will be conducted.[368]

---

and consequent unworthiness (Genesis 3:2-10), and of God's grace (Genesis 3:15) and consequent saving activity (Genesis 3:4; 4:5; 6:8, 13f.). This saving activity presents itself from the very beginning also under the form of promise or covenant, the radical idea of which is naturally faithfulness on the part of the promising God with the answering attitude of faith on the part of the receptive people. Face to face with a holy God, the sinner has no hope except in the free mercy of God, and can be authorized to trust in that mercy only by express assurance. Accordingly, the only cause of salvation is from the first the pitying love of God (Genesis 3:15, 8:21), which freely grants benefits to man; while on man's part there is never question of merit or of a strength by which he may prevail (1 Samuel 2:9), but rather a constant sense of unworthiness (Genesis 32:10), by virtue of which humility appears from the first as the keynote of Old Testament piety. . . . [F]rom the very beginning the distinctive feature of the life of the pious is that it is a life of faith, that its regulative principle is drawn, not from the earth but from above. Thus the first recorded human acts after the Fall—the naming of Eve, and the birth and naming of Cain—are expressive of trust in God's promise that, though men should die for their sins, yet man should not perish from the earth, but should triumph over the tempter; in a word, in the great promise of the Seed (Genesis 3:15). Similarly, the whole story of the Flood is so ordered as to throw into relief, on the one hand, the free grace of God in His dealings with Noah (Genesis 6:8, 18; 8:1, 21; 9:8), and, on the other, the determination of Noah's whole life by trust in God and His promises (Genesis 6:22; 7:5; 9:20). The open declaration of the faith-principle of Abraham's life (Genesis 15:6) only puts into words, in the case of him who stands at the root of Israel's whole national and religious existence, what not only might also be said of all the patriarchs, but what actually is most distinctly said both of Abraham and of them through the medium of their recorded history. The entire patriarchal narrative is set forth with the design and effect of exhibiting the life of the servants of God as a life of faith, and it is just by the fact of their implicit self-commitment to God that throughout the narrative the servants of God are differentiated from others. This does not mean, of course, that with them faith took the place of obedience: an entire self-commitment to God which did not show itself in obedience to Him would be self-contradictory, and the testing of faith by obedience is therefore a marked feature of the patriarchal narrative. But it does mean that faith was with them the precondition of all obedience. The patriarchal religion is essentially a religion, not of law but of promise, and therefore not primarily of obedience but of trust; the holy walk is characteristic of God's servants (Genesis 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15), but it is characteristically described as a walk "with God"; its peculiarity consisted precisely in the ordering of life by entire trust in God, and it expressed itself in conduct growing out of this trust (Genesis 3:20; 4:1; 6:22; 7:5; 8:18; 12:4; 17:23; 21:12, 16, 22). The righteousness of the patriarchal age was thus but the manifestation in life of an entire self-commitment to God, in unwavering trust in His promises.

The piety of the Old Testament thus began with faith. . . . Faith, therefore, does not appear as one of the precepts of the law, nor as a virtue superior to its precepts, nor yet as a substitute for keeping them; it rather lies behind the law as its presupposition. Accordingly, in the history of the giving of the law, faith is expressly emphasized as the presupposition of the whole relation existing between Israel and Jehovah. The signs by which Moses was accredited, and all Jehovah's deeds of power, had as their design (Exodus 3:12; 4:1, 5, 8, 9; 19:4, 9) and their effect (Exodus 4:31; 12:28, 34; 14:31; 24:3, 7; Psalm 106:12) the working of faith in the people; and their subsequent unbelief is treated as the deepest crime they could commit (Numbers 14:11; Deuteronomy 1:32; 9:23; Psalm 78:22, 32, 106:24), as is even momentary failure of faith on the part of their leaders (Numbers 20:12). It is only as a consequent of the relation of the people to Him, instituted by grace on His part and by faith on theirs, that Jehovah proceeds to carry out His gracious purposes for them, delivering them from bondage, giving them a law for the regulation of their lives, and framing them in the promised land into a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. In other words, it is a precondition of the law that Israel's life is not of the earth, but is hid with God, and is therefore to be ordered by His precepts. Its design was, therefore, not to provide a means by which man might come into relation with Jehovah, but to publish the mode of life incumbent on those who stand in the relation of children to Jehovah[.] ((“The Biblical Doctrine of Faith,” Warfield, in *Biblical Doctrines*, vol. 2 of *Works*)

368 Summarizing the evidence of the New Testament, Warfield writes:

By means of the providentially mediated diversity of emphasis of the New Testament writers on the several aspects of faith, the outlines of the biblical conception of faith are thrown into very high relief.

Of its *subjective nature* we have what is almost a formal definition in the description of it as an "assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen" (Hebrews 11:1). It obviously contains in it, therefore, an element of knowledge (Hebrews 11:6), and it as obviously issues in conduct (Hebrews 11:8, cf. 5:9; 1 Peter 1:22). But it consists neither in assent nor in obedience, but in a reliant trust in the invisible Author of all good (Hebrews 11:27), in which the mind is set upon the things that are above and not on the things that are upon the earth (Colossians 3:2, cf. 2 Corinthians 4:16-18; Matthew 6:25. The examples cited

in Hebrews 11 are themselves enough to show that the faith there commended is not a mere belief in God's existence and justice and goodness, or crediting of His word and promises, but a practical counting of Him faithful (Hebrews 11:11), with a trust so profound that no trial can shake it (Hebrews 11:35), and so absolute that it survives the loss of even its own pledge (Hebrews 11:17). So little is faith in its biblical conception merely a conviction of the understanding, that, when that is called faith, the true idea of faith needs to be built up above this word (James 2:14ff). It is a movement of the whole inner man (Romans 10:9, 10), and is set in contrast with an unbelief that is akin, not to ignorance but to disobedience (Hebrews 3:18, 19; John 3:36; Romans 11:20, 30, 15:31; 1 Thessalonians 1:8; Hebrews 4:2, 6; 1 Peter 1:7, 8; 3:1, 20; 4:18; Acts 14:2; 19:9), and that grows out of, not lack of information, but that aversion of the heart from God (Hebrews 3:12) which takes pleasure in unrighteousness (2 Thessalonians 2:12), and is so unsparingly exposed by our Lord (John 3:19; 5:44; 8:47; 10:26). In the breadth of its idea, it is thus the going out of the heart from itself and its resting on God in confident trust for all good. But the scriptural revelation has to do with, and is directed to the needs of, not man in the abstract, but sinful man; and for sinful man this hearty reliance on God necessarily becomes humble trust in Him for the fundamental need of the sinner—forgiveness of sins and reception into favour. In response to the revelations of His grace and the provisions of His mercy, it commits itself without reserve and with abnegation of all self-dependence, to Him as its sole and sufficient Saviour, and thus, in one act, empties itself of all claim on God and casts itself upon His grace alone for salvation.

It is, accordingly, solely from its *object* that faith derives its value. This object is uniformly the God of grace, whether conceived of broadly as the source of all life, light, and blessing, on whom man in his creaturely weakness is entirely dependent, or, whenever sin and the eternal welfare of the soul are in view, as the Author of salvation in whom alone the hope of unworthy man can be placed. This one object of saving faith never varies from the beginning to the end of the scriptural revelation; though, naturally, there is an immense difference between its earlier and later stages in fulness of knowledge as to the nature of the redemptive work by which the salvation intrusted to God shall be accomplished; and as naturally there occurs a very great variety of forms of statement in which trust in the God of salvation receives expression. Already, however, at the gate of Eden, the God in whom the trust of our first parents is reposed is the God of the gracious promise of the retrieval of the injury inflicted by the serpent; and from that beginning of knowledge the progress is steady, until, what is implied in the primal promise having become express in the accomplished work of redemption, the trust of sinners is explicitly placed in the God who was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself (2 Corinthians 5:19). Such a faith, again, could not fail to embrace with humble confidence all the gracious promises of the God of salvation, from which indeed it draws its life and strength; nor could it fail to lay hold with strong conviction on all those revealed truths concerning Him which constitute, indeed, in the varied circumstances in which it has been called upon to persist throughout the ages, the very grounds in view of which it has been able to rest upon Him with steadfast trust. These truths, in which the "Gospel" or glad-tidings to God's people has been from time to time embodied, run all the way from such simple facts as that it was the very God of their fathers that had appeared unto Moses for their deliverance (Exodus 4:5), to such stupendous facts, lying at the root of the very work of salvation itself, as that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God sent of God to save the world (John 6:69; 8:24; 11:42; 13:19; 16:27, 30; 17:8, 21; 20:31; 1 John 5:15), that God has raised Him from the dead (Romans 10:9; 1 Thessalonians 4:14), and that as His children we shall live with Him (Romans 6:8). But in believing this variously presented Gospel, faith has ever terminated with trustful reliance, not on the promise but on the Promiser,— not on the propositions which declare God's grace and willingness to save, or Christ's divine nature and power, or the reality and perfection of His saving work, but on the Saviour upon whom, because of these great facts, it could securely rest as on One able to save to the uttermost. Jesus Christ, God the Redeemer, is accordingly the one object of saving faith, presented to its embrace at first implicitly and in promise, and ever more and more openly until at last it is entirely explicit and we read that "a man is not justified save through faith in Jesus Christ" (Galatians 2:16). If, with even greater explicitness still, faith is sometimes said to rest upon some element in the saving work of Christ, as, for example, upon His blood or His righteousness (Romans 3:25; 2 Peter 1:1), obviously such a singling out of the very thing in His work on which faith takes hold, in no way derogates from its repose upon Him, and Him only, as the sole and sufficient Saviour.

The *saving power* of faith resides thus not in itself, but in the Almighty Saviour on whom it rests. It is never on account of its formal nature as a psychic act that faith is conceived in Scripture to be saving,—as if this frame of mind or attitude of heart were itself a virtue with claims on God for reward, or at least especially pleasing to Him (either in its nature or as an act of obedience) and thus predisposing Him to favour, or as if it brought the soul into an attitude of receptivity or of sympathy with God, or opened a channel of communication from Him. It is not faith that saves, but faith in Jesus Christ: faith in any other saviour, or in this or that philosophy or human conceit (Colossians 2:16, 18; 1 Timothy 4:1), or in any other gospel than that of Jesus Christ and Him as crucified (Galatians 1:8, 9), brings not salvation but a curse. It is not, strictly speaking, even faith in Christ that saves, but Christ that saves through faith. The saving power resides exclusively, not in the act of faith or the attitude of faith or the nature of faith, but in the object of faith; and in

this the whole biblical representation centres, so that we could not more radically misconceive it than by transferring to faith even the smallest fraction of that saving energy which is attributed in the Scriptures solely to Christ Himself. This purely mediatory function of faith is very clearly indicated in the regimens in which it stands, which ordinarily express simple instrumentality. It is most frequently joined to its verb as the dative of means or instrument (Acts 15:9; 26:18; Romans 3:28; 4:20; 5:2; 11:20; 2 Corinthians 1:24; Hebrews 11:3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31); and the relationship intended is further explained by the use to express it of the prepositions ἐκ (Romans 1:17; 3:26, 30; 4:16; 5:1; 9:30, 32; 10:6; 14:23; Galatians 2:16; 3:7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 27, 28; 5:5, 1 Timothy 1:5; Hebrews 10:38; James 2:24) and διά (with the genitive, never with the accusative, Romans 3:22, 25, 30; 2 Corinthians 5:7; Galatians 2:16; 3:14, 26; 2 Timothy 3:15; Hebrews 6:12; 11:33, 39; 1 Peter 1:5),—the fundamental idea of the former construction being that of source or origin, and of the latter that of mediation or instrumentality, though they are used together in the same context, apparently with no distinction of meaning (Romans 3:25, 26, 30; Galatians 2:16). It is not necessary to discover an essentially different implication in the exceptional usage of the prepositions ἐπί (Acts 3:16; Philippians 3:9) and κατά (Hebrews 11:7, 13; cf. Matthew 9:29) in this connexion: ἐπί is apparently to be taken in a quasi-temporal sense, "on faith," giving the occasion of the divine act, and κατά very similarly in the sense of conformability, "in conformity with faith." Not infrequently we meet also with a construction with the preposition ἐν which properly designates the sphere, but which in passages like Galatians 2:20; Colossians 2:7; 2 Thessalonians 2:13 appears to pass over into the conception of instrumentality.

So little indeed is faith conceived as containing in itself the energy or ground of salvation, that it is consistently represented as, in its origin, itself a gratuity from God in the prosecution of His saving work. It comes, not of one's own strength or virtue, but only to those who are chosen of God for its reception (2 Thessalonians 2:13), and hence is His gift (Ephesians 6:23, cf. 2:8, 9; Philippians 1:29), through Christ (Acts 3:16; Philippians 1:29; 1 Peter 1:21; cf. Hebrews 12:2), by the Spirit (2 Corinthians 4:13; Galatians 5:5), by means of the preached word (Romans 10:17; Galatians 3:2, 5); and as it is thus obtained from God (2 Peter 1:1; Jude 3; 1 Peter 1:21), thanks are to be returned to God for it (Colossians 1:4; 2 Thessalonians 1:3). Thus, even here all boasting is excluded, and salvation is conceived in all its elements as the pure product of unalloyed grace, issuing not from, but in, good works (Ephesians 2:8-12). The place of faith in the process of salvation, as biblically conceived, could scarcely, therefore, be better described than by the use of the scholastic term "instrumental cause." Not in one portion of the Scriptures alone, but throughout their whole extent, it is conceived as a boon from above which comes to men, no doubt through the channels of their own activities, but not as if it were an effect of their energies, but rather, as it has been finely phrased, as a gift which God lays in the lap of the soul. "With the heart," indeed, "man believeth unto righteousness"; but this believing does not arise of itself out of any heart indifferently, nor is it grounded in the heart's own potencies; it is grounded rather in the freely-giving goodness of God, and comes to man as a benefaction out of heaven. . . .

[H]e who humbly but confidently casts himself on the God of salvation has the assurance that he shall not be put to shame (Romans 11:11; 9:33), but shall receive the end of his faith, even the salvation of his soul (1 Peter 1:9). This salvation is no doubt, in its idea, received all at once (John 3:36; 1 John 5:12); but it is in its very nature a process, and its stages come, each in its order. First of all, the believer, renouncing by the very act of faith his own righteousness which is out of the law, receives that "righteousness which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God on faith" (Philippians 3:9, cf. Romans 3:22; 4:11; 9:30; 10:3, 10; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 5:5; Hebrews 11:7; 2 Peter 1:1). On the ground of this righteousness, which in its origin is the "righteous act" of Christ, constituted by His "obedience" (Romans 5:18, 19), and comes to the believer as a "gift" (Romans 5:17), being reckoned to him apart from works (Romans 4:6), he that believes in Christ is justified in God's sight, received into His favour, and made the recipient of the Holy Spirit (John 7:39, cf. Acts 5:32), by whose indwelling men are constituted the sons of God (Romans 8:13). And if children, then are they heirs (Romans 8:17), assured of an incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading inheritance, reserved in heaven for them; and meanwhile they are guarded by the power of God through faith unto this gloriously complete salvation (1 Peter 1:4, 5). Thus, though the immediate effect of faith is only to make the believer possessor before the judgment-seat of God of the alien righteousness wrought out by Christ, through this one effect it draws in its train the whole series of saving acts of God, and of saving effects on the soul. Being justified by faith, the enmity which has existed between the sinner and God has been abolished, and he has been introduced into the very family of God, and made sharer in all the blessings of His house (Ephesians 2:13f.). Being justified by faith, he has peace with God, and rejoices in the hope of the glory of God, and is enabled to meet the trials of life, not merely with patience but with joy (Romans 5:1f.). Being justified by faith, he has already working within him the life which the Son has brought into the world, and by which, through the operations of the Spirit which those who believe in Him receive (John 7:39), he is enabled to overcome the world lying in the evil one, and, kept by God from the evil one, to sin not (1 John 5:19). In a word, because we are justified by faith, we are, through faith, endowedwith all the privileges and supplied with all the graces of the children of God. ("The Biblical Doctrine of Faith," *Biblical*

The New Testament confirms that it is the *just*[369] or *righteous* man who will live by faith. The *just* are so for two reasons. First, arising out of the decree of the Father, they have been accounted perfectly righteous legally[370] on the sole basis of the imputed righteousness of the perfectly righteous Christ,[371] who has the very righteousness of God.[372] Second, the just have also been made inwardly righteous—although imperfectly in this life (Romans 3:10), since they will not be completely "made perfect" until their departure from this world (Hebrews 12:23)—through regeneration and progessive sanctification by the Holy Spirit. Before their regeneration, the just were entirely abominable sinners without any righteousness,[373] but after being born again they possess both inward and outward righteousness rather than inward wickedness and a hypocritical or even a sincere but merely outward righteousness.[374] The just man characteristically acts in a righteous way, a way that is in accord with the righteousness that God has placed within his heart in regeneration and strengthens in progressive sanctification (Matthew 1:19). At times the just are specified as *righteous* without distinguishing between their perfect judicial justifying and imperfect but still real inward righteousness,[375] for both are necessarily conjoined; all the righteous possess both imputed righteousness and imparted inward holiness,[376] for without both (1 John 3:7) men are cast into hell fire,[377] the place of those who are "disobedient"[378] and "unjust,"[379] those who practice evil (1 Peter 3:12), the

---

Doctrines, Warfield, vol. 2 of *Works*)

369 δίκαιος. The complete list of New Testament references is: Matthew 1:19; 5:45; 9:13; 10:41; 13:17, 43, 49; 20:4, 7; 23:28–29, 35; 25:37, 46; 27:19, 24; Mark 2:17; 6:20; Luke 1:6, 17; 2:25; 5:32; 12:57; 14:14; 15:7; 18:9; 20:20; 23:47, 50; John 5:30; 7:24; 17:25; Acts 3:14; 4:19; 7:52; 10:22; 22:14; 24:15; Romans 1:17; 2:13; 3:10, 26; 5:7, 19; 7:12; Galatians 3:11; Ephesians 6:1; Philippians 1:7; 4:8; Colossians 4:1; 2 Thessalonians 1:5–6; 1 Timothy 1:9; 2 Timothy :8; Titus 1:8; Hebrews 10:38; 11:4; 12:23; James 5:6, 16; 1 Peter 3:12, 18; 4:18; 2 Peter 1:13; 2:7–8; 1 John 1:9; 2:1, 29; 3:7, 12; Revelation 15:3; 16:5, 7; 19:2; 22:11.

370 Romans 5:19; also 1 John 3:7, "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." τεκνία, μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς· ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην δίκαιός ἐστι, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν. The one who characteristically practices righteousness as a lifestyle (ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην), although he does so imperfectly (cf. 1 John 1:8-10), is nonetheless perfectly righteous, even as God is righteous (δίκαιός ἐστι, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν), because of the imputed righteousness received at the moment of conversion, faith, and regeneration.

371 Matthew 27:19, 24; Luke 23:47; 1 Peter 2:21-24; 3:18; 1 John 2:1, 29.

372 John 17:24; Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14; Romans 3:26; 1 John 1:9; Revelation 16:5.

373 Matthew 9:13; Mark 2:17; Luke 5:32; cf. 15:7; 18:9.

374 Matthew 23:28; Luke 20:20; Acts 10:22.

375 Matthew 10:41; 13:17; 1 Timothy 1:9; Titus 1:8; 2 Peter 2:7-8; 1 John 2:29; 3:7, 12.

376 Matthew 23:28-29, 35; Luke 14:4; Romans 5:7; Hebrews 11:4; 12:23; James 5:16; Revelation 22:11.

377 Matthew 13:41-43, 48-49; 25:34-46.

378 ἀπειθής, Luke 1:17.

"filthy,"[380] the "ungodly"[381] and the "sinner,"[382] rather than the righteous. Just men are characteristically "good,"[383] "devout,"[384] and "holy" (Mark 6:20), "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke 1:6) as "doers of the law" (Romans 2:13), who characteristically practice righteousness (1 John 2:29), for they have been inwardly renewed in regeneration and are being transformed into Christ's image by sanctification. These men—those perfectly righteous by justification solely on the basis of Christ's imputed righteousness, and characteristically growing progressively more inwardly holy through sanctification by the Spirit—are the *just* who shall *live*.

As in Genesis 15:6 the reckoning or accounting of Abraham as righteous was a reference to a legal or judicial imputation of righteousness, not to an infusion or inner impartation of holiness, so when the New Testament speaks of righteousness being *counted*, *accounted*, or *imputed*[385] to Abraham or to believers in general, reference is made to a legal reckoning of righteousness, not an infusion or a making inwardly just. While inner transformation in progressive sanctification is the necessary and certain result of the receipt of Divine imputed righteousness through justification, the root and fundament of the designation of the people of God as *just* or *righteous* is the legal accounting of their persons as righteous on the basis of Christ's substitutionary atonement. Many references to the verb *to account* or *impute*[386] are very clear instances of a declarative or an accounting idea, and no reference in the New Testament with the verb speaks of a transformation or infusion of new personal qualities by means of imputation. Similarly, the verb *to justify*[387] always refers to a reckoning or declaration of

---

379 ἄδικος, Luke 16:10.

380 Revelation 22:11, ὁ ῥυπῶν, from ῥυπόω.

381 1 Peter 4:18, ἀσεβής.

382 1 Peter 4:18, ἁμαρτωλός. While a sinful saint Peter, feeling overwhelmed, once refers to himself as a ἁμαρτωλός (Luke 5:8), in all the clear texts where the Divine determination is in view, the unregenerate, not the regenerate, are *sinners*; see the complete list of texts: Matthew 9:10–11, 13; 11:19; 26:45; Mark 2:15–17; 8:38; 14:41; Luke 5:8, 30, 32; 6:32–34; 7:34, 37, 39; 13:2; 15:1–2, 7, 10; 18:13; 19:7; 24:7; John 9:16, 24–25, 31; Romans 3:7; 5:8, 19; 7:13; Galatians 2:15, 17; 1 Timothy 1:9, 15; Hebrews 7:26; 12:3; James 4:8; 5:20; 1 Peter 4:18; Jude 1:15.

383 Matthew 5:45; 13:48-49; Luke 23:50. Such a man is both ἀγαθός and καλός as opposed to πονηρός, σαπρός, ἄδικος, and κακός (1 Peter 3:12).

384 Luke 2:25, εὐλάβης.

385 λογίζομαι, Romans 4:3; Galatians 3:6; James 2:23.

386 This fact is easily verifiable by an examination of the 41 instances of λογίζομαι in the New Testament: Mark 11:31; 15:28; Luke 22:37; Acts 19:27; Romans 2:3, 26; 3:28; 4:3–6, 8–11, 22–24; 6:11; 8:18, 36; 9:8; 14:14; 1 Corinthians 4:1; 13:5, 11; 2 Corinthians 3:5; 5:19; 10:2, 7, 11; 11:5; 12:6; Galatians 3:6; Philippians 3:13; 4:8; 2 Timoty 4:16; Hebrews 11:19; James 2:23; 1 Peter 5:12.

387 δικαιόω. The verb appears 40 times in the New Testament: Matthew 11:19; 12:37; Luke 7:29, 35; 10:29; 16:15; 18:14; Acts 13:39; Romans 2:13; 3:4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9; 6:7; 8:30, 33; 1

righteousness, and never to a transformation into an inwardly righteous state. Consequently, in line with the truth affirmed in Genesis 15:6, the New Testament references to Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 affirm that the *righteousness* of the *just* is fundamentally forensic and legal, a righteousness received by all the people of God through the imputation or crediting of Christ's merit.

Habakkuk 2:4, as quoted in the New Testament,[388] promises that the just shall *live* by faith. The verb *to live*[389] is employed for the essential life of the Triune God,[390] for physical life on earth in its different aspects,[391] for the life of individuals who have been raised from the dead through a miracle worked by Christ or the Apostles in the first century,[392] for the life of those who will be raised from the dead in the future resurrection of all men and for life possessed in the resurrected eschatological state,[393] for Christ's life after His bodily resurrection,[394] for the Messianic theanthropic life,[395] for the life of the unconverted in bondage to their sinful nature,[396] for the believer's spiritual life on

---

Corinthians 4:4; 6:11; Galatians 2:16–17; 3:8, 11, 24; 5:4; 1 Timothy 3:16; Titus 3:7; James 2:21, 24–25; Revelation 22:11.

388 Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38.

389 ζάω. The verb appears 142 times in 127 verses in the New Testament. Other uses are found, in addition to those listed in the text. The verb is employed to designate fresh spring water ("living" water) rather than stagnant water, John 4:10, 11; 7:38; Revelation 7:17 (cf. Genesis 21:19; 26:19; Leviticus 14:5–6, 50–51; Numbers 19:17; Song 4:15; Zechariah 14:8, LXX; the "living water," while literally fresh spring water, is also certainly used with spiritual significance), to identify the Scripture as a "living" Word (Acts 7:38; Hebrews 4:12; 1 Peter 1:23), etc.; not every verse is categorized in the body of the text above. The complete list of references is: Matthew 4:4; 9:18; 16:16; 22:32; 26:63; 27:63; Mark 5:23; 12:27; 16:11; Luke 2:36; 4:4; 10:28; 15:13; 20:38; 24:5, 23; John 4:10–11, 50–51, 53; 5:25; 6:51, 57–58, 69; 7:38; 11:25–26; 14:19; Acts 1:3; 7:38; 9:41; 10:42; 14:15; 17:28; 20:12; 22:22; 25:19, 24; 26:5; 28:4; Romans 1:17; 6:2, 10–11, 13; 7:1–3, 9; 8:12–13; 9:26; 10:5; 12:1; 14:7–9, 11; 1 Corinthians 7:39; 9:14; 15:45; 2 Corinthians 1:8; 3:3; 4:11; 5:15; 6:9, 16; 13:4; Galatians 2:14, 19–20; 3:11–12; 5:25; Philippians 1:21–22; Colossians 2:20; 3:7; 1 Thessalonians 1:9; 3:8; 4:15, 17; 5:10; 1 Timothy 3:15; 4:10; 5:6; 6:17; 2 Timothy 3:12; 4:1; Titus 2:12; Hebrews 2:15; 3:12; 4:12; 7:8, 25; 9:14, 17; 10:20, 31, 38; 12:9, 22; James 4:15; 1 Peter 1:3, 23; 2:4–5, 24; 4:5–6; 1 John 4:9; Revelation 1:18; 2:8; 3:1; 4:9–10; 5:14; 7:2, 17; 10:6; 13:14; 15:7; 16:3; 19:20; 20:4.

390 Matthew 16:16; 26:63; John 6:57; Acts 14:15; Romans 9:26; 14:11; 2 Corinthians 3:3; 6:16; Galatians 2:20; 1 Thessalonians 1:9; 1 Timothy 3:15; 4:10; 6:17; Hebrews 3:12; 9:14; 10:31; 12:22; Revelation 1:18; 4:9-10; 5:14; 7:2; Revelation 10:6; 15:7.

391 Matthew 27:63; Mark 5:23; Luke 2:36; 15:13; John 4:50, 51, 53; Acts 10:42; 17:28; 22:22; 25:24; 26:5; 28:4; Romans 7:1-3; 1 Corinthians 7:39; 9:14; 15:45; 2 Corinthians 1:8; 6:9; Galatians 2:14; Philippians 1:21-22; Colossians 2:20; 1 Thessalonians 4:15, 17; 1 Timothy 5:6; 2 Timothy 3:12; 4:1; Titus 2:12; Hebrews 2:15; 9:17; James 4:15; 1 Peter 2:5; Revelation 13:14; 16:3; 19:20.

392 Matthew 9:18; Acts 9:41; 20:12.

393 John 5:25; 2 Corinthians 13:4; Revelation 20:4.

394 Mark 16:11; Luke 24:5, 23; Acts 1:3; 25:19; 2 Corinthains 13:4.

395 John 6:57; 14:19; Hebrews 7:8, 25; Revelation 1:18; 2:8. The believer's eternal life is derived from the living Triune God through Christ as Theanthropic Mediator; cf. John 1:4; 5:26-27; 1 John 1:1-2; 2:25.

396 Romans 8:12-13; Colossians 3:7.

earth,[397] for the believer's enjoyment of life with God after his death but before his resurrection,[398] and for all aspects of eternal life, including both present and eschatological spiritual and resurrected eternal life—that is, for "life" in all senses associated with salvation.[399] Similarly, the noun *life*[400] is employed for physical life,[401] including life in the Millennial kingdom,[402] life in both its spiritual and physical aspects,[403] and the Theanthropic life of Christ,[404] but is used the large majority of the time for eternal life in all its aspects, from present spiritual life to eschatological resurrected life.[405] As in Habakkuk 2:4 the just would *live*—have life in its spiritual, physical, and eschatological blessings as a gift from their God and Redeemer with whom they had been brought into saving union, so in the New Testament the just receive *life* in the like manner. Eternal life—both spiritual life in this present age and eschatological life, which includes the life of the resurrected and glorified physical body—are promised to the just in the New Testament.

The New Testament indicates that Abraham received life when he *believed*[406] God,[407] for the just shall live by *faith*.[408] The verb *believe* is used[409] of receiving

---

397 Matthew 4:4; Luke 4:4; Romans 6:2, 10, 11, 13; 12:1; 14:7-9; 2 Corinthians 4:11; 5:15; Galatians 2:19-20; 1 Peter 2:24.

398 Matthew 22:32; Mark 12:27; Luke 20:38.

399 Luke 10:28; John 6:51, 57, 58; 11:25-26; 14:19; Romans 1:17; 8:13; 10:5; Galatians 3:11-12; 5:25; 1 Thessalonians 5:10; Hebrews 10:38; 12:9; 1 John 4:9; Revelation 3:1.

400 ζωή. The noun appears 134 times in 126 verses. The complete list of references is: Matthew 7:14; 18:8–9; 19:16–17, 29; 25:46; Mark 9:43, 45; 10:17, 30; Luke 1:75; 10:25; 12:15; 16:25; 18:18, 30; John 1:4; 3:15–16, 36; 4:14, 36; 5:24, 26, 29, 39–40; 6:27, 33, 35, 40, 47–48, 51, 53–54, 63, 68; 8:12; 10:10, 28; 11:25; 12:25, 50; 14:6; 17:2–3; 20:31; Acts 2:28; 3:15; 5:20; 8:33; 11:18; 13:46, 48; 17:25; Romans 2:7; 5:10, 17–18, 21; 6:4, 22–23; 7:10; 8:2, 6, 10, 38; 11:15; 1 Corinthians 3:22; 15:19; 2 Corinthians 2:16; 4:10–12; 5:4; Galatians 6:8; Ephesians 4:18; Philippians 1:20; 2:16; 4:3; Colossians 3:3–4; 1 Timothy 1:16; 4:8; 6:12, 19; 2 Timothy 1:1, 10; Titus 1:2; 3:7; Hebrews 7:3, 16; James 1:12; 4:14; 1 Peter 3:7, 10; 2 Peter 1:3; 1 John 1:1–2; 2:25; 3:14–15; 5:11–13, 16, 20; Jude 1:21; Revelation 2:7, 10; 3:5; 11:11; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 21:6, 27–22:2; 22:14, 17, 19.

401 Luke 16:25; John 12:25; Acts 8:33; 17:25; Romans 8:38; 1 Corinthians 3:22; 15:19; 2 Corinthians 4:11; Philippians 1:20; 1 Timothy 4:8; James 4:14; Revelation 11:11.

402 Luke 1:75.

403 Luke 12:15; Acts 3:15; 1 Peter 3:7, 10.

404 John 5:26; Romans 5:10; Hebrews 7:3, 16; 1 John 1:1-2.

405 Matthew 7:14; 18:8-9; 19:16-17, 29; 25:46; Mark 9:43, 45, 10:17, 30; Luke 10:25; 18:18, 30; John 1:4; 3:15-16, 36; 4:14, 46; 5:24, 26, 29, 39, 40; 6:27, 33, 35, 40, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 63, 68; 8:12; 10:10; 11:25; 12:25, 50; 14:6; 17:2-3; 20:31; Acts 2:28; 3:15; 5:20; 11:18; 13:46, 48; Romans 2:6; 5:17, 21; 6:4, 22-23; 7:10; 8:2, 6, 10; 11:15; 2 Corinthians 2:16; 4:10-12; 5:4; Galatians 6:8; Ephesians 4:18; Philippians 2:16; 4:3; Colossians 3:3-4; 1 Timothy 1:16; 4:8; 6:12, 19; 2 Timothy 1:1, 10; Titus 1:2; 3:7; James 1:12; 1 Peter 3:7, 10; 2 Peter 1:3; 1 John 1:1-2; 2:25; 3:14-15; 5:11-13, 16, 20; Jude 21; Revelation 2:7, 10; 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 21:6, 27; 22:1-2, 14, 16, 19.

406 πιστεύω. The verb appears 248 times in the New Testament: Matthew 8:13; 9:28; 18:6; 21:22, 25, 32; 24:23, 26; 27:42; Mark 1:15; 5:36; 9:23–24, 42; 11:23–24, 31; 13:21; 15:32; 16:13–14, 16–17; Luke 1:20, 45; 8:12–13, 50; 16:11; 20:5; 22:67; 24:25; John 1:7, 12, 50; 2:11, 22–24; 3:12, 15–16, 18, 36;

revelation[410] and of the moment of saving belief in the gospel and in the Christ who is revealed therein, through which sinners become the people of God.[411] Such saving faith

---

4:21, 39, 41–42, 48, 50, 53; 5:24, 38, 44, 46–47; 6:29–30, 35–36, 40, 47, 64, 69; 7:5, 31, 38–39, 48; 8:24, 30–31, 45–46; 9:18, 35–36, 38; 10:25–26, 37–38, 42; 11:15, 25–27, 40, 42, 45, 48; 12:11, 36–39, 42, 44, 46–47; 13:19; 14:1, 10–12, 29; 16:9, 27, 30–31; 17:8, 20–21; 19:35; 20:8, 25, 29, 31; Acts 2:44; 4:4, 32; 5:14; 8:12–13, 37; 9:26, 42; 10:43; 11:17, 21; 13:12, 39, 41, 48; 14:1, 23; 15:5, 7, 11; 16:31, 34; 17:12, 34; 18:8, 27; 19:2, 4, 18; 21:20, 25; 22:19; 24:14; 26:27; 27:25; Romans 1:16; 3:2, 22; 4:3, 5, 11, 17–18, 24; 6:8; 9:33; 10:4, 9–11, 14, 16; 13:11; 14:2; 15:13; 1 Corinthians 1:21; 3:5; 9:17; 11:18; 13:7; 14:22; 15:2, 11; 2 Corinthians 4:13; Galatians 2:7, 16; 3:6, 22; Ephesians 1:13, 19; Philippians 1:29; 1 Thessalonians 1:7; 2:4, 10, 13; 4:14; 2 Thessalonians 1:10; 2:11–12; 1 Timothy 1:11, 16; 3:16; 2 Timothy 1:12; Titus 1:3; 3:8; Hebrews 4:3; 11:6; James 2:19, 23; 1 Peter 1:8, 21; 2:6–7; 1 John 3:23; 4:1, 16; 5:1, 5, 10, 13; Jude 5.

[407] Romans 4:3; Galatians 3:6; James 2:23.

[408] Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38; πίστις. The noun appears 244 times in the New Testament: Matthew 8:10; 9:2, 22, 29; 15:28; 17:20; 21:21; 23:23; Mark 2:5; 4:40; 5:34; 10:52; 11:22; Luke 5:20; 7:9, 50; 8:25, 48; 17:5–6, 19; 18:8, 42; 22:32; Acts 3:16; 6:5, 7–8; 11:24; 13:8; 14:9, 22, 27; 15:9; 16:5; 17:31; 20:21; 24:24; 26:18; Romans 1:5, 8, 12, 17; 3:3, 22, 25–28, 30–31; 4:5, 9, 11–14, 16, 19–20; 5:1–2; 9:30, 32; 10:6, 8, 17; 11:20; 12:3, 6; 14:1, 22–23; 16:26; 1 Corinthians 2:5; 12:9; 13:2, 13; 15:14, 17; 16:13; 2 Corinthians 1:24; 4:13; 5:7; 8:7; 10:15; 13:5; Galatians 1:23; 2:16, 20; 3:2, 5, 7–9, 11–12, 14, 22–26; 5:5–6, 22; 6:10; Ephesians 1:15; 2:8; 3:12, 17; 4:5, 13; 6:16, 23; Philippians 1:25, 27; 2:17; 3:9; Colossians 1:4, 23; 2:5, 7, 12; 1 Thessalonians 1:3, 8; 3:2, 5–7, 10; 5:8; 2 Thessalonians 1:3–4, 11; 2:13; 3:2; 1 Timothy 1:2, 4–5, 14, 19; 2:7, 15; 3:9, 13; 4:1, 6, 12; 5:8, 12; 6:10–12, 21; 2 Timothy 1:5, 13; 2:18, 22; 3:8, 10, 15; 4:7; Titus 1:1, 4, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:15; Philemon 1:5–6; Hebrews 4:2; 6:1, 12; 10:22, 38–11:1; 11:3–9, 11, 13, 17, 20–24, 27–31, 33, 39; 12:2; 13:7; James 1:3, 6; 2:1, 5, 14, 17–18, 20, 22, 24, 26; 5:15; 1 Peter 1:5, 7, 9, 21; 5:9; 2 Peter 1:1, 5; 1 John 5:4; Jude 1:3, 20; Revelation 2:13, 19; 13:10; 14:12.

Note also the 67 uses of the adjective πιστός: Matthew 24:45; 25:21, 23; Luke 12:42; 16:10–12; 19:17; John 20:27; Acts 10:45; 13:34; 16:1, 15; 1 Corinthians 1:9; 4:2, 17; 7:25; 10:13; 2 Corinthians 1:18; 6:15; Galatians 3:9; Ephesians 1:1; 6:21; Colossians 1:2, 7; 4:7, 9; 1 Thessalonians 5:24; 2 Thessalonians 3:3; 1 Timothy 1:12, 15; 3:1, 11; 4:3, 9–10, 12; 5:16; 6:2; 2 Timothy 2:2, 11, 13; Titus 1:6, 9; 3:8; Hebrews 2:17; 3:2, 5; 10:23; 11:11; 1 Peter 4:19; 5:12; 1 John 1:9; 3 John 1:5; Revelation 1:5; 2:10, 13; 3:14; 17:14; 19:11; 21:5; 22:6.

The words πιστόω (2 Timothy 3:4), ἀπιστέω (Mark 16:11, 16; Luke 24:11, 41; Acts 28:24; Romans 3:3; 2 Timothy 2:13), ἀπιστία (Matthew 13:58; 17:20; Mark 6:6; 9:24; 16:14; Romans 3:3; 4:20; 11:20, 23; 1 Timothy 1:13; Hebrews 3:12, 19), ἄπιστος (Matthew 17:17; Mark 9:19; Luke 9:41; 12:46; John 20:27; Acts 26:8; 1 Corinthians 6:6; 7:12–15; 10:27; 14:22–24; 2 Corinthians 4:4; 6:14–15; 1 Timothy 5:8; Titus 1:15; Revelation 21:8) and ὀλιγόπιστος (Matthew 6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; Luke 12:28) complete the word group in the New Testament. Naturally, at different points the various words in the word group are placed together; e. g., 1 Corinthians 14:22 contrasts τοῖς πιστεύουσιν with τοῖς ἀπίστοις.

[409] The classification in the rest of this paragraph is not a comprehensive examination of all that is involved in every usage of πιστεύω in the New Testament. It provides an overview of all uses as background for the uses of πιστεύω that relate to sanctification, the subject of the paragraphs that follow. The classification of the uses of πίστις follows the examination of the uses of πιστεύω.

[410] The aorist of πιστεύω is employed for receipt of revelation about Christ that preceeds the aorist act of saving faith in John 4:21; 10:38; Acts 13:41; Romans 10:16 & Hebrews 11:6. In John 4:21, Christ commands the woman at the well to believe (Γύναι, πίστευσόν μοι) in the Word of God that He is speaking and revealing, so that she might come to saving faith, for receiving the Word is necessary to come to saving faith in Christ (John 10:38), although the unbeliever can exercise a kind of faith in Divine revelation that falls short of saving faith (John 2:23-3:3; Acts 8:13; 26:27-28).

[411] The aorist of πιστεύω is employed for the instantaneous transaction of justifying faith in Matthew 21:32 (publicans and harlots believe the gospel as preached by John the Baptist, while the chief priests and elders did not believe, nor feel remorse, in order that they might believe); Mark 16:15-17; Luke 8:12; John 1:7; 4:39-41; 4:53; 5:44; 6:29-30; 7:31, 48; 8:24, 30; 9:36; 10:38 (where aorist belief in Christ's

always leads to continuing faith[412] in God through Christ by means of the Word, for when God gives the lost saving faith, He will continue to give them faith.[413] That is, by means of the exercise of saving faith in Christ at the moment of conversion and regeneration, the lost become those who are believers, those who are believing ones.[414] They believe at a

---

miracles, receipt of revelation about Christ, preceeds the aorist act of saving faith); 10:42; 11:42, 45; 12:38, 47; 17:8, 21; 19:35; 20:29, 31; Acts 4:4, 32; 8:12-13 (genuine conversion in most, spurious "faith" in Simon the sorceror); 9:42; 11:17, 21; 13:12, 48; 14:1; 15:7; 16:31; 17:12, 34; 18:8; 19:2 (what Paul assumes was a true conversion, although it was not one at this point); 19:4; Romans 10:9 (summary action for both belief and confession, although belief, unlike confession, must take place at the moment of regeneration); 10:14; 13:11; 1 Corinthians 3:5; 15:2, 11; Galatians 2:16; Ephesians 1:13; 2 Thessalonians 2:12 (cf. v. 11-13); 1 Timothy 3:16; Hebrews 4:3.

The future of πιστεύω likewise regularly represents the point of saving conversion, a fact supported in the contexts where *belief* as receiving the Word is under consideration (John 3:12; 5:47), where *belief* is shown to be *entrusting* (Luke 16:11), and, of course, where specifically saving *belief* is in view (John 11:48, cf. v. 42, 45 & 12:11; John 17:20; Romans 10:14). In Matthew 27:42 (cf. the aorist subjunctive in Mark 15:32) the Jewish religious leaders make a mocking promise to believe if Christ rejects the way of the cross, while one of the thieves crucified with Christ comes to saving faith in the crucified Christ (Luke 23:42), and after Christ's death, because of His High Priestly intercession, the guard of Gentile soldiers watching Him are born again (Luke 23:34, 47; Matthew 27:54).

412 Thus, many of the aorists of πιστεύω in John express the initial action of saving faith, which leads to continuing faith. For example, the aorist belief of John 4:39-42 leads to the present tense belief of 4:42; the aorist belief of 8:30 leads to the faith expressed with a perfect participle in 8:31; 9:35-38 presents the sequence: "Are you a believer (present tense, πιστεύεις)?" (9:35); "Who do I need to believe (aorist, πιστεύσω) on?" (9:36); "Me," (9:37); "I am a believer [having just become one]; Πιστεύω," (9:38) and so I now recognize You as Lord and God, the One who deserves worship: Πιστεύω, Κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν. Outside of John, comparisons are present such as the present participle in Acts 2:44 and the aorist participle in Acts 4:32, or the aorist imperative in Acts 16:31 and the perfect participle in 16:34, or the present and aorist in 10:43 and 11:17, or the interplay of tenses in Romans 10:9-14; 2 Thessalonians 1:10; cf. also the contrast in the aorist and present subjunctives in 1 John 3:23.

The handful of instances of the imperfect of πιστεύσω provide only limited further support for a durative character of saving faith. In John 12:11, the imperfect is iterative and distributive, used of many coming to saving faith in Christ at different times because of the raising of Lazarus (cf. John 11:42, 45, 48). Acts 18:8 is another distributive use of the imperfect for many coming to conversion and being baptized. John 7:5 & 12:37 speak of continuing unbelief in Christ, as does John 5:46. John 5:46b does, however, provide some evidence for a durative character to saving faith—if those spoken of had been believing in Moses, they would have been believing in Christ (2nd class, present contrary-to-fact condition). Finally, John 2:24 speaks of Christ not entrusting or commiting Himself to those who had not truly come to saving faith in Him (cf. 2:23-3:3).

413 Thus, note the present infinitive of *believe* in Philippians 1:29; the people of God have faith in both its initial and continuing aspects given to them. The other present infinitives of πιστεύω in the New Testament are durative; see Luke 24:25; John 12:39; Romans 15:13; 1 Timothy 1:16 (not an exception because of the present tense of μέλλω—the verb appears 92 times in the present tense, 17 times in the imperfect, once in the future, and never in the aorist).

414 Thus, Scripture frequently employs a substantival present tense participle of πιστεύω to designate believers. Note Matthew 18:6; Mark 9:42; John 1:12; 3:15, 16, 18, 36; 5:24; 6:35, 40, 47, 64; 7:38-39; 11:25-26; 12:44 (belief in the Son is belief in the Father also); 12:46; 14:12; Acts 2:44; 5:14 (believers added to the Lord's church through baptism); 10:43; 13:39 (note the present tense of "justified"; compare the sense of Genesis 15:6; all who have their confidence in Christ are currently justified through the sole instrumentality of faith, a condition that began at the moment of conversion); 22:19; Romans 1:16; 3:22; 4:5, 11, 24; 9:33; 10:4; 10:11; 1 Corinthians 1:21; 14:22; Galatians 3:22; Ephesians 1:19; 1 Thessalonians 1:7; 2:10, 13; 2 Thessalonians 1:10; 1 Peter 1:21; 2:6, 7; 1 John 5:1, 5, 10, 13.

point in time, with the result that they continue to believe.[415] Their belief is not simply intellectual assent, but a whole-hearted committal, surrender, and entrusting of their entire persons to Christ as the Son of God and their own personal Savior,[416] being assured that He will keep His promise to save all those who in this manner come to Him.[417] In

---

It is worthy of note that all believers, not a subcategory of believers who have entered a Higher Life, are designated with the substantival present participle of πιστεύω; no text in the Bible indicates that only some believers are specified with the substantival present participle of *believe*, or contrasts some believers that are within this category with other believers who are allegedly not so, while the category of being one who is believing is entered into at the moment of saving faith (cf. John 9:38 & many other texts), not at some later point.

The present indicative of πιστεύω in relation to conversion provides further evidence that the people of God are those who are believing in Christ's Person, work, and Word. Note John 1:50; 8:45-46; 9:35, 38; 12:44; 14:10 (a question with οὐ expects a positive answer); Acts 8:37; 27:25; Romans 10:10; 1 Thessalonians 4:14. Note also the present adverbial participle in 1 Peter 1:8 and the present imperatives in Mark 1:15 & John 12:36, indicating that the response to the gospel is not initial belief alone, but also continuing faith. The use of the present tense of in matters other than conversion also supports a durative idea; see Acts 9:26; 15:11; 24:14; 26:27; Romans 6:8; 14:2; 1 Corinthians 11:18; 13:7; 1 John 4:1.

[415] The aspect of the Greek perfect of πιστεύω encapsulates the combination of the point of conversion and the continuing faith in the regenerate; see John 3:18; 6:69; 8:31; 11:27; 16:27; 20:29; Acts 15:5; 16:34; 18:27; 19:18; 21:20, 25; 2 Timothy 1:12; Titus 3:8; 1 John 4:16; 5:10. The two instances where πιστεύω in the perfect is not used for personal conversion (1 Corinthians 9:17; Galatians 2:17) also both illustrate the aspect of the perfect as a portrayal of point action with continuing results.

[416] The idea of committal or entrustment in πιστεύω is exemplified in Luke 16:11 (committing or entrusting true riches to a person); John 2:24 (Christ's not committing Himself to the unregenerate); Romans 3:2 (the Word of God being entrusted or commited to Israel); 1 Corinthians 9:17; Galatians 2:7; 1 Timothy 1:11; Titus 1:3 (an administration of the gospel being committed or entrusted to Paul, or (1 Thessalonians 2:4) to Paul and his associates.

Furthermore, "Deissmann in *Light From the Ancient East* gives several convincing quotations from the papyri to prove that πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν meant *surrender* or *submission to*. A slave was sold *into the name of the god of a temple;* i. e., to be a temple servant. G. Milligan agrees with Deissmann that this papyri usage of εἰς αὐτόν is also found regularly in the New Testament. Thus to believe on or . . . into the name of Jesus means to renounce self and to consider onself the life-time servant of Jesus" (pg. 105, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, H. E. Dana & Julius R. Mantey. New York, NY: MacMillan, 1955). Concerning the contribution of the prepositional usages with πιστεύω, Warfield notes:

> πιστεύω + ἐν, which is the most frequent of the constructions with prepositions in the Septuagint, retires almost out of use in the New Testament[.] . . . The implication of this construction would seem to be firm fixedness of confidence in its object. Scarcely more common is the parallel construction of ἐπί with the dative, expressive of steady, resting repose, reliance upon the object. . . . The constructions with prepositions governing the accusative, which involve an implication of "moral motion, mental direction towards," are more frequently used. . . . The special New Testament construction . . . is that with εἰς, which occurs some forty-nine times, about four-fifths of which are Johannine and the remainder more or less Pauline. . . . [W]hat these passages express is "an absolute transference of trust from ourselves to another," a complete self-surrender to Christ. . . . [Similarly,] πίστις [is] self-abandoning trust[.] . . . [NT] usage [of the πιστεύω word group demonstrates] . . . that the idea of "faith" is conceived of in the New Testament as the characteristic idea of Christianity, and that it does not import mere "belief" in an intellectual sense, but all that enters into an entire self-commitment of the soul to Jesus as the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. (pgs. 476-478, 483, *Biblical Doctrines*, Warfield)

[417] The element of assurance in πιστεύω is validated in all the texts where the idea of *trusting* or *entrusting* is prominent; cf. Luke 16:11; Ephesians 1:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:4; 1 Timothy 1:11; 2 Timothy 1:12. Compare 2 Timothy 3:14's use of πιστόω, "to be sure about something because of its reliability, *feel confidence, be convinced*" (BDAG), for "the things which thou . . . hast been assured of," and also the important πείθω word group.

contrast, the unconverted are in a state of unbelief[418] in Christ.[419] While they can make superficially positive responses to Christ,[420] they refuse to entrust themselves to Him[421] and believe the gospel[422] because they reject the testimony to Him of the Word.[423]

The adjective *faithful/believing*[424] illustrates the Biblical continuity between the initial act of faith in conversion and the continued believing of the regenerate and the

---

418 Compare the uses of ἀπιστέω, used in the New Testament only for disbelief in the resurrection of Christ (Mark 16:11; Luke 24:11, 41) and for those who do not believe and are consequently are eternally damned (Mark 16:16; Acts 28:24; Romans 3:3; 2 Timothy 2:13 (cf. 2:13 with 2:12b)).

419 John 6:36, 64; 10:25-26, 37-38; 16:9 (present tense); 7:5 (imperfect); 1 John 5:10 (present participle and perfect tense verb)

420 That is, they can have a temporary belief without possessing a root in themselves (Luke 8:13), a belief that the Lord Jesus is from God and a doer of miracles without genuine saving faith and the new birth (John 2:23-3:3; Acts 8:13-24), a belief that does not displace a predominant love of self, so that one is unwilling to confess Christ and endure religious persecution (John 12:42-43), and a belief that Christ speaks the truth (John 4:50) or that is an assent to doctrinal orthodoxy (James 2:19). Scripture never uses the perfect tense of πιστεύω for the "faith" of the unconverted, and John never uses the present tense in such a manner, either. The use of the present tense in Luke 8:13 is specifically limited in context (οἳ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσι), and the character of the belief as mere assent is also very clear in the context of James 2:19. The testimony of Scripture is clear that saints exercise saving faith at a particular moment in time, and that their belief then continues, while the ungodly neither exercise saving faith nor have a persevereing faith.

421 In Jude 5, those spoken of are eternally destroyed because they are those who never come to faith (τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας, aorist participle). In John 3:18, the one in a state of unbelief (ὁ . . . μὴ πιστεύων, contrasted with ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν) is already condemned (ἤδη κέκριται) because he has never come to place his faith in the Son of God (ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ).

422 Mark 16:15-17.

423 Believing in a person and believing his message are closely related (Luke 22:67; John 10:25-26; Matthew 21:25, 32; Mark 11:31; Luke 20:5; all these texts are aorists). The Jews do not have God's Word abiding (τὸν λόγον . . . οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα) in them, because they do not believe (οὐ πιστεύετε) in Christ (John 5:38). They should believe the testimony involved in Christ's works (τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε) in order that they might come to faith (ἵνα . . . πιστεύσητε) in Christ as the Divine Messiah (John 10:25-26, 37-38). In John 5:44-47, the unconverted Jews were not able to come to faith in Christ (δύνασθε . . . πιστεῦσαι) because they were seeking honor of each other and not seeking the honor that comes from God alone (δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μονου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε) and because, although they trusted in (ἠλπίκατε) Moses, they were actually in a state of unbelief in the Word written by Moses, and so were unable to believe in Christ or His Word (εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωσῇ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν. εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασι πιστεύσετε). Furthermore, remaining in unbelief concerning earthly things testified to by Christ (John 3:12a, present tense) prevents one from believing in heavenly things He speaks of (John 3:12b, future tense; cf. the example of unbelief (in the aorist) in Christ's miraculous healing of the man born blind, John 9:18). Apart from signs and wonders the Jews would by no means believe (Ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδητε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε, John 4:48, cf. 20:29), but even after Christ did vast numbers of miracles, they could not believe because of their hardened hearts and blinded eyes (John 12:38-39). Because the unconverted refuse to believe the Word, they will believe a Satanic lie (πιστεῦσαι . . . τῷ ψεύδει) when it is set before them and be damned because they did not believe the truth (οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀληθεία, 2 Thessalonians 2:11-13; contrasted with ἀδελφοι ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου who have πίστει ἀληθείας).

related identity of those who have believed in Christ and those who are faithful to Him. God[425] and Christ[426] are faithful, many individual Christians[427] and groups of Christians[428] are specified as being faithful, and all those who believe[429] are the

---

[424] πιστός. The translational difference between *faithful* and *believing* is a product of the adjective presenting the passive or active ideas of πιστεύω; πιστός is either "1. pertaining to being worthy of belief or trust, *trustworthy, faithful, dependable, inspiring trust/faith,* pass. aspect of πιστεύω" or "2. pert. to being trusting, *trusting, cherishing faith/trust* act. aspect of πιστεύω" (BDAG). The large majority of the time in the New Testament πιστός refers specifically to faithfulness; it is translated *faithful* 53 times, and *believe* or *believing* only 8 times out of its 67 appearances. All the references where πιστός sis predicated of non-animate objects necessarily refer to faithfulness, as only animated beings can actively believe; hence deeds can be faithful (3 John 5, "a faithful thing thou doest," πιστὸν ποιεῖς), the mercies of David are "sure" or faithful (Acts 13:44), Scripture is faithful (Titus 1:9), and various sayings, in particular the words of God (Revelation 21:5; 22:6), are true and faithful (1 Timothy 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Timothy 2:11; Titus 3:8). The complete list of references is: Matthew 24:45; 25:21, 23; Luke 12:42; 16:10–12; 19:17; John 20:27; Acts 10:45; 13:34; 16:1, 15; 1 Corinthians 1:9; 4:2, 17; 7:25; 10:13; 2 Corinthians 1:18; 6:15; Galatians 3:9; Ephesians 1:1; 6:21; Colossians 1:2, 7; 4:7, 9; 1 Thessalonians 5:24; 2 Thessalonians 3:3; 1 Timothy 1:12, 15; 3:1, 11; 4:3, 9–10, 12; 5:16; 6:2; 2 Timothy 2:2, 11, 13; Titus 1:6, 9; 3:8; Hebrews 2:17; 3:2, 5; 10:23; 11:11; 1 Peter 4:19; 5:12; 1 John 1:9; 3 John 5; Revelation 1:5; 2:10, 13; 3:14; 17:14; 19:11; 21:5; 22:6.

[425] 1 Corinthians 1:9; 10:13; 2 Corinthians 1:18; 1 Thessalonians 5:24; 2 Thessalonians 3:3; 2 Timothy 2:13; Hebrews 10:23; 11:11; 1 Peter 4:19; 1 John 1:9.

Lightfoot points out the close connection between *believing* and *faithfulness* in the idea of πιστός and its Hebrew and English cognates:

> The Hebrew אֱמוּנָה, the Greek πίστις, the Latin 'fides,' and the English 'faith,' hover between two meanings; *trustfulness*, the frame of mind which relies on another; and *trustworthiness*, the frame of mind which can be relied upon. Not only are the two connected together grammatically, as active and passive senses of the same word, or logically, as subject and object of the same act; but there is a close moral affinity between them. Fidelity, constancy, firmness, confidence, reliance, trust, belief—these are the links which connect the two extremes, the passive with the active meaning of 'faith.' Owing to these combined causes, the two senses will at times be so blended together that they can only be separated by some arbitrary distinction. When the members of the Christian brotherhood, for instance, are called 'the faithful,' οἱ πιστοί, what is meant by this? Does it imply their constancy, their trustworthiness, or their faith, their belief? In all such cases it is better to accept the latitude, and even the vagueness, of a word or phrase, than to attempt a rigid definition, which after all can be only artificial. And indeed the loss in grammatical precision is often more than compensated by the gain in theological depth. In the case of 'the faithful' for instance, does not the one quality of heart carry the other with it, so that they who are trustful are trusty also; they who have faith in God are stedfast and immovable in the path of duty? (Lightfoot, *Commentary on Galatians*, sec. "The Words Denoting 'Faith'")

[426] Christ is a faithful High Priest (Hebrews 2:17; 3:2; cf. 3:5, Moses' faithfulness as a type of Christ), and a faithful witness, (Revelation 1:5; 3:14; 19:11). Christ's faithfulness in Revelation is set forth as a pattern for the believer's faithfulness. Christ was a faithful witness unto death, and Christians must likewise be faithful unto death (Revelation 1:5; 2:10, 13; 3:14; 17:14; 19:11).

[427] Moses as a type of the faithful Christ (Hebrews 3:5); Paul (1 Corinthians 7:25; 1 Timothy 1:12); Timothy (1 Corinthians 4:17); Tychicus (Ephesians 6:21; Colossians 4:7); Epaphras (Colossians 1:7); Onesimus (Colossians 4:9); Silvanus (1 Peter 5:12); Antipas (Revelation 2:13) & Abraham (Galatians 3:9). The use of πίστος for Abraham illustrates the continuity between those who are *believing* and those who are *faithful;* Abraham is the father and the pattern of the people of God, for he was *faithful/believing* and so are they. Similarly, those who love Christ—as all do who will be saved (John 8:42; 1 Corinthians 16:22; Ephesians 6:24)—are the *faithful/believing* who receive the crown of life (Revelation 2:10; James 1:12).

[428] Paul and his coworkers (1 Corinthians 4:2); the wives of deacons (1 Timothy 3:11); the children of qualified overseers (Titus 1:6); & male church members with the ability to teach others (2 Timothy 2:2; "faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also," πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται

faithful.[430] While there are certainly degrees of faithfulness, and indwelling sin is present and ever active in the regenerate, nonetheless all Christians are specified as *faithful*, and no text indicates that any believer is unfaithful.[431] On the contrary, only those who are

---

καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι, are all the regenerate men, the believing and faithful men, in the church with teaching ability; Scripture gives no category of unfaithful and unbelieving men who are properly church members—the unfaithful are the unregenerate who are eternally damned, Revelation 21:8).

[429] Acts 10:45; 16:1; 2 Corinthians 6:15; 1 Timothy 4:3, 10, 12, 5:16; 6:2. None of these passages even hint that some who believe are not faithful. Indeed, 1 Timothy 6:2 (And they that have believing masters, let them not despise *them*, because they are brethren; but rather do *them* service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort, οἱ δὲ πιστοὺς ἔχοντες δεσπότας μὴ καταφρονείτωσαν, ὅτι ἀδελφοί εἰσιν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν, ὅτι πιστοί εἰσι καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι. ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει.) specifically identifies the *believing* and the *faithful*. Those with "believing" masters—clearly all Christian masters, all who are "brethren"—are to honor their masters because they are "faithful and beloved." πιστοί . . . καὶ ἀγαπητοί is translated correctly in the Authorized Version, for as "beloved" (ἀγαπητός) in the verse signifies "one being loved," the passive sense of ἀγαπάω, so "faithful" (πιστός) is the passive sense of of πιστεύω, that is, "faithful" rather than "believing." That is, the masters are specified as "faithful and beloved," rather than "believing and beloved." Consequently, the two senses of πιστός are equated as identical categories in 1 Timothy 6:2. The "believing" are the "faithful."

[430] Matthew 24:45; 25:21, 23; Luke 12:42; 16:10-12; 19:17; Acts 16:15; Ephesians 1:1; Colossians 1:2; Revelation 2:10; 17:14.

[431] John 20:27, the verse containing the only use of πιστός in John's Gospel, as well as the only use of ἄπιστος, is no exception. (The noun πίστις does not appear in John's Gospel.) The Apostle Thomas is not specified as one who is in the category of the faithless, but as one who is on the way to such a category, but is stopped from becoming faithless by the almighty power of the resurrected Christ—a power He exercises on behalf of all His people. Thomas had affirmed that he would by no means come to faith in Christ's resurrection without seeing physical evidence of it (οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω, John 20:25—an attitude Christ had condemned in the unregenerate Jews, 4:48), but upon the appearance of Christ in His resurrected body, the Lord exhorted Thomas to not become faithless and unbelieving, but faithful and believing (μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός, John 20:27), accompanying His exhortation with supernatural grace and power, the kind of supernatural grace and power exerted by the risen Christ whenever He brings a sinner from darkness into light (cf. John 6:44), resulting in Thomas's great confession of Christ as his own Lord and his own God (Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, 20:28), and Christ's recognition that, as evidenced by his confession, Thomas was now in a state of believing, having passed out of his position on the road to faithlessness to a state of faith and consequent faithfulness (πεπίστευκας, 20:29, so that Thomas was now πιστός, not one on the path to ἄπιστος, 20:27). The Lord Jesus' word, μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός, was Christ's command to Thomas not to continue on the pathway toward becoming a faithless unbeliever, but rather to become a faithful believer, and His command was accompanied by effectual grace that made His Word so. By His word of command, Christ created the universe out of nothing (cf. the uses of γίνομαι in John 1:3; 10 & Genesis 1:3, 6, etc.), and by the same omnipotent word of command, He created faith within Thomas. By his unbelief in the act of the resurrection, Thomas was in danger of becoming an unbeliever in Christ generally, and the Lord effectually interposed to deliver His beloved sheep from such a possibility by bringing him to a belief in the resurrection. "Stop becoming an unbeliever," or "Do not be becoming an unbeliever," μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, using γίνομαι, "to become," is a different command than μὴ ἴσθι ἄπιστος, "Do not continue to be an unbeliever," using εἰμί, "to be." John's Gospel is very capable of clearly distinguishing γίνομαι and εἰμί (cf. John 1:1–2, 4, 8–10, 15, 18 & John 1:3, 6, 10, 12, 14–15, 17). As Peter's faith was, considered independently of Christ, able to fail, but because of Christ's High Priestly intercession for Peter, the Apostle's faith was certainly not going to fail, but would certainly be strengthened (Luke 22:32), so the Apostle Thomas's faith, considered independently, was capable of failure, but Christ's effectual work on his behalf as Mediator guaranteed that Thomas would not become an unbeliever (cf. John 17); instead, Christ's command of power in John 20:27

lost are specified by the adjective *unfaithful* or *unbelieving*.[432] The faithful are all those who have received spiritual grace, been adopted into God's family, and consequently become church members, rather than only a subcategory of the church or a subclass of Christian.[433] The faithful are those who enter the everlasting kingdom rather than burning in hell,[434] and those who receive the crown of life and who will be with the Lamb rather than being separated from Him forever.[435] Those who come to believe in Christ are made, by supernatural grace, into those who will continue to entrust themselves to Him. God makes them into those who are characteristically faithful, rather than being unfaithful.

As with the verb *to believe*, the noun *faith*[436] regularly refers to the faith exercised at the moment of conversion and regeneration, bringing immediate justification and all the blessings of union with Christ.[437] As seen with the adjective *faithful/believing*, Scripture does not draw a sharp distinction in its usage of the noun *faith* between the faith

---

immediately and effectually turned Thomas from the path towards unbelief and brought the Apostle to make his great confession to Christ, "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28).

Indeed, as John 20 is the climax of John's Gospel, Thomas' confession of the crucified and resurrected Christ as his own Lord and God (20:28), consequent upon Christ's effectual command and exercise of supernatural efficacy upon Thomas to be a believer (20:27; cf. 6:44-45, 65), is a paradigm of the character of saving faith in the Son of God as exercised by the unbeliever (John 20:29-31). Thomas's faith-response to the revelation of Christ is paradigmatic for the Divinely-enabled response of faith in the conversion of the lost and for the continuing Divinely-enabled faith-response to greater revelations of the Person and work of the Triune God to the believer. Thus, considered in context, John 20:27 is so far from proving that a true Christian can be ἄπιστος, "unbelieving/unfaithful," instead of πιστός, "faithful/believing," that it affirms both that conversion involves a transition from being ἄπιστος to being πιστός and that Christ prevents His people from ever falling into the category of ἄπιστος as He preserves every last one of them unto His eternal kingdom.

[432] ἄπιστος. The complete list of references is: Matthew 17:17; Mark 9:19; Luke 9:41; 12:46; John 20:27; Acts 26:8; 1 Corinthians 6:6; 7:12–15; 10:27; 14:22–24; 2 Corinthians 4:4; 6:14–15; 1 Timothy 5:8; Titus 1:15; Revelation 21:8. In every instance, with the sole exception of Acts 26:8, where reference is not made to persons, but to an event that is deemed hard to believe or incredible, it is very clear that the ἄπιστος is an unconverted person, one who is contrasted with the people of God, one who is under the control of Satan (2 Corinthians 4:4) and whose eternal destiny is the lake of fire (Revelation 21:8).

However, the noun ἀπιστία is used in the Gospels for not only for the lack of faith of the unsaved (Matthew 13:58; Mark 6:6) but also for the weakness of faith of the people of God (Mark 16:14) that reduces their effectiveness in service (Matthew 17:20; Mark 9:24). Paul restricts ἀπιστία to the unconverted (Romans 3:3; 4:20; 11:20, 23; 1 Timothy 1:13; Hebrews 3:12, 19) in the manner that the entirety of the New Testament restricts the status of ἄπιστος to the unconverted.

[433] Ephesians 1:1, cf. 1:2ff.; Colossians 1:2.

[434] Matthew 24:45 vs. 51; 25:21, 23 vs. 25:30; Luke 12:42 vs. 46; 16:10-14 (the unfaithful are without true, spiritual riches, like the unconverted Pharisees); 19:17 vs. 22-27.

[435] Revelation 2:10; 17:14.

[436] πίστις.

[437] Matthew 8:10-11; 9:2; Mark 2:5; 5:34; 10:52; Luke 5:20; 7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42; Acts 14:27; 15:9; 20:21; 26:18; Romans 3:25-28, 30-31; 4:5, 9, 11-14, 16, 19-20; 5:1-2, 9:30, 32; 10:6, 8, 17; 11:20; Galatians 3:2, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 22-26, 5:5-6, Ephesians 2:8; Colossians 2:12; 2 Thessalonians 2:13.

exercised at the moment of regeneration and the faith continually present in all true Christians—the believer's continuing entrusting of himself to Christ for justification, sanctification, and eternal life is simply the continuation of the state into which he entered for the first time at the moment of his conversion.[438] Thus, all God's people continually trust in Christ alone for their salvation;[439] even those in a state of severe backsliding are preserved from the loss of faith by the intercession of their High Priest (Luke 22:31-34; cf. 1 Peter 1:5). Those who receive spiritual and eternal life at the moment of their justification by faith never have their faith or spiritual life entirely eliminated. Consequently, in all the saints their union with Christ by faith produces visible results, so that their faith is never isolated from spiritual graces and never without works.[440] Saving faith always results in justification, but not justification only, but also sanctification and its endpoint, glorification, for the exercise of saving faith always results in the "obedience of faith."[441]

The specific object of faith is Christ the Mediator, and through Him the Triune God,[442] to whom one comes with an assured confidence[443] in His ability and willingness

---

438 An examination of all or at least almost all the passages referenced in the previous footnote will validate this fact. As Abraham's faith in his initial conversion began a lifelong entrusting of himself to his Redeemer, so the Christian's exercise of saving faith leads to his being one who walks in the steps of the faith exercised by Abraham (Romans 4:11-12) for the word of faith includes both righteousness received at the moment of conversion and the confession of Christ before men and life of prayer that springs out of the presence of faith in the heart (Romans 10:6-17); initial receipt of the Spirit at the moment of faith is united to the presence of faith that leads to the exercise of spiritual gifts (Galatians 3:2, 5), and those who receive righteousness by faith are those in whom faith works by love (Galatians 5:5-6). A variety of texts speak of the faith present as a mark of all the people of God; cf. 1 Corinthians 15:14, 17 & the texts in the following note.

439 Thus, all the people of God have faith, Luke 18:7-8; Romans 1:8, 12; 1 Corinthians 2:5; Galatians 6:10; Colossians 1:4; Philippians 2:17; 1 Thessalonians 3:2, 5-7; 2 Thessalonians 3:2.

440 James speaks of faith as the present possession of all the saints (James 1:3, 2:1, 5), and the kind of faith that they possess, the "faith of God's elect" (Titus 1:1), is never without works (James 2:17-26). Hebrews similarly assumes justifying faith always results in perseverance, even in light of severe difficulties. Evidence from both James and Hebrews is explicated below.

441 ὑπακοὴν πίστεως, Romans 1:5; 16:26. These two texts, the first and last references to *faith* in Romans, both mentioning the "obedience of faith" through which pagan Gentiles are transformed into ἅγιοι, holy ones or saints (1:7), illustrate the fact that Romans teaches that the salvation which is received through faith includes not justification only (3-5), but sanctification also (6-8, 12-15).

442 In texts such as Romans 3:22; Galatians 2:16, 20; 3:22; Ephesians 3:12; Philippians 3:9 the πίστις Χριστοῦ, "faith of Christ," and their related phrases are objective genitives, signifying "faith in Christ." Compare Romans 5:1-2; Ephesians 2:18; & pgs. 81-98, Chapter 7, "On the πίστις Χριστοῦ Question," *On Romans: And Other New Testament Essays*, C. E. B. Cranfield. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998. Carson & Beale note:

> [P]rior to the 1970s the construction *pistis Iēsou Christou* was almost universally understood to mean "faith in Jesus Christ" (the so-called objective genitive), but in recent decades many scholars have argued that it should be rendered "the faith/faithfulness of Jesus Christ" (subjective genitive). . . . [T]he arguments usually advanced against the traditional interpretation are either irrelevant (e.g., some scholars point to the absence of *pistis* + objective genitive of a person in classical literature, but this absence is precisely what one would expect in documents that do not otherwise speak about the need for believing in a person) or based on an

to save, without any additional human requirements of works (Romans 3:27-28), in accordance with His promise, but it also encompasses the entire revelation and body of truth contained in the Word of God, which is "the faith."[444] "The faith in Christ"[445] includes, in addition to the direct act of faith in the Person of the Redeemer, the recognition of other Scriptural truths such as "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come" (Acts 24:24). "The faith" includes the gospel (Philippians 1:27), all that Paul preached (Galatians 1:23), and all the propositional and practical affirmations of Christianity (Ephesians 4:5), for it consists of all that has been revealed by Christ,[446] the entirety of the Scripture, to which each true believer and church are commanded to conform and to which they will attain perfect conformity eschatologically (Ephesians 4:13-14). Loyalty to Christ and Christianity, to "the faith," requires both justifying faith and faithfulness.[447] Thus, those who are born again are "obedient to the faith" (Acts

---

inadequate understanding of the objective genitive (e.g., that it is not natural, or that it does not apply in this case because *pisteuō* is construed with the dative or with a prepositional phrase). The ambiguity inherent in genitival constructions can be resolved only by examining unambiguous constructions in the immediate and broader contexts, preferably if they use the same or cognate terms. The NT as a whole, and Paul in particular, regularly and indisputably use both *pistis* and *pisteuō* of the individual's faith in God or Christ, but they never make unambiguous statements such as *episteusen Iēsous* ("Jesus believed") or *pistos estin Iēsous* ("Jesus is believing/faithful"). These and other considerations explain why the early fathers who spoke Greek as their native tongue never seem to have entertained the idea that this genitival construction has Jesus Christ as the subject of the implied action (pgs. 789-790, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, G. K. Beale & D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007)

Similarly, Warfield noted:

> [The] object [of] πίστις is most frequently joined to [it] as an objective genitive, a construction occurring some seventeen times, twelve of which fall in the writings of Paul. In four of them the genitive is that of the thing, namely in Philippians 1:27 the gospel, in 2 Thessalonians 2:13 the saving truth, in Colossians 2:12 the almighty working of God, and in Acts 3:16 the name of Jesus. In one of them it is God (Mark 11:22). The certainty that the genitive is that of object in these cases is decisive with reference to its nature in the remaining cases, in which Jesus Christ is set forth as the object on which faith rests (Romans 3:22, 26; Galatians 2:16 [2x], 20; 3:22; Ephesians 3:12; 4:13; Philippians 3:9; James 2:1; Revelation 2:13; 14:12). ("The Biblical Doctrine of Faith," Warfield, in *Biblical Doctrines*, vol. 2 of *Works*.)

Compare the many πιστεύω + εἰς contructions with Christ as their object (Matthew 18:6; Mark 9:42; John 1:12; 2:11; 3:15-18, etc.), although such faith directed toward Christ includes faith in that God who sent Him as well (John 5:24; 1 Thessalonians 1:8; 1 Peter 1:21).

443 Acts 17:31; Romans 4:21. While personal assurance of salvation is not of the essence, but is of the well-being, of faith, faith does necessarily involve certainty about the ability and willingness of God to save in accordance with His gospel promises.

444 In Galatians 3:23, 25, "the faith" refers to the fuller revelation in the New Testament, as set in contrast with the Mosaic dispensation, that Jesus Christ of Nazareth is the promised Messiah; saving faith now involves trusting that the son of Mary is the crucified and risen Redeemer.

445 τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως.

446 Revelation 2:13; 14:12. "The faith" is "the faith of Jesus" (τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ), who calls it "my faith" (τὴν πίστιν μου), because it is revelation from Him and about Him, a body of truth that pertains to Him and, being possessed by Him, is communicated to, received by, and practiced by His people.

447 Revelation 2:19; 13:10, etc. It is very clear that πίστις refers, at times, to faithfulness, rather than to the subjective act of faith; see, e. g., Romans 3:3; Titus 2:10.

6:7)[448] while an unconverted man who "turn[s] away . . . from the faith" rejects Christianity and refuses to come to conversion (Acts 13:8). Those who have Christ in them—which necessarily produces inward and outward holiness—are those who are "in the faith" (2 Corinthians 13:5). The faith[449] includes both doctrinal propositions[450] and a holy lifestyle, including edifying speech (1 Timothy 1:4), care for one's needy family members (1 Timothy 5:8), righteousness, godliness, faithfulness, love, patience, and meekness (1 Timothy 6:11), and both the avoidance of a love for money (1 Timothy 6:10) and profane babblings (1 Timothy 6:20-21). The propositional and practical elements of the faith are inextricably intertwined,[451] so that a sound or healthy faith includes both propositional and practical soundness.[452] Scriptural faith and faithfulness includes walking humbly with God.[453] Fighting the "good fight of faith" (1 Timothy 6:12) and earnestly contending for the faith (Jude 3) involves a grace-enabled battle for both the propositional and practical elements of the faith in the church and the world while holding to them oneself; the believer is to possess and contend for an unhypocritical or unfeigned faith.[454] The "faith of God's elect" includes both "truth" and "godliness" (Titus 1:1); failure to tenaciously hold to faith and a good conscience leads to doctrinal and practical shipwreck concerning the faith.[455] Obedience to Scripture establishes Christians and churches in the faith (Acts 16:5), for those who are reconciled to God "continue in the faith grounded and settled," and are not "moved away from the

---

448 ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει. The imperfect ὑπήκουον includes more than just obedience to the Divine summons to pardon and justification.

449 All the references to πίστις in in the pastoral epistles relate to the faith as a body of truth, while some to faithfulness also, and to the subjective exercise of faith in sanctification, with one or the other side of πίστις emphasized to different degrees in the various passages; see 1 Timothy 1:2, 4–5, 14, 19; 2:7, 15; 3:9, 13; 4:1, 6, 12; 5:8, 12; 6:10–12, 21; 2 Timothy 1:5, 13; 2:18, 22; 3:8, 10, 15; 4:7; Titus 1:1, 4, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:15. The study entitled "The πίστις word-group in the Pastoral Epistles" (pgs. 213-217, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, I. H. Marshall & P. H. Towner. London: T & T Clark, 2004) has some value, despite various errors, including those derived from rationalism.

450 1 Timothy 4:1, 6; 6:20-21; 2 Timothy 1:13; 2:18.

451 2 Timothy 3:8-16; 4:1-7.

452 Titus 1:10-16; 2:1-10; Jude 3-20; Revelation 2:13-16; cf. the results of coming to "the unity of the faith" in knowledge of and likeness to the Son of God in purity of doctrine and of life (Ephesians 4:14-16), in love for God with all the mind and all the heart and soul.

453 Matthew 23:23, referencing Micah 6:8. Micah's "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" (עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט וְאַהֲבַת חֶסֶד וְהַצְנֵעַ לֶכֶת עִם־אֱלֹהֶיךָ׃) is referenced in Matthew as "judgment, mercy, and faith" (τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸν ἔλεον καὶ τὴν πίστιν). Compare also Zechariah 7:9.

454 A πίστις that is ἀνυπόκριτος; 1 Timothy 1:5; 2 Timothy 1:5. The believer, and especially the spiritual leader, must not be a fake or be disingenuous in his doctrinal profession or his lifestyle.

455 1 Timothy 1:19; cf. 3:9.

hope of the gospel" (Colossians 1:23).[456] Spiritual leaders and disciplers are to train others to faithful steadfastness in all the truths of the Word, acting as spiritual fathers who establish spiritual sons in the faith,[457] for sanctification includes being progressively built up upon the foundation of the faith.[458] Believers commit themselves to "the faith" at the moment of their conversion and grow in their knowledge of, practice of, and ability to practice, defend, and propagate the faith in its propositional and practical entirety in their progressive sanctification.

The synoptic Gospels indicate that believing has an important role in the Christian life as a response to specific revelation from God and as an instrument for the receipt of specific blessings from God, particularly the receipt of answers to prayer. The disciple who disbelieves specific revealed truths or acts of God is blameworthy,[459] while disbelieving a counterfeit of the Word as proclaimed by false prophets is commanded.[460] On the other hand, answers to prayer are given to believers[461] who, recognizing the ability of God in Christ to meet their needs, petition and trust in Him to do so[462] and remain stedfast in faith,[463] as enabled by the Holy Spirit, although God in His mercy can answer the sincere prayer offered by one who groans under the burden of felt unbelief.[464] Thus, while God preserves perpetually a root of faith in all those to whom He has given it at the moment of their regeneration and conversion, faith is sometimes a grace that

---

456 The "if," εἴγε, of Colossians 1:23 introduces a first class, not a third class conditional clause; Paul assumes that the Colossians will continue in the faith.

457 1 Timothy 1:2; Titus 1:4.

458 Jude 20. Jude opens and closes his epistle with a reference to "the faith" (Jude 3, 20), so "building up yourselves on your most holy faith," τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτούς, refers to individual and corporate Christian edification on the basis of and grounded upon "the faith," so that in this manner growing spiritually, believers will be protected from apostasy and "keep themselves in the love of God," ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσετε, Jude 21.

459 Mark 16:13-14; Luke 1:20 (cf. 1:45); 24:25.

460 Matthew 24:23, 26; Mark 13:21.

461 In all of the texts where faith is enjoined upon people for answer to prayer those who have exercised saving faith are in view; the unconverted are never in view.

462 Matthew 8:13; Mark 5:36; 9:23-24; Luke 1:45.

463 Note the present tenses for the state of faith associated with answered prayer in Matthew 9:28 (Πιστεύετε ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ναί, Κύριε); 21:22 (πάντα ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, πιστεύοντες, λήψεσθε; note the contrast between the aorist αἰτήσητε and the present πιστεύοντες); Mark 5:36 (Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε); 9:23-24 (note both coming to faith and the state of faith in Εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι, πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι) 11:23-24 (note again the aorist and present in ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, Ἄρθητι, καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύσῃ ὅτι ἃ λέγει γίνεται· ἔσται αὐτῷ ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ. διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, Πάντα ὅσα ἂν προσευχόμενοι αἰτεῖσθε, πιστεύετε ὅτι λαμβάνετε, καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν); Luke 8:50 (Μὴ φοβοῦ· μόνον πίστευε, καὶ σωθήσεται).

464 Mark 9:23-24.

pertains to the believer's particular acts of trust for specific situations.[465] A believer who wants certainty that God will answer his prayers must, enabled by grace, "have faith, and doubt not," and then "whatsoever [h]e shall ask in prayer, believing, [h]e shall receive."[466] Such answers to prayer are related to the genuineness, rather than the quantity, of the believer's faith (Matthew 17:20); one either is trusting the Lord for an answer to prayer, or is lacking in faith (Luke 17:6).[467] Faith is consequently required in prayer for healing.[468] Likewise, one who lacks wisdom is commanded to "ask of God, that giveth to all *men* liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord" (James 1:5-7). Those who doubt in a particular situation, such as trusting God for safety and consequently being free from fear in a storm (Psalm 46:1-3; Isaiah 43:2), and are consequently wavering like the waves of the sea, have, in that particular situation "no faith,"[469] instead of having a steadfast faith (Colossians 2:7). For specific blessings, Christians must with assurance and confidence trust the Lord to meet specific needs, and, in prayer, ask with unwavering faith, for then God has promised to answer them.

As a grace[470] that pertains to the believer's continual, lifelong level of entrusting himself to the Lord, some disciples have weak faith, some have strong faith, and faith can become weaker or grow stronger. When "the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase[471] our

---

465 The texts in the first part of this paragraph employ πιστεύω, while the latter half examines uses of πίστις. The two are combined because of the similar teaching enforced by the verb and the noun.

466 Matthew 21:21-22; Mark 11:22-24.

467 The εἰ εἴχετε πίστιν . . . ἂν of Luke 17:6 (corrupted in the critical text to εἰ ἔχετε), a second class conditional, indicates that no faith was present for the particular prayer request mentioned in the verse.

468 James 5:15 sets forth the general principle that "the prayer of faith shall save the sick," while New Testament narrative provides a variety of examples where Christ tells those who have entrusted themselves to Him for salvation, "as thou hast believed" for a particular healing "*so* be it done unto thee" (Matthew 8:13), "according to your faith be it unto you" (Matthew 9:29; cf. 9:22; 15:28; Mark 5:34; 10:52; Luke 7:9-10; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42; Acts 3:16; 14:9). Acts 3:16 also agrees with James 5:14-16 in ascribing faith for healing to supernatural grace given by God through Christ (the faith which is by him, ἡ πίστις ἡ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ, cf. "the faith which comes through him," ἡ πίστις ἡ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ, *Ignatius to the Philadelphians* 8:2) **Reference the discussion of James 5 in the section on Boardman.**

469 Mark 4:40; Luke 8:25. Matthew 8:26 indicates that the disciples had a little faith, but as the storm kept going on, their faith for safety failed, even as Peter had faith for a little while to walk to Christ on stormy water, but then his faith, being only little, failed him as well, and he began to sink (Matthew 14:28-31).

470 Thus, faith is a central and abiding quality in the believer comparable to hope and love, 1 Corinthians 13:13.

471 πρόσθες, from προστίθημι, "to add to something that is already present or exists" (BDAG).

faith" (Luke 17:5), they asked for something very proper.[472] As regenerate persons, the Apostles already possessed faith, but they wished for their already extant faith to grow. They did not ask for a new type of faith, but for an increase and growth in what they already had from the time of their conversion—they want "furtherance . . . of faith," faith progressing and passing into an ever more advanced state.[473] Faith does not experience a qualitative alteration from mistrust into trust, but in progressive sanctification it does undergo a quantitative increase and a qualitative increase in stedfastness and decrease in mutability.[474] Furthermore, faith is not an autonomous product of the human will, but a supernaturally imparted gift given by Christ. Indeed, God deals to believers different measures of faith, and they should think soberly of themselves and exercise their spiritual gifts in accordance with the measure of faith God has given them[475] through Christ by the

---

[472] A genuine trust in the Lord for a particular request in prayer, such as an ability to forgive those who repeatedly wrong one, is a matter of either the possession of a true confidence in God to answer the request or a lack thereof—even the faith of a mustard seed, if a true confidence, will bring the fulfillment of the prayer (Luke 17:4-6). On the other hand, the believer's entrusting of himself to God in Christ, which began at the time of his conversion and never thenceforward departs for the course of his life, can increase in its measure. As a mustard seed, in the proper conditions of watering and provision, grows into a very large tree, Matthew 13:31-32, so faith grows through the spiritual provision of God. Indeed, both the continual entrusting of oneself to Christ that marks a Christian and the ability to trust the Lord for a specific answer to prayer are Divinely wrought graces within the soul—neither is a self-production of the human will.

[473] Philippians 1:25, προκοπὴν . . . τῆς πίστεως. A "progress, advance . . . frequently of moral progress" (Liddell-Scott) of faith, a "change [of] one's state for the better by advancing and making progress," to "advance, to progress, to change for the better, advancement" (Louw-Nida). Compare 1 Timothy 4:15 & *TLNT*, as well as προκόπτω in Luke 2:52; Galatians 1:14; 2 Timothy 2:16; 3:13.

[474] The qualitative continuity and quantitative development of faith is well expressed in the Old London/Philadelphia Baptist Confession of 1689:

> 1. The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ (2 Corinthians 4:13; Ephesians 2:8) in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the (Romans 10:14, 17) word; by which also, and by the administration of baptism, and the Lord's supper, prayer, and other means appointed of God, it is increased (Luke 17:5; 1 Peter 2:2; Acts 20:32) and strengthened. 2. By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true (Acts 24:14) whatsoever is revealed in the word, for the authority of God himself; and also apprehendeth an excellency therein (Psalm 19:7, 8, 9, 10; Psalm 119:72) above all other writings, and all things in the world; as it bears forth the glory of God in his attributes, the excellency of Christ in his nature and offices, and the power and fulness of the Holy Spirit in his workings and operations; and so is enabled to (2 Timothy 1:12) cast his soul upon the truth thus believed; and also acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the (John 15:14) commands, trembling at the (Isaiah 66:2) threatenings, and embracing the (Hebrews 11:13) promises of God, for this life and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith have immediate relation to Christ, accepting, receiving, and resting upon (John 1:12; Acts 16:31; Galatians 2:20; Acts 15:11) him alone, for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace. 3. This faith, although it be different in degrees, and may be weak (Hebrews 5:13, 14; Matthew 6:30; Romans 4:19, 20), or strong, yet it is in the least degree of it different in the kind, or nature of it (as is all other saving grace) from the faith (2 Peter 1:1) and common grace of temporary believers; and therefore, though it may be many times assailed and weakened, yet it gets (Ephesians 6:16; 1 John 5:4, 5) the victory, growing up in many, to the attainment of a full (Hebrews 6:11, 12; Colossians 2:2) assurance through Christ, who is both the author (Hebrews 12:2) and finisher of our faith. (Chapter 14, "Of Saving Faith.")

[475] Romans 12:3-6. In Romans 12:3, both μερίζω, "to make an allotment . . . deal out, assign, apportion" (BDAG), and μέτρον, "the result of measuring, quantity" (BDAG), are clear evidence that faith

Spirit.[476] They should not have weak faith,[477] or "little faith,"[478] but "great faith"[479] and "strong . . . faith."[480] They are to seek, by means of exercise, to have their faith "increase,"[481] "grow exceedingly,"[482] and "abound,"[483] growing towards the goal of having "all faith" (1 Corinthians 13:2), possessing the highest possible quantity and quality of faith, just as they seek the highest degree of diligence, knowledge, and love (2 Corinthians 8:7). However, as long as indwelling sin remains in the believer, faith has "that which is lacking"[484] in it, and stands in need of being "perfect[ed]" (1 Thessalonians 3:10). Disciples should not let their faith become weak, but maintain a steadfast and strong faith.[485] They should fervently pray, night and day, and have others pray also, for the perfecting of that which is lacking in their faith,[486] and become those who are both "full of faith"[487] and yet growing ever the more full. While the New Testament emphasizes faith as either present or absent in regard to receiving spiritual blessings in specific situations, it also presents faith as a spiritual grace that, while present in all the

---

can increase in its quantity and quality, as is the reference to faith's ἀναλογία, "proportion" (BDAG; cf. "mathematical proportion," Liddell-Scott), in Romans 12:6.

476 Ephesians 6:23; 1 Corinthians 12:8-9; Galatians 5:22.

477 Romans 14:1; ἀσθενέω & πίστς.

478 Matthew 6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; Luke 12:28, ὀλιγόπιστος, "pertaining to having relatively little faith—'of little faith, of insufficient faith'" (Louw-Nida). ὀλίγος can refer, among other uses, to smallness in amount (1 Timothy 5:23) or duration (Acts 14:28). Little faith is both small temporally and quantitatively. Also, while little faith fears (Matthew 8:26), strong faith does not (Hebrews 11:23).

479 Matthew 8:10; Luke 7:9, τοσοῦτος πίστις, faith of a "high degree of quantity, so much, so great," or a "high degree of quality . . . so great/strong" (BDAG).

480 Romans 4:20, ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, explained in v. 21 as "being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform," πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὃ ἐπήγγελται, δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι.

481 2 Corinthians 10:5, αὐξάνω, "to become greater, grow, increase . . . in extent, size, state, or quality" (BDAG).

482 2 Thessalonians 1:3, ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις, from ὑπεραυξάνω, "to increase beyond measure; to grow exceedingly" (Thayer). Such spectacular growth ought to be a continual process, as it was among the Thessalonians.

483 2 Corinthians 8:7, περισσεύω, "to exist in abundance" (Louw-Nida). The verse affirms that faith is a spiritual grace that can grow and abound like other graces, such as love, knowledge, or diligence.

484 ὑστέρημα, "the lack of what is needed or desirable, frequently in contrast to abundance, *need, want, deficiency* . . . a defect that must be removed so that perfection can be attained*, lack, shortcoming*" (BDAG). The word is usually quantitative in the New Testament; note the complete list of references: Luke 21:4; 1 Corinthians 16:17; 2 Corinthians 8:13–14; 9:12; 11:9; Philippians 2:30; Colossians 1:24 (not Christ's vicarious sufferings, which are never designated with θλῖψις in the New Testament, but Paul's afflictions for Christ, which have a Divinely ordained full measure); 1 Thessalonians 3:10. The Christian's failure to have "all faith" indicates his quantitative lack, which muts be perfected.

485 Colossians 2:5; Acts 16:5; στερέωμα, "firmness, steadfastness, strength," & στερεόω; cf. Acts 3:7, 16.

486 1 Thessalonians 3:10, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ὑπὲρ ἐκπερισσοῦ δεόμενοι εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν.

487 Acts 6:5, 8; 11:24; πλήρης πίστεως.

regenerate, has degrees, and is Divinely strengthened, increases, and abounds, as believers exercise it.

The Apostle Paul also taught that a believer's continuing faith played a role in his sanctification, both as an instrument to enable specific ministry and as a conduit for receipt of Divine grace and transformation in general. As King David, in the Old Testament, spoke for the Lord despite trial and affliction (Psalm 116:1-9) because he believed (Psalm 116:10), so Paul and other preachers speak and preach the truth and endure persecution (2 Corinthians 4:8-12) because of their continuing faith in Christ (2 Corinthians 4:13) arising out of their conversion. That is, Christian ministry, specifically bold preaching of the gospel, even in the face of tremendous hostility and opposition, arises out of the continuing faith and confidence of the believer in the risen Christ, his Redeemer (2 Corinthians 4:14). Paul also taught that God fills believers with all joy and peace as they believe and by means of their faith (Romans 15:13);[488] faith is the human response through which God makes the believer holy, filling him with the holy attributes of hope, peace, and joy. The Apostle Paul taught that faith was the necessary foundation for boldness and perseverance in gospel ministry and the means through which God transforms believers into His image. Thus, as the verb *believe* illuminates the believer's greater entrustment of himself to Christ in progressive sanctification, so the noun *faith* illuminates the role of faith in the spiritual life of the regenerate.[489] Faith prompts the believer to perform specific spiritual ministries, such as speaking for Christ (2 Corinthians 4:13), for power from the Holy Spirit arises out of the "hearing of faith."[490] Faith prompts generous sharing of physical goods with other believers (Philemon 5-7). Saving faith will always result in good works (James 2).[491] Furthermore, faith is indeed essential for spiritual life and growth, because whatever does not proceed out of, whatever is not sourced in faith is sin (Romans 14:23).[492] A strong faith will trust in God and His promises despite human impossibilities, while a weak faith will stagger in such

---

488 Note the discussion of this verse in the examination of the book of Romans below.

489 The first part of this paragraph examines uses of πιστεύω, and the latter half uses of πίστις; similarity of content justifies bringing the two together.

490 Galatians 3:5, cf. 3:2. Spiritual gifts, such as the first century sign gift of miracle working power mentioned in 3:5, are a product which developed out of the continuing hearing of faith (ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως). The Spirit Himself was received at the moment of conversion and regeneration by the hearing of faith, ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως, 3:2, and His gifts are bestowed in the same manner, 3:5.

491 James 2; πίστις appears in 2:1, 5, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26.

492 πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν (Romans 14:23b). While the specific issue in context is faith in eating certain foods (Romans 14:22-23a), Christian life is a life ἐκ πίστεως, for ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38.

situations (Romans 4:19-20).[493] The degree of weakness or strength of faith leads the believer to its respective degree of proneness to wander and susceptability to fall or to stedfastness and faithfulness (Romans 14). Patience is produced by faith that is successfully tried and tested.[494] It is not surprising, then, that by "taking[495] the shield of faith" and the "breastplate of faith and love," the Christian can "quench all the fiery darts of the wicked," "stand,"[496] and "resist . . . the devil . . . steadfast in the faith"[497]—faith is key to resisting sin and Satan. Indeed, God continually keeps, preserves, and guards His people through faith, and so brings them to ultimate salvation.[498] Those with faith are the regenerate, and all such people definitively overcame the world at the moment of their conversion, are overcoming now, and will ultimately and finally overcome the world and enter the eternal kingdom.[499] Faith in both its initial bestowal and its increase in sanctification is not an autonomous product of man, but is initially created and

---

493 That the faith of the Christian life is an outflow of the initial entrustment to Christ of the people of God is evident in Romans 4:19-20's placement within a context of many instances of πίστις that refer to the moment of justification.

494 James 1:3; cf. 1 Peter 1:7.

495 The command of Ephesians 6:13, ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν, is to take up the armor to use it in battle, here in spiritual battle.

496 Ephesians 6:13-18; 1 Thessalonians 5:8. The shield of faith can by no means be neglected; "above all," ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, (cf. Colossians 3:14; Luke 3:20; not the tiny minority text reading ἐν πᾶσιν), "taking the shield of faith."

497 1 Peter 5:8-9. ὁ . . . διάβολος . . . ᾧ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει.

498 God has a certain inheritance reserved in heaven (κληρονομίαν . . . τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς) for those whom He keeps by His power through faith unto eschatological salvation, τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1 Peter 1:5-6, so that they will certainly receive the end of their faith (τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως), the salvation of their souls (1 Peter 1:9), even if God tries their precious faith (1 Peter 1:7). Sanctifying faith, which is the continuation of initial justifying faith, reaches its ultimate issue in glorification.

499 1 John 5:4-5, ὅτι πᾶν τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ νικᾷ τὸν κόσμον· καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν. τίς ἐστιν ὁ νικῶν τὸν κόσμον, εἰ μὴ ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ; Those who have been and consequently are born of God (τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ) are having victories, are overcoming (νικᾷ) the world, because the root of that victory, through which the world was at its fundamental level overcome, ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον, (cf. 1 John 2:13; 4:4 with νικάω in the perfect) took place at the moment of faith, πίστις, and regeneration, through which they were brought into union with that Christ who has overcome (νενίκηκα) the world (John 16:33), and gives them His Spirit to destroy their sinfulness and sinning, so that those who believe are those who are overcoming now (ὁ νικῶν τὸν κόσμον . . . . ἐστιν . . . ὁ πιστεύων), the root of faith in Jesus Christ continuing to powerfully produce results, so that these will ultimately, finally, and completely overcome the world. Faith "is the victory" as a metonomy for the means through which victory was obtained; because faith unites believers with Christ, faith is the means through which victory is achieved.

It is noteworthy that 1 John 5:4 is the only instance of the noun πίστις in either John's Gospel or his three Epistles, although he uses the word several times in Revelation.

subsequently strengthened by the supernatural efficacy of the Holy Spirit,[500] although not the Spirit alone, but also the Father and the Son, and therefore, the entire Trinity, give believers both initial faith and ever greater measures of faith, love, and other spiritual graces (2 Peter 1:1; Ephesians 6:23). Through the efficacious working of God, the believer's faith is established, strengthened, and confirmed, with the result that it abounds[501] and "groweth exceedingly."[502] God produces this increase of faith through the Scripture, for faith, while ultimately resting on God, proximately rests upon His revelation of Himself in the Word. While God produces faith, believers are responsible to "add to their faith" virtue, knowledge, and other holy graces, which develop out of the root of faith; believers are to diligently and industriously pursue the means to obtain what they desire God to bestow upon them,[503] and in this manner their faith, knowledge, godliness, charity, and other holy graces will be in them all the more, increasing and abounding, with the result that they bear spiritual fruit.[504] Sanctification takes place as one is "nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine," inspired words that both produce faith and sound doctrine and which describe and delimit what such faith and doctrine are.[505] Believers are to "stand fast in the faith" (1 Corinthians 16:13), for Paul

---

500 That is, faith is a fruit of the Spirit, something that originates in Him, in contrast to the works of the flesh, which are indeed products originating with the fallen human person, rather than with God (Galatians 5:19-23).

501 βεβαιούμενοι ἐν τῇ πίστει . . . περισσεύοντες ἐν αὐτῇ, Colossians 2:7. Compare the other βεβαιόω texts in the New Testament: Mark 16:20; Romans 15:8; 1 Corinthians 1:6, 8; 2 Corinthians 1:21; Colossians 2:7; Hebrews 2:3; 13:9.

502 2 Thessalonians 1:3, ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις; a continuing action, resulting in strength to endure persecutions and tribulations, 1:4, and set in contrast to a faith that is "lacking" or deficient (ὑστέρημα, 1 Thessalonians 3:10)

503 2 Peter 1:5-7. Believers are to add or supply (ἐπιχορηγέω) such virtues to their faith, but God gives (χορηγέω, 1 Peter 4:11; cf. 2 Peter 1:1, 3) the faith in the first place. Compare the ἐπιχορηγέω/ χορηγέω in 2 Corinthians 9:10. By adding or ministering additionally (ἐπιχορηγέω) to their faith, an entrance into God's eternal kingdom will be given or ministered additionally (ἐπιχορηγέω) to them, 2 Peter 1:11.

504 2 Peter 1:8, "these things" (ταῦτα) the holy graces of the previous verses, can be in them and be increasing or abounding (ὑπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα), and they will make them (καθίστησιν) not to be unfruitful (οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους).

505 In 1 Timothy 4:6, rather than giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, through his faithful warning ministry Timothy will "be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine," καλὸς ἔσῃ διάκονος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας. The articular τῆς πίστεως is not limited to a body of teaching or truth rather than personally possessed and exercised faith because: 1.) Elsewhere in the pastoral epistles a distinction between articular and nonarticular πίστις as, respectively, a body of truth and personally exercised faith, cannot be maintained; see, e. g., 2 Timothy 1:5; 3:10. 2.) τῆς πίστεως is in the second attributive position, and "[e]specially when the article is used to denote the second attributive position would we say that it has almost no semantic meaning" (pg. 239, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace). 3.) The personal exercise of faith is intimately associated with the body of doctrine in which faith is exercised. 4.) Being "nourished up" in the realm and by the instrumentality of "the words of

writes, "by faith ye stand" (2 Corinthians 1:24). Indeed, believers "walk by faith, not by sight" (2 Corinthians 5:7),[506] so the spiritual life of the Christian is a walk of faith, specifically, faith in the Son of God (Galatians 2:20),[507] through whom believers are strengthened by the Spirit to employ their free, gracious, and confident access by faith to the Father.[508] Rather than Jewish ceremonial, faith that works by and is being energized by love is what matters (Galatians 5:6).[509] The believer's faith can grow in quantity, resulting in his proper exercise of his spiritual giftedness and in holy living (Romans 12:3-21), for the more faith the believer has, the more spiritual joy and other holy graces he has, and the greater progress he makes in holiness (Philippians 1:25).[510] An increase of faith will result in an increase in good works, in the "work of faith."[511] Indeed, while all believers already have Christ in them,[512] the Father grants that believers, as they are spiritually strengthened, have Christ dwelling[513] in their hearts by faith in an ever greater

---

faith" supports the idea that personal faith is in view. 5.) Other portions of Scripture indicate that faith is produced by the Word (Romans 10:17, cf. v. 8). Compare also "faith in Him," τὸν λόγον τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως, *Dialogue with Trypho* 40.

506 Note that there is nothing in the context of 2 Corinthians 5:7 that suggests that only a subcategory of Christians who have discovered the secret of the Higher Life walk by faith, while the rest of God's people do not do so, nor that believers enter into a walk of faith at some point subsequent to their conversion, from which they can fall by not walking by faith but then re-enter by starting to walk by faith again. It is certain that the faith of believers can vary in its strength, and believers can certainly fail to exercise faith in specific situations, but nothing like the distinctive Higher Life theology is supported by 2 Corinthians 5:7 in its context.

507 ἐν πίστει ζῷ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ is clearly an objective genitive construction.

508 Romans 5:2; Ephesians 2:18; 3:12. Access (προσαγωγή) was obtained at the moment of faith and regeneration, and continues always to be available to the believer (note the perfect tense ἐσχήκαμεν in Romans 5:2).

509 ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει, οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις δι᾽ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη. Note the rather frequent association of faith and love: 1 Corinthians 13:2, 13; 2 Corinthians 8:7; Galatians 5:6, 22; Ephesians 1:15; 3:17; 6:23; Colossians1:4; 1 Thessalonians 1:3; 3:6; 5:8; 2 Thessalonians 1:3; 1 Timothy 1:5, 14; 2:15; 4:12; 6:11; 2 Timothy 1:13; 2:22; 3:10; Titus 2:2; Philemon 5; Revelation 2:19.

510 In Philippians 1:25's τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως, πίστεως and ὑμῶν modify both προκοπὴν and χαρὰν; compare 1:20. The connection between joy and faith is also affirmed in Romans 15:13.

511 1 Thessalonians 1:3. In the "work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope" (τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος) the genitives all produce what is signified by the head noun. God works to fulfill in believers "the work of faith with power," 2 Thessalonians 1:11; ὁ Θεὸς . . . πληρώσῃ πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης καὶ ἔργον πίστεως ἐν δυνάμει.

512 Colossians 1:27; 2 Corinthians 13:5.

513 Ephesians 3:17, κατοικέω. Paul teaches that all believers have the Holy Spirit (and consequently the undivided Trinity) dwelling (οἰκέω, Romans 8:9, 11; cf. 1 Corinthians 3:16) in them, but Christ's presence dwelling (κατοικέω) in them can increase, so that their personal possession of the Divine presence can grow towards that of Christ the Mediator, in whom dwells (κατοικέω) all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (Colossians 1:19; 2:9), and who dispenses of that fulness to them (John 1:16). (The truth here stated does not, and should not be employed to by any means deny the absoute uniqueness of the

way, and as His special presence in them increases, they are rooted and grounded in love for their brethren, experientially know the love of Christ, and are filled with ever greater degrees of the fulness of God.[514]

The *peitho* word group[515] supplies further light on the nature of Christian faith.[516] The verb means "to come to believe the certainty of something on the basis of being convinced—'to be certain, to be sure, to be convinced,'" or "to believe in something or someone to the extent of placing reliance or trust in or on—'to rely on, to trust in, to depend on, to have (complete) confidence in, confidence, trust.'"[517] Coming to saving faith, to *believing*, is to *be persuaded*[518] of the truth about Christ and the gospel, and consequently, turning from all false confidences,[519] to *trust* or place one's *confidence*[520] in Him alone. Related words signify *persuasive*, *convincing*,[521] *persuasion*,[522] and

---

hypostatic union as properly confessed at Chalcedon, nor should any attempt be made to reduce the union of natures in the undivided Person of Christ to a mere Nestorianizing indwelling of God in the human Christ.) Compare the greater strength of κατοικέω as compared with οἰκέω in the LXX in Genesis 19:30; Jeremiah 31:28 (Eng. 48:28); Ezekiel 38:11; Judith 5:5; cf. also Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* 78; *Theophilus to Autolycus* 2:3, and Philo, *Flaccus* 55.

514 Ephesians 3:14-19. A greater degree of the presence of the Son in the believer necessitates a greater presence of the Trinitarian God, for the Divine essence is undivided.

515 πείθω, Matthew 27:20, 43; 28:14; Mark 10:24; Luke 11:22; 16:31; 18:9; 20:6; Acts 5:36–37, 40; 12:20; 13:43; 14:19; 17:4; 18:4; 19:8, 26; 21:14; 23:21; 26:26, 28; 27:11; 28:23–24; Romans 2:8, 19; 8:38; 14:14; 15:14; 2 Corinthians 1:9; 2:3; 5:11; 10:7; Galatians 1:10; 3:1; 5:7, 10; Philippians 1:6, 14, 25; 2:24; 3:3–4; 2 Thessalonians 3:4; 2 Timothy 1:5, 12; Philemon 1:21; Hebrews 2:13; 6:9; 11:13; 13:17–18; James 3:3; 1 John 3:19 (the only use in the Johannine corpus; John 3:36 is the only other use in the entire word group); πεποίθησις, 2 Corinthians 1:15; 3:4; 8:22; 10:2; Ephesians 3:12; Philippians 3:4; πειθός, 1 Corinthians 2:4; πεισμονή, Galatians 5:8; πειθαρχέω, Acts 5:29, 32; 27:21; Titus 3:1; ἀπειθής, Luke 1:17; Acts 26:19; Romans 1:30; 2 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:16; 3:3; ἀπειθέω, John 3:36; Acts 14:2; 17:5; 19:9; Romans 2:8; 10:21; 11:30–31; 15:31; Hebrews 3:18; 11:31; 1 Peter 2:7–8; 3:1, 20; 4:17; ἀπείθεια, Romans 11:30, 32; Ephesians 2:2; 5:6; Colossians 3:6; Hebrews 4:6, 11.

516 "πείθω . . . [is] allied with pistis, fides, foedus, etc." (Thayer, *Greek Lexicon*, on πείθω). "Constructs in πιστ- derive from the dep. πείθομαι" (pg. 175, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6, Kittel). Note the parallelism between πείθω and πιστεύω in John 3:36 (ὁ πιστεύων . . . ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν).

517 Louw-Nida 31.46, 31.82. The breakdown in BDAG is very helpful.

518 Acts 17:4 (aorist passive); 28:24 (imperfect passive); cf. Luke 16:31; Acts 18:4; 19:8, 26; 26:28; 28:23; 2 Corinthians 5:11; Galatians 1:10. Paul persuaded men to turn from their sins and entrust themselves to Christ, and then continue in the grace of God (Acts 13:43).

519 E. g., riches, Mark 10:24, themselves, 2 Corinthians 1:9, their own righteousness, Luke 18:9, or the flesh and religious ceremonies, Philippians 3:3-4.

520 2 Corinthians 1:9; Philippians 2:24; 3:3-4; Hebrews 2:13 (Christ as the Son of Man, identified and in union with his human brethren, perfectly trusted in God, as do they, Psalm 18:2, albeit imperfectly; also Matthew 27:43 & Psalm 22:8); 13:8. See also Luke 11:22.

521 πειθός, "pertaining to being able to persuade or convince—'persuasive, convincing.'" (Louw-Nida).

522 πεισμονή, "the means by which someone is caused to believe—'that which persuades, the means of convincing' . . . [or] the actual process of persuasion" (Louw-Nida), that is, "πεισμονή . . . like the English 'persuasion,' may be either active or passive; 'the act of persuading' . . . or 'the state of one persuaded'" (*St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, J. B. Lightfoot on Galatians 5:8).

confidence or *trust*.[523] Paul, as a pattern true for every Christian, testified: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."[524] The saving faith of the Old Testament saints, set forth as a paradigm for those in the dispensation of grace, possessed, in addition to knowledge, persuasion of the truth concerning Christ and the promises about Him as a constituent element, which resulted in an embrace of the promises and He who was offered in them.[525] Persuasion, confidence, trust, and assurance that Christ will indeed save those who come to Him are elements of saving faith.[526] Since "[t]o be convinced and to believe is finally to obey,"[527] *peitho* consequently passes over from confidence and trust to obedience.[528] The idea *obey* is clearly present in the word group.[529] The people of God are those who believingly trust and consequently obey[530]—thus, the verb

---

[523] πεποίθησις, "1. a state of certainty about something to the extent of placing reliance on, *trust, confidence.*" (BDAG).

[524] 2 Timothy 1:12, οἶδα γὰρ ᾧ πεπίστευκα, καὶ πέπεισμαι ὅτι δυνατός ἐστι τὴν παραθήκην μου φυλάξαι εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν. Paul had entrusted himself to the Lord Jesus, at which moment he came to be persuaded that Christ was able to keep him from spiritual destruction, and his entrusting and persuasion continued to the time of his statement.

[525] Hebrews 11:13, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες, καὶ πεισθέντες, καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Their faith included knowledge of the promises ("having seem them afar off,"), persuasion, and a trusting embrace of the promises, which resulted in confession.

[526] The ideas of persuasion and confident assurance are found in the New Testament in many texts where the specific act of justifying faith is not under consideration. For persuasion, consider Matthew 27:20; 28:14; Luke 20:6; Acts 5:40 (aorist passive is rendered "agreed"); 12:20 (the chamberlain persuaded, convinced, won over, cf. 2 Maccabees 4:45, ἤδη δὲ λελειμμένος ὁ Μενέλαος ἐπηγγείλατο χρήματα ἱκανὰ τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ Δορυμένους πρὸς τὸ πεῖσαι τὸν βασιλέα, "But Menelaus, being now convicted, promised Ptolemee the son of Dorymenes to give him much money, if he would pacify the king toward him."); 14:19; 21:14; 23:21 (being persuaded results in yielding); 26:26; 27:11 ("believed"); Romans 8:38; 14:14; 15:14; 2 Timothy 1:5; Hebrews 6:9; 1 John 3:19. For confident assurance and trust, consider Romans 2:19; 8:38; 15:14; 2 Corinthians 2:3; 10:7; Galatians 5:10; Philippians 1:6, 14, 25, 2 Thessalonians 3:4; 2 Timothy 1:5; Philemon 21; 1 John 3:19.

It is one thing—and a truth—to say that saving faith is inherently assured of the sufficiency of Christ and the truth of the Divine promises in the Gospel. It is another—and a falsehood—to say that saving faith involves within it the assurance that one is personally converted. Assurance in this latter sense belongs to the well-being, not the essence, of Christian faith.

[527] πείθω, πείθομαι, πειθός, πεισμονή, πεποίθησις, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament,* vol. 3, Spicq & Earnest, pg. 67.

[528] Acts 5:36-37; Romans 2:8 (note the πείθω/ἀπειθέω contrast in the μέν/δέ clause); Galatians 3:1; 5:7; Hebrews 13:16; James 3:3.

[529] As evidenced, e. g., in the uses of πειθαρχέω, Acts 5:29, 32; 27:21; Titus 3:1. The "verb is ordinarily translated 'obey,' . . . [with] the peculiar nuance of . . . voluntary consent" (*Theological Lexicon*, Spicq).

[530] In none of its 55 uses in the New Testament are the people of God ever said to be people devoid of πείθω. Galatians 3:1 & 5:7 would be the only texts that might appear to indicate otherwise. However, in these verses false teachers were seeking to lead the Galatians to apostatize from the gospel, but in both

disbelieve or *disobey*[531] is never used of them, nor are its related noun[532] or adjective.[533] Saving faith is an entrusting of oneself to Christ which results in obedience.

The specific quotations of Genesis 15:6[534] and Habakkuk 2:4 in the New Testament, both by Paul and by James, lie in clear continuity with both the grammatical-historical meaning of the Old Testament texts in their specific contexts and the wider Old and New Testament doctrines about the status and character of the just, the nature of the life that they possess, and the role of faith. The New Testament quotations will be examined in their chronological order—James, then Galatians, then Romans, and finally Hebrews.

James, in his quotation from Genesis 15:6 in James 2:23, emphasizes the aspect of the Old Testament doctrine of faith that indicates that continuing faith, faithfulness, and

---

verses "that ye should not obey the truth" (τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι) is a purpose clause, specifying, respectively, the purpose the false teachers had in their bewitching (3:1) and the purpose of the false teachers in their hindering the Galatians' running well (5:7). While many of the regenerate members of the church at Galatia had been influenced by these false teachers, so that, no doubt, their understanding and obedience were being shaken, neither in Galatians 3:1 nor 5:7 does Paul make the affirmation that they had actually become people who were rejectors of the truth or people who had now apostatized and become people of unbelief and disobedience. He simply states the purpose of the false teachers with the infinitive πείθεσθαι.

531 ἀπειθέω is used for those who disbelieve in or disobey the Son instead of believing (πιστεύω) in Him and not being condemned (John 3:36), for unbelieving and disobedient Jews (Acts 14:2; 17:5), for hardened people who do not believe or obey the gospel (Acts 19:9), for the unregenerate who disobey and disbelieve the truth (Romans 2:8), as unconverted Israel disbelieves and disobeys (Romans 10:21; 15:31) and the Gentiles disbelieved and disobeyed before their conversion, but did not do so after their salvation (Romans 11:30-31), and for those who disbelieve and disobey so that they do not enter into spiritual rest but eternally perish (Hebrews 3:18; 11:31). Christ is precious to those who believe (πιστεύω), but to the disbelieving and disobedient He is a stone of stumbling (1 Peter 2:7-8; cf. John 3:36). A non-Christian husband is disobedient and disbelieving in the Word (1 Peter 3:1), as the ungodly in Noah's day who died in the flood were disbelieving and disobedient (1 Peter 3:20). A terrible end will come upon the disbelieving and disobedient (1 Peter 4:17)—the lake of fire.

532 ἀπείθεια; The lost are in unbelief or disobedience (Romans 11:30, 32), for they are the sons of disobedience and unbelief (Ephesians 2:2; 5:6; Colossians 3:6), and they will fall because of their unbelief and disobedience (Hebrews 4:6, 11).

533 ἀπειθής; The unsaved are the disobedient (Luke 1:17), disobeying both God (Titus 1:16; 3:3) and their parents (Romans 1:30; 2 Timothy 3:2). Paul, in contrast, was not disobedient (Acts 26:19).

534 Richard Longenecker notes:

> The theme of the faith of Abraham in the NT . . . has a number of facets to it, and each possesses its own validity as well as serves to enhance the whole: Faith is a wholehearted response to God in Christ, apart from a person's own attempts to gain merit, as Paul has stressed in countering the Judaizers; it is that which results in acts of positive helpfulness and kindness with respect to the physical needs of others, as James has emphasized in combating a perversion of Christian doctrine: and it is that which eagerly looks forward to the full realization of God's promises in the future, arranging its priorities and setting its lifestyle accordingly here and now, as . . . Hebrews has highlighted in confronting the situation [it] was addressing. Like the beauty of a diamond which is only fully appreciated when the gem is rotated slowly in the light, so the faith of Abraham is only known in its fulness as we study it in its varying circumstantial dimensions and as we allow those dimensions to transform our own thinking, outlook, lifestyle and action. (pg. 211, "The 'Faith of Abraham' Theme in Paul, James, and Hebrews: A Study in the Circumstantial Nature of New Testament Teaching," Richard N. Longenecker. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20:3 (September 1977) 203-212)

obedience are the certain products of genuine conversion and justifying faith. His usage is clear from an examination of James 2:14-26. A man who says that he has faith, but does not have works, does not have the sort of faith that Abraham possessed, but a "faith" of a different and inferior character, a kind of mental assent that does not result in inward renewal and one that will not save he who possesses only it (James 2:14).[535] James 2:14a-d does not actually affirm that the speaker is a possessor of genuine *faith*; rather, he is one who only vocally testifies that he is a possessor of faith (cf. 1:25). Nor does James call him a "brother"; he is simply "a man," a certain one who says[536] he has faith—indeed, he is but a "vain man" (2:20). While he does not affirm that this "vain man" has real faith, James does state that this man does not have works—while such a person says that he has faith, what is actually clear is that he does not have works.[537] His faith does not express itself in deeds, only in words—the only way that he can show that he has faith is by a confession of orthodox doctrine, for his deeds show nothing (2:18-19).[538] The absence of works is a clear distinguishing characteristic of his life.[539] James therefore asks, "can faith—the kind of faith[540] that does not produce works—save?" (James 2:14e). James' answer to this question is "no."[541] Such a profession of faith is as empty and worthless as are pleasant sounding words unaccompanied by genuine material

---

535 Τί τὸ ὄφελος, ἀδελφοί μου, ἐὰν πίστιν λέγῃ τις ἔχειν, ἔργα δὲ μὴ ἔχῃ; μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶσαι αὐτόν; James 2:14 states the topic of the entire section of 2:14-26.

536 λέγῃ τις. Note also 2:18, where his claim that he has faith is repeated, although James affirms that his claim is merely empty.

537 ἔργα δὲ μὴ ἔχῃ.

538 James' reference to the *Shema* (Deuteronomy 6:4) is illustrative, not comprehensive, of the orthodox doctrinal affirmations of his rhetorical adversary (the "vain man" of v. 20) in 2:14-26. The point is not that one has dead faith who is merely a monotheist, but that one who has a matchless profession of doctrinal orthodoxy, as illustrated in a happy confession of the *Shema*, but has no deeds, has dead faith. The devils are not merely monotheists, but have a peerless theological orthodoxy; they believe in the Trinity, in justification before God by faith alone, in the creation account of Genesis, the resurrection of Christ, heaven and hell, and all other Biblical doctrine, but they are obviously devoid of saving faith.

539 James consequently employs the present subjunctive ἔχῃ rather than the aorist subjunctive σχῶ (Acts 25:26; Romans 1:13; Philippians 2:27) to describe what the man of James 2:14 does not have. Many texts with the present subjunctive of ἔχω clearly refer to durative or continuing action, and not one clearly refers to a point action (Matthew 17:20; 19:16; 21:21; Mark 4:25; Luke 8:18; John 3:15–16; 5:40; 6:40; 8:6; 10:10; 13:35; 16:33; 17:13; 20:31; Romans 15:4; 1 Corinthians 4:15; 6:4; 13:1–3; 2 Corinthians 1:15; 2:3; 5:12; 8:12; Ephesians 4:28; Colossians 3:13; 1 Thessalonians 4:12; 1 Timothy 5:20; Hebrews 6:18; 12:28; James 2:14, 17; 1 John 1:3; 2:28; 3:17; 4:17).

540 The article in James 2:14e on ἡ πίστις is anaphoric, referring to the πίστιν λέγῃ τις ἔχειν of James 2:14c; that is, it "points back to a certain kind of faith as defined by the author" (pg. 219, Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*), namely, the kind of faith that does not produce works. This kind of faith, a faith that does not manifest itself in works, is the topic in view throughout the passage. Note the series of anaphoric articles on *faith* in the following verses: ἡ πίστις, v. 17; τὴν πίστιν σου . . . τὴν πίστιν μου, v. 18; ἡ πίστις, v. 20; ἡ πίστις, v. 22 (2x); ἡ πίστις, v. 26.

541 The question with μή in v. 14 anticipates a negative answer.

assistance to a desperately needy, hungry, and naked Christian brother who is in danger of death by starvation or exposure (2:15-17; cf. Matthew 25:36, 43). A profession of compassion without deeds has no value in meeting physical needs, and an empty profession of faith that does not produce works similarly has no power to save spiritually. This kind of faith,[542] the kind that is characteristically or continually unaccompanied by works,[543] is dead, being alone or by itself[544] (2:17, 20, 26). There is as much of a difference between this professed but empty and dead "faith" and saving faith as there is between a dead body and a living man (2:26),[545] and such a dead faith will only save men as much as it will save devils (2:19).[546]

James sets forth Abraham (2:21-24) as the paradigmatic example of the fact that saving faith is always accompanied with works. Abraham was justified by works[547]—shown to be righteous[548] in this world—when he offered Isaac his son, as recorded in

---

542 Note again the anaphoric article in οὕτω καὶ ἡ πίστις.

543 μὴ ἔργα ἔχῃ expresses durative action.

544 Compare the καθ᾽ ἑαυτήν of James 2:17 with Acts 28:16; Hebrews 6:13.

545 In James 2:26, the "faith" which is compared to a body is, in keeping with the pericope, intellectual assent to a body of doctrinal propositions. Such intellectual assent, James affirms, is not alive without works, which are compared to the animating spirit. A living man, in contrast to a corpse, has both a body and a spirit.

546 While the πιστεύω ὅτι in James 2:19 is not unable to express the totality of what is involved in saving faith, it here emphasizes the intellectual assent of the "faith" mentioned.

547 The question of James 2:20 with οὐ, which introduces the example of Abraham, expects a positive answer, as do the questions with οὐ in 2:4-7, 25; 4:1, 4.

548 The verb *to justify* (δικαιόω) in James 2:21, 24, 25 does not refer to a legal declaration of righteousness at the judgment bar of God, based solely on the imputed righteousness of Christ, as it does in a variety of other texts in the New Testament (Luke 18:14; Acts 13:39; Revelation 22:11) and especially frequently in Paul, when he refers to the present justification believers receive through the sole instrumentality of faith (cf. Romans 3:20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9; 8:30, 33; 1 Corinthians 6:11; Galatians 2:16-17; 3:8, 11, 24; 5:4; Titus 3:7). A variety of other senses of *justification* appear in the New Testament (cf. 1 Timothy 3:16; 1 Corinthians 4:4). The reference in James is rather to Abraham being declared, manifested, or shown as righteous in this world, during his lifetime, because of his righteous actions. James' declarative point is clearly stated in the context: "I will shew thee my faith by my works" (James 2:18). Abraham was shown to be righteous because he offered up Isaac, and Rahab was shown to be righteous because she protected the Hebrew spies. Neither the predominant Pauline sense of *to justify* as a reference to the Divine declaration of the believer as righteous based solely on the imputed righteousness of Christ, nor the sense of *to justify* in James 2, refers to justification as an infusion of righteousness that confounds justification with progressive sanctification; in both Paul and James justification is a declaration based on what is already present, not an infusion of holiness that inwardly constitutes one righteous. It should be noted that the New Testament certainly does not always refer to justification as a legal declaration by God directed towards men, although justification remains always a declaration of righteousness rather than an infusion of holiness: the children of wisdom justify wisdom (Matthew 11:19; Luke 7:35); God is justified in his sayings and overcomes when He is judged (Romans 3:4); people justify God by submitting to the baptism of John the Baptist (Luke 7:29); the self-righteous wish to justify themselves (Luke 10:29), and, indeed, the Pharisees were justifying themselves before men while they were still abominable to God (Luke 16:15). People can declare God to be righteous, but they hardly can make Him so. In light of the range in New Testament usage, there is nothing out of the ordinary in James' use of

Genesis 22.[549] Works did not transfer Abraham from the realm of those under Divine wrath and headed for damnation into the realm of the redeemed who possess the Divine favor and are headed for eternal glory. Such a transformation, as James indicates by his quotation of Genesis 15:6, took place when Abraham believed and was accounted righteous through the imputation of Messianic righteousness. Works do not transform a dead faith into a living faith, but they manifest the presence of living faith. James recognizes the teaching of Genesis that faith, not obedience, is the instrumentality through which men receive that perfect and sufficient righteousness that provides a sure everlasting hope in the sight of God, while he emphasizes the fact, also clearly taught in Genesis and the rest of the Old Testament, that the *believing* are the *faithful*, so that those who are declared righteous before God on the basis of imputed righteousness are also shown righteous in this life by their works. James refers to the "works" of Abraham, rather than to the single "work" of offering up Isaac, because Abraham's faithfulness on Mount Moriah, in putting Jehovah's command before his own beloved Isaac (Genesis 22), was the culminating work recorded in Genesis of the patriarch's life of faithfulness, all of which sprung out of the transformation that took place in his life decades earlier through his being brought into union with God through faith in the land of Ur[550] as attested in Genesis 15:6. Abraham's faith was "made perfect"[551] by his works (James

---

justification as a this-worldy recognition of the righteousness of the righteous upon the earth, nor does his usage of the verb in this sense contradict in the least the usage of Paul about justification before the legal tribunal of God in heaven.

James' usage of *to justify* also matches the dominant Pauline usage of the verb to refer to present realities possesssed by the people of God upon the earth, rather than an eschatological vindication. In James 2 neither Abraham nor Rahab was justified with reference to an eschatological judgment; Abraham offered up Isaac, and Rahab protected the spies, on the earth during their respective lifetimes. Since all those who possess true faith will also be faithful, so that those who have had Christ perfectly fulfill the law for them will also be characterized by obedience to the law, there is no reason to deny that the people of God will experience an eschatological vindication of themselves as righteous associated with their speech and deeds (Matthew 12:37, cf. Romans 10:9-10). Nonetheless those that are shown righteous, whether in this life (James 2) or in eschatological judgment, still have as the ultimate ground or basis of their standing before God only a righteousness from Christ credited to them through faith alone. Those who characteristically obey the law will be justified (Romans 2:13), but not on the ground or basis of their obedience to the law, but because the doers of the law are those who have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ and consequently, by means of regeneration, have become faithful, although their standing before God, whether during their earthly pilgrimage or at the time of their standing before God in judgment, remains solely based on the imputed righteousness of Christ.

[549] Note God's statement of Abraham's righteousness in Genesis 22:12, where Abraham's willingness to offer Isaac reveals the patriarch's already extant faith, resulting in the blessings stated in 22:16-18.

[550] Compare Hebrews 11:8-19. Note the view of James 2 in 1 Clement 10-12 also.

[551] In the expression ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη, τελειόω + ἐκ indicates that faith is "made perfect" by works in the sense that faith reaches its intended goal in works, rather than that faith is inherently imperfect or flawed until a certain level of works become manifest. A conceptual parallel is found in 1 John 4:12 (ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ

2:22) because Abraham's receipt of a Divine imputed righteousness was not left alone, but led to progressive sanctification and ultimately to glorification. Justification, sanctification, and glorification are a continuum along which all the saints, but none but they, are brought. Abraham's faith in response to the Divine call and revelation in Genesis 12 and 15 was brought to full measure, to completeness, by works, in that inward holiness and its outward fruit of good works are products of the union with Christ established through faith. The statement of Genesis 15:6 that Abraham believed God was "fulfilled" (James 2:23) by Abraham's faithful obedience, culminating in the events of Genesis 22, because true faith, the faith that brings he who exercises it into union with Jehovah and results in imputed righteousness, also always results in faithfulness and obedience. Such obedience is so certain an issue of saving faith that James can regard the statement of Abraham's exercise of saving faith in Genesis 15:6 as a prediction[552] of following obedience which was fulfilled in the patriarch's works, culminating in Genesis 22. Abraham's offering up his son was a fulfillment of his believing in God. One who believes will come to act like Abraham did in Genesis 22 and will be the friend of God[553] instead of being the friend of the world and the adulterous enemy of God (James 4:4). Had Abraham stayed in Ur of the Chaldees instead of rejecting idolatry and entrusting himself to and following Jehovah based on the Abrahamic covenant, he would not have been justified, as Rahab would likewise not have been justified had she sided with the idolatrous enemies of Jehovah in Jericho and had she refused to protect the spies (James 2:25; Joshua 2, 6), but they both would have been unjustified not because they had a true faith that just never produced anything, but because such a lack of works would have been indicative of an absence of true faith.[554] Since true faith always results in

---

τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν), where the love of God is "perfected" in believers as they love one another in that Divine love is brought to its intended goal—certainly God's love is not imperfect until believers come to love one another enough. The specific τελειόω + ἐκ construction in James 2:22 is a New Testament *hapax legomenon*, but Koiné parallels support the idea of perfecting as being brought to an intended goal; e. g., Philo refers to one who has been "made perfect by education," that is, brought to the intended goal by means of education (ἐκ διδασκαλίας τελειωθέντι, *On Rewards and Punishments* 1:49; cf. *On Husbandry* 1:42; *On the Confusion of Tongues* 1:181).

552 The "and the scripture was fulfilled" (καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή) formula of James 2:23 is Biblically employed for the fulfillment of prophecy (Matthew 26:54, 56; Mark 14:49; 15:28; Luke 4:21; Acts 1:16) and should not have its prophecy/fulfillment sense weakened in the exposition of James 2.

553 James 2:23, φίλος Θεοῦ. See Isaiah 41:8 (Symmachus, τοῦ φίλου μου for the Hebrew אֹהֲבִי); 2 Chronicles 20:7; cf. John 15:14-15. In Genesis 18, Abraham also showed friendship/hospitality (φιλοξενία) to the Lord and two angels (Hebrews 13:2). Abraham *was* the friend of God from the time of his justification by faith, but he was called (ἐκλήθη, James 2:23) and recognized as the friend of God subsequently because of the works that manifested his faith.

554 Hebrews 11:31. All the inhabitants of the city of Jericho had the "faith" of the "vain man" of James 2:20 (Joshua 2:9-11), but only Rahab truly believed and entrusted herself to Jehovah (Hebrews 11:31; Joshua 2:11; cf. Deuteronomy 4:39) and consequently acted on her already present living faith, so

faithfulness,[555] the kind of faith that does not produce works is dead (James 2:20, 24, 26). James affirms, as does Paul (Romans 2:13) and the rest of the Old and New Testament, that one who possesses a dead "faith only"[556] that is without works, one who is a "hearer only" (James 1:22)[557] who does not obey the Word, is yet unregenerate.[558] Such a person must not allow himself to be deceived by his empty profession. Abraham's life is clear—true faith results in faithfulness, and only the believing, who are the faithful, possess spiritual life now and eternal life in the eschaton. The just shall live by faith.

In the book of Galatians, Paul quotes Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 to establish the fundamental soteriological doctrine of justification before God by faith alone. Genesis 15:6 is quoted in Galatians 3:6, while Habakkuk 2:4 is quoted in Galatians 3:11. Galatians 3:1-4:11 provides arguments in favor of the propositions Paul stated in

---

that she was saved instead of perishing with the idolators of Jericho. While those in Jericho with the vain man's "faith" perished as "accursed" (חֵרֶם) under the temporal curse of death and the eternal curse of the second death, "Rahab . . . shall live" and be "saved . . . alive" (Joshua 6:17, 25, חָיָה) with all that pertained to her, delivered from spiritual, physical, and eternal death with the pagans in Jericho, to possess spiritual life, a blessed portion with the people of God, and eternal life.

[555] From his use of both Abraham and Rahab as illustrations, James demonstrates that in all cases works proceed from true faith. If those from the status of the patriarch of Israel down to the status of a Canaanite prostitute woman manifest their faith in works, surely all those of any status with real faith will manifest their belief in works (cf. James 2:1ff.).

[556] πίστις μόνος.

[557] μόνος ἀκροατής, the only other use of μόνος in James.

[558] Warfield notes:

> It was to James that it fell to rebuke the Jewish tendency to conceive of the faith which was pleasing to Jehovah as a mere intellectual acquiescence in His being and claims, when imported into the Church and made to do duty as 'the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Glory' (James 2:1). He has sometimes been misread as if he were depreciating faith, or at least the place of faith in salvation. But it is perfectly clear that with James, as truly as with any other New Testament writer, a sound faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the manifested God (James 2:1) lies at the very basis of the Christian life (James 1:3), and is the condition of all acceptable approach to God (James 1:6, 5:15). It is not faith as he conceives it which he depreciates, but that professed faith (λέγῃ, James 2:14) which cannot be shown to be real by appropriate works (James 2:18), and so differs by a whole diameter alike from the faith of Abraham that was reckoned unto him for righteousness (James 2:23), and from the faith of Christians as James understood it (James 2:1, 1:3, cf. 1:22). The impression which is easily taken from the last half of the second chapter of James, that his teaching and that of Paul stand in some polemic relation, is, nevertheless, a delusion, and arises from an insufficient realization of the place occupied by faith in the discussions of the Jewish schools, reflections of which have naturally found their way into the language of both Paul and James. And so far are we from needing to suppose some reference, direct or indirect, to Pauline teaching to account for James' entrance upon the question which he discusses, that this was a matter upon which an earnest teacher could not fail to touch in the presence of a tendency common among the Jews at the advent of Christianity (cf. Matthew 3:9; 7:21; 23:3; Romans 2:17), and certain to pass over into Jewish-Christian circles: and James' treatment of it finds, indeed, its entire presupposition in the state of things underlying the exhortation of James 1:22. When read from his own historical standpoint, James' teachings are free from any disaccord with those of Paul, who as strongly as James denies all value to a faith which does not work by love (Galatians 5:6; 1 Corinthians 13:2; 1 Thessalonians 1:3). In short, James is not depreciating faith: with him, too, it is faith that is reckoned unto righteousness (ii.23), though only such a faith as shows itself in works can be so reckoned, because a faith which does not come to fruitage in works is dead, non-existent. He is rather deepening the idea of faith, and insisting that it includes in its very conception something more than an otiose intellectual assent. ("The Biblical Doctrine of Faith," *Biblical Doctrines*, vol. 2 of *Works*)

Galatians 2:15-21. Galatians 3:1-18 proves that righteousness is received apart from the law. Within 3:1-18, 3:6-14 provides arguments from the Old Testament establishing the truth of justification by faith apart from the law.[559] Paul points out, first of all, that the truth that one is justified in the sight of God apart from the law (2:16) is established because Abraham was accounted righteous, receiving the imputed righteousness of the Messiah, through the sole instrumentality of faith (3:6).[560] Consequently, believers, "they which are of faith," rather than law-keepers, "are the children of Abraham" spiritually (3:7). Those who believe as Abraham did become the recipients of the redemptive blessings associated with the patriarch. Indeed, the Old Testament had foreseen that God would justify Gentiles, non-lawkeepers, through faith, for God had promised Abraham all nations, not lawkeeping Jews only, blessing through his Seed, the Messiah.[561] Consequently, all those who are of faith receive the Abrahamic blessing (3:9). Indeed, none of the sons of Adam can receive salvation through obedience to the law, for the legal standard is continual, perfect, sinless obedience, but all have sinned and deserve God's curse.[562] Furthermore, the explicit testimony that "the just shall live by faith"[563]

---

559 Compare the outline in *Galatians*, Richard N. Longenecker, vol. 41 in the *Word Biblical Commentary*.

560 Note the further discussion below in the analysis of the quotations of Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 as found in the book of Romans. In Galatians 3, the quotation from Genesis 15:6 is central to the entire passage.

561 Galatians 3:8; Genesis 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4 28:14. The προευαγγελίζομαι of Galatians 3:8 specifies that the gospel was preached beforehand to Abraham, not only in the proclamation of the Messiah, but also in the declaration of the doctrine of righteousness by faith.

562 Galatians 3:10; Deuteronomy 27:26.

563 A comparison of Galatians 3:11 and 12 indicates that Paul interpreted Habakkuk 2:4 in accordance with its meaning in its original context, that is, as "the righteous shall live by faith" rather than as "he who through faith is righteous shall live" (for a comparison of the writers who take the one or the other position, see, e. g., pgs. 33-35, "'The Righteous Shall Live by Faith'—A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation," H C. C. Cavallin. *Studia Theologica* 32 (1978) 33-43). The sense of *live* in both ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται and in ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς is parallel. In Galatians 3:12 and Leviticus 18:5 (יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם הָאָדָם וָחַי בָּהֶם) the prepositional phrase cannot be construed with the subject, but must be taken to modify the verb. Consequently, in both 3:11 and 3:12 the prepositional phrases (ἐκ πίστεως/ἐν αὐτοῖς), not the subjects (ὁ δίκαιος/ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος), modify the verb ζήσεται in their respective clauses, even as in Galatians 3:11a the prepositional phrase ἐν νόμῳ modifies the verb δικαιοῦται, paralleling the modification of ζήσεται by ἐκ πίστεως in 3:11b. Since both spiritual life on earth and eschatological eternal *life* are included in the quotation in Galatians from Leviticus 18:5 (parallel texts such as Deuteronomy 5:33 validate the fact that "life" with the smile and blessing of God now is included in Leviticus 18:5, but eschatological life is by no means excluded; see the interpretation of the Leviticus text as a reference to "eternal life" in the Targum Onkelos & Pseudo-Jonathan—note furthermore that Paul's quotation of Leviticus 18:5 in Romans 10:5, where a contrast with the promise of Habakkuk 2:4 as found in Romans 1:16-17 likewise includes both justification, spiritual life on earth, and eschatological salvation—the same kinds of *life* are contrasted in Romans 1:16-17; 10:5, as they are in Galatians 3:11-12), both are included also in Paul's view of the *life* promised in Habakkuk 2:4, rather than justification at the moment of conversion alone. Of course, Paul's recognition that Habakkuk 2:4 promises both spiritual and eschatological *life* to faith includes as its good

elminates the possibility that life comes from the law, for the just are all those who are justified by faith (3:11).[564] The law sets a different and contrary standard—life for sinless obedience.[565] Christ took the curse of the law upon Himself on the cross so that the Gentiles could be accepted by God and receive salvation in all its aspects, inclusive of both justification and the promise of the Spirit, through faith.[566]

Paul's use of Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 in Galatians 3 emphasizes the receipt of justification through faith alone rather than the faithfulness and holiness that are the fruit of justifying faith. As the Apostle demonstrates, the Old Testament is clear—righteousness before God is the possession of all those who believe, rather than a possession of those who merit salvation by works. However, the faithfulness that is the fruit of the union with Christ entered into at the moment of justification is by no means excluded in Galatians. The promised Spirit, who sinners receive through faith alone at the moment of their justification (3:14), will produce His fruit (5:16-26; 4:6) in those who have received Him. Those justified by faith alone will be led by the Spirit (5:18) into a walk of holiness that is characterized by love, joy, peace, longsuffering, and other holy

---

and necessary consequence that one is justified by faith as well as living the continuing Christian pilgrimage by faith. In Galatians 3:11, Romans 1:17, and Hebrews 10:38 Paul employs the quotation of Habakkuk 2:4 properly in its original context as a reference to the receipt of the blessing of spiritual life, including justification, sanctification, and glorification, through the instrumentality of faith, emphasizing one or the other facet of the life received in his various references to Habakkuk.

While a real offer of *life* to sinless perfection and perfect obedience to the law is made in Galatians 3:12; Romans 10:5; Leviticus 18:5 (cf. Deuteronomy 4:1ff., 30:16-20; Romans 7:10; contrast Romans 10:4-11; Habakkuk 2:4; Isaiah 55:1-3, etc.) the promise cannot be received by any of the fallen sons of Adam because of their sin (Galatians 3:10). The law itself is not imperfect, and it gives instructions for perfect righteousness, but only the virgin-born Messiah has ever perfectly fulfilled its holy requirements (cf. Galatians 3:21). Therefore, spiritual inheritance can actually be received by sinners only through the free promise of grace through faith—a way not anulled by the law, but which actually preceded the law—and, in any case, God knew that sinners could not perfectly keep His law, and did not give it to them for the purpose of them receiving salvation by obedience to it (3:15-22). These facts explain why the method of justification set forth by the law is one foreign to faith (3:12a).

564 That is, Galatians 3:11 identifies the "just" and the "justified": ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς *δικαιοῦται* παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, δῆλον· ὅτι Ὁ *δίκαιος* ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. All believers are the just who live by faith.

565 Galatians 3:12; Leviticus 18:5; Nehemiah 9:29; Ezekiel 20:11, 13. Note that the quotations of Leviticus 18:5 in Nehemiah, Ezekiel, and Galatians all indicate failure to meet the decreed standard of sinless perfection, just as the Pentateuch itself indicates that Israel was failing and would continue to fail to keep the law (Deuteronomy 4:26-30; 9:5, etc.). No text in either the Old or New Testament indicates that any son of Adam actually met the standard of obedience commanded by the law. The Pentateuch itself, as well as the references in Nehemiah 9 and Ezekiel 20 to Leviticus 18:5, support Paul's setting of Galatians 3:10 and 3:12 in sharp contrast to 3:11—law and curse are set against faith and righteousness. Galatians 3:10-12 provides Paul's proofs from the propositional statements of the Old Testament that his affirmations in 2:16, 21 are true, and that the Old Testament validates his affirmations about the experience of the Galatians (3:1-5) and of Abraham (3:6-9).

566 Galatians 3:13-14; Deuteronomy 21:23. Note that the reference to the Spirit in v. 14 ties back to 3:2-5, where not only conversion, but also the continuation of the Christian life, is under discussion. The promise of the Spirit is a promise that includes the progressive sanctification of all believers.

Spirit-produced acts, rather than the fleshly works that characterize those who will not enter the kingdom but suffer damnation (5:19-23). Faith will work by love (5:6). Indeed, the entire Christian life is lived by faith in the Son of God (2:20; cf. 5:5). The Christian dispensation itself is the coming of faith (3:23, 25). Justification by faith alone (2:16, 21) does not lead to a life of sin, because the believer is legally dead to the law, crucified with Christ, and alive to God (2:17-20). As is clear in Genesis and Habakkuk, Galatians affirms the twin truths that justification in the sight of God is by grace through faith alone, based on the imputed righteousness of Christ alone, and that faithfulness and holiness are the inevitable consequents springing from true faith. The just shall live by faith, as Abraham did.

The affirmation of Habakkuk 2:4 that "the just shall live by faith," the thesis statement of the Old Testament prophet,[567] is found in the thesis statement of the book of Romans: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith" (Romans 1:16-17).[568] Genesis 15:6 is also quoted in Romans 4:3 to prove that Abraham was justified by faith alone apart from works of the law. The significance of these two quotations in the context of the book of Romans, and their value in illuminating the character of Christian faith, will be examined in book order.

Romans 1:16-17 reads: "I am not ashamed[569] of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith."[570] Romans 1:16-17a illuminate what is involved in

---

567 R. M. Moody demonstrates that "Romans . . . has in a very important way the same theme as Habakkuk. . . . In Habakkuk the centre of the solution of Habakkuk's problem is Hab 2:4, and the theme verse of Romans is 1:17 . . . both books are on the same subject. . . . We therefore arrive at the conclusion that we have in Romans an extensive study of Habakkuk in the light of the coming of Christ in which Paul fully examines every aspect of Habakkuk's solution to the problem of God's dealing with Jew and Gentile" (pg. 208, "The Habakkuk Quotation in Romans 1:17," R. M. Moody. *Expository Times* 90 (1980-81) 205-208).

568 οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ· δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

569 Contrast the use of ἐπαισχύνομαι in 1:16 with the only other use in Romans, found in 6:21; Paul, as one would expect for the saints of God, is not ashamed of the gospel of the crucified God-Man, but believers are ashamed of the sins they committed before their conversion. Compare the other NT ἐπαισχύνομαι texts: Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26; 2 Timothy 1:8, 12, 16; Hebrews 2:11; 11:16.

570 οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ· δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν

the affirmation of Habbakuk that "the just shall live by faith."[571] First, Paul proves in 1:18-3:20 that all need the gracious justification of God through the gospel of Christ,

---

αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. The verses are full of key terms that appear throughout Romans.

It should be noted that both instances of πίστις in Romans 1:17's "from faith to faith" refer to the act of human believing, so that the phrase speaks of the increase and strengthening of the believer's faith; neither instance in Romans 1:17 refers to God's faithfulness, and consequently the sense of the phrase is not "from the faithfulness of God to man's faith." Indeed, both the ἐκ πίστεως construction in the New Testament (Romans 1:17; 3:26, 30; 4:16; 5:1; 9:30, 32; 10:6; 14:23; Galatians 2:16; 3:7–9, 11–12, 22, 24; 5:5; Heb 10:38; James 2:24) and the διὰ πίστεως construction (Romans 1:12; 3:22, 25, 27, 30–31; 4:13, 16; 2 Corinthians 5:7; Galatians 2:16; 3:14, 26; Ephesians 2:8; 3:12, 17; Philippians 3:9; Colossians 2:12; 1 Thessalonians 3:7; 2 Timothy 3:15; Hebrews 6:12; 11:33, 39; 1 Peter 1:5) always refer to human "faith" rather than to God or Christ's faithfulness (cf. pgs. 363-373, *The Epistle to the Romans*, vol. 1, John Murray, for further examination of this question and validation of the conclusions here stated).

571 As the Hebrew accentuation in Habakkuk 2:4 makes it clear that Habakkuk's assertion is "the just, by his faith he shall live," rather than "the just by his faith, he shall live," so in Romans 1:17 Paul's Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται does not mean "he who through faith is righteous shall live," but "the righteous shall live by his faith," a fact not only borne out by the Hebrew of Habakkuk but also a number of evidences from the Greek. That is, the ἐκ πίστεως modifies ζήσεται, rather than δίκαιος. Paul could easily have written ὁ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος ζήσεται or ὁ δίκαιος ὁ ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται had he wished to indicate that ἐκ πίστεως modified δίκαιος.

As noted by Moody Smith (pgs. 17-19, "O DE DIKAIOS EK PISTEWS ZHSETAI," Moody D. Smith, in *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament*, FS K. W. Clark, ed B. L. Daniels and M. J. Suggs. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1967; Smith's argument is very closely followed below), Romans 1:16f. falls into four parts, the first three introduced by γάρ and the fourth by καθώς. The first, introductory, section is v. 16a. The subsequent parts consist of three propositions with significant parallelism. Three elements appear in each part, with the following pattern: a.) The action of God b.) is a revelation which brings salvation c.) for all who receive it in faith. That is:

A v. 16b δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ
  b. 17a δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ
  v. 17b ὁ δὲ δίκαιος
B v. 16b ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν
  v. 17a ἐν αὐτῷ (=εὐαγγελίῳ) ἀποκαλύπτεται
  v. 17b ζήσεται
C v. 16b παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι
  v. 17a ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν
  v. 17b ἐκ πίστεως

In v. 16b and 17a the pattern ABC is followed. Since Paul follws the order of the text of Habakkuk (יִחְיֶה׃ וְצַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ), v. 17b has the order ACB, but the pattern of the two preceding syntactical units indicates how Paul understands the Habakkuk quotation. The pattern in v. 16b and 17a of: a.) God's action, b.) salvific revelation, c.) reception by faith, provides a key for unlocking Paul's understanding of the Habakkuk quotation. Furthermore, the Habakkuk formula helps explain the disposition of the two preceding affirmations in three parallel elements. Thus, the parallel structure supports the fact that Paul construes the ἐκ πίστεως with the verb ζήσεται.

Furthermore, it appears that v. 17a is a restatement of v. 16b in terms supplied by Habakkuk 2:4. Paul's mention of the righteousness of God is an abstraction prompted by the upcoming ὁ δίκαιος. The present tense ἀποκαλύπτεται corresponds to the future ζήσεται of the Habakkuk quotation. The present tense of ἀποκαλύπτεται, with the phrase ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, indicates a continuing process of Divine self-disclosure on the basis of faith. What Paul affirms abstractly and with respect to its Divine origin in 17a is then given scriptural grounds and set forth in concrete terms with respect to the human situation in 17b: "The righteous [man] shall live by faith."

The view that the New Testament quotation of Habakkuk 2:4 means "the righteous shall live by faith" rather than "the righteous by faith shall live" is found throughout the church age; see, e. g., for the

because all, Jew and Gentile, are sinners devoid of righteousness. They stand in need of, by faith, becoming those who are just and shall live. Men are by nature and choice the enemies of God,[572] under His wrath, and separated from the spiritual and eternal life[573] that comes through faith.[574] Whether Jews (2:1-29) or Gentiles (1:18-32), all[575] stand condemned (3:1-20).[576] In 1:18-3:20, the righteous wrath of God is revealed (1:18), rather than His righteous manner of showing mercy in and by Christ (8:18),[577] for men are unrighteous,[578] while God is righteous.[579]

Second, Paul proves in 3:21-5:21 that men are delivered from sin and justified apart from the law and through faith alone. Since, as Habakkuk affirms, those who have faith are those who have spiritual and eternal life, and are the just before God, clearly

---

early church period, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Tarsians*, Chapter 1; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 2:6; 4:16; Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, Homily 7.

572 While Θεός, and His righteous wrath and judment, are ubiquitous in Romans 1:18-3:20 (see 1:18–19, 21, 23–26, 28, 32; 2:2–5, 11, 13, 16–17, 23–24, 29; 3:2–7, 11, 18–19), Χριστός (and Ἰησοῦς) appears only in 2:16 (the only reference to εὐαγγέλιον in this portion of the epistle also), where His Messianic judgment and condemnation of the unbelieving wicked is in view; there is no σωτηρία in 1:18-3:20 (the complete list of texts with the word in Romans is: 1:16; 5:9–10; 8:24; 9:27; 10:1, 9–10, 13; 11:11, 14, 26; 13:11). In contrast, God as Author of the gospel and the loving and propitiated Father of those in Christ appears very frequently in the other portions of Romans (cf. 1:1, 7-9, 16-17, 3:21-23, 25-26, 29-30, 4:2-3, 6, 17, 20; 5:1-2, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15; 6:10, 11, 13, 17, 22-23, 7:4, 22, 25; 8:3, 9, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 39, 9:8, 11, 16, 26, 10:1, 3, 9, 17; 11:2, 22-23, 29-30, 32-33; 12:1-3, 14:3, 6, 17-18, 20, 22, 15:5-9, 13, 15-17, 19, 30, 32-33; 16:20, 26-27) among a significant variety of other uses of Θεός (cf. 1:4, 10; 8:7-8; 9:5-6, 14, 20, 22; 10:2, 11:8, 21; 13:1-2, 4, 6, 14:11-12—note that His judgment and wrath are also present in a variety of these texts). Χριστός appears elsewhere frequently in Romans (1:1, 4, 6–8, 16; 3:22, 24; 5:1, 6, 8, 11, 15, 17, 21; 6:3–4, 8–9, 11, 23; 7:4, 25–8:2; 8:9–11, 17, 34–35, 39–9:1; 9:3, 5; 10:4, 6–7; 12:5; 13:14; 14:9–10, 15, 18; 15:3, 5–8, 16–20, 29–30; 16:3, 5, 7, 9–10, 16, 18, 20, 24–25, 27) as does Ἰησοῦς (1:1, 4, 6–8; 3:22, 24, 26; 4:24; 5:1, 11, 15, 17, 21; 6:3, 11, 23; 7:25–8:2; 8:11, 39; 10:9; 13:14; 14:14; 15:5–6, 8, 16–17, 30; 16:3, 18, 20, 24–25, 27).

573 Romans 2:7-8. Of course, spiritual life and eternal life are highly overlapping or even synonymous terms—those who will have eternal and spiritual life eschatologically are those who have spiritual and eternal life now by means of faith and regeneration.

574 The human exercise of πίστις is absent in 1:18-3:20. Obviously, 3:3 is no exception.

575 All (πᾶς, 1:16) need the salvation set forth in the gospel because God's wrath is revealed against all unrighteousness and ungodliness (1:18) of all men, Jew or Gentile (2:1, 9-10; 3:9) who are filled with all unrighteousness (1:29; 3:12) and therefore are all unable to be justified by the law (3:19-20). Thankfully, the gospel is set forth in Romans as offered to all, whether Jew or Gentile, who believe (3:22-23; 4:11, 16; 5:12, 18; 9:33; 10:4, 11-13, 18, 26, 32; 15:11; 16:26). The point of Romans 2:13 is the availability of salvation to both Jew and Gentile, as the following context demonstrates, while the verse also indicates that all who are justified by faith alone will characteristically keep God's commandments.

576 2:9; 3:9. 2:10 is a proleptic reference to truth explained after 3:20—the manner in which, by grace through faith alone, one can become a true Jew (2:17, 28-29).

577 ἀποκαλύπτω appears only in 1:17, 18; 8:18.

578 ἀδικία, 1:18, 29; 2:8; 3:5; cf. 6:13. Οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς, 3:10. The δίκαιος recipient of δικαιόω in 2:13 does not receive elaboration in the portion from 1:18-3:20; the following portions of the epistle provide elaboration.

579 3:4-5; 9:14.

salvation is the possession of every believer, whether Jew or Gentile, rather than the prize only of those who perform meritorious works.

> But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; Even the righteousness of God *which is* by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where *is* boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. (Romans 3:21-28)[580]

The *just* or *righteous* are all[581] those Jews and Gentiles[582] who have been declared righteous by the gracious God[583] on the basis of the imputed righteousness of the God-Man, Jesus Christ.[584] Works cannot earn righteous standing before God—on the contrary, imputed righteousness is received solely through the instrumentality of faith.[585] The imputation of righteousness brings *salvation* and spiritual and eternal *life*.[586]

---

[580] 21 νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν· 22 δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας· οὐ γὰρ ἐστι διαστολή· 23 πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, 24 δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 25 ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον, διὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων, 26 ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ· πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. 27 ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη. διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. 28 λογιζόμεθα οὖν πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι ἄνθρωπον, χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.

[581] 3:22–23; 4:11, 16; 5:12, 18.

[582] 3:29; 4:17–18.

[583] The emphasis of the texts with Θεός in 3:21-5:21 (3:21–23, 25–26, 29–30; 4:2–3, 6, 17, 20; 5:1–2, 5, 8, 10–11, 15) differs radically from those references to Θεός in 1:18-3:20—in the latter section, God is now, because of Jesus Christ, who is abundantly referenced in the section (3:22, 24; 5:1, 6, 8, 11, 15, 17, 21), the God who manifests grace and love through propitiated justice, rather than the God of wrath who justly punishes those who have not been reconciled through the Redeemer.

[584] Notice the abundance of references to both God's and to imputed δικαιοσύνη (3:21-22, 25-26, 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22; 5:17, 21) and to δικαιόω (3:20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9); note also δίκαιος (3:26; 5:7, 19). The progression manifested in the uses of δικαίωμα is noteworthy. The ungodly know God's righteous judgments but do not keep them (1:32), while regenerate Gentiles who keep God's righteous judgments will be reckoned among the people of God (2:26). Despite many offences, the people of God receive δικαίωμα for Christ's sake, δι᾽ ἑνὸς δικαιώματος receiving δικαίωσις (5:16, 18). Consequently, because of regeneration, the righteous judgments of the law are fulfilled in them (8:4).

In the book of Romans, the complete list of references to δικαιοσύνη is: 1:17; 3:5, 21–22, 25–26; 4:3, 5–6, 9, 11, 13, 22; 5:17, 21; 6:13, 16, 18–20; 8:10; 9:28, 30–31; 10:3–6, 10; 14:17; δικαιόω appears in 2:13; 3:4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9; 6:7; 8:30, 33, and δίκαιος in 1:17; 2:13; 3:10, 26; 5:7, 19; 7:12.

[585] πίστις, 3:22, 25–28, 30–31; 4:5, 9, 11–14, 16, 19–20; 5:1–2; πιστεύω, 4:3, 17–18, 24.

[586] σωτηρία, 5:9-10 (eschatological, rather than present, σωτηρία); ζωή, 5:17, 18, 21 (see also 5:10)—note the references to ζωή appear only at the end of the section 3:21-5:21, where a transition is being made to 6:1-8:39, and the references to σωτηρία are also both in chapter 5, where the δικαιόω word group is, although certainly still present, less overwhelmingly central than it is in chapters 3-4.

Third, Paul proves in 6:1-8:39 that those justified by faith receive a spiritual life that encompasses not justification only, but also progressive sanctification and glorification. Entrance into the realm of righteousness and the reign of grace makes certain the possession of life in all its justifying, sanctifying, and glorifying fulness (5:21). Indeed, all of *life* in its future and present aspects proceeds out of or from faith,[587] so that the Christian life is a life of faith. Since salvation in all its aspects arises from faith,[588] God justifies those who are of faith,[589] crediting righteousness to them.[590] The spiritual life of the Christian earthly pilgrimage that proceeds from the reception of life at the moment of regeneration and justification is likewise lived by faith,[591] as the believer by faith eagerly awaits his future inheritance[592] with a faith that is accompanied by holiness of life,[593] since "whatsoever is not of faith is sin."[594] In this manner those justified by faith shall live on earth by faith, and, as God gives to them increasing measures of faith,[595] their earthly sojourn is a life "from faith to faith,"[596] from one measure of faith to another and greater measure, and from one degree of holiness to the

---

587 ἐκ πίστεως. Note that this important Pauline expression (Romans 1:17; 3:26, 30; 4:16; 5:1; 9:30, 32; 10:6; 14:23; Galatians 2:16; 3:7–9, 11–12, 22, 24; 5:5; Hebrews 10:38) occurs only in Habakkuk 2:4 in the LXX. It is also rare in the writings of early post-apostolic Christendom (but cf. Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* 135: "[T]here are two seeds of Judah, and two races, as there are two houses of Jacob: the one begotten by blood and flesh, the other by faith and the Spirit" (δύο σπέρματα Ἰούδα, καὶ δύο γένη, ὡς δύο οἴκους Ἰακώβ· τὸν μὲν ἐξ αἵματος καὶ σαρκός· τὸν δὲ ἐκ πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος γεγεννημένον).

588 The believer is one who has the quality of being ὁ ἐκ πίστεως, Romans 4:16.

589 ὁ ἐκ πίστεως, Romans 3:26, 30; 4:16; Galatians 3:7-9; also Romans 5:1; Galatians 2:16; 3:22-24; contrast 3:12.

590 Romans 9:30-32; 10:6.

591 In addition to Romans 12:3; 14:23; 15:13, note also 1 Corinthians 16:13; 2 Corinthians 1:24; 4:13; 5:7, for evidence that the entire Christian life from justification to glory is a life of faith.

592 Galatians 5:5, ἐκ πίστεως . . . ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.

593 James 2:24.

594 πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστί, Romans 14:23b.

595 Romans 12:3, ὁ Θεὸς ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως.

596 ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν—followed by καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. The significance of the "from faith to faith" (ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν) is illuminated by "they shall go from strength to strength" (πορεύσονται ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν, Psalm 84:7 (83:8, LXX)); "they have gone on from evil to evil" (ἐκ κακῶν εἰς κακὰ ἐξήλθοσαν, Jeremiah 9:2 (9:3, LXX)); "To the one *we are* the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life" (οἷς μὲν ὀσμὴ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὀσμὴ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν, 2 Corinthians 2:16); "But we all . . . are changed into the same image from glory to glory" (ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες . . . τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, 2 Corinthians 3:18); classical parallels include Suetonius, *Galba* 14.1, where in abandoning one imperial choice after the next after the death of Nero, "some demon" drove the soldiers "from treachery to treachery" (ἐκ προδοσίας εἰς προδοσίαν).

next, in contrast to the ungodly, whose life is a servitude to uncleanness and "to iniquity unto iniquity."[597]

Nonetheless, Paul's focus in 6:1-8:39 is not the progressive growth of Christian *faith*,[598] but the sure possession and character of Christian *life*, specifically, the life "in Christ"[599] that is the product of union with Him at the moment of justification and regeneration—the just *shall live* by faith.[600] Eternal life is the present possession of the believer because of the reign of grace through Jesus Christ (5:17-21), and the possession of this *life*, in conjunction with its corollary, the believer's judicial death to sin, and progressive death to sin's practice and growth in practical righteousness, arising out of union with Christ in His death and resurrection and the receipt of judicial righteousness in justification, guarantees that the believer will not continue in sin (6:1-14). The "righteousness of God" is revealed in the salvation through the gospel of Christ in both judicial justifying and inward sanctifying righteousness, for the "just" or righteous are the heirs of both by grace (1:16-17).[601] The ability to obey is restored by the regenerating and sanctifying power of God, based on the work of Christ, through the application of the Holy Spirit—this is part of what is included in the gospel being "the power of God unto salvation" (1:16).[602] Paul asks, "Is it possible for the believer to continue in sin?"

---

597 Romans 6:19; note the contrast: ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ *τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν*, οὕτω νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα *τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν*, the latter being a description of the same process of progressive sanctification as 1:17's ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν.

598 Thus, πίστις appears in Rom 1:5, 8, 12, 17; 3:3, 22, 25–28, 30–31; 4:5, 9, 11–14, 16, 19–20; 5:1–2, but then disappears until 9:30, after which it appears again in 9:32; 10:6, 8, 17; 11:20; 12:3, 6; 14:1, 22–23; 16:26. The πιστεύω word group appears only in 6:8 between 5:2 and 9:30. The gap is unmistakable when the entire group in Romans is examined: Romans 1:5, 8, 12, 16–17; 3:2–3, 22, 25–28, 30–31; 4:3, 5, 9, 11–14, 16–20, 24; 5:1–2; 6:8; 9:30, 32–33; 10:4, 6, 8–11, 14, 16–17; 11:20, 23; 12:3, 6; 13:11; 14:1–2, 22–23; 15:13; 16:22, 26.

599 ἐν Χριστῷ appears once in Romans 1-5 (3:24), but becomes more frequent after the idea involved in union with Adam and with Christ is set forth, although without the specific use of ἐν Χριστῷ, in 5:12-21; thus, in the section 6:1-8:39 (where ἐν Χριστῷ concludes the section in 8:39), and in the subsequent portions of Romans, the phraseology grows very notably in abundance (Romans 3:24; 6:11, 23; 8:1–2, 39–9:1; 12:5; 15:17; 16:3, 7, 9–10).

600 Thus, ζωή and ζάω are central in 6-8, being found in 6:2, 4, 10–11, 13, 22–7:3; 7:9–10; 8:2, 6, 10, 12–13, 38—Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως *ζήσεται*. Note the identification of Christ and His life with the believer and his life through the συζάω of 6:8. ἀναζάω is also found in 7:9. The complete list of ζωή texts in Romans is: 2:7; 5:10, 17–18, 21; 6:4, 22–23; 7:10; 8:2, 6, 10, 38; 11:15. ζάω appears in 1:17; 6:2, 10–11, 13; 7:1–3, 9; 8:12–13; 9:26; 10:5; 12:1; 14:7–9, 11.

601 Note the transition from judicial righteousness to practical righteousness in progressive sanctification in the use of the δίκαιος word group; contrast the uses in Romans 3:20–22, 24–26, 28, 30; 4:2–3, 5–6, 9, 11, 13, 22; 5:1, 7, 9, 17, 19, 21 with those in Romans 6:7, 13, 16, 18–20.

602 That is, the δύναμις . . . Θεοῦ . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν of 1:16 includes a restoration by the Holy Spirit (8:9ff.) of the δύναμις to obey God lost in the Fall (8:7-8, δύναμαι), and God's exercise of δύναμις is absolutely and unstoppably effectual in its purpose (cf. 8:38-39); see 15:13, 14, 19; 16:25.

"Certainly not," the Apostle answers, because the Christian is dead to it, and therefore cannot live in it any longer (6:1-2).[603] As pictured in his post-conversion immersion, the

---

603 While a rhetorical *oughtness* should not be excluded from the questions in Romans 6:1, 15 (Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? ἐπιμενοῦμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ; Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? ἁμαρτήσομεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ χάριν;), the questions are not simply ones of propriety, but ones of possibility—a possibility indubitably negated, Paul declares. That is, the "God forbid" (μὴ γένοιτο) that answers Paul's questions does not just negate the propriety of continuing in sin, but the possibility of it. The fact that Romans 6:1ff. teaches that the believer is certain to not continue in sin is demonstrated by a number of exegetical considerations.

First, whenever Paul follows a "What shall we say" (τί ἐροῦμεν;) question in Romans with another question, what is negated is the possibility, not merely the propriety, of the action. Consider the examples outside of Romans 6:

> A.) The answer to "What shall we say? *Is* God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?" (Romans 3:5, τί ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω);—note that the "I speak as a man" is an appropriate addition to all of the following similar questions in Romans) is not, "God who takes vengeance ought not to be unrighteous, but perhaps He is unrighteous," but "God who takes vengeance is certainly not unrighteous."
>
> B.) The answer to "What shall we say then? *Is* the law sin?" (Romans 7:7, Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία;), is not "The law ought not to be sin, but perhaps it is sin," but "The law certainly is not sin."
>
> C.) The answer to the question, "What shall we then say to these things? If God *be* for us, who *can be* against us?" (Romans 8:31, Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ᾽ ἡμῶν;), is not "No one ought to be effectually against us and defeat God's purpose of grace, but it is possible that God will be defeated," but "Certainly no one is effectually against us and can defeat God's purpose of grace."
>
> D.) The answer to the question, "What shall we say then? *Is there* unrighteousness with God?" (Romans 9:14, Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ;), is not, "There ought not to be unrighteousness with God, but perhaps there is," but "There is certainly no unrighteousness with God."

Certainty, not possibility, is not only under consideration in all the "What shall we say?" constructions in Romans followed by a question outside of chapter six, but also in view when a statement rather than a question follows (9:30). Consequently, the questions in Romans 6 are also answered by certainties, not mere potentialities or proprieties. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" (Romans 6:1, Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμενοῦμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ;) is not answered, "we ought not, but may, continue in sin," but "we shall certainly not continue in sin." "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" (Romans 6:2, οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;) is not answered, "We that are dead ought not to be alive to and live in sin any longer, but we may," but "We that are dead will not be alive to and live in sin any longer." The question, "What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace?" (Romans 6:15, Τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσομεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ χάριν;) is not answered, "We ought not to continue in sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace, but we might," but "We will not continue in sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace." Likewise, the condition in Romans 6:8 is not merely possible, but certain; those that are dead with Christ will certainly, rather than only potentially, live with Him—they are eternally secure and saved from sin's penalty and power. The questions that parallel those of Romans 6:1, 15 demonstrate that the believer will certainly not continue in sin.

Second, leaving aside the "What shall we say?" (Romans 3:5; 4:1; 6:1; 7:7; 8:31; 9:14, 30) use of ἐροῦμεν, which does not, in any case, provide any contrary evidence, Paul always uses the first plural future active indicative (the *Textus Receptus* properly reads ἐπιμενοῦμεν and ἁμαρτήσομεν in Romans 6:1, 15, while the minority text's reading of ἐπιμένωμεν and ἁμαρτήσωμεν is corrupt) of a certainty, not a mere possibility. Believers are certain to judge angels (1 Corinthians 6:3); it is certain that it is not a great thing to reap carnal things where spiritual things have been sown (1 Corinthians 9:11); it is certain that believers will bear the image of the heavenly second Adam (1 Corinthians 15:49); it is certain that believers who do not faint will reap (Galatians 6:9); it is certain that those who are dead with Christ will

believer is identified with Christ's death and resurrection and will therefore walk in newness of life (6:3-6), since he is judicially free from sin (6:7). He is free from the dominion of sin and lives spiritually to God, for he is alive with Christ (6:8-10). He is to reckon himself dead to sin and alive to God, as one who has risen from spiritual death to life, because sin will not have dominion over him, since he is under the reign of grace (6:11-14; 5:21). So will the believer sin, because he is under God's grace? No, he will not, because he has been made free from sin when he was converted—he will, therefore, characteristically yield himself more and more to righteousness and holiness instead of to ever greater depths of iniquity (6:15-22). He will not receive the wages of sin in spiritual death, but the gift of God, eternal and spiritual life through Jesus Christ—life in growing measure through the course of his Christian walk, and everlasting life to the highest extent in the coming glory (6:23). He is dead to his old sinful servitude and the spiritual

---

live with Him (2 Timothy 2:11); it is certain that those who suffer with Christ will reign with Him (2 Timothy 2:12); it is certain that the audience of Hebrews will go on, if God permit (Hebrews 6:3); it is certain that those who are in subjection to the Father of spirits shall live (Hebrews 12:9). Consequently, it is also certain that believers will not continue in sin (Romans 6:1, 15) and will not live in sin (Romans 6:2) but will live with Christ (Romans 6:8).

Third, in every instance where Paul negates an affirmation with "God forbid" (μὴ γένοιτο) in Romans, what is negated is not potentially possible, but certainly impossible. It is certain that the faithfulness of God is not of none effect (Romans 3:3-4). It is certain that God who takes vengence is not unrighteous (Romans 3:5-6). It is certain that the law is not sin (Romans 7:7). It is certain that God's good law was not made death unto Paul (Romans 7:13). It is certain that there is no unrighteousness with God (Romans 9:14). It is certain that God has not cast away His people (Romans 11:1). It is certain that Israel has not stumbled so that the nation was cast off forever (Romans 11:11). Indeed, there is no clear evidence of any instance of "God forbid" in Paul's writings that does not deal with a certainty (Romans 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11; 1 Corinthians 6:15 (cf. 6:9-11); Galatians 2:17; 3:21; 6:14). Consequently, it is a certainty that believers will not continue in sin (Romans 6:1-2, 15). God forbid—He will not allow it to be so. (Note that God is involved, and "God forbid" a proper translation, in the expression μὴ γένοιτο. See, on the Old Testament construction with חָלִילָה, *Commentary on the Old Testament,* C. F. Keil & F. Delitzsch, on Joshua 22:29; also see 1 Samuel 24:6; 26:11; 1 Kings 21:3; Job 34:10; 1 Chronicles 11:19. The LXX renders the Old Testament חָלִילָה phrase with μὴ γένοιτο at times (Genesis 44:7, 17; Joshua 22:29; 24:16). A. T. Robertson notes: "In modern Greek Dr. Rouse finds people saying not μὴ γένοιτο, but ὁ θεὸς νὰ φυλάξῃ" (pg. 940, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research,* A. T. Robertson. See also pg. 94, *The Epistle to the Romans,* John Murray).

Fourth, the context of Romans 6 indicates that the believer is certain not to live in sin. His death to sin and identification with Christ (6:1-4) make a walk in newness of life certain. He is certain to be in the holy likeness of Christ's resurrection (6:5). Crucifixion with Christ is certain to bring freedom from sin's domination (6:6-7); the believer's new spiritual life is as certain as the resurrection of Christ to new life (6:8-10). The believer is to reckon himself dead to sin and alive to God (6:11-13), not because it is possible that true Christians can be dominated by sin, but because God's promise is certain: "sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace" (6:14). While his new obedience is imperfect (6:19), nonetheless the time that believers were enslaved to sin is in the past—now all have become the servants of righteousness and are free from sin's dominion (6:17-21). All believers have their fruit unto holiness, and their end everlasting life (6:22), while all those who still bring forth fruit unto sin receive spiritual death and eternal damnation (6:15-16, 21-23).

Sound exegesis makes it very clear that Romans 6:1 and 15 affirm that the believer not only ought not to, but certainly will not, live in sin as do the unregenerate.

death associated with it and alive to a new master, Christ, in a manner comparable to that of a woman whose old husband has died and who now has a new lord (7:1-6). The law, which should have been the means of life, brought death because of the power of sin, with the result that sin came to be recognized as exceedingly sinful (7:7-13). Indeed, the contrast of the perfect standard of the law and even the believer's obedience is very great, but Jesus Christ gives the victory and even now the believer no longer sins with his whole being, but serves God with his mind (7:14-25). Therefore, believers do not walk after the flesh, but after the Spirit, because the law of the Spirit of life in Christ has made them free from the law of sin and death (8:1-2). Christ's death has brought believers deliverance from the power of sin and death and the presence of the indwelling Spirit[604] with the result that the righteous requirements of the law are now partially fulfilled within and by the believer on earth as, by grace, he grows in holiness, and are totally and perfectly filled in the eschaton (8:3-4).[605] Christians now have life and peace because of their possession of a spiritual mind, instead of the fleshly and rebellious mind they had before their conversion, which brings spiritual death (8:5-8). They have spiritual life and the indwelling Holy Spirit (8:9-11). They are led by the Spirit of God to mortify their indwelling sin and receive eternal life (8:12-14), being freed from bondage into the glory of the adopted sons of God (8:15-17), a glory that will extend to the redemption of the whole creation—indeed, all things work together for good to them, and blessings from predestination in eternity past, to present justification, to future glorification, are certain to them (8:18-39). Judicial and practical righteousness, spiritual and eternal life, are all included in the life that believers, who are the just, receive by grace alone from their redeeming God.

---

604 Note the plentitude of references to the πνεῦμα in Romans 8 (8:1–2, 4–6, 9–11, 13–16, 23, 26); the Holy Spirit is mentioned earlier in Romans only in 1:4 and 5:5 (though the word πνεῦμα also appears in 1:9; 2:29; 7:6. After Romans 8, the Holy Spirit is mentioned also in 9:1; 14:17; 15:13, 16, 19, 30; πνεῦμα appears also in 11:8; 12:11). The Holy Spirit as a Product and Gift of the "in Christ" relationship, and as Producer of spiritual life, comes to the fore in Romans 8. It should be noted that His presence and work are a blessing possessed by all those in union with Christ in Romans 8—nothing in the chapter limits His work to a minority of Christians or to, say, those who affirm that they have entered into a post-conversion second blessing or Higher Life experience.

605 The passive πληρωθῇ in τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν indicates that God is the source of the fulfillment of the law—grace is the source of all in the believer's salvation and new covenant obedience. However, there is nothing in Romans 8:4 that indicates that the believer's progressive sanctification is vicarious or that the believer does not himself act in the fulfillment of the law. In the similar syntax in John 17:13 (ἵνα ἔχωσι τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς), God is certainly the One who produces the fulfillment, but the believers are actively joyful. Indeed, the syntax of the passive of πληρόω + ἐν + pronoun can even be instrumental; cf. "this was Jesus, and that the Scripture was fulfilled in/by Him," Τοῦτον εἶναι Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πεπληρῶσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν Γραφήν, (Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3:12:8).

Romans 9-11 unfolds some of what is involved in the gospel being "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (1:16).[606] Israel received tremendous privileges (9:1-5, cf. 3:1-2), from the Scriptures to the covenants to the eternally blessed God over all, the Messiah. Nevertheless, only a Jewish remnant believed the gospel as Paul preached it in the dispensation of grace. This fact, however, was by no means a failure of the Word or promises of God, for under the old covenant also only a remnant was saved—despite Israel's national election, only those who were and are of faith constituted the true seed of Abraham who received everlasting salvation (9:6-29). In fact, the Old Testament indicated that not Jews only, but all, including Gentiles, who would believe would be saved (9:24, 30-33), and that salvation by faith, which was universally and indiscriminately offered to all men, would indeed by received by many Gentiles but rejected by many of the physical seed of Israel (10:1-21). However, God had not cast Israel away, nor had His promises and Word failed, for a remnant would continue to come to faith throughout the dispensation of grace, and the entire Jewish nation will be converted in the future at the end of the Tribulation period as the Millennial kingdom is ushered in (11:1-36). Whether Jews or Gentiles, those who are of faith are the just who shall live.

Romans 12:1-15:13 exhorts the Roman church to a myriad of practical duties that should adorn the life of those who by faith are just. In light of the "mercies of God"[607] set forth in Romans 1-11, Paul "therefore" exhorts the "brethren," the just who live by faith, to serve God as living sacrifices (12:1ff.). Romans 15:13, which concludes the main body of Romans that began with the thesis statement of 1:16-17, indicates, as does the "from faith to faith" of 1:16-17, that God fills the saints with all joy and peace as they

---

606 Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι. Ἕλλην appears in 10:12 after being absent since early in Romans (1:14, 16; 2:9–10; 3:9), and Ἰουδαῖος reappears also in 9:24, 10:12 after being absent since 1-3 (1:16; 2:9–10, 17, 28–3:1; 3:9, 29), while Ἰσραήλ appears only in 9-11, but there very frequently (9:6, 27, 31; 10:1, 19, 21; 11:2, 7, 25–26; note also ἔθνος in 9:24, 30; 10:19; 11:11–13, 25, which had been absent since 1-4; ἔθνος also reappears in 15-16 in light of the content of those chapters, after being absent in 12-14). Since the receipt, or rejection, of salvation (σωτηρία/σῴζω, 9:27; 10:1, 9–10, 13; 11:11, 14, 26) in its juridical, renewing, and eschatological fullness is under consideration in the chapters, the development from emphasis upon *righteousness* and consequently *life* found in the progression from 3:20-5:21 and 6:1-8:39 is no longer maintained. Thus, πίστις reappears (Romans 9:30, 32; 10:6, 8, 17; 11:20) along with πιστεύω (9:33; 10:4, 9–11, 14, 16) frequently in the company of δικαιοσύνη (9:28, 30–31; 10:3–6, 10), while the fact that receipt of righteousness brings *life* is assumed rather than receiving continued emphasis (hence ζάω appears only in 9:26; 10:5, in neither case of the life of the justified by faith). Note also the reappearance of εὐαγγέλιον/εὐαγγελίζω in 10:15–16; 11:28, appearing earlier only in 1:1, 9, 15–16; 2:16.

607 διὰ τῶν οἰκτίρμων τοῦ Θεοῦ in 12:1 refers back to 9:15, Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτείρω.

believe and by means of their faith;[608] faith is the human response through which God makes the believer holy, filling him with the holy attributes of hope, peace, and joy. The increase of the saint's inward holiness consequently results in holy actions (15:14; cf. 12:1-15:13). The gospel of God, through the power[609] of the Holy Ghost, provides all the saints a judicial righteousness, practical righteousness, and a perfect ultimate righteousness, and, indeed, all spiritual blessings, as necessary concomitants of union with the Son (8:32). Paul's preaching of the gospel was a priestly service[610] that led to formerly wicked Gentiles becoming an acceptable[611] sacrifice, "sanctified by the Holy Ghost" (15:16), obedient in word and deed because of the sanctifying efficacy of the Almighty Spirit of God (15:18-19).[612] Sanctification is an absolutely certain consequence of justification—Gentiles incorporated into the people of God become living and holy sacrifices[613] to the God whose mercy delivered them from the penalty and power of sin (12:1-2). Receipt of the gospel in faith leads both to justification and to the saints being established in holiness by the power of God, resulting in the "obedience of faith" (16:25-27).[614] Paul's use of Habakkuk 2:4 in the thesis statement of his epistle to the Romans in 1:16-17 is exactly in line with the meaning of the Lord through the Old Testament

---

608 In Romans 15:13, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, the ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν of Romans 15:13 indicates the means (cf. pg. 145, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 3, Nigel Turner) by which the saints are filled with joy and peace, just as the ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου indicates means. Both the Divine power and the human responsibility in sanctification are seen in the parallel ἐν phrases, while Paul does not affirm that they have equal ultimacy. While ἐν τῷ + infinitive is more commonly used for contemporaneous time than for means, the parallelism with ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου supports means (cf. also 15:19, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Θεοῦ). Furthermore, even if one wished to affirm that ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν indicates contemporaneous time, the fact that the filling takes place at the time of the believing would support that belief is in some sense a condition of being filled with joy and peace. The spiritual life of Divinely produced joy and peace received by means of faith is part of what is involved in the life that the just have by faith (Romans 1:16-17), as Romans 15:13 is the logical conclusion to the main body of the letter that began in 1:16. Compare 1 Peter 1:8.

609 The ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου of 15:13 also ties back to the "power of God," the δύναμις . . . Θεοῦ, of 1:16; note the references to δύναμαι at 15:14 and the end of the epistle in 16:25.

610 A ἱερουργέω of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ; note also λειτουργός; cf. Hebrews 8:2; Ezra 7:24; Nehemiah 10:39; Isaiah 61:6 (LXX).

611 εὐπρόσδεκτος; cf. 1 Peter 2:5, Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικός, ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

612 Romans 15:18-19 indicates that the ὑπακοή ἐθνῶν, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, was a product of the mediate agency of Paul's apostolic ministry ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων and the ultimate agency of the Spirit, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Θεοῦ.

613 The offering of 15:25-33 and the holy actions mentioned in the people listed in 16:1-24 are examples of the holy sacrifices that the almighty grace of God produces in those justified and regenerated; they are specific manifestations of what the renewed life of those who have become just by faith looks like.

614 The continuity and development from 1:16-17 to 15:13-16 (cf. 17-20) and 16:25-27 is clear.

prophet. Since the just shall live by faith, justification is a free gift received by grace alone through faith alone. Since the just shall live by faith, progressive sanctification and growth in spiritual life, faith, faithfulness, and holiness is certain for all the justified, for all those who possess faith, while faithfulness is impossible without saving faith. Since the just shall live by faith, ultimate glorification is also certain for all the justified (cf. 8:28-39)—every one of God's precious just ones shall receive the consummation of eternal life in a blessed eternity. All believers continue to rely on Christ alone for the entirety of their justifying righteousness, and all believers live—they have spiritual life now, characteristically trust in Jehovah and grow in faith and other fruits of the Spirit, and will receive the consummation of the life they now enjoy in a blessed life in the eschaton.

As in Romans 1:16-17 Paul's interpretation of Habakkuk 2:4 is in complete harmony with the literal meaning of the Old Testament passage, so the Apostle's quotation in Romans 4:3 of Genesis 15:6 is in full agreement with the literal meaning of Moses. Paul wrote: "For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."[615] As in Genesis 15:6, so in Romans 4:3 faith is the instrument through which Christ's righteousness is imputed, rather than faith itself being the ground or basis of the receipt of righteousness.[616] Paul makes it very clear that

---

615 τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; Ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. The One who accounted Abraham as righteous is God, τῷ Θεῷ; ἐλογίσθη is a form of the Divine passive. "Abraham believed in God, and God reckoned [it] ["it was reckoned by God"] to him unto righteousness." Compare Leviticus 7:18 (7:8, LXX): ἐὰν δὲ φαγὼν φάγῃ ἀπὸ τῶν κρεῶν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ, οὐ δεχθήσεται αὐτῷ τῷ προσφέροντι αὐτό, οὐ λογισθήσεται αὐτῷ, μίασμά ἐστιν· ἡ δὲ ψυχή, ἥτις ἐὰν φάγῃ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν λήμψεται, "And if he do at all eat of the flesh on the third day, it shall not be accepted for him that offers: it shall not be reckoned to him, it is pollution; and whatsoever soul shall eat of it, shall bear his iniquity." Whether in Romans 4:3, Galatians 3:6, or James 2:23, the aorist of Ἐπίστευσε in the New Testament quotation of Genesis 15:6 is constative. Compare the present tenses of πιστεύω employed for Christian belief in 4:5, 11, 24 and the aorists for Abraham's belief in 4:3, 17, 18.

616 Charles Hodge explains:

> According to the Remonstrants or Arminians, faith is the ground [rather than merely the instrumental cause] of justification. Under the Gospel God accepts our imperfect obedience including faith and springing from it, in place of the perfect obedience demanded by the law originally given to Adam. There is one passage in the Bible, or rather one form of expression, which occurs in several places, which seems to favour this view of the subject. In Romans 4:3, it is said, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness;" and again in ver. 22 of that chapter, and in Galatians 3:6. If this phrase be interpreted according to the analogy of such passages as Romans 2:26, "Shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?" it does mean that faith is taken or accepted for righteousness. The Bible, however, is the word of God and therefore self-consistent. Consequently if a passage admits of one interpretation inconsistent with the teaching of the Bible in other places, and of another interpretation consistent with that teaching, we are bound to accept the latter. . . . [We must not only consider what] grammatical structure and logical connection indicate . . . [but also] the analogy of Scripture. . . . [T]he Apostle . . . teaches, first, that the great promise made to Abraham, and faith in which secured his justification, was not that his natural descendants should be as numerous as the stars of heaven, but that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed; secondly, that the seed intended was not a multitude, but one person, and that that one person was Christ (Gal. 3:16); and, thirdly, that the blessing which the seed of Abraham was to secure for the world was

justification is by faith alone in Christ alone, through which the sinner receives the imputed righteousness of Christ and obtains a perfect legal standing before God. Abraham was not justified by works, but solely through faith, entirely by grace exclusive of all human merit or effort (4:1-5), a teaching to which David also testifed (4:6-8). Since Abraham was justified prior to his circumcision, it is apparent that ceremonies or rituals, even those ordained by God such as circumcision, are not the instrumentality

---

redemption. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: … that the blessing of Abraham (*i.e.*, the promise made to Abraham) might come on" us. The promise made to Abraham, therefore, was redemption through Christ. Hence those who are Christ's, the Apostle teaches, are Abraham's seed and heirs of his promise. What, therefore, Abraham believed, was that the seed of the woman, the Shiloh, the promised Redeemer of the world, was to be born of him. He believed in Christ, as his Saviour, as his righteousness, and deliverer, and therefore it was that he was accepted as righteous, not for the merit of his faith, and not on the ground of faith, or by taking faith in lieu of righteousness, but because he received and rested on Christ alone for his salvation.

Unless such be the meaning of the Apostle, it is hard to see how there is any coherence or force in his arguments. His object is to prove that men are justified, not by works, but gratuitously; not for what they are or do, but for what is done for them. They are saved by a ransom; by a sacrifice. But it is absurd to say that trust in a ransom redeems, or is taken in place of the ransom; or that faith in a sacrifice, and not the sacrifice itself, is the ground of acceptance. To prove that such is the Scriptural method of justification, Paul appeals to the case of Abraham. He was not justified for his works, but by faith in a Redeemer. He expected to be justified as ungodly (Romans 4:5). This, he tells us, is what we must do. We have no righteousness of our own. We must take Christ for our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. In the immediately preceding chapter the Apostle had said we are justified by faith in the blood of Christ, as a propitiation for sin; and for him to prove this from the fact that Abraham was justified on account of his confiding, trusting state of mind, which led him to believe that, although a hundred years old, he should be the father of a numerous posterity, would be a contradiction.

Besides, it is to be remembered, not only that the Scriptures never say that we are justified "on account" of faith (διὰ πίστιν), but always "by," or "through" faith (διὰ or ἐκ πίστεως, or πίστει); but also that it is not by faith as such; not by faith in God, nor in the Scriptures; and not by faith in a specific divine promise such as that made to Abraham of a numerous posterity, or of the possession of the land of Canaan; but only by faith in one particular promise, namely, that of salvation through Christ. It is, therefore, not on account of the state of mind, of which faith is the evidence, nor of the good works which are its fruits, but only by faith as an act of trust in Christ, that we are justified. This of necessity supposes that He, and not our faith, is the ground of our justification. He, and not our faith, is the ground of our confidence. How can any Christian wish it to be otherwise? What comparison is there between the absolutely perfect and the infinitely meritorious righteousness of Christ, and our own imperfect evangelical obedience as a ground of confidence and peace!

This doctrine is moreover dishonouring to the Gospel. It supposes the Gospel to be less holy than the law. The law required perfect obedience; the Gospel is satisfied with imperfect obedience. And how imperfect and insufficient our best obedience is, the conscience of every believer certifies. If it does not satisfy us, how can it satisfy God?

The grand objection, however, to this Remonstrant doctrine as to the relation between faith and justification, is that it is in direct contradiction to the plain and pervading teachings of the Word of God. The Bible teaches that we are not justified by works. This doctrine affirms that we are justified by works. The Bible teaches that we are justified by the blood of Christ; that it is for his obedience that the sentence of justification is passed on men. This doctrine affirms that God pronounces us righteous because of our own righteousness. The Bible from first to last teaches that the whole ground of our salvation or of our justification is objective, what Christ as our Redeemer, our ransom, our sacrifice, our surety, has done for us. This doctrine teaches us to look within, to what we are and to what we do, as the ground of our acceptance with God. It may safely be said that this is altogether unsatisfactory to the awakened conscience. The sinner cannot rely on anything in himself. He instinctively looks to Christ, to his work done for us as the ground of confidence and peace. This in the last resort is the hope of all believers . . . they all cast their dying eyes on Christ. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." (pgs. 167-170, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, Charles Hodge)

through which sinners are justified (4:9-12).[617] Salvation is by grace through faith to all, whether Jew or Gentile, and not by the law or circumcision, for Abraham's justification apart from circumcision and the law (4:12-22) is a pattern for Christian justification (4:23-25). In the book of Romans, Paul cogently and clearly demonstrates with his quotation from Genesis 15:6 that Abraham, and all, receive justification apart from works by grace through faith alone.

---

617 The Reformed sacramental notion that infant baptism is a vehicle conveying saving grace and that through baptism grace is "conferred by the Holy Ghost" upon the elect (*Westminster Confession of Faith,* Article 28) because baptism is a "seal" of salvation is a serious heresy. Since Romans 4:11 is the only verse in Scripture that could with any plausibility be used to support the Reformed view, its advocates argue from this text that circumcision is a "seal" of grace, that their sacrament of infant baptism is equivalent to circumcision, and that, therefore, infant baptism seals or conveys grace to their infants. This argument is filled with errors. Even if circumcision were equivalent to baptism, which it is not, the example of Abraham would teach that faith is a prerequisite to baptism. A parallel between circumcision given to all the physical seed of Abraham and baptism given to the spiritual seed of Abraham would restrict baptism to believers, since "they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Galatians 3:7).

The use of the word "seal" (σφραγίς) in Romans 4:11—for the already justified and already believing Abraham—by no means supports the Reformed contention. First, the verse does not say that circumcision was a seal of grace to Jewish male infants. While circumcision was a "sign" by nature, it is not affirmed to have been a "seal" to all, but only personally to believing Abraham, who received it when he had already been justified by faith. A recognition of this distinction in Romans 4:11 explains the Old Testament use of the word *sign* or *token* (אוֹת) in connection with circumcision (Genesis 17:11) but the complete absence of references in the Old Testament to the ceremony as a "seal." Second, the New Testament does not equate circumcision with baptism or state that the latter replaces the former. Third, the Biblical immersion of believers has nothing to do with the ceremonial application of water to infants that the Reformed claim is baptism. Fourth, a seal is a visible mark or impression evidencing the authority of the one who authorizes the seal to the genuineness or correctness of whatever is witnessed to by its presence. However, baptism does not leave a visible mark upon those who receive it, and it is not administered to single individuals by Divine authority—the authority given the church to administer baptism is general (Matthew 28:18-20). No man can put marks upon the elect of God which shall authoritatively certify that they are His, and neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper authenticate one's personal election to himself or to others; such authentication is given to the regenerate individual himself by the presence of true faith and the manifestation of that faith in a changed life, as taught in 1 John (cf. 5:13). Unlike the ordinance of baptism, the "seal" of circumcision given to Abraham was indeed a visible mark and was applied to the individual man Abraham by direct Divine authority. Circumcision was a seal to Abraham, but to nobody else. Finally, when advocates of Reformed theology and other Protestants speak of baptism as a "seal" or vehicle of grace, they use the word in a sense entirely absent in Scripture. None of the appearances of the word "seal" (σφραγίς) in the New Testament indicate that grace is conveyed through a "seal" (Romans 4:11; 1 Corinthians 9:2; 2 Timothy 2:19; Revelation 5:1-2, 5, 9; 6:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12; 7:2; 8:1; 9:4). Those who think that infant baptism was the instrument of their receiving forgiveness, those who think that they received the sacrament as confirmation and evidence that they were already regenerated in the womb, and those who think they had water applied to them in infancy as evidence that they were certain to be regenerated in the future unless they consciously rejected the "sacrament" and its efficacy are underneath a terrible spiritual delusion. They will certainly be damned unless they recognize that their unbiblical religious ceremony did nothing beneficial for them, admit they are still lost, and then repent and believe the gospel.

Indeed, baptism is not even a "sign" in the sense regularly employed in Reformed theology. The ordinance is indeed a sign of what Christ did and suffered, but it is not a "sign" promising that any saving work will be done in the one who receives it—yet it is in this latter sense that the Reformed generally speak of the ordinance as a "sign."

While Paul's main point in his argument of Romans four is justification, the transformed lifestyle that is the certain consequent of and companion of gratuitous justification is not absent from the chapter. Those who have ceased working to obtain justification and simply believe on Christ (4:5) are those whose lifestyle evidences a "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham."[618] Those justified by faith alone will also be the faithful, following the pattern of Abraham who not only received a free justification but also separated from the idolatry of Ur and obeyed, loved, and served Jehovah. God both declared that Abraham was righteous solely by faith and stated of the patriarch, "Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (Genesis 26:5). Abraham not only entrusted himself to the Lord at a particular moment, but he also persevered in the faith (Romans 4:17-22). The continuity between justifying and persevering, sanctifying faith is clear in Romans 4-5—one and the same faith results in both salvific blessings. While the main emphasis of Romans 4 is the element of the Old Testament doctrine that "the just shall live by faith" that establishes justification by faith alone based on the righteousness of Christ alone, the corollary truth of the life of faithfulness of the justified is also apparent.

Finally, Paul[619] also quotes Habakkuk 2:4 in the book of Hebrews. Based on the foundation of justification by faith, Paul's quotation in Hebrews 10:38 emphasizes the perseverance that results from genuine saving faith.[620] Those who are truly just, Paul

---

618 Romans 4:12, τοῖς στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. The present participle στοιχοῦσι supports the fact that a continuing lifestyle that matches Abraham's is in view, rather than only the action of a particular moment.

619 There are many convincing works defending the Pauline authorship of Hebrews, from John Owen's "Of the Penman of the Epistle to the Hebrews" in his *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews* in vol. 17 of his complete works, to Charles Forster's *The Apostolic Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: James Duncan, 1838), to William Leonard's *Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews: Critical Problem and Use of the Old Testament* (Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1939), to more modern works. However, the testimony of Scripture itself to the Pauline authorship of the Apostle's 14th epistle is conclusive. 2 Peter 3:15-16 indicates that Paul wrote an inspired epistle, a work that is part of the New Testament canon, to the Jewish diaspora (2 Peter 3:1; 1 Peter 1:1; cf. James 1:1). Since Paul's other thirteen inspired and canonical epistles are written to specific Gentile churches, the book of Hebrews must be the Pauline epistle that Peter refers to in 2 Peter 3:15-16.

620 "That in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is the general idea of faith, or, to be more exact, the subjective nature of faith, that is dwelt upon, rather than its specific object, is not due to a peculiar conception of what faith lays hold upon, but to the particular task which fell to its writer in the work of planting Christianity in the world. With him, too, the person and work of Christ are the specific object of faith (Hebrews 13:7, 8; 3:14; 10:22). But the danger against which, in the providence of God, he was called upon to guard the infant flock, was not that it should fall away from faith to works, but that it should fall away from faith into despair. His readers were threatened not with legalism but with 'shrinking back' (Hebrews 10:39), and he needed, therefore, to emphasize not so much the object of faith as the duty of faith. Accordingly, it is not so much on the righteousness of faith as on its perfecting that he insists; it is not so much its contrast with works as its contrast with impatience that he impresses on his readers' consciences; it is not so much to faith specifically in Christ and in Him alone that he exhorts them as to an

teaches, will live by faith: "Now the just shall live by faith: but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul."[621] The *just*, those who believe to the saving[622] of their souls, all the people of God, are contrasted with those who apostatize instead of persevering, who "draw back unto perdition"[623] and are eternally damned. Paul sets forth this truth as an encouragement to the believing Hebrews to persevere in the faith despite persecution and as a warning to those who would apostatize from Christ and return to the shadows of Judaism that they will receive, not freedom from persecution only, but with it God's eternal curse and everlasting damnation. Those who respond in faith to the gospel (Hebrews 4:2) have more than a bare faith in God (Hebrews 6:1, cf. v. 1-9), but a kind of faith that will be mixed with patience and therefore will receive an eternal inheritance (Hebrews 6:12), a kind of faith that brings with it the purified heart of the New Covenant (Hebrews 10:22; 8:8-12). The heroes of the Old Testament recalled in Hebrews 11 are the justified, those who obtained a good report and will be perfected in eternal glory with those of the first century who persevered in like manner (Hebrews 11:2, 39-40); they are the just who live by faith,

---

attitude of faith—an attitude which could rise above the seen to the unseen, the present to the future, the temporal to the eternal, and which in the midst of sufferings could retain patience, in the midst of disappointments could preserve hope. This is the key to the whole treatment of faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews—its definition as the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen (Hebrews 11:1); its illustration and enforcement by the example of the heroes of faith in the past, a list chosen and treated with the utmost skill for the end in view (11.); its constant attachment to the promises (Hebrews 4:1, 2; 6:12; 10:36, 38; 11:9); its connexion with the faithfulness (Hebrews 11:11; cf. 10:23), almightiness (Hebrews 11:19), and the rewards of God (Hebrews 11:6, 26); and its association with such virtues as boldness (Hebrews 3:6; 4:16; 10:19, 35), confidence (Hebrews 3:14; 11:1), patience (Hebrews 10:36; 12:1), [and] hope (Hebrews 3:6; 6:11, 18; 10:23)" ("The Biblical Doctrine of Faith," *Biblical Doctrines*, Warfield, vol. 2 of *Works*).

621 ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.

The critical text corruption that changes Paul's ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται into ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται in Hebrews 10:38 contradicts the Hebrew text of Habakkuk 2:4 and Paul's own method of quoting the passage in Romans and Galatians. The *Textus Receptus* follows 97% of Greek MSS, while the critical text corruption follows the remaining 3%. There is even evidence in the MSS of the LXX for ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται rather than ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

622 While ἀπώλεια is a word Scripture reserves, in spiritual judgments, to the unregenerate, περιποίησις, "saving" in Hebrews 10:39, is employed only of blessings upon the people of God (Ephesians 1:14; 1 Thessalonians 5:9; 2 Thessalonians 2:14; Hebrews 10:39; 1 Peter 2:9).

623 The proud person, the עֻפְּלָה֙ לֹא־יְשָׁרָ֣ה נַפְשׁ֔וֹ בּ֑וֹ of Habakkuk 2:4a, is the one who draws back (ὑποστείληται) in Habakkuk 2:4a, LXX—the passage identifies him as an unsaved person. Furthermore, "perdition," ἀπώλεια, is never used in the New Testament of a spiritual judgment that a saved person can undergo, but is very regularly used of the eternal damnation of the unregenerate (cf. the complete list of uses: Matthew 7:13; 26:8; Mark 14:4; John 17:12; Acts 8:20; 25:16; Romans 9:22; Philippians 1:28; 3:19; 2 Thessalonians 2:3; 1 Timothy 6:9; Hebrews 10:39; 2 Peter 2:1–3; 3:7, 16; Revelation 17:8, 11). Note also συναπόλλυμι for the fate of unbelievers in Hebrews 11:31.

those who believe to the saving of their souls, those just men made perfect who enter the New Jerusalem (Hebrews 12:23) and are a great cloud of witnesses to encourage the Hebrews in Paul's day to persevere (Hebrews 12:1), even as the godly Christian preachers known to the recipients of Hebrews had a saving faith that led them to a blessed eternity with Jesus Christ (Hebrews 13:7-8), in contrast with those in whom God has no pleasure (cf. Hebrews 10:38; 11:5-6), those who draw back to perdition (Hebrews 10:38-39).

Thus, explicating Hebrews 10:38-39, Hebrews 11 supplies an extensive analysis of how genuine faith, that possessed by those that believe to the saving of the soul, appeared in the life of Old Testament believers. The "by faith"[624] refrain of chapter 11 indicates that the Old Testament worthies acted as they did both because of the presence of genuine faith in them and through the instrumentality of that faith. The chapter does not affirm that they were free from the effects of indwelling sin, or that they never experienced spiritual declensions, but it does teach that, as people of genuine faith, they possessed a graciously given predominant bent towards God that manifested itself in a life characterized by faithfulness and acts of faith. The servants of God in Hebrews 11, therefore, do not represent a second or higher class of Christian, but all those truly in the kingdom of God their recognized Creator (Hebrews 11:1-3), the just or righteous (Hebrews 10:38; 11:4) who please God (11:5-6), who are righteous by faith and receive salvation (11:7), who will, like Abraham and Sarah, enter the heavenly city (11:8-19), who look for future reward and therefore suffer affliction with the people of God instead of enjoying the temporary pleasures of sin (11:25-26, cf. 20-26), who forsake the heathen and are not destroyed with them (27-31), and who live by faith in whatever circumstances God places them in and enjoy the resurrection to life with an abundant reward (32-38), receiving the promise of eternal inheritance with the rest of those who possess true faith and consequently persevere (9:15; 11:39-40). That is, Hebrews 11 teaches both that justification is simply by faith and sets forth the pattern of the life of faith that will mark the justified.[625] Since the elders obtained a good report simply by faith (11:1-2), works do not justify; nevertheless, those who have such a good report will manifest that they are just or righteous by acts such as Abel's worship of God even at the cost of martyrdom, and will, after their life by faith as just men, enter into eternal blessedness.[626]

---

624 πίστει.

625 Compare John Owen's extensive exposition of chapter 11 in his *Exposition of Hebrews*.

626 Hebrews 10:38; 11:4; 12:23 are the only texts with δίκαιος in Hebrews, and they all refer to the same sort of person. Those who are the just will live like just Abel, and then enter into the eternal home of just men made perfect.

They will be resurrected with the just because in their lifetime they pleased God,[627] as did Enoch (11:5), by faith (11:6). Like all the righteous of chapter 11, their good report before God in justification will issue in sanctification (11:39).[628] Those who would inherit "the righteousness which is by faith" will stand for God against the opposition of the world like Noah did when he built the ark (11:7). Those with saving faith will follow the example of Abraham, who "by faith . . . obeyed" God's call, even at the cost of separation from one's kindred and way of life for a wandering existence as a stranger and foreigner (11:8-9), because enduring such earthly trials to inherit the New Jerusalem is worthwhile (11:10). Saving faith recognizes the validity of God's promises, as Sarah did, even if they seem impossible (11:11-12). Saving faith not only intellectually apprehends and is persuaded of God's promises, but embraces them, resulting in an open confession of and identification with Him, His ways, and His people (11:13), and an open declaration of a preference for His heavenly country (11:14, 16) because of an inward preference for such a holy land and for its holy King—one who truly inwardly prefers this world to God's coming kingdom will find an occasion to turn back from the way of faith and spiritual and everlasting life (11:15). True believers are not ashamed of God, and He is not ashamed of them, but has prepared an eternal city for them.[629] They characteristically respond in faith to trials, as Abraham did when he put God's command before his own son Isaac (11:17-19). They have respect to the promises of God and act in accordance with them, as did Isaac (11:20).[630] Saving faith has respect to the Divine promises even to the time of death and manifests itself in a true heart of worship, as seen

---

627 εὐηρεστηκέναι τῷ Θεῷ. εὐαρεστέω appears in the NT only in Hebrews 11:5-6; 13:16. As in Hebrews 11:5-6 those with saving faith please God, so in Hebrews 13:16 God is pleased with the good deeds and charitable sharing with needy fellow Christians that arise out of a heart established with grace, rather than being pleased with the sacrifices performed by the unconverted Jews who would call the Christian Hebrews back to the shadows of the ceremonial law (13:7-17).

628 Note the continuity demonstrated in the uses of μαρτυρέω in Hebrews 11:

11:2 ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ **ἐμαρτυρήθησαν** οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.
For by it the elders **obtained a good report**.

11:4 πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ Κάϊν προσήνεγκε τῷ Θεῷ, δι᾽ ἧς **ἐμαρτυρήθη** εἶναι δίκαιος, **μαρτυροῦντος** ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ.
By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he **obtained witness** that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

11:5 πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκετο, διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός· πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως αὐτοῦ **μεμαρτύρηται** εὐηρεστηκέναι τῷ Θεῷ·
By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he **had this testimony**, that he pleased God.

11:39 καὶ οὗτοι πάντες, **μαρτυρηθέντες** διὰ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν,
And these all, having **obtained a good report** through faith, received not the promise:

629 Hebrews 11:16; cf. 2:11; Romans 9:33; 10:9-11; 1 Peter 2:6.

630 Genesis 27, which is referred to in Hebrews 11:20, illustrates both the true faith present in Isaac and that serious sins and manifestations of corruption from indwelling sin can be present in those with saving faith.

in Jacob and Joseph (11:21-22). Saving faith fears God rather than man, and honors Him even if the government commands the contrary, as seen in Moses' parents (11:23). Saving faith identifies with the people of God and their worship, esteems reproach for Christ greater riches than worldly treasures, forsakes the world, and endures, because it looks to the coming eternal reward, as Moses did (11:24-28). Faith exposes its possessors to what appear to be severe physical dangers if required by the command of God, as is evident in Israel's passing through the Red Sea, whose waters could, were they not restrained by God, have drowned the whole nation as they did the Egyptian army (11:29). Faith will fight the spiritual warfare to which God has called His people in accordance with His commandment (11:30), as seen in Israel's conquest of Jericho. Faith will lead believers to protect God's servants even at great personal risk, so that those who possess it, as did Rahab, will not perish with those who are unbelievers (11:31).[631] Indeed, the Old Testament validates that faith is the cause and instrument for both obtaining spiritual victories and for possessing an overcoming endurance of extreme suffering, torture, and martyrdom for Christ's sake (11:32-38). Since such Old Testament heroes received life and lived by faith, Paul concludes, so must the Hebrews endure and overcome by faith if they are to obtain the promise of eternal life (11:39-12:1)—indeed, they must look to and follow the greatest Pattern of all of overcoming endurance, Jesus Christ Himself (12:2-3). As they took up the cross to follow Christ at the moment of their conversion, so must they continue to follow Him. As Habakkuk made clear, the book of Hebrews affirms that the just not only enter into life by faith but also live by faith during their earthly pilgrimage and consequently enter into their promised eternal inheritance. The complete idea taught in Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4 appears, although with differences of emphasis, in all the New Testament quotations of the Old Testament text in James, Galatians, Romans, and Hebrews.

John's Gospel teaches that believers have their faith strengthened and deepened through the believing reception of greater revelations through the Word (John 2:22)[632] of the Triune God in His ontology and economy,[633] particularly as seen in Christ the

---

631 Note that the section from 11:4-31 begins with a plain statement that acts of faith manifest the presence of spiritual life in the just or righteous and are instrumental in holy practice (11:4) and ends with an indication that those who do not possess those products of faith in the life will perish as unbelievers (11:31).

632 In John 2:22, both the Old Testament Scripture and Christ's audible speech during His earthly ministry are the Word of God (ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς), which the disciples believe in regard to His resurrection (2:18-22).

633 The "ontological Trinity [refers to] the internal, intratrinitarian distinctions *ad intra* or within the Godhead itself," while the "economic Trinity [refers to] the offices or functions performed by each of the three members of the Trinity. The economic Trinity concerns the roles that each member performs in terms

Mediator,[634] and through their response, enabled by grace, of fuller surrender to and entrusting of themselves to Him. Even the smallest degree of true confidence in, coming to, and cleaving to Christ will bring union with Him, and consequently justification, sanctification, and all the other blessings of salvation, but one can cleave to Christ more closely, grow in confidence in Him, surrender more fully to Him, and entrust oneself more fully to Him. Such a greater degree of trust in the Person of the Redeemer and in the Triune God, which is associated in Scripture with receipt of a fuller revelation of His nature and work through the Word, is growth in faith. Through such an increase of faith the saints partake of an increase of spiritual life and fellowship with God. Christ's exercise of creative power in transforming water into the fruit of the vine in John 2 was a manifestation of His glory, in response to which His disciples, those who had already exercised saving faith, believed on Him in a deeper way (John 2:11).[635] His miracle, both

---

of the created order *ad extra* or outside of himself" (pgs. 954, 959, *Dogmatic Theology*, W. G. T. Shedd, 3rd. ed. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2003). That is, the ontological Trinity is God as He is in Himself, while the economic Trinity is God as He is towards us.

634 Brian Kay, in setting forth the Trinitarian spirituality of John Owen, effectively explains the connection between meditation on the Trinity and on Christ the Mediator:

> [W]hat exactly is the connection between meditating on the Trinity in action and actual growth towards Christian maturity? The best way to understand this may come by examining . . . another related question which is more specific: how is meditating on Christ transformative for the believer? These are related questions, of course, because . . . the prime *ad extra* act of the Trinity is to communicate Christ to the believer[.] . . . Thus, to meditate on the glory of Christ as Redeemer is to meditate on the most important work of the Trinity. . . . [A]pprehending Christ in his glory is not only the remedy for spiritual decays, but our apprehension of this glory is the spring of all our obedience and is also the controlling object of Christian affection because of Christ's consuming beauty. How is this contemplation so effective? Two reasons . . . rise to the surface. The first is that since the Spirit's work is to fashion believers into the image of Christ's human nature, the believer's own transformation begins as he fills his mind with thoughts of the now glorified human nature of Christ [and other elements of His Theanthropic glory]. In other words, one slowly becomes what one fills one's mind with . . . one becomes what one apprehends or gazes upon. The connection between beholding and transformation comes also in the scriptural language "we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord[."] . . .
>
> More deeply, a consideration by the worshipper of the very hypostatic union by which Christ's human nature is united to [the] divine nature is especially powerful. On one hand, diligently inspecting the Son of God's condescension to take on human nature impresses the believer's mind with the prototype of all Christian self-denial, for human obedience is similarly acting in self-denying submission to the will of the Father. On the other hand, the hypostatic union presents to the mind a glorious mystery that exalts God's ineffable wisdom in salvation. . . . [C]ontemplating . . . Christ as fully God and fully man . . . raises the human mind to new heights of both delight in God and progress in sanctification. Somehow, such lofty thoughts of such an inexplicable union, yet a union made real by the Godhead as an act of love for those who would be saved because of it, moves the soul to humble worship and new sensations of appreciative delight. . . . [E]njoyment [is] the language of . . . meditating on Christ[.] . . . In the last analysis, the enjoyment of Christ is what drives out the enjoyment of sin, for the former causes the believer to lose his appetite for the latter. The late-born Puritan Thomas Chalmers would express the same idea with the title of a sermon on the secret of dislodging fleshly appetites, "The Expulsive Power of a new Affection." (pgs. 70-71, *Trinitarian Spirituality*, Brian Kay. Some quotation marks have been removed and the traditional English generic pronoun restored.)

635 ταύτην ἐποίησε τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. The specific manifestation of Christ's glory in the miracle at the wedding feast in Cana, and the specific belief in Him as

an exercise of creative power such as pertained only to the eternal Jehovah and a manifestation of His grace and lovingkindness as the Provider for and Redeemer of His people, showed forth Christ's glory as both the eternal Son of God and as the incarnate God-Man, and the faith of His disciples was directed towards Him[636] as all He was in Himself and on their behalf in a greater way as a consequence. Furthermore, through the display of the Divine glory manifested by the incarnate Christ through His raising of Lazarus from the dead, His disciples were led to believe in Him in a deeper way (John 11:15). Christ was revealed as One who, weeping over Lazarus' death, could perfectly identify with human sorrow, and was filled to the fullest extent with perfect human love and sympathy (John 11:35-36), while He was also revealed as God the Word and the Father's only begotten Son, as One who was Himself the Resurrection and the Life, and who, out of His infinite Divine love, could and would exercise the Almighty power of God to redeem His beloved ones from even that last enemy, death (John 11:25-27). While revelation of the glory of God in Christ leads His people to deeper faith (John 2:11; 11:15), at the same time their response of faith to His Word is a condition of and a means to a greater revelation of His glory (John 11:40).[637] Christ reveals Himself to His chosen ones, so that love that contemplates Him, faith that trusts in Him, and obedience that follows Him, is aroused the more in them. To such faith, love, and obedience, Christ in turn responds by revealing Himself in yet clearer and clearer ways. Christ also predicted His betrayal to strengthen His disciples' faith in Him as the Messiah and as Jehovah, the I AM (John 13:19).[638] In John 14:1, Christ addressed His disciples: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me."[639] His disciples had already believed, and were believing, in God, and already had come to saving faith in Christ, but the Lord exhorts them to a deeper faith in Himself as the One who is going to go away and come again to receive them to Himself, to a faith that clearly respects His humiliation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and mediatorial office (John 14:6,

---

a response to this particular manifestation of His glory, is specified by the aorists ἐφανέρωσε and ἐπίστευσαν. Note that John 11:15, 40; 13:19; 19:35; 20:8, 25, 29, 31; 1 John 3:23 also contain aorists.

636 πιστεύω + εἰς.

637 ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς, ὄψει τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. While all present in John 11 saw the physical miracle of the raising of Lazarus, only those with spiritual sight could see the glory of God in Christ revealed by the miracle.

638 ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα, ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

639 Μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. As in the Authorized Version, the first πιστεύετε is an indicative, while the second is an imperative; cf. *Non turbetur cor vestrum. Creditis in Deum, et in me credite* (Vulgate). Support for taking πιστεύετε in 14:1b as an imperative is also found in the present imperative πιστεύετε in 14:11 and the exhortation to πιστεύω in 14:10.

29[640]), to be added to their already extant justifying faith. The Lord Jesus exhorts His disciples to a deeper faith in His Person in John 14:1, but does not there exhort His disciples to a deeper faith in the Father in particular, because the first Person of the Trinity is not the One who they would see in such a radically different light or have difficulty recognizing in light of the cross.[641] Christ then proceeds to lead His disciples to a stronger faith in the Trinitarian perichoresis[642] (cf. John 10:30, 38) and to Himself as the One in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily on account of His Word and works (John 14:10-12).[643] As a result of the discourse of John 14-16, the disciples, who had already come to saving faith in Christ with all of its permanent results, and consequently loved Him and were loved by the Father (John 16:27),[644] declared that they were now believing in a deeper way in Christ (John 16:30),[645] although the Lord warned them that their faith was still weak enough that it would not keep them from forsaking Him when He was betrayed (John 16:31-32),[646] for stronger faith leads to a more decided stand for Christ against the world and to all other fruits of righteousness. Unbelievers are exhorted to trust in the crucified Christ, and believers exhorted to a closer embrace of Christ in faith,[647] because of the revelation of His saving work, as predicted in the Old Testament, grounded in His substitutionary death, and producing justification and sanctification for those in union with Him (John 19:34-37). Men should follow the pattern of a believing response to the Divine saving self-revelation in the crucifixion and

---

640 The πιστεύσητε of John 14:29 is a specific and deeper faith in Christ as all He has revealed Himself to be in John 14, specifically in Christ as the soon to be crucified and ascended Redeemer who would send the Spirit, and come again.

641 The πιστεύετε, both the indicative and the imperative, are in the present tense. As the disciples were already believing in God, so they were to believe ever the more deeply in Christ as His saving work on their behalf was revealed to them in the Word and fulfilled in history.

642 "[T]he Greek *perichōrēsis* (περιχώρησις), or *emperichōrēsis* . . . [is] used as a synonym of . . . *circumincessio*: circumincession or coinherence. . . . *Circumincessio* refers primarily to the coinherence of the persons of the Trinity in the divine essence and in each other, but it can also indicate the coinherence of Christ's divine and human natures in their communion or personal union. (pgs. 67-68, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*, Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1985). The fact that the fulness of the Godhead is in the *Theanthropos* is the natural consequence in salvation-history of the ontological trinitarian circumincession.

643 The question "Believest thou not[?]" (οὐ πιστεύεις) of 14:10 expects a positive answer. Note that 14:11 subordinates belief based on Christ's miracles to belief based on His Word.

644 The disciples already had a perfect tense faith (πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον, John 16:27), one which began at the moment of their regeneration and which had abiding results.

645 νῦν . . . πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες.

646 Ἄρτι πιστεύετε; ἰδού, ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν, ἵνα σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια, καὶ ἐμὲ μόνον ἀφῆτε. Their faith was deeper, but it still was far weaker than it should have been.

647 πιστεύσητε, John 19:35. The audience of the "that ye might believe" is the same as the audience of the gospel of John as a whole, 20:30-31.

resurrection by entrusting themselves to Christ as their own Lord and God (John 20:28-31) and becoming people who are believingly faithful (John 20:27). Such a response of faith appeared in the Apostle John when, in light of the empty tomb, he "saw, and believed" (John 20:8), and in the Apostle Thomas when he saw and believed (John 20:29)[648] and was consequently no longer on the path to faithlessness, but was believing (John 20:27, 25), although in truth "blessed *are* they that have not seen, and *yet* have believed" (John 20:29).[649] All believers are in such a state of blessedness, for they have come to saving faith in the crucified and resurrected Christ[650] and have consequently become believing and faithful people. The record of Thomas's response of faith to the crucified and resurrected Son of God as Redeemer, Lord, and God, contained as it is within the climax of the Gospel of John in chapter twenty,[651] is set forth as a pattern for all men—those who are unconverted need to make a comparable faith response in Christ to enter into life, and those who are already converted need to continue to embrace Christ in faith ever the more fully, that they might experientially possess spiritual life in an ever

---

[648] Οτι ἑώρακας με, Θωμᾶ, πεπίστευκας.

[649] By means of Christ's exhortation to Thomas to not become faithless and unbelieving, but faithful and believing (μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός, John 20:27), accompanied by His effectual grace and power, Thomas was brought into a state of believing, having passed out of his position as one on the road to faithlessness to a state of faith and consequent faithfulness (πεπίστευκας, 20:29, so that Thomas was now πιστός, not one on the path to ἄπιστος, 20:27). John 20:27 contains the only references to the adjectives πιστός and ἄπιστος in the Gospel; the noun πίστις does not appear in John's Gospel. A comparison with the Johannine epistles and Revelation, supported also by the context of John 20, indicates that the emphasis of πιστός/ἄπιστος in John 20:27 is faithfulness (1 John 1:9; 3 John 1:5; Revelation 1:5; 2:10, 13; 3:14; 17:14; 19:11; 21:5; 22:6 & Revelation 21:8) although, of course, such faithfulness is impossible without faith (3 John 5; Revelation 2:10, 13; 17:14; 21:8). Thomas is exhorted to embrace the truth of the resurrection, with all that it involves about the Person and Office of Christ, and consequently become one who is faithful, not faithless (note the present imperative in μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός; cf. γίνου πιστὸς ἄχρι θανάτου, Revelation 2:10, and the discussion on pgs.121ff. of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 1, J. H. Moulton). As Christ's exhortation is accompanied by His Almighty power, Thomas does indeed respond in faith to Christ's self-revelation, confess Him as Lord and God, and become one who is believing and faithful (πεπίστευκας, 20:29). The believing response in the Apostle Thomas is a paradigm of the faith of the normal Christian, the one who has not seen, and yet has believed, and so is blessed (μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες, καὶ πιστεύσαντες, John 20:29); such a believing response is the purpose of the Gospel (John 20:30-31).

[650] Thomas's faith-response to the revelation of Christ is set forth as a pattern by John for the response of faith in the conversion of the lost and for the continuing faith-response to greater revelations of the Person and work of Christ by the Christian, although, in light of 1 Corinthians 15, the specific doubt about the bodily resurrection of Christ by Thomas is not possible for the child of God in the fully inaugurated dispensation of grace as it was for the disciples in the pre-resurrection and ascension period. Indeed, John 20, in its context, clearly teaches that rejecting the resurrection is an act of the unregenerate, and Christ prevents Thomas from reaching that point through His command, accompanied by His effectual grace, in 20:27.

[651] For a helpful outline of John's Gospel, its themes, purpose, and plan, see "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel, Part I" and "The Plan of the Fourth Gospel, Part II," by W. H. Griffith Thomas, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 125:499 (July 1968) 254-263 & 125:500 (October 1968) 313-324.

higher degree, such earthly spiritual life being a sweet foretaste of the blessed fulness of life in the coming eschatological glory. John's Gospel is written "that ye might believe[652] that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing[653] ye might have life through his name" (John 20:31). The revelation of the glory and salvation of Christ and God through the signs recorded in the Gospel are written so that people might come to initial saving faith, and that those who are believers might through a continuing and ever deeper entrustment of themselves to Christ experientially possess a greater fulness of *life* in all its senses—that is, "that they might have life, and that they might have *it* more abundantly" (John 10:10)—for *life* is not bare existence, or simply a future state of joy instead of pain, but knowing the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent (John 17:3). It is impossible for the unbeliever to possess any saving knowledge of God and Christ, while all believers possess such cognitive and experiential knowledge, but the believer's knowledge, and thus his experience of spiritual and eternal life, can be deepened through repeated, stronger, and fuller responses to the revelation of his God and Savior in the Word.

The Apostle John similarly taught in his first epistle that unbelievers are to come to faith in Christ and, through the receipt of a new nature, become people of love who also are to exercise particular acts of faith in Christ (1 John 3:23),[654] while believers, those who have exercised saving faith and become believing ones,[655] should, by obtaining assurance of their salvation, believe more deeply. Their growth in faith is associated with their disbelief in false teachers (1 John 4:1)[656] because of the failure of such teachers to fit the criteria set forth by the Apostolic faith in the Word (1 John 4:1-6). Concluding his epistle, John stated: "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on

---

652 ἵνα πιστεύσητε, "that ye might come to initial saving faith in Christ," the first purpose of the Gospel of John, a fact supported by the aorist tense verb. (The aorist, found in the *Textus Receptus* and 99.5% of Greek MSS, is indubitably the correct reading.)

653 ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, "that you might through continuing deeper and fuller entrusting of and surrender to Christ, be having life in ever greater spiritual fulness through Christ's name," the second purpose of the Gospel of John, a fact supported by the present tense verbs.

654 πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, leading to continuing love, a fruit of regeneration (ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους). The first person plural "we should believe," and the fact that the audience of 1 John is believers, indicates that the πιστεύσωμεν is not limited to the conversion of the unbeliever. God also commands the regenerate to exercise particular acts of faith in Christ.

655 1 John 4:16; 5:1, 5, 10, 13; ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχει ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, through which the Christian now is ὁ πιστεύων, 1 John 5:1, 5, 10, 13, while the unbeliever is ὁ μὴ πιστεύων because οὐ πεπίστευκεν, 5:10. Those who enter into perfect tense faith possess present tense faith.

656 μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύετε.

the name of the Son of God" (1 John 5:13).[657] The verse indicates that John writes his epistle to those who are believers[658] in the Son of God. He wants them to enjoy the knowledge that they currently possess eternal life.[659] By possessing assurance, and growing in their assurance of their personal salvation, they will believe the more deeply and exercise ever greater faith in the Son of God,[660] resulting in full joy (1 John 1:4) and holy living (1 John 2:1).

In agreement with the teaching of the Old Testament,[661] John makes it clear that communion with the Father and the Son by the Spirit through the revelation of the Triune God in His ontology and economy to His beloved people will result in ever greater degrees of Christ-conformity in the ever more deeply believing believer. The saints are the possessors of a real relationship with, sharing in, association and fellowship with[662] Jehovah; they can say: "truly our fellowship *is* with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 1:3). The saint who is right with God has Christ's promise: "I will come

---

657 Ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

658 τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.

659 εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον. Since εἰδῆτε is from οἶδα the perfect functions as does the present ἔχετε. It is unfortunate that the critical Greek New Testament follows a tiny minority of Greek MSS to corrupt both the purpose statement of 1 John in 5:13 and the purpose statement of the Gospel of John (20:31).

660 ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

661 Moses knew the value of greater experiential knowledge of God and of the holy graces that flowed from such knowledge, and consequently prayed in Exodus 33:13 that because he had found grace, the Jehovah of the Theophany, the eternal Son of God (John 1:18), would reveal Himself to him, that he might have the more grace, based on Jehovah's redeeming covenants with His people: וּרְאֵ֣ה כִֽי־עַמְּךָ֣ הַגּ֣וֹי הַזֶּ֑ה׃ וְעַתָּ֗ה אִם־נָ֤א מָצָ֙אתִי֙ חֵ֣ן בְּעֵינֶ֔יךָ הוֹדִ֥עֵנִי נָ֖א אֶת־דְּרָכֶ֑ךָ וְאֵדָ֣עֲךָ֔ לְמַ֥עַן אֶמְצָא־חֵ֖ן בְּעֵינֶ֑יךָ "Now therefore, I pray thee, if I have found grace in thy sight, shew me now thy way, that I may know thee, that I may find grace in thy sight: and consider that this nation *is* thy people." The presence of experiential knowledge and communion in the text was recognized by the LXX translator (although the last clause of the verse is mistranslated): εἰ οὖν εὕρηκα χάριν ἐναντίον σου, ἐμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτόν· γνωστῶς ἴδω σε, ὅπως ἂν ὦ εὑρηκὼς χάριν ἐναντίον σου, καὶ ἵνα γνῶ ὅτι λαός σου τὸ ἔθνος τὸ μέγα τοῦτο. "If then I have found favour in thy sight, reveal thyself to me, that I may evidently see thee; that I may find favour in thy sight, and that I may know that this great nation *is* thy people."

David recorded the Messiah's promise to His Father that as the Risen Redeemer He would reveal the Father to His people after His crucifixion and resurrection: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee." אֲסַפְּרָ֣ה שִׁמְךָ֣ לְאֶחָ֑י בְּת֖וֹךְ קָהָ֣ל אֲהַלְלֶֽךָּ׃ Psalm 22:22, cf. 22:1-21 & Hebrews 2:12, Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee."

The intertestamental Jews also knew that the Lord revealed Himself to those who believed in Him: Ἀγαπήσατε δικαιοσύνην, οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν, φρονήσατε περὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἀγαθότητι καὶ ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας ζητήσατε αὐτόν. ὅτι εὑρίσκεται τοῖς μὴ πειράζουσιν αὐτόν, ἐμφανίζεται δὲ τοῖς μὴ ἀπιστοῦσιν αὐτῷ. "Love righteousness, ye that be judges of the earth: think of the Lord with a good heart, and in simplicity of heart seek him. For he will be found of them that tempt him not; and manifests himself to such as are not disbelieving in him" (Wisdom 1:1-2).

662 That is, κοινωνία.

in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (Revelation 3:20).[663] The Lord Jesus does not leave His purchased ones alone, but promises: "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you" (John 14:18).[664] They love Christ and keep His commandments, and are those whom the Son and His Father love, and to whom they manifest themselves in a manner of which the unconverted world can know nothing, so that the Divine Persons come to dwell in and with them, that their closeness and sweet fellowship might grow the more as the Triune Presence is the more manifest. The Lord Jesus explained:

> He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.[665]

As their Theanthropic Mediator, Christ makes known to His people by the Holy Spirit the revelation the Father gave Him for them.[666] Through the Spirit and mediated by the Son, they have the Father's glory revealed to them, and are transformed by this vision of God's glory and brought into ever closer union with the Triune God through the God-Man. Such a revelation of the Father was the eternal Divine purpose on the heart of God, as appears in the covenant of redemption among the Divine Persons and the covenant of grace[667] through which the Father would save the elect by the Son through the Spirit, for

---

663 Revelation 3:20 has absolutely nothing to do with an unsaved person asking Jesus to come into his heart in order to be saved. The unregenerate need to repent and believe, not ask Jesus to come into their hearts.

664 οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς· ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. The Lord Jesus will not leave His own "without the aid and comfort of one who serves as associate and friend, *orphaned*" (BDAG on ὀρφανός; cf. KJV margin, "comfortless: or, orphans.")

665 John 14:21-23, ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτάς, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με· ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με, ἀγαπηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀγαπήσω αὐτόν, καὶ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν. λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, Κύριε, τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτόν, καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα, καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν. The verb ἐμφανίζω is to "lay open to view, *make visible* . . . to provide information, *make clear, explain, inform, make a report* . . . of matters that transcend physical sight or mere verbal statement *reveal, make known* . . . ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν *I will reveal myself to that person* J 14:21" (BDAG). Compare the use of ἐμφανίζω in Exodus 33:13 (LXX) and the evidence of inter-testamental Judaism in the use in Wisdom 1:2.

666 John 15:15; 16:13-14, "[A]ll things that I [Christ] have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. . . . [T]he Spirit of truth . . . shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew *it* unto you," πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν. . . . τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας . . . ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. Note that the order of the working in the economic Trinity reflects the eternal order in the ontological Trinity; the Son who is eternally begotten by the Father is, in time, sent by the Father and is the Agent for the revelation of the Father, and the Holy Spirit, who eternally proceeds from the Father and the Son as from a single principle, is in time sent by the Father and the Son to reveal to the saints what has been given by the Father to the God-Man Mediator. Compare also Matthew 11:27; Luke 10:22; John 1:18; 14:6-9.

667 The *covenant of redemption* or *pactum salutis* is "the pretemporal, intratrinitarian agreement of the Father and the Son concerning the covenant of grace and its ratification in and through the work of the Son

this revelation of God, which takes place through the Word, is at the heart of what is involved in the possession of eternal life:

> And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. . . . I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word. . . . For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received *them*, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. . . . I have given them thy word . . . sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. . . . And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare *it*: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them. [668]

---

incarnate. The Son covenants with the Father, in the unity of the Godhead, to be the temporal *sponsor* of the Father's *testamentum* in and through the work of the Mediator. In that work, the Son fulfills his *sponsio* or *fideiussio*, i.e., his guarantee of payment of the debt of sin in ratification of the Father's *testamentum*. . . . [T]he idea of the *pactum salutis* is to emphasize the eternal, inviolable, and trinitarian foundation of the temporal *foedus gratiae* much in the way that the eternal decree underlies and guarantees the *ordo salutis*. . . . [The] foedus gratiae [or] *covenant of grace;* also foedus gratiae gratuitum: *gracious or graciously given covenant of grace;* and foedus gratiae evangelicum: *covenant of grace concerning the gospel* or *evangelical covenant of grace;* considered, first, as a *foedus monopleuron*, or one-sided covenant, the covenant of grace is the pact (*pactum, pactio*) made by God beginning with the *protevangelium*, confirmed and revealed more fully in Abraham, and finally fulfilled in Christ. It is a *foedus monopleuron* because it stands as a gracious promise of salvation given to fallen man apart from any consideration of man's ability to respond to it or fulfill it and apart from any human initiative. Human beings are drawn into covenant by the grace of God alone. Once they enter covenant, however, and become parties to the divine offer of salvation, they take on responsibilities, under the covenant, before God. The *foedus gratiae*, therefore, also appears as a mutual pact and agreement between God and man, a *foedus dipleuron*" (pgs. 120-121, 217*, Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, Richard Muller).

It should be noted that recognition of the fact that the ideas of a covenant of redemption and covenant of grace have Scriptural support does not deny the clear Biblical covenantal distinctions affirmed by classical dispensationalism, nor does the use of such a terminology constitute either an endorsement of Reformed covenant theology or a rejection of dispensationalism, any more than the acceptance of the covenant of redemption and of grace by Lewis Sperry Chafer constitutes a repudiation of his own theological system by that outstanding dispensationalist (cf. pg. 42, vol. 1, pgs. 163-165, 232, vol. 4, etc., *Systematic Theology*, Chafer).

668 John 17:3, 6, 8, 14, 17, 22-26. αὕτη δὲ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. . . . ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς δέδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου· σοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοὺς δέδωκας· καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετηρήκασι. . . . ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς· καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον, καὶ ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας. . . . ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου . . . ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθεια ἐστι. . . . καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ὦσιν ἕν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν ἐσμεν. ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν, καὶ ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ ἠγάπησας αὐτούς, καθὼς ἐμὲ ἠγάπησας. πάτερ, οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, κἀκεῖνοι ὦσι μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ· ἵνα θεωρῶσι τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν, ἣν ἔδωκάς μοι, ὅτι ἠγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων, καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας· καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου, καὶ γνωρίσω· ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη, ἣν ἠγάπησας με, ἐν αὐτοῖς ᾖ, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

The supernatural revelation and manifestation of God's name, character, and glory through Christ by the Spirit in the Scriptures to the saints results in their sanctification, in a greater degree of God's presence in and with them, and in their possession and manifestation of all the communicable Divine attributes, so that as they are filled with the Divine presence they are also filled with Divine love and all other holy attributes, including faith and faithfulness.

Both the Old and New Testaments teach that the just—those who receive the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ, and who consequently have lives characterized by justice—will live. They possess spiritual life and fellowship with God on earth and are certain of eternal life in Christ's everlasting kingdom. This life came to them through the instrumentality of faith. At the moment they believingly embraced Christ, they were justified. Their Christian growth is associated with greater and stronger entrustings of themselves to the Lord Jesus in faith as He draws closer to them and they draw closer to Him. In this manner their spiritual life is carried on by faith until the completion of their earthly pilgrimage and their entry into that glorious realm of sight where faith and hope are done away and charity only remains.

Applications of the Truth that the Just Shall Live by Faith

Do you have saving faith? If not, why, oh unbeliever, will you trust in anything or anyone other than the Triune Jehovah, who loved you and sent His Son to die for your sins? Is not hope in men in vain? Why will you perish? For you certainly will do so. There is not the slightest doubt that you will be eternally damned unless you repent of your sins and come to the Lord Jesus Christ in saving faith. Turn from any confidence in works, sacraments, self-righteousness, outward decisions such as the repetition of a "sinner's prayer," and all else, to trust only in the all-sufficient merit of the atoning death of the Son of God. Surrender to Christ as Lord. Roll your full persuasion and confidence upon Him and His gospel promises. He will not fail you, nor ever cast you out. He will effectually deliver you from the penalty, power, and presence of sin, and keep you eternally secure from the moment of your regeneration to all eternity future, if you will, enabled by His grace, come to Him.

Saving faith is not just mental assent, but whole-souled entrustment of Christ as both Lord and Savior, a product of supernatural grace working in the heart. Consequently, all who have truly embraced Christ in faith will be faithful. Nobody without faithfulness has true saving faith. Saving faith always results in obedience, and faith without works is dead. If, after your professed conversion, you are still like the

heathen who stayed in Jericho rather than Rahab, or still like the idolators of Ur rather than like Abraham, your eternal destiny will be the same fire and brimstone which those unconverted pagan wretches have been hopelessly enduring for the last three thousand years and more. Abraham was not a sinless man after his conversion (e. g., Genesis 12:10-13), but he was unquestionably a changed man. The new birth does not bring sinless perfection, but it always brings genuine spiritual life. The New Covenant includes both the Divine promise, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more" and the equally sure Divine promise, "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people" (Hebrews 8:10-12). If you do not have the law written in your mind and heart, your sins have not been remitted. If you are still a proud and rebellious man (Habakkuk 2:4a), your problem is not that you have not entered into the Higher Life or into a Second Blessing, but that you have never become a just man by means of genuine faith (Habakkuk 2:4b). All the saints, not an elite minority of them only, are just, and not by imputed only, but also by imparted righteousness. The Bible never teachs that some Christians are entirely devoid of spiritual life because they have failed to make a post-conversion faith-decision to appropriate sanctification. Rather, Scripture teaches that all believers have spiritual life and the kernel from which all spiritual blessings, including not justification only, but also sanctification, progressively unfold themselves in ever-greater fulness and glory. There is no evidence in either the Old or New Testaments that some saved people do not live by faith.[669] Can the believer's faith fail him in particular trials? Yes, certainly. Can he fall into spiritual declensions and periods in which his faith is growing weaker? Sadly, the answer is an unequivocal affirmative. However, notwithstanding all such concessions, it is nevertheless those only who are *just* who will *live*, and will do so because they exercised saving faith, entrusting themselves to Jesus Christ as both Lord and Savior, at the moment of their justification and regeneration. Have you truly come to Jesus Christ?

---

669 That is, the Higher Life view of Habakkuk 2:4 and its New Testament quotations, as set forth by William Boardman and others (cf. Hannah W. Smith's article in the *Friends Review* of 1867, reproduced in the entry for February 18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter), must be reckoned eisegesis, not exegesis:

> "The just shall live by faith." The just shall be *made alive* first, and *afterwards learn to live* by faith. The just shall be *justified before God* first, and afterwards learn the way *to become just also in heart and life*, by faith. . . . [This is the] two-fold significance of the text, illustrated by its suggestion the first and second time in [Luther's] heart, as by a celesial voice within, with the interval of years between the two, and meeting in each case a want so different[.] (pg. 191, *The Higher Christian Life*, W. E. Boardman. New York: Sheldon & Co., 1859. Italics found in original.)

Boardman's "afterwards" disjunction that leaves some Christians, those who have not yet discovered his Higher Life theology, without any spiritual growth, has no support whatsoever in the New Testament doctrine of the just living by faith, and his historical reconstruction of Luther's life is most questionable.

Furthermore, one who does not manifest the obedience of faith should neither be self-assured, nor be assured by others, that he has indeed passed from death to life. Believers have the blessed possibility and privilege of being assured of their salvation (1 John 5:13), but only those who manifest the changes evident in 1 John are truly believers. Christian personal workers should follow the pattern of Jesus Christ, who told new converts, "If ye continue in my word, *then* are ye my disciples indeed" (John 8:30-32). Someone who has newly professed conversion should not be given assurance because he has repeated a sinner's prayer or made an outward profession. While it is most proper to rejoice that someone has made such a decision, personal workers should explain that true conversion results in a lifestyle of obedience to Jesus Christ, and explaining what Scripture sets forth as the faithfulness that pertains to the just, they should allow the Holy Spirit to give assurance. Indeed, neither one with a merely outward profession, nor a true Christian who is backslidden and spiritually decaying, should expect to have Biblical assurance of salvation. Also, before a backslidden Christian can possess Biblical assurance, he needs to repent and have an upright heart before the Lord restored.

On the other hand, believers who do manifest the obedience of faith should not doubt their salvation. God wants His faithful people to joyfully possess an assured salvation, and a lack of assurance is a great hinderance to the further growth of Christian faith and to holy living (1 John 1:4; 2:1; 5:13c). Believer, be assured of your salvation, so that you may more deeply believe in Christ! It is not a secondary or a little thing for you to have assurance. It is the will of God. God has changed you, and His Spirit testifies inwardly to you that you are a child of God. Will you supress and deny God's testimony and His work in you? What sort of ingratitude and unreasonableness is this? God has specifically, and in love, "written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God" (1 John 5:13). Receive His promise—be assured of your salvation—and go on in your Christian walk from strength to strength.

The exercise of saving faith is a definite, conscious, willful action that takes place at a particular moment of a person's life. One who has, by grace, turned with all his heart and soul to Jesus Christ and been born again would in all but the most extraordinary of situations be able to clearly testify to and explain his conversion. The idea, often set forth by advocates of Reformed theology, that one can have "always believed,"[670] so that

---

670 E. g.: "We must insist, with . . . the Reformed confessions . . . that . . . it is intolerable cruelty to demand of people a dramatic conversion experience before they can be assured of their salvation. Such obstacles may not be placed before believers who grew up in the church, who were taught to pray on their mother's knee, who were catechized and who therefore do not know a time when they did not believe in

someone who has grown up under Christian influences, or who has had baptismal water applied to him in his infancy, need never consciously come to a point of conversion, is an extremely dangerous, indeed, a soul-damning heresy. Ephesians 2:1-3 states: "And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also *we all* had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Ephesians was written to the Christian congregation at Ephesus (Ephesians 1:1), which, of course, included parents who had infants and children (6:1). The children of Christians, like everyone else, are dead in their sins, under the power of the devil, and fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, until they are made alive at the moment they are born again by grace through faith in Christ (2:8-9). Since infants have "no knowledge between good and evil,"[671] they do not conduct themselves "in the lusts of [their] flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind." Since all those made alive in Christ at one time conducted themselves in the lusts of the flesh and of the mind, people—including those with Christian parents—are only born again after they have reached an age where they are able to so conduct themselves, and consciously repent and believe the gospel. Nobody has always been a Christian. The only people who are made alive in Christ are those who have been consciously lost, walking in sin, and have subsequently repented and believed.[672] Conversion is the most important event that can take place in the life of any individual. One does not repent by accident. A person who has experienced the stupendous change associated with conversion should be able to describe when and how it took place.

How truly "blessed *are* they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." How truly "blessed *is* the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Romans 4:7-8)! Oh Christian, marvel in the blessedness of the forgiveness of your sins. They were innumerable, and each of them an infinite evil, but now they are all gone. You were

---

Christ. . . . Nor may it be demanded on the mission field. . . . True conversion is a lifelong process, where the child of God daily turns from sin to God[.] . . . This is the Reformed doctrine of conversion as set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism" (pgs. 83-84, "The Notion of Preparatory Grace in the Puritans," Martyn McGeown. *Protestant Reformed Theological Journal* 41:1 (November 2007) 58-84). While such an idea may indeed be the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism, it is certainly not the teaching of the Bible.

671 Deuteronomy 1:39; Isaiah 7:16; Jonah 4:11; Romans 9:11.

672 This fact is supported not only by the pattern of Old and New Testament conversion, but also by the fact that saving faith, as seen in the perfect tense uses of *pisteuo*, "to believe," contain within them the idea of a snapshot action—the point of conversion—with results that continue. One must come to Christ with an aorist, point-action of *faith* before one can have a perfect tense belief in the Lord Jesus Christ.

black, but Christ has made you white. You were pressing down to hell under an intolerable weight of transgression, but Jesus Christ has forever removed your load. You were in bondage, but Christ has made you free. You were certain of everlasting torment, but Christ endured all that torment for you, so that you might enter into inconceivable and eternal blessedness. And not only so, but the Lord Jesus has brought you into an intimate union with Himself, and with God through Him. Say to yourself, "How can it be that I have been brought into union with Jesus Christ—that infinitely lovely and precious One? Oh, what am I, that the God of glory, the Creator of the heaven and earth, God the Father, Son, and Spirit, would reveal Himself to me—to me, who would not, of myself, take even the smallest step towards Him! And not reveal Himself only, but in Christ suffer the shame, the bitterness, and the torment of the cross, to bring my wretched soul to Himself!" Yes, Christian, because of God's mere grace alone—not of yourself, not of your works, not of your striving, not of your preparation for grace, not of anything you ever did, have done, or will do, you have been brought into union with the Lord Jesus Christ. How you ought to treasure the fact of this union and glory in Him with whom you have been united! How you ought to esteem and love Jesus Christ, the blessed and ever-overflowing fount of all spiritual treasures, graces, and blessings that you have ever received, or ever will receive, to all eternity! Do you do so?

Glory, then, not in your own righteousness, but in Christ and His righteousness. All your righteousnesses are filthy rags, and all holiness imparted to you in sanctification is only and entirely a product of God's grace, power, and love. Indeed, you need Christ to sanctify the iniquity clinging to your very holiest things (Exodus 28:38). You have nothing to glory in yourself. The evidential just character of the redeemed is solely a product of Divine grace and power, and your faith is not a meritorious instrument, but simply the means through which you embrace God and receive all freely from Him. Indeed, the more inward holiness God creates within you, the more you will see how wretched, vile and hateful you really are, and with the greater strength you will cleave to Christ and His righteousness only as your perfect standing before God. Yet notwithstanding all your unworthiness, the Lord Jehovah says to you: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue *that* shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This *is* the heritage of the servants of the LORD, and their righteousness *is* of me, saith the LORD" (Isaiah 54:17). Have you received His priceless righteousness "without money and without price" (Isaiah 55:1)? Then hearken to the Scripture: "I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh *himself* with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth

herself with her jewels" (Isaiah 61:10). Oh blessed imputed righteousness of Christ, the glory and the ground of exceedingly great rejoicing for the saints of all ages from the foundation of the world to today, the trust of all the spiritual sons of Abraham from the time of the conversion of that abominable idolator until today, when it becomes the perfect standing for such wretched sinners as you are!

You should earnestly strive to have God's view of your own fleshly tendency towards self-righteousness—seek to see it as the abominable and detestable wickedness that God considers it. Also recognize the hateful and abominable character of all false religions of works-righteousness, whether Romanism, Quakerism, cults such as the Watchtower or Seventh Day Adventism, or all other systems of salvation by works and merit. Be astonished, be horribly afraid, be overwhelmed with indignation that any would dare to exalt his own righteousness against the righteousness of the infinite Jehovah. What rebellion, what blasphemy is this! And, alas, oh God, what is this tendency to such self-exaltation that I see within my own fleshly heart! Purge me, oh God, and I will be clean—wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.

Recognize that it is God's blessed decree that you actually grow increasingly righteous over the course of your earthly pilgrimage, and the consummation of that creative work of righteousness is certain in the coming kingdom. He has covenanted to perform that work in you by His own Almighty power, the same power that created the world, raised Christ from the dead, and regenerated you. Both the initial bestowal of faith, and the increase of faith, are supernatural gifts from God, not autonomous products of your will, and the Lord has committed Himself to work in you both to will and do of His good pleasure until the day of Jesus Christ. Therefore, with confidence pursue the means of sanctification, recognizing that it is by such means that God will transform you. Passionately treasure the Word. Read it, study it, memorize it, meditate upon it, hear it preached, discuss it with others. Reject all theologies of sanctification that deny that God produces real inward holiness within His people. Indwelling sin is not merely to be counteracted, but progressively eradicated; inward holiness is not just to be maintained, but to grow. You are crucified with Christ—you are legally dead to sin, and its dominion has been shattered. Then reckon it to be so, and strengthened by the Spirit, put to death the remnants of indwelling sin. At the moment of your regeneration, you overcame the world—manifest that victory through ever greater conquests and desolations of your already defeated foe. Settle for nothing less than what God has promised. Recognize, nevertheless, that the fulness of perfect holiness will not be obtained short of your entrance into eternal rest. How this fact should make you treasure heaven! For the eternal dwelling of the redeemed is not just a place of peace, happiness, and freedom

from pain, but of holiness—blessed, perfect, desirable, sweet, and glorious holiness—the dwelling of that Holy One who makes it so. There you will see your Jesus, and be like Him, seeing Him as He is. There you will be pure, even as He is pure. There you will be fully embraced by and enter into the fellowship of the eternal Trinitarian love. There you will enjoy, with all the purchased saints, fulness of communion with the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for ever and ever and ever. Let your soul cry out, "Oh come, Lord Jesus—take me, and all thy purchased pilgrims, home to be with Thee! Or if it is not yet Thy appointed time to return, oh, how I long to be with Thee and see Thy face, not only by faith, but in full sight! When is it, oh my Father, oh my Redeemer, that I will be forever with Thee? Thou art all my hope, my joy, and the desire of my heart, now and for ever."

Furthermore, the propositional and practical elements of the faith are inextricably intertwined—faithfulness includes fidelity to both. The devils know doctrine, and a natural man can have a kind of unspiritual pleasure through an intellectual apprehension of the theological system of Scripture—a system that he, nevertheless, refuses to practice. Mere nature can also lead others, who hate the beauty and glory of the theological system of the Bible—which to hate is to despise the mind of Christ and the Wisdom of God—to the practice of a kind of merely natural morality. The saints must avoid both errors, and passionately embrace both the totality of the propositional revelation of Himself that their Father has commanded them to love with all their minds and the totality of the practical duties that are the necessary concomitants of true submissive assent to the Scriptural revelation. Is your faith genuine—unfeigned, and unhypocritical? Do you both believe and do? Do you earnestly contend for both propositions and praxis?

Since "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Romans 14:23), be sure that you can act out of faith in all that you do. Do not look for gray areas or take refuge in what is not clearly wrong, but "merely" doubtful. Take the higher ground. Practice only what is unquestionably right. Stay far away from any violation of Scripture, and consider very carefully the testimony of your conscience. You will, without any doubt, have to give an account to God one day. If you would, in the things that pertain merely to this life, take great pains that your gold, silver, and precious stones were not stolen and replaced with wood, hay, and stubble, how much the more ought you to take heed that you do not lose eternal treasures for the sake of some doubtful and fleeting temporal pleasure?

Do you believe? Then speak—open your mouth and preach the gospel! (2 Corinthians 4:8-13). Is not the Lamb who was slain worthy of a greater number casting their crowns before Him? If you believe, you will not keep silent. Those who believe in their hearts will confess Christ with their mouths. Does your testimony to your family, neighbors, and coworkers, evidence that you believe? Are you going house to house

preaching repentance and faith, as the first century Christians were (Acts 20:20-21; 5:42)? Are you filling your local area with the gospel? What are you doing so that everyone in your area—and those even to the uttermost parts of the earth—hear the gospel of the Lord Jesus?

Do you speak, because of faith, against compromise, error, and false doctrine of all kinds, or do you allow leaven to spread unchecked and unwarned about? Do not deceive yourself into thinking that your silence, your refusal to follow the practice of Christ and the Apostles in specifically identifying, marking, warning about, and separating from all false teachers and false teaching is generosity, kindness, a friendly spirit, charitableness, or any other good thing. No, God's view of your silence is very different. His view is that you are a faithless rebel and a coward. If you would follow the Apostolic example, you will speak, because you believe. You will boldly, unashamedly, and purely set forth all the truth, without adding or taking away anything. That is living by faith—and that is true love.

All Christian ministry and service must be grounded in faith. Faithlessness will eliminate the blessing of Jehovah. Furthermore, your spiritual enemies are not merely natural, but supernatural—you have the world, the flesh, and the devil to fight, and you cannot overcome them on your own. How will you slay the indwelling lusts that, before your regeneration, held you in an unbreakable grip, without the strength of the Lord through faith? Do you think you will defeat the devil and his vast hosts of demons without taking to yourself the "shield of faith" (Ephesians 6:16)? How necessary it is to trust in the Lord your God in all situations—and also how sweet it is so to do! He is a sure and unfailing confidence. Do not fear, but place all your confidence in Him. He is a certain refuge, a strong rock, and a high tower. Men may, and will, fail, as will their devices, but the counsel of the Sovereign and Almighty One shall stand. Indeed, the righteous trust in the Lord—not in outward action only, in their inward disposition. Do you act like the righteous when times are easy, but abandon their Rock in times of trial? What, then, is this weakness of faith? Meditate upon the revelation of the character of God as the faithful God, as your own God in covenant with you, for He reveals Himself, and gives His people precious promises, to quicken and strengthen their trust in Him. He is a good Father, who gives abundantly to His own children out of His overflowing abundance. He will strengthen you in your weakness, strengthen your wavering faith, and fill you abundantly with His grace.

Trust, without doubting, that you have from your Father what you ask, and God will answer your prayers. His promises indicate His desire to hear and answer you: "And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive" (Matthew

21:22). His character is such that He will certainly fulfill His promises. Therefore, meet the conditions for answered prayer: 1.) Ask! "Ye have not because ye ask not" (James 4:2). You will not receive if you do not ask; therefore "ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full" (John 16:24). 2.) Ask in faith. This is impossible unless you have an upright heart. "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear *me*" (Psalm 66:18). You cannot ask in faith if you are wilfully cherishing sin. If you are right with God, then you can always ask in faith for anything that God has promised you in His Word, for you can know without a doubt that all such promises are as certain as God's own self-testimony. Do you lack wisdom? "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all *men* liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him" (James 1:5). Are you being tempted? "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God *is* faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear *it*" (1 Corinthians 10:13). Do you long for holiness? "[H]is divine power hath given unto us all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust" (2 Peter 1:3-4). Furthermore, you are encouraged to pray about everything, since God "is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think" (Ephesians 3:20). When it is His will (2 Corinthians 12:9) to fulfill your request, your Father can give you faith for that need (James 5:15). Christian, do you come to your Father with confidence, or are you vacillating and doubting when you cry to Him? Do you even cry? Do you seek the Lord in prayer in such a manner as befits your deep duty and astonishing privilege of coming to Him?

Faith is the instrumentality through which God fills you with spiritual joy and peace, as well as other holy attributes (Romans 15:13). Saint of God, you have tasted that the Lord is good. You know that you possess a rich spiritual banquet that the world knows nothing of, and cannot even comprehend. Would you be filled with greater measures of this blessed joy and peace? Such sweet spiritual treasures are part of the glorious inheritance of *life* that those who are just receive by faith. Exercise your faith, so that it will grow! Moreover, do not just grit your teeth and seek to endure trials, but value them as occasions for the strengthening of faith. The "trial of your faith" is far more precious than "gold that perisheth," and the fact that the successful passage of such trials will bring "praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ" can bring

you, believing, an anticipatory "joy unspeakable and full of glory" (1 Peter 1:3-9) even before the certainly coming final consummation of joy.

Since *life* in all its blessed fulness comes to those who entrust themselves to the Lord, and greater measures of life are found in those who more closely trust their God, how essential it is that you entrust yourself to Him! The worldly pleasures that the wicked prefer to God, that keep them from trusting in Him, will not last. These rebellious ones are living on borrowed time; *life*, even in its physical sense, is not promised to them. The physical, as well as the incomparably glorious spiritual delights, that will be partaken of forever in the New Jerusalem are inconceivably superior to anything possessed in this present time, but they will be shut out from them all. They chose to go from iniquity to iniquity, and wrath will fall upon them to the uttermost. In contrast, in the regenerate, spiritual life increases as they go from faith to faith. Therefore, by God's grace, grow in faith, for then you will receive greater measures of life from God. What a blessing that, instead of going, as by nature you would certainly have done, from iniquity to iniquity, you can go from faith to faith, receiving from the fulness of Christ grace for grace! What is there in this dying world that could be better than this? Eternal glory is but the consummation of that spiritual and eternal life you can possess, in growing measure, now. Do you treasure spiritual life as you ought? Are you increasing in your possession of this blessed life?

Do you wish for your faith to grow? John's Gospel teaches that your faith is strengthened and deepened through the exercise of believing receipt of greater revelations through the Word of the Triune God in His ontology and economy and through your response, enabled by grace, of fuller surrender to and entrusting of yourself to Him. Therefore, while unbelievers refuse, to their eternal ruin, to see the Lord Jesus in the Word and entrust themselves to Him at all, you must seek to see more and more of Christ and the entire Triune Godhead in the Word, and entrust yourself to Him in an ever greater way as the revelation of Him in the Scripture is illuminated to your soul, through the supernatural grace decreed by the Father for your good by Christ the Mediator through the applicatory work of God the Holy Spirit. See ever the more of the glory of the Lord Jesus' Divine Person. Wonder ever the more at the condescending love manifested in His incarnation. Meditate upon all the aspects of His glorious saving work. Think in amazement about His exercise of all the Divine attributes towards you for your good. Rejoice with exceeding joy at His exercise of all the attributes of His glorified human nature towards you for your good. Fill yourself up with these things. You will be worshipping and praising your Triune God through your precious Lord Jesus for them for all eternity.

Specifically:

1.) *Passionately desire that God the Spirit will illumine to you the revelation of the Triune Jehovah, and of Christ the Blessed Mediator, in the Word.* How necessary it is that God reveals Himself to you! Left to yourself, you are utterly unable to discover Him. You will not know whether to turn to the right hand or the left. Furthermore, your heart contains such corruption and wickedness within it that God would be perfectly just to immediately thrust you into the depths of hell, separated from His blessed face for all eternity. Is the infinite King of glory obliged to show Himself to such a worm? God forbid! Recognize that both the initial bestowal of faith upon you, and the increase of faith in its exercise in you, are supernatural gifts from God, not autonomous products of your fallen will, and look to the Lord to perform in you what you cannot perform yourself. Without the free, gracious, and sovereign work of the Spirit in revealing Christ to you, you will never find Him. How necessary it is, then, that God takes the initative and reveals Himself to your soul!

You certainly should have no such expectation of a gracious revelation, and you will not be looking to the Lord and seeking for God to reveal Himself to you in Christ, if you are not upright in heart—if you are wilfully choosing sin over Christ, you evidence that you do not desire a part in any of this glory, as you prefer your sinful abominations to that knowledge of and communion with God that is the greatest treasure of eternity.

2.) *Diligently apply yourself to the reading, study, memorization of, and meditation on the Word, praying for the illumination of the Spirit, depending on His sovereign grace alone, hungering and thirsting after knowledge of God in Christ*. The Bible is the very Word of God, the infallible, inerrant, revelatory speech of the Most High to man. It is a more sure Word than even the audible testimony of the Father to Christ as heard on the Mount of Transfiguration (2 Peter 1:16-21). It is the perfect, unbreakably authoritative revelation of the Father to you through Christ by the Spirit. Oh, the sureness, the power, the infinite value of the Scriptures! Here is a sure anchor for your faith. Here is pure knowledge of God. Here is a genuine revelation, each jot and tittle of which is more sure and more lasting than the heavens and the earth. Here is the spring from whence the waters of life flow. Here is the love-letter of the Most High to His blood-bought people. The Bible is the instrument that the Spirit uses to show God in Christ to those who cry out for knowledge of Him. Do you treat the Bible as the invaluable treasure that it is? Does your use of time reflect such a view of God's Word? What is your attitude when you read and study it? "[T]o this *man* will I look . . . saith the LORD . . . *even* to *him that is* poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word" (Isaiah 66:2). Furthermore,

read, study, memorize, and meditate upon the Word with the expectation that God will work. He has promised that if you draw nigh to Him, He will draw nigh to you. He both supernaturally produces initial saving faith and supernaturally strengthens faith through the instrumentality of the Word (Romans 10:17). If you hunger and thirst after Him, He will certainly satisfy your longings for Him and will sup with you, and you with Him—for He Himself, in His gracious love, has placed those desires within you. He will shine in your heart the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Seek, then, oh Christian—seek your God in His Word!

3.) Indeed, *the believer should seek for the highest intellectual knowledge of Christ's Person, of his Triune God, and of the specific character of all their works*. Careful, detailed, and taxing theological work and careful study contributes to, rather than detracts from, affective appreciation of God in Christ. Carelessness or disinterest in careful thought about God is not piety, but ungodliness. Do you love the truth represented by the Nicene *homoousios*? Do you love the truth represented by the Chalcedonian definition of Christ's Person and natures? Throughout John's Gospel, learning and understanding more about Christ led to greater faith in Him. Do you long to learn and understand more about the Lord Jesus Christ? While the intellectual apprehension of facts is not enough—commital to Him, based on those facts, must follow (John 2:23-3:3)—unknowing determinations of the will without knowledge are also insufficient (John 9:1-34 vs. 35-41).[673] The embrace of faith requires a properly known and apprehended object. Do you seek God with your mind, as well as your will and affections?

Furthermore, since the Biblical Christ is a real Person—the Creator and Redeemer of the world, and the only begotten Son of God—believing fellowship with Jesus Christ is both a product of and a means to a greater knowledge of Him, and leads to a holy abhorrance of every counterfeit "Jesus" (2 Corinthians 11:4) set forth by the world, the flesh, and the devil. Love for the living Christ and views of His glory will lead to a love of holy and spiritual worship and a rejection of the fleshly worship of fleshly "Jesus"; a love for the Redeemer who boldly and plainly rebuked the false doctrines of the Pharisees and Saduccees will lead the Christian to reject the ecumenical "Jesus" that unites false doctrine with the true; knowledge of the true Christ will lead one to reject the fanaticism

673 That is, those in John 2:23-25 knew that Christ did miracles and had intellectual apprehension of various facts about Him, but did not commit themselves to Him, and were thus still unconverted (3:1-3). The blind man Christ healed in John 9 was willing to get cast out of the synagogue for His sake, yet he did not know that the Lord Jesus was the Son of God (9:36), or that He was not a sinner (9:25), and was only converted at the end of the chapter when he found out the proper knowledge of the Person of Christ (9:35-41).

of the charismatic "Jesus," the annihilationist "Jesus" of sundry cults, the Arian or Sabellian "Jesus" of others, the wafer "Jesus" of Romanism, and all other false Christs.

4.) *Behold in the Word the glory of God in Christ*.

a.) Behold the glory of Jesus Christ as the eternal Son of God. He has existed from eternity with His Father, rejoicing always before Him, participating in the ineffable communion of love and delight of the three Persons in the undivided Trinity. Before the beginning, now, and to all eternity, He possesses in full the undivided Divine essence. He is God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, eternally begotten of the Father. His throne, as God, is for ever and ever, and the scepter of His kingdom is a righteous sceptre. He is the I AM, who was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty. He is self-existent, immeasurable, and eternal. He is the Creator and Sovereign of the Universe—all things were made by Him, all things consist by Him, and all things are of Him, through Him, and unto Him. He fully possesses the infinite Divine glory, and will receive, with His Father and the Holy Spirit, the worship and adoration of the entire redeemed creation, for ever and ever.

b.) Behold the glory of Jesus Christ in His Mediatorial office. Behold, in the eternal counsel of peace, the Father giving the elect to the Son, the Son agreeing to redeem them, and the Spirit determining to regenerate them. Behold, and wonder at the mystery of godliness: God manifest in the flesh. See the condescension of the Father's express Image tabernacling among men, He who was always consubstantial with the Father as to His Godhead becoming consubstantial with humanity as to His manhood, uniting in His one Person the Divine nature and a true human nature. Behold the eternal Word conceived in the womb of Mary, being born in a manger. See the fulness of the Godhead embodied in a true Child who grew in wisdom and stature, and favor with God and man. Behold Him in His human identification with the sinful and desperately needy race He came to redeem. See Him growing weary with a journey, and sitting on Jacob's well to rest. See Him weeping at the grave of Lazarus—and raising his beloved friend from the dead. See His tender friendship with the Apostle John, the disciple whom Jesus loved. See Him sorrowful and very heavy in light of His coming cross, agonizing in prayer to the Father, betrayed by a familiar friend and deserted and denied by the rest. See Him unjustly condemned, mocked, spat upon, whipped, and crucified. See Him saving the soul and bringing to Paradise the repentant thief crucified next to Him. See Him bearing the sins of the world in His body, perfectly satisfying the demands of Divine justice through His one offering. See Him rising from the dead and so destroying the power of death, and ascending to the right hand of His Father, being crowned with glory

and honor, and having all power in heaven and earth given into His hand. See Him interceding for His people as their Priest and Advocate, and by His omnipotent power preserving every one of them to everlasting glory. See Him, with the Father, sending the Holy Spirit, reflecting the Spirit's eternal procession from the Father and the Son in His temporal mission to indwell the church. See the union His elect have with Him in His death, burial, resurrection, and ascension. See Him completing the work of His humiliation, and uniting to His immutable Divine perfections the human perfections that make Him the perfect and all-sufficient Savior of all who will come to Him. See Him ruling over the church in the world, preparing mansions for His beloved people, and coming again to bring them to Himself. See Him sitting on the throne of David and manifesting the righteous rule of God over the earth in the Millennial kingdom. See Him as the Light of the New Jerusalem, and His people singing the praises of redeeming love and serving Him before the throne of God and the Lamb for ever and ever. See Christ's glory in John's Gospel as the bread of life, the light of the world, the door to eternal life, the good shepherd who gives His life for the sheep, the resurrection and the life, the way, the truth, and the life, and the true vine, the source of all grace, the font of spiritual and eternal life for all those brought into union with Him. See the glory of the Lord Jesus in all Scripture, in type and in antitype, in promise and in fulfillment, and embrace Him, cleave to Him ever the more in all that He is and in all that He does. The glory of God in Christ is an inexhaustible theme, the delight and glory of the saints to all eternity. A few lines of application certainly cannot even begin to compass it in its beauty and glory.[674] Oh Christian, set in motion the work of eternity now—through the Scripture, behold the glory of God in Christ! In so doing, He will reveal Himself to you, you will partake in ever greater levels of spiritual life, and you will be transformed into the moral likeness of your incarnate Head.

5.) Consider also that *the more true intellectual and experiential knowledge of God in Christ the Christian has, the more he longs for more such knowledge, and the more he hates his fleshly feebleness in seeking after it*. Does your heart and flesh, all the faculties of your whole renewed person, cry out for God, the living God, as your own God? What an awful evil is this faintness, this feebleness, in seeking after God your Father, His Son,

---

674 For what is arguably the preeminent treatment of this theme, see *ΧΡΙΣΤΟΛΟΓΙΑ: or, a Declaration of the Glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ*, and *Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ, in His Person, Office, and Grace: With the Differences Between Faith and Sight: Applied unto the Use of Them that Believe & Applied unto Unconverted Sinners and Saints Under Spiritual Decays*, by John Owen.

and His Spirit? How does believing meditation on Gethsemane, and on the cross, affect the heart! For seeing the Lord Jesus in His glory enflames the believer's soul with love for Him, with true sanctification as a result. And yet the disciples failed to watch and pray, but slept while the Lord wept His infinitely precious tears of blood, and forsook the Lord when He went to the cross. How often do I follow their faithless and criminal example, and fail to draw nigh to the Lord when He has come nigh to me? My God, oh for grace to love and know Thee more!

6.) Consider *the great privilege believers, and in particular ministers, have, in proclaiming the mystery of God in Christ*. Oh Christian, you have the privilege and the duty to give the gospel to the unconverted, and to set forth the Lord Jesus before believers in all His glory and grace to stir up their holy affections for Him. How much time do you spend proclaiming the gospel? How many doors have you knocked on this week? Is not Jesus Christ worthy of being known by all men? Furthermore, Hebrews 10:24-25 commands you to provoke others in the church to love and to good works. How better to do this than to set God in Christ before them? Do you talk of your Father, and of His Son your Redeemer, on the Lord's Day? "Then they that feared the LORD spake often one to another: and the LORD hearkened, and heard *it*, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the LORD, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the LORD of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him. Then shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not" (Malachi 3:16-18).

Furthermore, pastor, evangelist, and Christian preacher, you have the privilege and duty of setting forth the most stupendous of all truths in the proclamation of the Triune God and the incarnate, crucified, and risen Christ. Am *I* to proclaim the "mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh"? Who is sufficient for these things? Employ the great privileges that God has given you and set forth the truth, and all the truth, with nothing added or taken away, with holy boldness and passion, and with holy fear and trembling over the fact that the Lord has chosen and commanded you so to do. Earnestly contend for the faith, that nothing whatever of the glory of God revealed in Christ through the Scriptures, and committed to you for bold and public proclamation everywhere to all men, be lost.

7.) *Do not turn aside from the full proclamation of God in Christ, as set forth from Genesis to Revelation, to any other and lesser message*. Do not turn from Christ to a

merely "practical" message or mere moralism. Doubtless the people of God must, and will, adorn their knowledge of God with good works. Indeed, the greater their true spiritual fellowship with Christ, the greater will be their outward manifestations of practical holiness. However, to take knowledge of the Lord Jesus away to focus exclusively upon what is "practical" is to rip out the soul from true religion and leave a lifeless corpse. Any "piety" that does not lead men to behold, believe on, receive, and know Jesus Christ is false, fleshly, and devilish.

What is more, as you strive against specific sins, do not let the Lord Jesus be removed from your view. It is certainly proper to set yourself mightily against particular lusts and products of the old man and to strive to utterly put to death specific manifestations of indwelling sin (Romans 8:13; Colossians 3:5). But do not remove the glory of God in Christ from its central place in your heart and mind. Sweet fellowship with Him causes the vain allurements of sin to quickly fade. Yes, your specific sins are awful, and a terrible problem—fight them with all your might. But make sure that in your warfare you have the Captain of the hosts of the Lord with you—without Him you can do nothing. Closer communion with Christ will end many a seemingly intractable battle with besetting sins.

Also, you should expect God's blessing to the conversion of sinners and the spiritual strengthening of saints when Christ is preached and plainly set forth. Proper preaching of the Lord Jesus will have supernatural efficacy to produce spiritual results, while the employment of humanly devised marketing or salesmanship techniques will only detract from a real focus on the revealed glory of God in the incarnate Redeemer. What is the chaff to the wheat?

Indeed, in the instituted services of the church, the worship of the Triune God through Christ must not be removed from its proper central place. Since God's own instituted worship is the best means of His own revelation, the Regulative Principle of worship must be consistently practiced. What is more, in whatever music is employed, not only must all fleshly sounds be rejected, but even proper melody and harmony must not be allowed to overshadow the spiritual worship of God. *He* must always remain the focus—let not the elements of worship, and especially the circumstances, attract attention to themselves and become ends in themselves.

E. The Body of Sin Is Indeed Destroyed, Not Merely Counteracted

BDAG[675] provides the following definition for the verb *katargeo* (καταργέω), translated *destroy* in Romans 6:6:

> **καταργέω** fut. καταργήσω; 1 aor. κατήργησα; pf. κατήργηκα. Pass.: 1 fut. καταργηθήσομαι; 1 aor. κατηργήθην; pf. κατήργημαι (s. ἀργέω; since Eur., Phoen. 753; Polyb.; POxy 38, 7 [49/50 AD]; PFlor 176, 7; 218, 13; PStras 32, 7; 2 Esdr; TestSol [also PVindobBosw for 18:38]; AscIs 3:31; Just.).
>
> **1. to cause someth. to be unproductive, *use up, exhaust, waste*** of a tree κ. τὴν γῆν Lk 13:7 (cp. ἀργεῖ οὐδὲν ἀλλὰ καρποφορεῖ OdeSol 11:23).
>
> **2. to cause someth. to lose its power or effectiveness, *invalidate, make powerless*** fig. extension of 1 (so, above all, in Paul and the writings dependent on him; cp. Herm. Wr. 13, 7 κατάργησον τ. σώματος τὰς αἰσθήσεις; of the soul of Jesus: κ. τὰ ἐπὶ κολάσεσιν πάθη Iren. 1, 25, 1 [Harv. I 205, 4]) *make ineffective, nullify* τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ *God's fidelity* Ro 3:3. ἐπαγγελίαν Gal 3:17; cp. Ro 4:14; τὰ ὄντα κ. *nullify the things that* (actually) *exist* 1 Cor 1:28. τὸν νόμον *make the law invalid* Eph 2:15; cp. Ro 3:31 (RThompson, ETh 63, '87, 136–48, on alleged rabbinic background; s. also ἵστημι A4). Also in B of the OT cultic ordinances, which have lost their validity for Christians 5:6; 9:4; 16:2.
>
> **3. to cause someth. to come to an end or to be no longer in existence, *abolish, wipe out, set aside*** τὶ *someth.* τὰ τοῦ νηπίου *set aside childish ways* 1 Cor 13:11. Of God or Christ: God will *do away with* both stomach and food 6:13; *bring to an end* πᾶσαν ἀρχήν, ἐξουσίαν, δύναμιν 15:24. τὸν ἄνομον 2 Th 2:8. τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνόμου *put an end to the time of the lawless one* (i.e., the devil) B 15:5. τὸν θάνατον *break the power of death* 2 Ti 1:10; B 5:6; pass. 1 Cor 15:26 (MDahl, The Resurrection of the Body [1 Cor 15], '62, 117–19). τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου *destroy the one who has power over death* Hb 2:14. ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τ. ἁμαρτίας *in order that the sinful body may be done away with* Ro 6:6. In 2 Cor 3:14 the subject may be ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη or, more probably (despite some grammatical considerations), κάλυμμα; in the latter case the mng. is *remove.*—Pass. *cease, pass away* προφητεία, γνῶσις 1 Cor 13:8. τὸ ἐκ μέρους *what is imperfect* vs. 10. ἄρα κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ *the cross has ceased to be an obstacle* Gal 5:11. πᾶς πόλεμος καταργεῖται *every war is brought to an end* IEph 13:2. καταργούμενος *doomed to perish* of the ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου 1 Cor 2:6. Of the radiance on Moses' face 2 Cor 3:7. Subst. τὸ καταργούμενον *what is transitory* vss. 11, 13.
>
> **4. to cause the release of someone from an obligation (one has nothing more to do with it), *be discharged, be released.*** In our lit. pass. καταργοῦμαι ἀπό τινος of a woman upon the

675 Danker, Frederick William (ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd. ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

death of her husband κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός Ro 7:2. Of Christians κ. ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου *be released fr. the law* vs. 6. Of those who aspire to righteousness through the law κ. ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ *be estranged from Christ* Gal 5:4.—Frisk s.v. 2 ἀργός; also DELG s.v. ἔργον. M-M. EDNT. TW.

The lexicon places Romans 6:6 in category 3, "to cause something to come to an end or to be no longer in existence, *abolish, wipe out, set aside*," specifically translating the portion of Romans 6:6 in question[676] as "in order that the sinful body may be done away with." This is also the category of *katargeo* in the verse with the syntax that is closest to Romans 6:6 in the NT, namely, Hebrews 2:14: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil."[677] In both Romans 6:6 and Hebrews 2:14, the verb *katargeo* is an aorist subjunctive[678] within a subordinate *hina* clause that gives the Divine purpose (which brings a certain result) of the main clause. The certain result of cocrucifixion with Christ is the destruction of the body of sin, Romans 6:6; the certain result of the incarnation and death of Christ is the destruction of the devil, Hebrews 2:14. The similar syntax of *katargeo* in the aorist subjunctive within a *hina* clause in 1 Corinthians 1:28[679] also means much more than simply "counteract," as does the final instance of the word in the aorist subjunctive in 1 Corinthians 15:24.[680]

Indeed, all four of the definitions for *katargeo* (καταργέω) given by BDAG, each of which is certainly countenanced in the New Testament, mean more than simply "counteract." None of them can reduce Romans 6:6 to simply "that the body of sin might be counteracted." Definition #1, which is only used in the New Testament for a tree that makes ground unproductive, is not especially relevant to Romans 6:6. If one wanted to affirm that Romans 6:6 is an instance of definition #2 of *katargeo,* a restriction of the verse to "counteraction" does not fit; the body of sin "lose[s] its power or effectiveness,

---

676 ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

677 ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι τὸν διάβολον.

678 However, the verb in Hebrews 2:14 is in the active voice, while in Romans 6:6 the verb is in the passive voice.

679 And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, *yea*, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: καὶ τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός, καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ·

680 Then *cometh* the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν.

[is] invalidate[d] [and made] powerless" by its destruction from cocrucifixion. Advocates of the view that the strength and power of the flesh within believers is entirely unchanged through the course of one's life, and is thus equally powerful and living years and decades after regeneration as it is a minute after conversion, do not believe that there is any loss of power or effectiveness in the flesh at any point in one's Christian life. The "counteraction" view does not fit BDAG definition #2; something that is invalidated and made powerless has much more done to it than a simple counteraction, and a translation of *katargeo* as "invalidated" in the verse comes out to mean something very similar to "destroyed." The "religious sense [of *katargeo*], which is almost exclusive to Paul . . . means . . . 'to make completely inoperative' or 'to put out of use.'"[681] Such a meaning signifies far more than counteraction. If the flesh grows powerless and ineffective over the believer (not that the flesh itself gets better, Romans 7:18, but that it has less power) as it is gradually mortified and weakened until, at the moment of Christ's return or the believer's death, it is entirely destroyed, the significance of *katargeo* in Romans 6:6 comes out to mean just about the same thing whether one assigns it to definition #2 of BDAG or keeps the verse in #3, where the authors of the lexicon place it. Finally, if one affirmed Romans 6:6 is an instance of definition #4 (although that definition fits the verse poorly), it would not assist the advocates of simple counteraction. Advocates of "counteraction" in Romans 6:6[682] believe that the Christian can instantly return to life under the power of the flesh and of sin when he ceases to maintain the moment-by-moment faith decision that counteracts the flesh and keeps him in the realm of freedom from acts of sin, and then instantly return again to life under the power of Christ when he restores a moment-by-moment faith decision to counteract the flesh. (It should be noted that there are significant elements of truth here, in that one receives supplies of grace to mortify sin by faith in Christ, by looking to Him for that grace and strength, and that there is indeed a very clear Biblical distinction between one who is deliberately clinging to known sin and one who is seeking for and looking to Christ for deliverance from all sin, who has an evangelical sincerity—cf. 1 Corinthians 11:27-29.[683] However, there is

---

681 *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Bromily, καταργέω.

682 *Counteraction* in Romans 6:6 is especially the position of the Keswick theology; see "Excursus VIII: An Analysis of Keswick Theology as Set Forth In *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention,* by Steven Barabas," below.

683 "Every Christian, then, has a 'pure' heart [cf. Matthew 5:8]. But every Christian does not have a 'clean' heart (Psalm 51:10). That which pollutes the heart of a Christian is *unjudged sin*. Whenever sin is *allowed* by us, communion with God is broken, and pollution can only be removed, and communion restored, by genuine repentance—a condemning of ourselves, a mourning over the sin, and unsparing confession of the same, accompanied by a fervent desire and sincere resolution not to be overtaken by it again. The willing allowance and indulgence of any known sin cannot exist with a clean heart. . . . By

more to sanctification than this alone—one who is in a state of being right with God, who is evangelically sincere, also experiences progressive deliverance from the power of sin and progressive renewal into the image of Christ.) Definition #4 is employed for a woman who is separated from her husband on account of his death, and compared to the freedom of the Christian from the law (Romans 7:2, 6). A woman whose husband has died can never go back to her dead husband and resume the marital relationship. A believer is eternally secure and can never again be condemned by the law. The relation between a Christian and condemnation, and a widow and her dead husband, is not simply a "counteraction" of their connection so that the believer can again be lost or the widow can be remarried to her dead spouse. This idea simply does not fit the use of the word. There is no flip-flopping in Romans 6:6 from one category of believer who experiences *katargeo* of the flesh and another category of believer that does not experience *katargeo* for his flesh. (This is not to say, however, that a believer cannot have times when he is holding on to some sin and thus is losing ground spiritually and hindering the work of the Spirit to renew him into the image of Christ, and so is giving the flesh room for greater power as it lusts against the Spirit for dominance, Galatians 5:17. He can face setbacks where he allows sin to reign in more of his mortal body than it was when he was consciously surrendered to God in all areas, Romans 6:12.) Nor does Romans 6:6 give the least hint that the destruction of the sinful body or the freedom from service to sin is a sort of higher Christian life only attained by certain believers at certain times. The verse states a truth about all the saints, about all who died with Christ on the cross and become experientially cocrucified with Him in regeneration. Romans 6 is an explanation of why believers *will not* live in sin, rather than being only an explanation of how believers *may not* live in sin (although it does explain this as well, especially in connection with chapters 7-8). Thus, none of the definitions for *katargeo* in BDAG can be reduced to a mere counteraction of the flesh.

It is not surprising that, since none of the four definitions of *katargeo* listed in BDAG fit the idea that there is a mere counteraction of an unchanged, unweakened fleshly principle in Romans 6:6, an examination of all the verses in the N. T. with the verb provides not a single clear instance where such a "counteraction" idea, rather than

---

regeneration we have received a "pure heart:" proof of which is, we hate all impurity, although there is still that in us which delights in nothing else. We are to maintain communion with God by cleansing our own hearts (Psalm 73:13), and that, through constant mortification, and the daily and unsparing judgment of all known sin in and from us." (pgs. 54-55, *Doctrine of Sanctification,* chap. 7, Elec. acc. AGES Digital Library, Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Rio, WI: 2006)

one of the categories of use listed in BDAG, is required by the inspired text.[684] On the other hand, large numbers of verses clearly testify to a sense of "destroy" for the verb.[685] Similarly to BDAG, the Louw-Nida Greek lexicon[686] does not include "counteract" among its definitions for *katargeo*, while "to cause to cease to exist . . . to cause to come to an end, to cause to become nothing, to put an end to" is listed. Thayer's lexicon[687] is similar, prominently including the "destroy" idea but not listing "counteract" as a definition. The Liddell-Scott lexicon,[688] representing the classical Greek background, classifies Romans 6:6 as "to be abolished, cease" and does not list "counteract" as a definition of the verb.[689] In "the LXX . . . [the verb] occurs only . . . with the meaning 'to destroy,'"[690] and in the earliest documents of Christiandom after the completion of the New Testament, the apostolic patristics, the verb likewise only signifies "to destroy."[691]

---

684 The complete list of references is Luke 13:7; Romans 3:3, 31; 4:14; 6:6; 7:2, 6; 1 Corinthians 1:28; 2:6; 6:13; 13:8, 10-11; 15:24, 26; 2 Corinthians 3:7, 11, 13-14; Galatians 3:17; 5:4, 11; Ephesians 2:15; 2 Thessalonians 2:8; 2 Timothy 1:10; Hebrews 2:14.

685 Such as 1 Corinthians 6:13; 2 Thessalonians 3:8; Hebrews 2:14; etc.

686 *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, Johannes P. Louw & Eugene A. Nida, ed.

687 *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, by Henry Thayer. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978 (reprint ed.).

688 *Greek-English Lexicon, 9th ed.,* H. G. Liddell & R. Scott. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996.

689 Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* does, however, have "counteract" among its definitions of καταργέω. The earliest listed example comes from the writings of Origen, and no examples are listed where the verb is passive, as it is in Romans 6:6. The fact that the classical Greek and Koiné Greek lexica mentioned do not define the word as *counteract* does not mean that this idea is absolutely impossible to derive from any of the definitions that are listed, but *destroy,* a clearly live definition with very close syntactical parallel in the New Testament, must be heavily preferred to *counteract* in Romans 6:6 unless very strong evidence requires it to be abandoned in favor of *counteract*. Such evidence is not forthcoming, and therefore the translation of the Authorized Version must be deemed correct.

690 *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Bromily, καταργέω. The four uses of the verb in the LXX all relate to causing the rebuilding of Jerusalem to cease (Ezra 4:21, 23; 5:5) or to leaving alone the men who were doing the rebuilding (6:8).

691 Note:

Eph. 13:2 οὐδέν ἐστιν ἄμεινον εἰρήνης, ἐν ᾗ πᾶς πόλεμος καταργεῖται ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων. There is nothing better than peace, by which all warfare among those in heaven and those on earth is abolished.

Barn. 2:6 ταῦτα οὖν κατήργησεν, ἵνα ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὤν, μὴ ἀνθρωποποίητον ἔχῃ τὴν προσφοράν. Therefore he has abolished these things, in order that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is free from the yoke of compulsion, might have its offering, one not made by man.

Barn. 5:6 οἱ προφῆται, ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν. αὐτὸς δὲ ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι, ὑπέμεινεν, The prophets, receiving grace from him, prophesied about him. But he himself submitted, in order that he might destroy death and demonstrate the reality of the resurrection of the dead, because it was necessary that he be manifested in the flesh.

Barn. 9:4 οὐκοῦν περιέτεμεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἀκοάς, ἵνα ἀκούσαντες λόγον πιστεύσωμεν ἡμεῖς. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ περιτομὴ ἐφ᾽ ᾗ πεποίθασιν κατήργηται, περιτομὴν γὰρ εἴρηκεν οὐ σαρκὸς

F. Gradual Deliverance From The Power Of Sin Is Consistent With the Aorist Subjunctive Of "To Destroy" (*katargeo*) In Romans 6:6

If progressive destruction of the flesh as a result of crucifixion with Christ is indicated in Romans 6:6, one might ask why the verb *to destroy* is an aorist, not a present subjunctive. A number of considerations suggest themselves. First, the ultimate destruction of the sinful flesh in connection with the believer's entry into heaven is appropriately expressed by the aorist subjunctive. Glorification is truly a point action, the work of a moment. Had a present subjunctive of *katargeo* been employed in Romans 6:6, it could convey the idea that the body of sin is continually being destroyed and that there is no point in the future when it is actually utterly abolished. A present subjunctive would at least allow for, if not actually affirm, the continuance of the existence of the sinful flesh in believers in heaven. Cocrucifixion with Christ does not bring only a limited deliverance from sin, but absolute and total conquest over it and its utter destruction in every believer. The aorist, not the present subjunctive is the tense to use to express this idea.

One also notes that Romans 6:6 states "that henceforth we should not serve [*douleuein,* δουλεύειν] sin" employs a present, not an aorist, infinitive. Durative or progressive action is the consistent use of the present infinitive of *douleuo* (δουλεύω) in the New Testament (Matthew 6:24; Luke 16:13; Romans 6:6; 7:6; Galatians 4:9; 1

γενηθῆναι. ἀλλὰ παρέβησαν, ὅτι ἄγγελος πονηρὸς ἐσόφιζεν αὐτούς. In short, he circumcised our ears in order that when we hear the word we might believe. But the circumcision in which they have trusted has been abolished, for he declared that circumcision was not a matter of the flesh. But they disobeyed, because an evil angel "enlightened" them.

Barn. 15:5 καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ. τοῦτο λέγει· ὅταν ἐλθὼν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καταργήσει τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνόμου καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀλλάξει τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας, τότε καλῶς καταπαύσεται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ. "And he rested on the seventh day." This means: when his son comes, he will destroy the time of the lawless one and will judge the ungodly and will change the sun and the moon and the stars, and then he will truly rest on the seventh day.

Barn. 16:2 σχεδὸν γὰρ ὡς τὰ ἔθνη ἀφιέρωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ. ἀλλὰ πῶς λέγει κύριος καταργῶν αὐτόν; μάθετε· Τίς ἐμέτρησεν τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ, ἢ τὴν γῆν δρακί; οὐκ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος; ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, ἡ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου· ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι, ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου; ἐγνώκατε ὅτι ματαία ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτῶν. For they, almost like the heathen, consecrated him by means of the Temple. But what does the Lord say in abolishing it? Learn! "Who measured heaven with the span of his hand, or the earth with his palm? Was it not I, says the Lord? Heaven is my throne, and the earth is a footstool for my feet. What kind of house will you build for me, or what place for me to rest?" You now know that their hope was in vain.

Justin Martyr speaks of Christians exorcizing demons, καταργοῦντες καὶ ἐκδιώκοντες τοὺς κατέχοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δαίμονας (*Apology* 2:6), and of the end of circumcision, since τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς ἐκείνης κατήργηται, καὶ αἵματι σωτηρίῳ πεπιστεύκαμεν (*Trypho,* 24).

Thessalonians 1:9). From the moment of regeneration on through eternity future, the believer is permanently and continually freed from bondage to and the service of sin. While there is undoubtedly a very dramatic change in the fullness of the saint's service of God at glorification, his freedom from the slavery to and service of sin is a continual action that begins at the moment of his conversion and continues from that time onward without interruption. While this freedom from the service to sin is appropriately expressed with a Greek present tense, a continuing action of the same nature is not an appropriate way to express the destruction of the sinful flesh in the saint. That fruit of cocrucifixion is completed in a particular instant. There are no remnants of sin left in the believer to destroy from the time he enters glory to all eternity to come. A present subjunctive of *katargeo* would not fit the sense of Romans 6:6 as well as an aorist.

The aorist of *katargeo* does not eliminate the fact of the progressive weakening of the cocrucified body of sin during the believer's lifetime. The common category of the constative aorist "treats the act [of the verb in question] as a single whole entirely irrespective of the parts or time involved. If the act is a point in itself, well and good. But the aorist can be used also of an act which is not a point."[692] While a constative aorist does not eliminate the possibility of progressive destruction of the body of sin in this life culminated at glorification, an even better view takes the aorist of *katargeo* in Romans 6:6 as effective,[693] so that the aorist emphasizes the completion of the action of destruction without eliminating the possibility of a progressive beginning.[694]

The emphasis the aorist subjunctive places upon the final completion of the destruction of the sinful flesh at glorification in the *hina* clause of Romans 6:6 does not eliminate the progressive mortification and weakening of the body of sin because of cocrucifixion any more than the aorist subjunctive verb "sanctify" and its dependent aorist participle "cleanse" in the *hina* clause of Ephesians 5:26 eliminates the fact that Christ progressively sanctifies and washes the church by the Word as it is preached, taught, and received until the expected day when He completes the work at His coming and "present[s] . . . to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such

---

692 Pg. 833, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research,* A. T. Robertson. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934. Compare John 2:20, where an aorist represents the durative action of spending 46 years building the temple.

693 The . . . Consummative (Culminative, Ecbatic, Effective) Aorist . . . is often used to stress the cessation of an act or state. Certain verbs, by their *lexical* nature, virtually require this usage. . . . The context also assists in this usage at times; it may imply that an act was already in progress and the aorist then brings the action to a conclusion. (pg. 559, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics,* Daniel Wallace).

694 Compare Luke 19:42, ἐκρύβη; Acts 12:25, πληρώσαντες; Acts 27:43, ἐκώλυσεν; Philippians 4:11, ἔμαθον.

thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Ephesians 5:27).[695] A good case could be made that Hebrews 2:14 contains an effective aorist verb, just like Romans 6:6 and Ephesians 5:25-27. The use of *katargeo* in Hebrews 2:14 is, as noted earlier, syntactically very similar to Romans 6:6—the ultimate destruction of the devil in the lake of fire is assured by the death of Christ, but the fact that the Lord Jesus, through the conversion of sinners, starting of churches, and even Satan's Millennial binding (Revelation 20:1-3) achieves many partial victories that forecast Satan's ultimate demise is not eliminated because of the aorist in Hebrews 2:14. One can also note that the aorist subjunctive of *katargeo* in 1 Corinthians 15:24 is employed for the action of Christ of progressively putting down all His enemies, until He finally destroys the last enemy, death (15:24-26). Indeed, the parallel between Christ progressively defeating all His enemies until they are finally destroyed in 1 Corinthians 15:24-26 is very close to the progressive defeat and ultimate destruction of sin in the life of the believer in Romans 6:6. Comparable examples of *katargeo* and related texts about sanctification in the New Testament thus provide excellent support for taking the destruction of the body of sin in Romans 6:6 as a gradual process during life that culminates in sin's final defeat at the believer's glorification, employing an effective aorist.

Furthermore, the present subjunctive of *katargeo* is not found anywhere in the New Testament—all instances of the subjunctive are in the aorist (Romans 6:6; 1 Corinthians 1:28; 15:24; Hebrews 2:14). Nor are there any instances of the verb in the present subjunctive in the apostolic patristic writers.[696] The present subjunctive of the verb may not have been much of a live option at all.

Thus, employing the aorist subjunctive of *katargeo* in Romans 6:6 to state that "that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin" does not by any means negate the gradual weakening of the power of the flesh in progressive sanctification, while it emphasizes the ultimate destruction of sin in the believer at glorification. The connection with the present infinitive of "serve," a comparison with the aorist subjunctive in connection with sanctification in Ephesians 5:25-27, the categorization of the aorist in both Romans 6:6 and in Hebrews 2:14 as effective, the comparison to Christ's progressively dominant reign in 1 Corinthians 15:24-26, and the

---

695 Note the complete sentence in v. 25-27: οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς· ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ, καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι, ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον ἢ ῥυτίδα ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος.

696 The aorist subjunctive is found, however (Epistle of Barnabas 5:6). The subjunctive of καταργέω is not found in the LXX at all. Nor does the verb appear in Josephus, Philo, the Pseudepigrapha, or the Apocryphal Gospels.

nonexistence of the present subjunctive of *katargeo* in the New Testament and related *Koiné* literature all validate the appropriateness of the aorist. Indeed, a present subjunctive for the verb would be inappropriate, as it would suggest that even in heaven sin is not ultimately destroyed, but only progressively weakened. The aorist subjunctive in the purpose clause of Romans 6:6 is the appropriate tense to express the gradual mortification of sin and its ultimate utter abolition in glory that is the certain result of the believer's cocrucifixion with the Lord Jesus Christ in regeneration.

G. How Does God Make Believers More Holy in Progressive Sanctification?

As proven in the earlier portions of this composition, in regeneration, God supernaturally changes the predominant inclination of the believer from unholiness and rebellion to obedience. The one who has been born of God no longer is unable to do spiritual good or follow after God (Romans 3:11; John 6:44, 65; Jeremiah 13:23), nor is he enslaved to fleshly lusts. His entire person—mind, affections, spirit, soul, body, will, and heart—all of his being is made new in regeneration and then progressively renewed into the image of Christ by sanctification. His spiritual portion is given a new inclination towards holiness, and a knowledge and understanding of God, both of which were absent before his regeneration, and his body becomes the temple of the Holy Spirit. In progressive sanctification, by the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit, the influence of indwelling sin is gradually weakened, and the new nature of the saint strengthened. Progressive sanctification is the continuation and strengthening of the new principles imparted at regeneration, a process completed at glorification.[697] In progressive sanctification, the Christian's intellectual and practical knowledge of God increases, as does the strength of the predominant bent of his will, his inclination in his soul, towards holiness. Likewise, the influence of his ethically sinful flesh, of his remaining spiritual tendency towards evil, weakens. As God fills him with holy moral qualities (Romans 15:13), he becomes "full of goodness" (Romans 15:14c), of inward personal holiness, and "filled with all knowledge" (Romans 15:14d), intellectual and experiential knowledge of God and His Word, with the result that he performs holy actions (Romans 15:14e). This inward progressive transformation, performed by the supernatural power

697 "[S]anctification is wrought by the Spirit of God. As he regenerates the soul by imparting to it a holy disposition, so he carries on the work thus begun by increasing the power of that disposition, and subduing the evil tendencies which oppose it. Hence love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance, are said to be the fruit of the Spirit. Hence also it is said that the Spirit is opposed to the flesh, and the flesh to the Spirit" (pg. 12, *The Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared with the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, by Alvah Hovey).

of the Spirit of God, leads to his performance of holy actions. His body also becomes more holy as he more and more separates himself from all that defiles it. When he is glorified, his inclination towards holiness becomes absolute and fixed, indwelling sin is utterly extirpated, he enters into full knowledge of God, and he receives a perfectly holy glorified body. He becomes entirely holy, body, soul, and spirit, and fit to the absolute limit of his created capacity for fellowship with and the knowledge and service of his Triune God, as the moral image of Christ is made perfect in him.

The changes within the believer in regeneration, sanctification, and glorification are not physical in the sense that anything in the substance of a believer's humanity changes. An unregenerate man possesses the same human nature as a regenerate man. Birds, fish, and mammals on the redeemed Millennial earth will still be members of the same created kinds, possessing the same animal substance, with their progenitors in the current world-system. A less holy Christian possesses the same type of body, soul, and spirit as a more holy one, and in the New Jerusalem the saints will still be truly and genuinely human, even as their incarnate Savior possesses a true and complete human nature, redeeming, as the second Adam, the full humanity that He assumed in the incarnation. Thus, there is no alteration in the believer's substance in progressive sanctification. Mortification does not eliminate any constituent element of his humanity, nor does vivification impart any new physical element.

Regeneration and progressive sanctification begin and continue an ethical change, not a physical one, within the Christian.[698] The new nature imparted to the believer in regeneration is not a change of the substance of his humanity, but a new inclination, a change in the bent of the faculties of his soul and spirit. He comes to possess knowledge of God and the ability and desire to love, commune with, and obey Him. The development and growth of this new nature to maturity (cf. 1 John 2:12-14; Ephesians 4:13) is a spiritual and ethical development, not a physical and substantial one. When Scripture speaks of the *flesh* as the controlling power in the unregenerate and as a sinful element in the Christian, reference is not made to the human body as such, but to an ethical and immaterial inclination towards evil that reigns in the children of the devil and continues to afflict God's children in their earthly pilgrimage, although it is dethroned. In progressive sanctification, mortification does not not eliminate elements of the human substance, nor does vivification add new physical constituents; rather, the spiritual and ethical revolution that reversed the believer's ultimate allegiance from sin to holiness is

---

[698] Of course, there is a real change in the believer's body when it becomes incorruptible in the resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:42). This obvious fact is not being denied or argued against.

strengthened. Thus, speaking substantially, progressive sanctification does not involve either the weakening or eradication of any elements of human nature, but speaking ethically, progressive sanctification involves the weaking and progressive eradication of the flesh and the growth and development of the new holy nature imparted at the moment of the new birth, an ethical alteration that will be completed only at glorification with the full restoration of moral likeness to Christ.[699]

III. The Certainty of Practical Sanctification For All The Regenerate

A. Scripture Clearly Teaches That All Saved People Will Be Changed

Scripture teaches that all who have been regenerated, and are consequently crucified with Christ, will be practically sanctified. There is no such thing as a justified man who is totally unchanged[700]—indeed, there is no such thing as a believer who does

---

699 Thus, the word *nature* conveys a different idea when one speaks of the Christian possessing human *nature* (cf. Galatians 2:15) and when the Christian is said to partake of the divine *nature* (2 Peter 1:4). In sanctification, believers do not become gods, nor are they added to the Trinity, nor do they gain incommunicable attributes of the Divine substance, such as omnipotence, omnipresence, or omniscience. Their human nature or substance is in that sense unchanged. However, they do participate in ethical renovation and participate in the Divine nature in that they grow to become holy, loving, truthful, faithful, and righteous. William G. T. Shedd, explaining the meaning of *nature* in language such as *sin nature* and *new nature*, aptly wrote:

> When the term "nature" is applied to sin, it does not denote "nature" in the primary but the secondary sense. In the primary sense, "nature" denotes a substance, and one that is created by God. In this sense, Augustine denies that sin is "nature," and asserts that it is "intentio." . . . Howe (Oracles, II. xxiv.) remarks that "that evil heart, that nature, not as it is nature but as it is depraved nature, is now transmitted [from parents to children]." When "nature" signifies created substance, it is improper to call sin a nature. Aristotle (Politics, I. ii.) says: "What every being is in its *perfect* state, that certainly is the nature of that being, whether it be a man, a horse, or a house." Sin is imperfection, and therefore not "nature" in this sense. But there is a secondary meaning of the word. In this use of it, "nature" denotes "natural inclination," or "innate disposition." In this sense, sin is a "nature," and the adjective "natural" is applicable to the corruption of sin. In the same sense, holiness is called a nature in 2 Peter 1:4. Believers are "partakers of a divine nature," by being regenerated and coming to possess a holy disposition or inclination. "It is true that sin is a nature, but then it is a second nature, a state of degeneration." Nitzsch Christian Doctrine, § 107. . . . Since God is the author of nature, how comes it that no blame attaches to God if we are lost by nature? I answer, there is a twofold nature: The one [is] produced by God, and the other is [a] corruption of it. We are not born such as Adam was at first created. (pgs. 20-21, Chapter 5, "Original Sin," in *Dogmatic Theology: Anthropology,* William G. T. Shedd.)

One could consider the distinction between the unchanging character of *human nature* and the progressive development of the *divine nature* in progressive sanctification as a difference between *substance* and *properties*—the human substance remains unchanged, while properties such as holiness and purity develop. "Substances have properties that are 'in' them; properties are had by substances that possess them. . . . A substance . . . is a deep unity of properties, parts, and capacities. . . . Properties adhere together in substances . . . because they all . . . inhere in . . . the same substance that stands under them. . . . A substance regularly loses old parts, properties and lower-order capacities and gains new ones. But the substance itself underlies this change and remains the same throughout it" (pgs. 215-217, *Philosophical Foundations For A Christian Worldview,* J. P. Moreland & William Lane Craig).

700 "Works can be considered in three ways: either with reference to justification or sanctification or glorification. They are related to justification not antecedently, efficiently, and meritoriously, but consequently and declaratively. They are related to sanctification constitutively because they constitute and

not have a supernatural, evident change (Matthew 13:8; Mark 4:8, 20).[701] A few of the many texts that prove this esssential Biblical doctrine will be examined.[702]

1 Corinthiains 6:9-11 and Galatians 5:18-24 teach that true believers will not be fornicators, idolators, adulterers, sodomites, thieves, and so on, because they have a new nature, being now "washed . . . sanctified [and] . . . justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Corinthians 6:11). The "unrighteous" (ἄδικος) of 6:11, who will be excluded from God's kingdom, is the "unjust" (ἄδικος) of 6:1, the one who is not a brother but an unbeliever (6:6). Indeed, Scripture regularly contrasts the believer and the unbeliever as "the just and the unjust" (δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδικῶν, Acts 24:15; cf. Matthew 5:45; 2 Peter 2:9), but the regenerate are never called "unrighteous" in the Bible.[703] All believers are, in contrast, not the "unrighteous" (ἄδικος, v. 9) but those God views as righteous (δικαιόω, v. 11) because of their justification and sanctification. A contrast is not made between backslidden believers and obedient believers in v. 9-11, but between the people of God and the children of the devil. Similarly, Galatians 5:18-21 contrasts the believers in the church at Galatia ("ye/you," 5:18, 21) with the unsaved ("they," v. 21). Those who receive condemnation in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10; Galatians 5:18-24 are not backslidden believers, but the unregenerate.

When the Bible affirms that "they which do such things [οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες, those who practice such sins as the dominant characteristic of their lives] shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Galatians 5:21), it is impossible to interpret the warning that those who practice such sins "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Corinthians 6:11; Galatians 5:21) as merely a loss of reward for those who actually end up in heaven anyway. None of the 18 references to the verb *inherit* (κληρονομέω) in the New Testament distinguish between a higher class of believers that inherit the kingdom

---

promote it. They are related to glorification antededently and ordinatively beause they are related to it as the means to the end; yea, as the beginning to the complement because grace is glory begun, as glory is grace consummated. . . . [W]e do not on this account confound the law and the gospel and interfere with gratuitous justification by faith alone. Good works are required not for living according to the law, but because we live by the gospel; not as the causes on account of which life is given to us, but as effects which testify that life has been given to us" (pg. 705, Topic 17, Question 3:14, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, Francis Turretin)

701 A harvest that is "an hundredfold . . . sixtyfold . . . [or] thirtyfold" indicates different levels of Christian growth in believers, but even a "thirtyfold" spiritual harvest would be a very visible and notable production because of the sanctifying work of the Lord (cf. Genesis 26:12). Likewise, those who stop fornicating, stealing, committing idolatry, and so on, because they have been born again, manifest outwardly their inward renewal. Regeneration is not something that can remain entirely internal and hidden—it will show up in one's outward practices.

702 Note also "Excursus VII: Are All Believers Disciples?"

703 The complete list of references employing ἄδικος is: Matthew 5:45; Luke 16:10–11; 18:11; Acts 24:15; Romans 3:5; 1 Corinthians 6:1, 9; Hebrews 6:10; 1 Peter 3:18; 2 Peter 2:9.

and a lower class that somehow are saved but do not have an inheritance (Matthew 5:5; 19:29; 25:34; Mark 10:17; Luke 10:25; 18:18; 1 Corinthians 6:9-10; 15:50; Galatians 4:30; 5:21; Hebrews 1:4, 14; 6:12; 12:17; 1 Peter 3:9; Revelation 21:7); rather, the overwhelming contrast is between those who are saved, and thus "inherit everlasting life" (Matthew 19:29), "inherit the kingdom" (Matthew 25:34), "inherit the [Millennial] earth" (Matthew 5:5), "inherit eternal life" (Mark 10:17), "inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Corinthians 6:9-10; Galatians 5:21), and "inherit all things" (Revelation 21:7), and the lost who do not inherit eternal life.

Similarly, the related noun *inheritance* (κληρονομία) is regularly used to contrast what all saved people receive and all usaved people do not. Ephesians indicates that all who have the indwelling Spirit have the inheritance (1:13-14), all the predestinated have the inheritance (1:11; cf. 1:18), but "no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God" (5:5), for all such are "the children of disobedience" under the "wrath of God" (5:6; cf. 2:1-3) who have not been brought into union with Christ by faith and inwardly changed (2:4-10) and made into "children of light" (5:8). All those who have been "begotten . . . again" have an "inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven" (1 Peter 1:3-4). While the noun *inheritance* is sometimes used for the physical passing on of property to heirs by those who have deceased (cf. Luke 12:13), the noun, like the verb to which it is related, never contrasts a higher class of saved people from a lower class of those who are saved but have no inheritance (Matthew 21:38; Mark 12:7; Luke 12:13; 20:14; Acts 7:5; 20:32; Galatians 3:18; Ephesians 1:14, 18; 5:5; Colossians 3:24; Hebrews 9:15; 11:8; 1 Peter 1:4).

Furthermore, not one of the seventy-two verses in the New Testament that employ the phrase *kingdom of God* indicate that some saved people will be in the kingdom and others who are saved will somehow not enter the kingdom (Matthew 6:33; 12:28; 19:24; 21:31, 43; Mark 1:14-15; 4:11, 26, 30; 9:1, 47; 10:14-15, 23-25; 12:34; 14:25; 15:43; Luke 4:43; 6:20; 7:28; 8:1, 10; 9:2, 11, 27, 60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:20; 12:31; 13:18, 20, 28-29; 14:15; 16:16; 17:20-21; 18:16-17, 24-25, 29; 19:11; 21:31; 22:16, 18; 23:51; John 3:3, 5; Acts 1:3; 8:12; 14:22; 19:8; 20:25; 28:23, 31; Romans 14:17; 1 Corinthians 4:20; 6:9-10; 15:50; Galatians 5:21; Ephesians 5:5; Colossians 4:11; 1 Thessalonians 2:12; 2 Thessalonians 1:5; Revelation 12:10). While there certainly are phases of the kingdom, from its current spiritual form (Romans 14:17) to its future Millennial and eternal aspects (Revelation 12:10), all the lost are outside of the current spiritual form of the kingdom and will be excluded from its Millennial and eternal phases, and no saved person is outside of the present spiritual kingdom, nor will any of the saved be excluded from the

coming Millennial and eternal aspects of the kingdom. The contrast in Scripture is consistently between those who "enter into the kingdom of God" and those who are "cast into hell fire" (Mark 9:47) without any third category of saved people who do not enter the kingdom.

Sound exegesis makes it obvious that 1 Corinthians 6:9-11 and Galatians 5:18-24 teach, as do many other passages (Ephesians 5:5; 1 John 3:3-10; Revelation 21:8, 27; etc.) that no saved person, because he has received a new nature in regeneration, will be dominated by and continually practice sins such as fornication, theft, or idolatry. Since Scripture states, "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Corinthians 6:9-10), someone who states that believers can be fornicators, idolators, drunkards, extortioners, and so on, is teaching exactly the opposite of what God has declared in His Word. Such a person has been deceived, and should heed the Scripture: "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience" (Ephesians 5:5-6).

Many further passages of Scripture likewise teach the impossibility of a believer living just like an unconverted person. Just as, because of the dominant sin principle in him, it is impossible for an unbeliever to truly do good works, so it is equally impossible for a believer to be dominated by ungodly works, because of the dominant Divine principle of grace (Matthew 7:18-19), and thus the fact that everyone who does not do good works will be damned (Matthew 7:19) does not in any wise undermine eternal security. Christ's promise is that "A good tree <u>cannot</u> bring forth evil fruit" (Matthew 7:18). One notes that the parallel passages make it very clear that good works, not simply orthodox doctrine, is intended by good fruit (Matthew 3:8-10; Luke 6:43-48; Matthew 7:26-27—although orthodox doctrine is included within the larger category of good works).

The New Testament or Covenant (Hebrews 8:8-12; 9:15; 1 Corinthians 11:25; Jeremiah 31:31-34) involves God's promises of certain obedience: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do *them*" (Ezekiel 36:26-27). Scripture is very clear that people who are dominated by sin will not enter the kingdom of God because they have never been saved.

John 15:1-11 teaches that the one who does not, as a summary of his life, continue (note the aorist tense in 15:6 for *meno*) faithful to Christ is, as a branch without genuine connection to the Lord, and one consequently with only an outward profession of Christianity, cast into hell fire, where he will be continually burned (present tense, 15:6) for all eternity. The image of John 15:6 is not one of loss of reward for a believer who never brings forth any fruit. Other than John 15:6, the verbs "cast forth" (*ballo*) and "burned" (*kaio*) are found together only in Revelation 8:8; 19:20. Neither reference speaks of believers being cast forth or burned. Revelation 19:20 (cf. 20:11-15; 21:8, "the lake which burneth (*kaio*) with fire and brimstone"), however, demonstrates that the lost will be "cast (*ballo*) . . . into a lake of fire burning (*kaio*) with brimstone." Furthermore, out of 125 instances of the verb "cast forth" (*ballo*) in the New Testament, believers are never once said to be cast forth by God, but the lost are, over and over again, said to be cast (*ballo*) into the fires of hell (note Matthew 3:10; 5:13, 25, 29-30; 7:19; 13:42, 48; 18:8-9; Mark 9:42 (cf. vv. 41-48), 45, 47; Luke 3:9; 12:58; 14:35; Revelation 2:22; 12:4, 9, 13; 14:19; 18:21; 19:20; 20:3, 10, 14-15). Thus, the verse indicates that a total lack of fruit is evidence of a non-living connection to the vine and thus of a unregenerate individual. The present tense of *ballo,* in "cast" them into the fire, refers vividly (cf. the present tenses in Matthew 3:10; 7:19; Luke 3:9; Revelation 2:22) to the unconverted being cast into eternal torment. The judgment of the lost in hell fire is associated with a similar plant and fruit-bearing image to that of Matthew 3:10; 7:19; Luke 3:9. These unregenerate, apostate, "withered" and fruitless branches (cf. Jude 12; Job 8:11-13; James 1:11), of which Judas is the contextual example in John 15, are often "cast forth" (also *ballo,* here aorist, as in Mark 9:45, 47; Revelation 20:15) in a certain sense in this life, through outward apostasy from the church, to which they had been outwardly united (cf. Matthew 13:47), whether voluntarily or through church discipline, but their ultimate rejection and separation from the elect will take place at the day of judgment. At that time the wheat and chaff, the branches truly united to Christ and those only professedly so, will be "gathered" (*sunago,* cf. Matthew 3:12; 13:30; 25:32; Luke 3:17) to their respective destinies of eternal joy and torment. The branches without union to Christ will glorify God's justice in their miserable damnation; they will not glorify God here by good works, but they will glorify His justice by their being burned eternally (Ezekiel 15:2-5; Romans 9:22). Note that Christ, in John 15:6 says "if a man" abide not, rather than "if ye abide not," for, Judas having been separated from them, the remaining disciples were all genuine believers.[704]

---

[704] Note the comprehensive study of John 15:1-11 and the significance of abiding in Christ in light of

Ephesians 2:8-10 states, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." God has ordained that all those justified by grace through faith apart from works will do good works. Good works mark a believer's life (2:10) as evil works mark an unbeliever's life (2:2-3). The certainty of the unconverted living for the devil is the same as the certainty of a believer living for God, although both those who have sin reigning in them and those who have grace reigning in them fulfill their predominant principles in different degrees.[705] The verb translated *ordained* in Ephesians 2:10, *proetoimadzo*, is found elsewhere in the NT only in Romans 9:23, where it refers to God's elective decree of the vessels of mercy to glory.[706] Thus, this verb refers to God's decretive will, which is never frustrated. "The active [voice] is used in our literature [the Bible and early Christian writings] only of God" (BDAG). *Proetimadzo* is not used for God's desire or wish, but for His decretive will, in the New Testament, as it is in the apostolic patristic writings.[707] Note also the common use of *hetoimadzo* for the certain decree of God in the New Testament.[708] Thus, Ephesians 2:10 teaches that God's

---

the other NT uses of the verb *meno* and the Old Testament background to the vine image in the chapter "A Study of the Biblical Doctrine of Abiding in Christ."

[705] Sometimes the fact that believers will certainly do good works is misrepresented as a view that good works are "automatic" for the saints, almost as if God forces them to do good works and their mind, will, and affections are not involved. Evil works are certain for unbelievers (Romans 8:8-9), but their unrenewed mind, will, and affections are certainly involved in their unavoidable sinning. Only if one wishes to call the conscious, deliberate sinning done by all unconverted people "automatic" can one represent the Scriptural teaching that believers, because of the indwelling Spirit and their new nature, are certain to do good works, as a position that good works are "automatic." The truth is that the New Covenant promises: "I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them" (Ezekiel 36:27), but the fact that God causes the regenerate to walk in His statutes does not turn them into puppets without any freedom of the will. "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things" (Matthew 12:35), but the good works of the regenerate, and the evil works of the unregenerate, are still not "automatic."

It is interesting to note that, while sanctification is certainly not "automatic" in the sense described above, Scripture employs the adjective αὐτόματος, from which the English word *automatic* is derived, when describing the development of the reign of God in believers, that is, sanctification (Mark 4:28; cf. Acts 12:10; LXX Leviticus 25:5, 11; Joshua 6:5; 2 Kings 19:29; Job 24:24; Wisdom 17:6). The blessed influences of heaven upon believers leads them to certain spiritual growth in a manner comparable to that by which heavenly blessing leads crops to grow.

[706] Note also the use in the Apocryha in Wisdom 9:8.

[707] See 1 Clement 33:3; 38:3; Ignatius to the Ephesians 9:1; Martyrdom of Polycarp 14:2. The only other use is Shepherd 23:5, where the verb is not in the active voice and God is not the subject of the verb.

[708] Matt. 20:23 And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father.

Matt. 20:23 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε· τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ᾽ οἷς **ἡτοίμασται** ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου.
Matt. 25:34 Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:
Matt. 25:34 τότε ἐρεῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, Δεῦτε, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν **ἡτοιμασμένην** ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.
Matt. 25:41 Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:
Matt. 25:41 τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐωνύμων, Πορεύεσθε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, οἱ κατηραμένοι, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, τὸ **ἡτοιμασμένον** τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.
Mark 10:40 But to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared.
Mark 10:40 τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ᾽ οἷ ς **ἡτοίμασται**.
1Cor. 2:9 But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.
1Cor. 2:9 ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ **ἡτοίμασε** ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.
Heb. 11:16 But now they desire a better *country*, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.
Heb. 11:16 νυνὶ δὲ κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, ἐπουρανίου· διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός, Θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν· **ἡτοίμασε** γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν.
Rev. 9:15 And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men.
Rev. 9:15 καὶ ἐλύθησαν οἱ τέσσαρες ἄγγελοι οἱ **ἡτοιμασμένοι** εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτόν, ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσι τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
Rev. 12:6 And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred *and* threescore days.
Rev. 12:6 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἔχει τόπον **ἡτοιμασμένον** ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ τρέφωσιν αὐτήν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἑξήκοντα.
Rev. 21:2 And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.
Rev. 21:2 καὶ ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης εἶδον τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν, Ἱερουσαλὴμ καινήν, καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, **ἡτοιμασμένην** ὡς νύμφην κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς.

One could argue that in 2 Timothy 2:21 God's wish, rather than His decretive will, is in view:

2Tim. 2:21 If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, *and* prepared unto every good work.
2Tim. 2:21 ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν, ἡγιασμένον, καὶ εὔχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ, εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν **ἡτοιμασμένον**.

Note the similarities between 2 Timothy 2:21 and Ephesiahs 2:10, with the specific mention of preparation for good works. But on the text in Timothy, John Gill (*Commentary*) wrote: "*And prepared unto every good work*; which an unregenerate man is not; he is to every good work reprobate; he is not capable of performing good works; he is not prepared for them, nor ready at them; but a true believer, one that is regenerated, and sanctified by the Spirit of God, he is created in Christ Jesus unto good works; and has in the performing of them right principles, aims, and ends, as well as a supply of grace, by which he is enabled to do them." Thus, the text does not constitute an exception.

The instances above do not exhaust the uses of *hetoimadzo* in the New Testament; the verb is used in other ways that do not refer to the certain decree of God, or, for that matter, to God at all. The complete list of references is: Matthew 3:3; 20:23; 22:4; 25:34, 41; 26:17, 19; Mark 1:3; 10:40; 14:12, 15-16; Luke 1:17, 76; 2:31; 3:4; 9:52; 12:20, 47; 17:8; 22:8-9, 12-13; 23:56-24:1; John 14:2-3; Acts 23:23; 1 Corinthians 2:9; 2 Timothy 2:21; Philemon 1:22; Hebrews 11:16; Revelation 8:6; 9:7, 15; 12:6; 16:12; 19:7; 21:2.

unalterable sovereign decree is that those saved by grace will do good works. There is no such thing as an unchanged believer. Someone who is unchanged does not have saving faith (James 2:14-26).

Christ's High Priestly ministry guarantees that all believers will be sanctified. In John 17, the Lord Jesus prays that all those who have ever believed on Him (John 17:8, 20) will be with Him in heaven for all eternity: "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24). If even one person who ever trusted Christ for salvation were lost, the prayers of the Son of God would be a failure, something that is totally impossible (John 11:42), indeed, something blasphemous and unthinkable. However, Christ not only prays that all believers will be with Him in heaven, but that God the Father would make them all holy through the instrumentality of the Word of God: "Sanctify[709] them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17). Christ's High Priestly ministry would be a failure, and the prayers of God's Beloved Son would be rejected, were one believer to not reach heaven. The same unthinkable consequences would follow were one believer unchanged and left unholy. Christ has prayed that all believers will be sanctified—so all believers are absolutely certain to be sanctified.[710]

Many passages of Scripture teach that all those who are justified will also be progressively sanctified and evidently changed. Some of these texts have been examined here (Matthew 7:18-19; John 15:1-11; 17:17; 1 Corinthians 6:9-11; Galatians 5:18-24; Ephesians 2:8-10; 5:5-6; Hebrews 8:8-12; and Revelation 21:8, 27). The assertion that regenerate people may be dominated by sin and entirely unchanged and fruitless is a rserious false doctrine and, indeed, an assault upon the power and nature of the gospel. Indeed, it is a fundamental misunderstanding of what is involved in justification and regeneration:

---

709 An aorist imperative ἁγίασον. Compare Ephesians 5:25-26 (ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς· ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ, καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι); 1 Thessalonians 5:23 (Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς· καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη); Hebrews 2:11 (ὅ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι, ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες· δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν); Revelation 22:11 (ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι). The believer's sanctification begins at regeneration and continues from that time forward (cf. the perfect tense ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ in John 17:19).

710 While Christ's prayer guarantees that all believers will grow in holiness, the Lord did not pray that they would all grow at the same speed, or to the same extent—all believers "bea[r] fruit, and brin[g] forth," but some do so "an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty" (Matthew 13:23). Not every believer bears "an hundredfold," but likewise none bears no fruit at all—and the lowest number mentioned, "thirty[fold]," is itself a striking harvest, evidence of special Divine influence.

> Corruption is the very penalty of sin from which we are freed in justification; holiness is the very reward which is granted us in justification. It is therefore absurd to suppose that sanctification can fail where justification has taken place. Sanctification is but the execution of the justifying decree. For it to fail would be for the acquitted person not to be released in accordance with his acquittal. . . . "[J]ustifying faith" itself necessarily brings sanctification, because justification necessarily issues in sanctification—as the chains are necessarily knocked off of the limbs of the acquitted man.[711]

On the other hand, the fact that all believers are certain to be sanctified, because of their union with Christ and the omnipotent power of God, is a great motive to the saint to press onward in his spiritual growth. Certainty of success provides him with a tremendous encouragement and incentive in his holy warfare against sin. "Through God we shall do valiantly: for he *it is that* shall tread down our enemies" (Psalm 60:12).

B. 1 John Teaches That All Saved People Are And Will Be Different

The view that only some believers possess the marks mentioned in 1 John was popularized in the late 1980s by the antinomian heretic Zane Hodges,[712] under the

---

[711] Pg. 100, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part Two*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 8, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

[712] The first written representative of this position was Keswick speaker Guy H. King, who put it in print in 1954 in his book *The Fellowship* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott; elec. acc. http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com/NTStudies/FirstGeneralEpistleofJohnbyGuyKing/tabid/196/Default.aspx), after which it was taken up at Dallas Seminary, becoming spread most widely by Zane Hodges; see his *Absolutely Free!* (Dallas, TX: Redención Viva, 1989). As is well known and easily documented, Hodges "contends that saving faith cannot be distinguished from nonsaving faith by its fruits" and that "repentance is in no way necessary to becoming saved" (pgs. 506, 511, *Systematic Theology*, Norman L. Geisler, vol. 3. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 2004). Furthermore, "Hodges rejects the Reformational view of faith as *notitia*, *assensus*, and *fiducia*. Rather, faith is simply believing saving facts about Jesus or taking God at his Word" (pg. 265, *The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation*, Bruce A. Demarest). J. I. Packer wrote, concerning Hodges' novel false gospel: "If ten years ago, you had told me that I would live to see literate evangelicals, some with doctorates and a seminary teaching record, arguing for the reality of an eternal salvation, divinely guaranteed, that may have in it no repentance, no behavioral change, no practical acknowledgment of Christ as Lord of one's life, and no perseverance in faith, I would have told you that you were out of your mind." (*The Theology of the Christian life in J. I. Packer's Thought*, J. D. Payne. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2006). However, Hodges did not stop here; he went on to teach that the lost must only believe someone named "Jesus" guarantees everlasting life by faith alone—belief in the Trinity, in Christ's virgin birth, sinless and holy life, ascension, intercession, second coming, status as the God-man, status as the Son of God, death on the cross, burial, and resurrection, are not neceessary. Hodges' "Jesus" could be a mere man who was a sinner, indeed, a wicked man, who died in a car accident, never to rise again and return, but if one thought that this non-extant "Jesus" would give him eternal life, he would be saved. Hodges explained all this heretical and blasphemous trash in, among a variety of other settings, an article about how to lead people to Christ ("How to Lead People to Christ: Part 1: The Content of Our Message," Zane C. Hodges. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 13:2 (Autumn 2000) 3-12). With such a "Jesus" and such a gospel, it is not surprising that Hodges would deny that those who are regenerate will manifest the marks in 1 John. However, it would be not a little unwise to allow Zane Hodges' devilish false gospel (Galatians 1:8-9) to lead one to an incorrect view of the book that did not exist for the vast majority of church history.

influence of the weakness of Keswick theology on the certainty of the transformation of the regenerate stemming back to Keswick founder Hannah W. Smith.[713]

C. Excursus I: Does Colossians 2:6 Teach Sanctification by Faith Alone?

A variety of writers and speakers on sanctification[714] have affirmed that Colossians 2:6[715] establishes that the Christian serves the Lord in the same manner as that

---

713 Thus, for example, Hannah Smith preached at the Oxford Convention that assent to the statements of "believe" texts in Scripture "settles the question" of personal assurance—the transformed life 1 John indicates is key to assurance is not mentioned (pgs. 159-160, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). This error was passed on to many in the Keswick movement, eventually flowering in people who were willing to actually deny, and defend their denial of the plain teaching of 1 John, in Guy King and Zane Hodges.

714 For example, William Boardman wrote:

> [K]eep always the very attitude taken when Jesus was accepted. 'As ye have *received* the Lord Jesus Christ, so walk ye in him—rooted and grounded in him,' saith the apostle. . . . Even so abide. So walk ye in him. . . . The command is . . . even as ye *received* Christ Jesus, so walk in HIM.' . . . by faith . . . [not] blind struggles to gain the goal by works. . . . [W]hat shall we tell the young convert about the higher life? . . . Tell him simply to abide in Jesus. As he has received him, so to walk in him. (pgs. 309-310, 329, *The Higher Christian Life,* Boardman)

Likewise, Hannah Whitall Smith wrote:

> Christians . . . know that the forgiveness of sins through Jesus might have been preached to them forever, but it would never have become theirs consciously until they believed this preaching, and claimed the forgiveness as their own. But when it comes to living the Christian life, they lose sight of this principle, and think that, having been saved by faith, they are now to live by works and efforts; and instead of continuing to receive, they are now to begin to do. . . . And yet it is plainly declared, that "as we have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so we are to walk in Him." We received Him by faith, and by faith alone; therefore we are to walk in Him by faith, and by faith alone. . . . [The Christian has] nothing to do but lie passive in the potter's hands. (*The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life,* Hannah Whitall Smith, Chapter 4, "How To Enter In," & Chapter 1, "Introductory: God's Side and Man's Side.")

Similarly, she preached: "You received Christ by faith at first, how have you walked in Him—by faith or by effort? . . . *As* you have received Him, *so* you are to walk in Him by faith also" (pgs. 68-69, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Italics in original.). When the Christian "lie[s] passive in His hands," then "He saves me fully" (Journal, April 25, 1973, reproduced in the entry for June 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). In another book, Mrs. Smith employs Colossians 2:6-7 in this manner while putting in print a rejection of the essential gospel truth of forensic justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ alone in favor of the accursed Catholic and Quaker heresy of justification by imparted or infused righteousness. Hannah W. Smith, commenting on Romans 10:4; 3:19-20, wrote:

> He [Christ] is our righteousness. That is, the life of Christ in our souls is a righteous life [an affirmation by which Mrs. Smith denies justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ and thus denies the gospel]. . . the life of Christ in the soul makes righteousness take possession of us. . . . [N]otice the significance of the 'as' and 'so' in the verse which says, 'As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him.' You received Him by simple faith alone, and you must walk in Him by simple faith alone also. (pgs. 193-194, *Every-Day Religion, or The Common-Sense Teaching of the Bible*, Hannah W. Smith. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1893)

Hannah W. Smith published, as sound Quaker teaching, her view that "We not only receive life by faith, but, in just the same way, we must live by faith" in the Quaker *Friends Review* of 1867 (reproduced in the entry for February 18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter; Hannah Smith recognized this view of Colossians 2:6-7 as a Methodist doctrine also; see pgs. 242-243, 245, *The Unselfishness of God*.). In misinterpreting Colossians 2:6-7 and denying the doctrine of justification,

in which he received Christ at the moment of his conversion, that is, by faith alone. Indeed, in the Higher Life and Keswick movement "the text, more than any other, that . . . express[es] what [is] taught and experienced, is . . . Col. ii. 6, 7."[716] The verse allegedly establishes that one lives the Christian life by faith alone without works, just as one is justified originally by faith alone without works. It is argued that "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him," establishes that one lives for Christ now in the same manner in which one originally came to Him for mercy. A first act of simple faith received Christ for justification, and the justified Christian must subsequently with an additional or second act of faith receive Christ for sanctification. "As," or in the same manner that one received Christ, "so," in the same way, one is to walk in Him.

The word translated "as," *hos* (ὡς), is a common coordinating conjunction that appears 493 times in the New Testament. There are nine major definitions listed in

---

Hannah was indeed following the Quaker teaching of the premier Quaker theologian Robert Barclay, who taught that "justification consists in [a] subjective change" (*Systematic Theology,* Charles Hodge, vol. 1, pg. 94; cf. Barclay's *Apology* of 1678). Barclay was Hannah Smith's predecessor in teaching justification and sanctification were received in the identical manner and in denying the Biblical doctrine of justification:

> This most certain doctrine then being received, that there is an evangelical and saving light and grace in all . . . as many as resist not this light, but receive the same, in them is produced an holy, pure, and spiritual birth, bringing forth holiness, righteousness, purity, and all these other blessed fruits which are acceptable to God; by which holy birth (to-wit, Jesus Christ formed within us, and working his works in us) as we are sanctified, so are we justified in the sight of God. (pgs. vii-viii, cf. pgs. 87ff., Proposition 7, "Concerning Justification," and Proposition 8, "Concerning Perfection," *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People called Quakers*, Robert Barclay)

Note also the chapter below, "Hannah Whitall Smith: Speaker on Sanctification, Developer of the Keswick Theology, Quaker Quietist and Universalist Heretic," pg. 133, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874, etc.

Likewise, Robert "Pearsall Smith in the so-called Oxford-Brighton-Keswick Convention movement . . . augmented Luther's slogan 'being righteous by faith alone' with the following: 'as well as being completely holy by faith alone'" (pg. 246, *Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 4, Herman Bavinck; cf. pgs. 121-122, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

Critiquing the doctrine of sanctification by faith alone, J. C. Ryle wrote: "I never heard of any well-taught Christian who did not hold that faith is the root of holiness, and that until we believe we are not sanctified at all. But [if] . . . a man is sanctified by faith in the same way, and in the same sense, and in the same manner, that he is justified by faith . . . why [does] St. Paul so often sa[y] that we are '*justified* by faith without the deeds of the law' but never once says that we are 'sanctified by faith without the deeds of the law'[?]" (pg. 113, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875).

[715] Colossians 2:6-7 reads: 6 As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, *so* walk ye in him: 7 Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.
Ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ βεβαιούμενοι ἐν τῇ πίστει, καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε, περισσεύοντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ.

[716] pg. 320, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

BDAG, with a variety of subcategories, providing a great variety of potential significations. A study of *hos oun* (ὡς οὖν), the construction found in Colossians 2:6, will be more helpful (and less exhausting) in understanding Colossians 2:6 than an examination of the hundreds of instances of ὡς in a different construction. The ὡς οὖν construction appears seven times in the New Testament:

John 4:1 **Ὡς οὖν** ἔγνω ὁ Κύριος ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης

John 4:1 **When therefore** the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John,

John 4:40 **ὡς οὖν** ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σαμαρεῖται, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν μεῖναι παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας.

John 4:40 **So when** the Samaritans were come unto him, they besought him that he would tarry with them: and he abode there two days.

John 11:6 **ὡς οὖν** ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἀσθενεῖ, τότε μὲν ἔμεινεν ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπῳ δύο ἡμέρας.

John 11:6 **When** he had heard **therefore** that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was.

John 18:6 **ὡς οὖν** εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ ἔπεσον χαμαί.

John 18:6 **As** soon **then** as he had said unto them, I am *he*, they went backward, and fell to the ground.

John 20:11 Μαρία δὲ εἱστήκει πρὸς τὸ μνημεῖον κλαίουσα ἔξω· **ὡς οὖν** ἔκλαιε, παρέκυψεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον,

John 20:11 But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: **and as** she wept, she stooped down, *and looked* into the sepulchre,

John 21:9 **ὡς οὖν** ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν, βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακιὰν κειμένην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον, καὶ ἄρτον.

John 21:9 **As** soon **then** as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread.

Colossians 2:6 **Ὡς οὖν** παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε,

Colossians 2:6 **As** ye have **therefore** received Christ Jesus the Lord, *so* walk ye in him:

A study of these texts demonstrates that in each of the instances besides Colossians 2:6, *hos oun* is a temporal marker. This would strongly suggest that it is so in Colossians 2:6 as well, supporting a view that the "as" is not an affirmation that one is to walk in Christ in the same way as one received Him originally for salvation, but a declaration that since or as one received Him in a past time, one is consequently commanded to walk in Him. The idea of "in the same way, then" is impossible as a rendering of the New Testament *hos oun* constructions other than Colossians 2:6. A

temporal notion for *hos oun* is also supported by the LXX,[717] the apostolic patristic literature,[718] generally contemporary pseudepigraphical works,[719] Philo,[720] and Josephus.[721] In contrast, the "in the same way, then" idea is entirely unsupported. The

---

[717] The only text in which ὡς οὖν appears is Esther 1:17-18: καὶ γὰρ διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα τῆς βασιλίσσης καὶ ὡς ἀντεῖπεν τῷ βασιλεῖ **ὡς οὖν** ἀντεῖπεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀρταξέρξῃ οὕτως σήμερον αἱ τυραννίδες αἱ λοιπαὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων ἀκούσασαι τὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ λεχθέντα ὑπ᾽ αὐτῆς τολμήσουσιν ὁμοίως ἀτιμάσαι τοὺς ἄνδρας αὐτῶν, "for he has told them the words of the queen, and how she disobeyed the king. **As then**, *said he*, she refused *to obey* king Artaxerxes, so this day shall the other ladies of the chiefs of the Persians and Medes, having heard what she said to the king, dare in the same way to dishonour their husbands." (BLXX). The temporal sense is supported by the "this day." It is true that the other women would, it is alleged, follow Vashti's bad example. However, this is not something derived from the ὡς οὖν, but from the "in the same way" (ὁμοίως) later in the passage.

[718] 2 Clement 8:1 is the sole instance: **Ὡς οὖν** ἐσμὲν ἐπὶ γῆς, μετανοήσωμεν., "So, then, while we are yet on earth, let us repent." Note that the "while" temporal idea in the English translation is associated with the ὡς οὖν; ἐσμὲν alone would not provide it.

[719] **ὡς οὖν** εἶδον ὅτι μαινομένη βίᾳ κρατεῖ τὰ ἱμάτιά μου, γυμνὸς ἔφυγον . . . **ὡς οὖν** ἤμην ἐν πέδαις, ἡ Αἰγυπτία ἠσθένει ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, καὶ ἐπεκροῶτό μου, πῶς ὕμνουν κύριον ὢν ἐν οἴκῳ σκότους, καὶ ἱλαρᾷ φωνῇ χαίρων ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν μου, μόνον ὅτι διὰ προφάσεως ἀπηλλάγην τῆς Αἰγυπτίας.

"When, therefore, I saw that in her madness she was holding fast to my garment, I left it behind, and fled away naked. . . . And when I was in bonds, the Egyptian woman was oppressed with grief, and she came and heard how I gave thanks to the Lord and sang praises in the abode of darkness, and with glad voice rejoiced, glorifying my God that I was delivered from the lustful desire of the Egyptian woman." (*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Joseph 8:3, 5)

[720] The only instance is *Allegorical Interpretation* (Legum) 2:82: οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἄρχουσα σοφία Σάρρα φησίν· "ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἀκούσῃ, συγχαρεῖταί μοι;" ἀλλὰ φέρε τινὰ ἰσχῦσαι ἀκοῦσαι, ὅτι τέτοκεν ἡ ἀρετὴ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν Ἰσαάκ, καὶ εὐθὺς συγχαρητικὸν ὕμνον ὑμνήσει. **ὡς οὖν** τοῦ ἀκούσαντός ἐστι τὸ συγχαίρειν, οὕτως τοῦ σωφροσύνην καὶ θεὸν ἰδόντος εἰλικρινῶς τὸ μὴ ἀποθνῄσκειν. "Do you not see that wisdom when dominant, which is Sarah, says, 'For whosoever shall hear it shall rejoice with me.' But suppose that any were able to hear that virtue has brought forth happiness, namely, Isaac, immediately he will sing a congratulatory hymn. As, therefore, it can only be one who has heard the news that can sympathise in one's joy, so also it can only be he who has clearly seen temperance and God, who is safe from death."

[721] *Antiquities* 1:252 **Ὡς οὖν** τούτου γενομένου παρῆγε τὸν ξένον
As soon then as this was over, she introduced the stranger;
Antiquities 2:247 **ὡς οὖν** εἰς τὴν γῆν
As soon . . . as . . . [was come] to the land
Antiquities 2:343 **ὡς οὖν** ὁ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων στρατὸς ἅπας ἐντὸς ἦν
As soon, therefore, as ever the whole Egyptian army was within it,
Antiquities 4:7 **Ὡς οὖν** ταῦτ᾽ ἄμεινον αὐτοῖς ἔξειν ἔκριναν καὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐπῆλθον
When, therefore, they had come to this resolution, as being best for them, they went against their enemies;
Antiquities 5:110 **ὡς οὖν** τῆς ὑμετέρας αὐτῶν σωτηρία
Take therefore such measures in this assembly, as supposing that your own safety,
Antiquities 6:110 **ὡς οὖν** ἦκον εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ὁ Ἰωνάθης παρεθάρσυνε τὸν ὁπλοφόρον
As soon, therefore, as they came to the camp, Jonathan encouraged his armor bearer,
Antiquities 6:145 **ὡς οὖν** ἀπεῖπεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ τοῦ προφήτου δεήσει
As soon therefore as God had rejected the intercession of the prophet
Antiquities 7:296 **ὡς οὖν** ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἔμαθεν ἐπιζητεῖν τὸν θεόν μεταπέμπεται τοὺς Γαβαωνίτας
As soon therefore as the king understood that this it was which God sought, he sent for the Gibeonites,

Koiné background makes it clear that the *hos oun* of Colossians 2:6 is a declaration that as the Colossian church received Christ temporally in the past, they were consequently to walk in Him. The syntax of the passage does not affirm that Christians are to walk by faith alone now in the same manner in which they received Christ by faith alone; it simply states that they did receive Him in the past, and commands them to walk in Him. No second act of faith where Christ is specifically appropriated for sanctification by the believer is mentioned or hinted at anywhere in the passage. The way believers are to walk in Him is explicated in v. 7, not by the first clause of v. 6. There is nothing in the syntax of Colossians 2:6-7[722] that indicates that a believer is sanctified by faith alone in the same way that he was originally justified by faith.[723] One who preaches this doctrine

---

Antiquities 8:409 **ὡς οὖν** πλήξαντος αὐτοῦ τὸν Μιχαίαν μηδὲν συνέβη παθεῖν Ἄχαβος θαρρήσας
So when, upon his smiting Micaiah, no harm happened to him, Ahab took courage,
Antiquities 12:303 **ὡς οὖν** ἐν τῷ παρόντι κειμένων ὑμῖν ταύτην τε ἀπολαβεῖν
Since, therefore, you are in such circumstances at present
Antiquities 12:311 **ὡς οὖν** ταῦθ᾽ οὕτως ἔχοντα ἔμαθον οἱ σὺν Γοργίᾳ
When, therefore, those that were with Gorgias understood that things were in this posture,
Life of Josephus 292 **ὡς οὖν** ἀνεχωρήσαμεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Ἰωνάθην γράφουσι τῷ Ἰωάννῃ
As soon, therefore, as we were gone home, Jonathan and his colleagues wrote to John

[722] It is possible that one with a strong English preservation view of the KJV could allege that the italicized "so" in Colossians 2:6 demonstrates that one receives Christ by faith in the same way as one walks in Him. This contention fails, however, because: 1.) The word is in italics. It is not in Greek. One should not build his theology using words that are not in the New Testament but are helpful in translating it into English. Such words need to be interpreted in light of what the Greek words teach that were actually dictated by the Holy Ghost. Words not in Greek cannot be made normative for interpreting words that are in Greek. 2.) The idea of "so" in the English could very easily be "therefore," "consequently," "thus," or some other similar phrase that communicates the idea, "Since you received Christ at a moment in the past, therefore walk ye in Him," rather than "In the same way that you received Christ in the past, walk in Him now." As commentators have well said: "The particle '*so*' is supplied by our translators. . . . No stress should be laid on it, as is often done. The meaning is, simply, 'Since you have received Christ as your Lord as he was preached to you, hold fast the doctrine which you have received, and do not permit yourselves to be turned aside by any Jewish teachers, or teachers of philosophy.'" (Albert Barnes). "Many persons lay a certain stress on the words *as* and *so*, and make various fine heads of discourses from them; viz. . . . *as* ye received him in a spirit of *faith, so* walk in him, &c., &c. This may be all proper in itself; but nothing of the kind was intended by the apostle. His meaning is simply this: Seeing ye have embraced the doctrine of Christ, continue to hold it fast, and do not permit yourselves to be turned aside by sophistical or Judaizing teachers." (Adam Clarke)

[723] In addition to the body of commentaries, the conclusions above are sustained in other exegetical resources. For example, S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., who is very sympathetic to the doctrinal conclusion erroneously derived from Colossians 2:6, nevertheless noted in the journal *Bibliotheca Sacra*:

> *The Pauline exhortation to progress in the life of faith* (2:6–7). The warning against defection through deception is followed by exhortation to advance in the life of faith. The *oun* (AV, "therefore") marks the transition. We meet with difficulty in this sixth verse, which revolves around the force of the adverb *hōs* (AV, "as").
>
> (1) Popular expositors have often explained the passages as if Paul were saying: You received Christ by the initial exercise of faith; now, therefore, continue your Christian life by a constant trust in Him. Life

from Colossians 2:6-7 is not preaching what the Holy Spirit, the Author of sanctification, intended when He inspired the text. Since the Holy Spirit does not lead men to misinterpret Scripture, one who preaches Colossians 2:6-7 as a proof-text for a doctrine not found in the passage is not being led by the Spirit. Such a one is also not helping Christians to be genuinely sanctified, but is misleading them and hindering their growth in grace.

Not only does Colossians 2:6-7 fail to teach sanctification by faith alone, or that one must take Christ in a second work of grace for sanctification, but such doctrines are absent from the entirety of the Bible, contradicting the affirmations of some theologies of sanctification.[724] If the New Testament were filled with statements such as: "We

---

begins and proceeds upon the principle of faith. The truth is most certainly a New Testament one, but does Paul have it in mind here?

(2) On the other hand, there is substantial support for a different interpretation, namely, that Paul is exhorting his readers to let their conduct accord with the truths they received. The *hōs* would then refer to the *form* in which they received Christ, i.e., the doctrines. By the first-mentioned view the *hōs* would refer to the *principle* upon which they received Christ, i.e., faith. As Moule points out, by this second view there is a virtual identification of the tradition of the facts about Christ with the believer's experience of the Lord Himself (cf. 1:7; Eph 4:20–21). This interpretation is supported by the use of *paralambanō* in Paul (AV, "received"), which almost always refers to the reception of truth through transmission (cf. 4:6; 1 Cor 11:23; 15:1, 3; Gal 1:9, 12). The expression in verse seven, "as ye have been taught," adds further support. But the context is most decisive. The apostle has been warning (vv. 4–5) and will continue (v. 8) to warn against the heretical teaching at Colosse. In the midst of the admonition there very appropriately is placed the exhortation to persist in the genuine teaching. Paul, then, means in verse six: As you Colossians received the Messiah, Jesus the Lord, in the preaching of Epaphras, in accord with the truth of his preaching, and not in accord with the enticing words of the heretics, continue your Christian life. The present tense in *peripateite* (AV, "walk") stresses the permanent character of this walk in the Lord. Keep walking in Him.

The details of the walk are described in the seventh verse. The contrast in the tenses of the participles should be noted. The *erridsōmenoi* (AV, "rooted") is in the perfect tense and, therefore, stresses the initial rooting of the Colossians' faith in Christ when the good news was preached to them and the derived and developing life resulting from it. The three following present participles set forth the specific ways in which the life is to continually express itself—in progressively greater stability amid thanksgiving. (pgs. 305-306, "Studies in the Epistle to the Colossians, Part VI: Beware of Philosophy." *Bib Sac* 119:476 (Oct 62) 302-311)

Colossians 2:6 simply does not affirm that a believer is sanctified by faith alone, just as he is justified by faith alone.

[724] For example, following the theology of Hannah W. Smith, the Keswick movement teaches that a believer "steps into . . . uniform sustained victory over known sin . . . not by . . . laborious effort, but by a deliberate and decisive act of faith. . . . According to Keswick, we are not sanctified by self-effort or by works, but by faith . . . [s]anctification, like justification, is by grace alone. . . . We are asked . . . to accept holiness by faith in the same way that we accept justification by faith. . . . Freedom from the dominion of sin is a blessing we may claim by faith, just as we accept pardon. . . . Deliverance is not attained by struggle and painful effort, by earnest resolutions and self-denial, but . . . is stepped into by simple faith. . . . The Keswick position is that in Scripture sanctification comes by faith, and not in another way. . . . The heart and core of Keswick teaching is its doctrine of sanctification by faith. . . . Sanctification is thus the result, not of attempts at suppression of the flesh, but of faith in the finished work of Calvary" (pgs. 84, 86, 89, 90, 97, 100, 107, *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*, Steven Barabas). Were the Keswick affirmation simply one that believers walk by faith (2 Corinthians 5:7) and do not reject God's strength to depend upon their own independent efforts, the doctrine would be Biblical. However, the Keswick affirmation goes beyond these truths to deny that faith-based, God-dependent effort and struggle

conclude that a man is sanctified by faith without the deeds of the law," or "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be sanctified in his sight," or "Knowing that a man is not sanctified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be sanctified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be sanctified," (compare Romans 3:28, 20; Galatians 2:16), the conclusion that Scripture teaches sanctification by faith without works in the same way that justification is by faith without works would be justified. However, there are no such verses in the New Testament.[725] Furthermore, the Bible contains commands in relation to sanctification such as 2 Peter 1:5-11: "[G]iving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity," so that these holy character traits "abound" in the believer. Believers are never told that, to advance their justification, they must add virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, and have these traits of holiness abound in them—but they do advance their sanctification in this manner. Justification is by faith without works, but

---

are involved in progressive sanctification, affirming instead that sanctifying faith ceases from working in the same manner that justifying faith does (Romans 4:5). The only passage Barabas ever cites to provide alleged support for this Keswick doctrine of sanctification by faith alone is Romans 6, which says nothing about it. Keswick may affirm that both justification and sanctification are by faith alone, but it cannot prove the latter doctrine from Scripture.

[725] Acts 26:18, "To open their eyes, *and* to turn *them* from darkness to light, and *from* the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ καὶ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.), is about the only verse in the Bible that one could attempt to establish a doctrine of progressive sanctification by faith from. The verse teaches that at the moment every believer turns from darkness to light and from Satan to God through repentant faith in Christ, he receives forgiveness of sins and positional sanctification. Since the sanctification mentioned in the verse is the positional sanctification of all believers, which they receive at the same moment that they "receive forgiveness of sins," the text establishes absolutely nothing in favor of a doctrine of progressive sanctification by faith alone. Furthermore, the sanctification in the verse is the possession of all the regenerate, not of a select minority that have entered into a Higher Life by means of a post-conversion discovery of a doctrine of progressive sanctification by faith alone. Note also that Acts 20:32, which is not only the single other reference to the verb *hagiadzo*, "to sanctify," in Acts but even shares the same perfect passive substantival participle as Acts 26:18, contains a similar reference to an "inheritance" (κλῆρος/ κληρονομία), and is also on the lips of the Apostle Paul, likewise refers to the positional sanctification possessed by all the people of God. Compare the perfect passives in Romans 15:16; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 7:14; Hebrews 10:10; Jude 1.

while faith is absolutely necessary for sanctification (Hebrews 11:6),[726] progressive growth in holiness involves not faith alone, but also effort and works, in a way justification does not.[727]

The fact that neither Colossians 2:6-7, nor any other text in Scripture, teaches that the believer is sanctified by faith alone just as one is justified by faith alone should not be employed to minimize the essential role of living by faith for progressive sanctification. The truth of 2 Corinthians 5:7, "we walk by faith, not by sight," and the fact that "without faith it is impossible to please . . . God" (Hebrews 11:6) must not be neglected. Believers must live by faith and grow in their faith.[728] They should not misinterpret Colossians 2:6-7 and adopt a doctrine of sanctification by faith alone that is absent from the Bible, and so hinder their growth in holiness, nor react against this misinterpretation of Colossians 2:6-7 to minimize the importance of living by faith, and so hinder their growth in holiness.

D. Excursus II: Romans 7:14-25: A Depiction of Part of the Normal Christian Life

In Romans 7:14-25, Paul refers to the normal state of his Christian life as representative of believers in general. He does not speak of his unconverted state. Unbelievers do not hate sin (Romans 7:15) and have nothing within themselves that is against it (7:16-17, 19-20[729]), nor do they will to do right (7:18; cf. 3:11), nor do they

---

726 Anyone who would argue that sanctification must be by faith alone because a verse such as Hebrews 11:6 affirms that it is impossible to please God without faith would likewise have to argue that 1 Corinthians 13 establishes that sanctification is by love alone, since it is impossible to please God without love. Such an argument is a obvious example of a logical converse fallacy.

727 "A servant of Jesus does the trusting in no other sense than he does the loving, the hoping, the watching, the praying, the striving. To all these the Lord moves him by the joint agency of his Spirit and his Word. The idea of a simple passive trust springing from the human heart, as the God-appointed condition of sanctifying grace from Christ, is foreign to the Word of God" (pg. 127, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures,* by Alvah Hovey).

728 Sometimes those who incorrectly make Colossians 2:6-7 into a proof-text for sanctification by faith alone likewise deny that faith can grow, affirming that Scripture teaches only that one either has faith or that one does not. Such an assertion is false. See the discussion in the chapter "The Just Shall Live By Faith."

729 "[When Paul writes in Romans 7:19], 'The good that I would (θέλω), I do not, but the evil which I would not (οὐ θέλω), that I do (πράσσω),' [he means that by] reason of his regeneration and the implanting of the new life he is centrally and steadily inclined to holiness and disinclined to sin, but in a particular instance, under the stress of a temptation addressed to the *remainders* of his sinful inclination derived from his fall in Adam, he commits by a volition or choice, a single sin. His inclination is right, but his volition is wrong. And, be it observed, the volition in this instance gets its sinful quality from the

"delight in the law of God," nor do they possess a holy "inner man" (7:22), nor do they have a godly mind that wants righteousness (7:23, 25; cf. 1:28; 8:5, 7; Ephesians 2:3; Colossians 1:21; 2:18; Titus 1:15) and "thank God through Jesus Christ" because of freedom from the bondage of sin (Romans 7:25). Francis Turretin[730] effectively demolishes the position that Romans 7:14-25 deals with Paul in his unregenerate state:

> Socinus [believes] that Romans 7 does not treat of Paul as renewed, but as constituted under the law. . . . Arminius agrees with him. . . . [However,] we cannot recede from the opinion commonly received among the orthodox, which is that Paul speaks of himself as renewed and that this severe struggle (often occuring between the old and new man, the flesh and spirit) is here described by him.
>
> There are various reasons which prove it: (1) from the notation of time.[731] Paul does not speak in a past tense (as before in v. 9), but in a present tense—"I am carnal" (v. 14); "I do not the good I would, I delight in the law of God" (v. 19, 22). Now when he wrote this, he was no more under the law, but under grace. (2) He treats of him to whom the willing of good and the nilling of evil (or a hatred of sin) belongs: "For what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I" (v. 15) and "For to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not" (v. 18). Now this belongs only to the renewed, in whom God works both "to will and to do" (*to thelein kai to energeini)* although they are not always allowed to carry out what they wish (for us, to others who can think nothing good, how can they be said to will it?). (3) He treats of him who consents to the law of God in the inner man and who delights in it (v. 22), from which delight arises service—"With the mind I serve God" (v. 25). But who would say that any other than a believer delights in the law of God and according to it serves God; or that the inner man is any other than the new man?[732] He is frequently designated as such (Ephesians 3:16; 2 Corinthians 4:16; 1 Peter 3:4). (4)

---

remainders of sinful inclination, of which it is the executive, and not from the *holy inclination,* of which it is not the executive and with which it conflicts." (*Dogmatic Theology: Anthropology,* William G. T. Shedd, Chapter 3, "The Human Will," Supp. Help #31. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006). The statement of Romans 7:19 simply does not describe the state of an unregenerate person.

730 Pgs. 697-699, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology,* vol. 2, Topic 17:11-15. Trans. George Musgrave Giger, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr. Philippsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1994). Further evidence is examined in "Romans 7:14-25: Pauline Tension in the Christian Life," David S. Dockery. *Grace Theological Journal* 2:2 (Fall 1981) 239-258; see also J. I. Packer's incisive article, "The 'Wretched Man' in Romans 7." *Studia Evangelica* 2:1 (1964) 621-627.

731 "The first section [of Romans 7 under consideration] (vss. 7-13) is all in the past tense, and the natural way to understand it is as autobiography. . . . The second section (vss. 14-25) is written entirely in the present tense. Grammatically, therefore, the natural way to read it would be as a transcript fo Paul's self-knowledge at the time of writing[.] . . . [T]here is no recognized linguistic idiom which will account for the change of tense, [so] it follows that the only natural way for Paul's readers to interpret the present tenses of vss. 14ff. is as having a present reference, and as going on to describe something distinct from the past experience which the previous verses have recalled; and we must suppose that Paul knew this when he wrote them. [The idea that v. 14ff. continue to describe Paul's previous state as unconverted must] accuse Paul of wantonly obscuring his own meaning, and laying himself open to needless misunderstanding, by a change of tense for which there is no reason at all" (pgs. 622, 624, "The 'Wretched Man' in Romans 7," J. I Packer).

732 While some writers deny it, Scripture does in fact parallel the *outward/inward man* (ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος/ὁ ἔσω/ἔσωθεν ἄνθρωπος; Romans 7:22; 2 Corinthians 4:16; Ephesians 3:16) and the *old/new man* (ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος/ὁ καινὸς/νέος ἄνθρωπος; Romans 6:6; Ephesians 4:22-24 (cf. 2:15); Colossians 3:9-10). The outward man is corrupting/perishing (present passive of διαφθείρω, 2 Corinthians 4:16), and the old man is corrupting likewise (present passive of φθείρω, Ephesians 4:22). The verb διαφθείρω, employed for the corruption of the outward man, speaks not merely of physical decline but sinful corruption, as it does likewise in the reference to men of "corrupt minds"

He speaks of him in whom are distinguished two principles: one according to which he does the evil which he would not; the other according to which he does not perpetrate evil, but sin dwelling in him perpetrates it, and according to which he serves God (v. 17-19). Now it is evident that this can be said only of the believer, who has within him the old man and the new man, the flesh and the Spirit. (5) He treats of him who groans on account of his misery and who seeks and wishes for deliverance and congratulates himself and gives thanks when he has obtained it (v. 24-25)—which refer to no one except the renewed person. (6) A middle state between the regenerate and unregenerate is a pure invention, as if there were a middle ground between the child of God and the child of the Devil, between a living and a dead man. Nor can this be referred to the state under the law because those who lived under it were either reprobates (who were under it as a covenant and so under its curse, Galatians 3:10); or renewed (who were under it as a dispensation, in which although more sparingly and obscurely, still the grace of the regenerating Holy Spirit was granted to them).

Paul ascribes nothing here to himself which cannot be found in the renewed. Not his saying that "he is carnal and sold under sin" (v. 14), because this is not to be understood absolutely, but comparatively and relatively;[733] as Paul calls the Corinthians "carnal, and not spiritual" (1 Corinthians 3:1) because they still exhibited in their actions many remains of the flesh and the old man. Not a universal sale and captivity as to state, as if he were still under the dominion of sin, because thus he would neither delight in the law of God according to the inner man, nor could he be said to serve God with his mind; rather a particular captivity and selling as to certain acts, in which sense the flesh is said to lust against the Spirit, so that we do not what we would (Galatians

---

(διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν, 1 Timothy 6:5). The verb φθείρω, used for the corruption of the old man, is almost always employed for sinful corruption in the New Testament (1 Corinthians 3:17 (in this verse, the sole NT instance where φθείρω does not refer to sinful corruption is paralleled with an instance where the verb does do so); 15:33; 2 Corinthians 7:2; 11:3; Ephesians 4:22; Jude 1:10; Revelation 19:2). Also, φθείρω and διαφθείρω are employed comparably not only in Ephesians 4:22 and 2 Corinthians 4:16, but also in Revelation 19:2 and Revelation 11:18. Furthermore, the only two texts with the verb ἀνακαινόω in the New Testament refer, once, to the inward man being renewed (present tense, 2 Corinthians 4:16) and once to the new man being renewed (present tense, Colossians 3:10). An examination of the *outward/inward man* texts clearly indicates that the contrast involved is not merely one between the bodily human organism and a man's inner being, but one between the sinful and the holy in believers. This contrast is very obvious in the *old/new man* texts as well. Note, finally, the parallel to the *inward man/new man* in 1 Peter 3:4's reference to the incorruptible (ἀφθαρτός) *hidden man of the heart* (ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος).

The fact that the outward/inward man is employed of spiritual corruption and renewal does not mean that there is no association at all between the outward man and the physical decay of the human body. The existence of decay in the current world-system is a result of the entrance of sin with the fall of man. In the antelapsarian universe, as in the new heavens and new earth to come, physical decay, the concomittant of sin, is not present. The spiritual new creation in the believer is associated with the physical new creation to come, as the spiritual and physical outward man are associated. One sees this old/new dynamic in the fact that references to the outward/inward, corruptible/incorruptible in the believer refer to both his spiritual and physical aspects, in the fact that the *flesh* refers to both indwelling sin in the saint and to his physical body in this age as contrasted with his spiritual body to come (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:42-50), and in other areas of the doctrine of sanctification.

733 Thomas Smith explains:

> When the apostle says, "I am carnal," we do not undersand him as denying that he is spiritual also. But could the apostle make the general statement, "I am carnal," if it were true that he was also spiritual? We are not left to conjecture upon this point; for just four verses further on he makes precisely the same statement, accompanying it with the explanation that it is in this sense that he makes it: "In me, that is, in my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing." That assuredly is not the languge of a carnal man, but of a spiritual man, to whom the remnants of a carnal nature still adhere. . . . [I]n the apostle's judgment, the unregenerate man has no "inward man." He is carnal inwardly as well as outwardly, all of a piece. He has not only flesh, but a "carnal mind," all flesh together. . . . [N]one but the spiritual man [truly] knows himself to be carnal[.] (pgs. 278-279, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280)

5:17). Nor when he says "sin dwells in him," because it is one thing to dwell, another to reign. That denotes the presence of sin as it exists in the believer even unto the end, but this denotes its tyranny and dominion, which is overcome by the Spirit of Christ. Not that "he wishes for deliverance" from "the body of death," since the believer is freed from the law of sin and death. For an inchoate deliverance and a perfect deliverance differ: one is from the curse of the law and exposure to death; the other from the dominion of sin and mortality (which attends it). The believer has already obtained the first, but he as yet expects and wishes for the other.[734]

Although a struggle between the appetite and reason often occurs in the unregenerate, such as in the Medea of the poet, who said, "I see the good, approve it too, and yet the wrong pursue" (Ovid, *Metamorphosis* 7:20-21 [Loeb, 1:342-343]), still there is a great difference between this and the struggle of the flesh and the Spirit of the renewed (of which Paul speaks). (1) As to their causes, the struggle of the unrenewed arises from the dictation of the conscience (or the strictures of the natural light, which have their seat principally in the intellect) and from the fear of punishment; the struggle of believers arises from the new and supernatural quality or principle of the Holy Spirit, which is spontaneously borne along to those things which are good; not only from a slavish dread of punishment, but from a filial reverence of God. (2) As to their subject, the light of the unregenerate is merely theoretical, remaining in the intellect and not reaching to the heart. But the light of grace (granted to the renewed) not only inheres in the governing (*to hegemoniko*) or superior part of the soul, but passes also to the concupiscible (*to epithymetikon*) or its lower part. (3) As to their objects, the contest of the unregenerate is occupied only about the more gross sins, which all abominate by the natural light; while the contest of believers is occupied with those also which (in the external court of men) are neither subjected to punishment, nor to any rebuke. (4) As to their effects, the former struggle can consist with the daily practice of sin and if it sometimes causes that good be done or evil avoided, still it can never arise to this—that it should be well done—and so represses rather than destroys sin; hence at last the reason with its light yields and is conquered. But in the struggle of believers, the flesh is bruised and mortified to such a degree that even if it cannot be eradicated absolutely and as yet exerts itself in many acts, still it

---

734 "The freedom from sin's power which Christ bestows in this world is less than the deliverance for which the 'wretched man' cries out. For what he desires is deliverance 'out of (ἐκ) the body of this death,' i. e. this mortal body, which is at present sin's place of residence (v. 23). But that deliverance will not come until 'this mortal shall have put on immortality' (1 Corinthians 15:53): a consummation for which, according to Romans 8:23, those who have the Spirit wait, groaning. And it is surely this groaning, in exact terms, which Romans 7:24 voices. What the 'wretched man' is longing for is what 8:23 calls 'the redemption of our body.' But if this is so, then what he gives thanks for in v. 25a must be the promise that through Christ this blessing will ultimately be his. And if v. 25a is a thanksgiving, not for a present deliverance from the condition described in vss. 15-23, but for a hope of future deliverance from it, then the juxtaposition of v. 25b ceases to be a problem [as it is on the view that Paul speaks of himself in v. 14-25 as unconverted]. On this exegesis, v. 25b is neither a *non sequitur* nor an anticlimax: it is simply a summing-up of the situation thus far described, a state of affairs which will last while mortal life lasts. The man in Christ serves the law of God with his mind, in the sense that he wants and wills to keep it perfectly, but with the flesh he serves the law of sin, as appears from the fact that he never is able to keep the law as perfectly and consistently as he wishes to do. The emphatic αὐτὸς ἐγώ, "I, even I," [of v. 25, KJV "I myself"] expresses Paul's sense of how painfully paradoxical it is that a Christan man like himself, who desires so heartily to keep God's law and do only good, should find himself under the constant necessity of breaking the law and doing what in effect is evil. But such is the state of the Christian till his body is redeemed" (pg. 626, "The 'Wretched Man' in Romans 7," J. I Packer). That is: "[A]s to the agonizing question, 'Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' [t]he unregenerate, merely carnal, man does not regard his carnal self as a body of death, although it is such; but the spiritual man so regards the remnants of his carnal self. . . . The importance of the answer [to the question] depends upon the form of the question. Who *shall* deliver? I thank God, through Jesus Christ my Lord (I *shall* be delivered). And *therefore*, since such ultimate deliverance is in store for those who, while they have flesh, yet do not walk after the flesh, there is even *now* no condemnation" (pg. 279, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280).

cannot prevail, but is at length overcome by the Spirit, who makes believers more than conquerors (*hypernikan*).

To make Romans 7:14-25 into a description of an unconverted sinner is more consistent with Pelagianism than with the Biblical picture of the depravity of man.[735]

Romans 7:14-25 also cannot be correctly understood as the life of a lower category of Christian who has not discovered the secret of sanctification by faith alone or of higher life theology but is trapped in legalistic bondage and attempts at self-dependent Christianity and so lives in perpetual sin and defeat. Lewis Sperry Chafer presents this view:

> Two extended passages bear upon the conflict which continues in every believer between the flesh and the Spirit, and therein is presented the only way of deliverance. In the first of these passages (Rom 7:15 to 8:4), the Apostle testifies, first, of his own complete failure and, second, of his victory. The failure is complete in spite of the fact that he has made his greatest possible effort to succeed. In Romans 7:15–25 the conflict is between the regenerate man (hypothetically contemplated as acting independently, or apart from, the indwelling Spirit) and his flesh. It is *not* between the Holy Spirit and the flesh. Probably there is no more subtle delusion common among believers than the supposition that the saved man, if he tries hard enough, can, on the basis of the fact that he is regenerate, overcome the flesh. The result of this struggle on the part of the Apostle was defeat to the extent that he became a "wretched man"; but, out of this experience, he learned a most vital and important lesson, namely, that there are two mighty tendencies always in the child of God, one aspiring to that which is good, and the other demanding that which is evil. This is the meaning of the conflict between "I," the old nature, and "I," the new nature, as recorded in Romans 7:15–25, and there could be no more conclusive verdict rendered at the end of this impotent effort than the Apostle sets forth in verse 25: "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh [I serve] the law of sin."
>
> The Apostle's testimony is not closed thus. He goes on to report the discovery of a new principle of procedure, and a new and sufficient power available. The "Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," quite apart from his own regenerate self which had so ignominiously failed, makes him free from the law or power of sin and death (8:2). He testifles further that "the righteousness of the law,"-meaning here vastly more than any written code, including, as it does, all the will of God as to every detail in every moment of the believer's life-is fulfilled *in* him, but never fulfilled *by* him. This marvelous experience, the Apostle goes on to state, is granted to those only "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (8:4). Thus the Apostle prepares for the truth set forth in the second major passage (Gal 5:16–24) where the conflict is not between the regenerate man and his flesh with its inevitable defeat, but between the indwelling Holy Spirit and the flesh. We read: "*This* I say then, Walk in [or by dependence on] the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh (5:16). No greater promise of victory over the flesh could be extended to the child of God than this. Not, indeed, by self-crucifixion of the flesh, nor by a supposed second work of grace by which the flesh is eradicated, but by the immediate and unceasing, overcoming power of the

---

735 Snodgrass also notes concerning the idea that Romans 7:14-25 describes Paul in his unconverted state: "[T]o say nothing of the violence which is done to the understanding of the common reader, in supposing the apostle to describe past events in the use of the present tense—to say nothing of the absurdity of an unconverted sinner exclaiming, as he does in this passage, 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man'—to say nothing of the striking similarity between his language here and in other places in which he speaks, confessedly as a christian, of the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh . . . all of these considerations apart, it is enough to decide the question, to bring it into the light of historical facts, concerning which there can be no dispute. Let any candid inquirer look back upon the character and life of this distinguished individual, before his conversion; and see whether, in the progress of his history, there is no place for such a scene as that which is here described [cf. Philippians 3:4-6]" (pgs. 38-42, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*).

> Spirit. The believer must learn the life of faith in which he depends upon the provided power of God. Apart from this faith there is only defeat; but with this faith there is blessed deliverance from the flesh and its lusts or desires.[736]

Without question, a believer who is self-dependent, who is not looking in faith to his Triune Sanctifier for strength and spritual life, is going to decline spiritually (cf. 2 Corinthians 1:9).[737] Believers must live by faith if they are to grow (cf. Hebrews 11:6). However, Romans 7:14-25 does not specifically deal with this fact, nor does Romans present Paul in a lower Christian life in 7:14-25 from which he allegedly passes, starting in Romans 8:1, into a higher life of faith. Romans 7:14-8:4ff. does not teach that there are two sorts of Christians, one type that lives in perpetual defeat and the other in perpetual victory. Chafer's view has a number of serious problems. First, while a distinction between believers who are in fellowship with God and drawing closer to Him, and those who are out of fellowship, is clearly present in Scripture (1 John 1:9; 1 Corinthians 11:29), nowhere does the Bible speak of regenerate people who are "complete[ly] failure[s]" and produce no fruit at all.[738] Second, it is impossible for a believer to make "his greatest possible effort to succeed" in living for God while wickedly rejecting the aid and assistance of the Holy Spirit. Third, while saints can certainly grieve and quench the Spirit, one must very seriously question if a regenerate man can totally and absolutely "act independently, or apart from, the indwelling Spirit." Where does the Bible clearly present such a possibility? On the other hand, if Chafer means that such rebellious absolute independent action by saints is merely "hypothetically contemplated" but never actually exists in the world, one would wonder why such an extended passage of Scripture would address a situation that never actually takes place, and wonder whether advocates of Chafer's position ought to preach from Romans 7:14-25, since nobody on earth is ever actually in the situation presented. Fourth, Romans 7:14-8:4ff. does not set up a contrast between two categories of Christians, one of which has a lower life of perpetual defeat and the second of which has a higher life of perpetual victory because they are in the sub-category of Christians "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Romans 8 teaches that all who are "in Christ Jesus" will

---

736 Pgs. 404-406, "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 4," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 92:368 (Oct 35) 394-411.

737 "[W]e ought continually to *wait and depend on God* for supplies of his Spirit and grace, without which we can do nothing. . . . God is more the author, by his grace, of the good we do than we ourselves ("Not I, but the grace of God which was with me")[.] . . . [W]e ought to be careful that by our negligences and sins we provoke not the Holy Spirit to withhold his aids and assistances, and so to leave us to ourselves, in which condition we can do nothing that is spiritually good" (pgs. 458-459, *A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*, John Owen. Book 4:2. Elec. acc. AGES Digital Software Library, Christian Library Series vol. 9. Rio, WI: 2005).

738 Compare Section III, "The Certainty of Practical Sanctification For All The Regenerate."

"walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit"[739] (8:1)—those who do not walk after the Spirit instead of the flesh are still unregenerate and under "condemnation" (8:1). Those who are still "after the flesh" rather than "after the Spirit" (8:5) are the enemies of God who are headed to spiritual death in hell, while all believers, all who are indwelt by the Spirit, are "after the Spirit" (8:6-12) and characteristically walk after the Spirit. Those who live after the flesh will die spiritually, while those who are "led by the Spirit of God"—led "through the Spirit [to] mortify the deeds of the body"—they, and they only, "are the sons of God" (8:13-14).

Sound exegesis demands that the death which those who walk after the flesh undergo in Romans 8 (and those who characteristically yield themselves to sin in Romans 6; cf. v. 16, 21) is spiritual death in hell, not just some sort of lack of fellowship with God experienced by regenerate people who are allegedly stuck in a Romans 7:14-25 type of Christian experience. The verb for *death* in Romans 8:13, *apothnesko* (ἀποθνῄσκω), used in the warning "if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die," is found 49 times in Paul's epistles and 111 times in the New Testament.[740] Among a variety of other categories of use, the word is clearly employed with a reference to spiritual death by both Paul (Romans 5:15; 1 Corinthians 15:22; 2 Corinthians 5:14) and other New Testament writers (John 6:50; 8:21, 24, 52; 11:25-26; Jude 12). Not one of the 111 instances of the verb clearly speaks of saved people suffering a "death" consisting of lack of fellowship with God because of a legalistic Christian life. Furthermore, the *death* promised the carnally minded in Romans 8:6, indicated by the noun *thanatos* (θάνατος), which appears 119 times in the New Testament[741] and which Paul employs 50 times in his epistles, is clearly used, among a variety of other ideas, for spiritual death by Paul (Romans 1:32; 5:12, 21;

---

739 The removal of the inspired μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα in 8:1 in modern Bible versions that follow the corrupt modern critical Greek text, in opposition to the *Textus Receptus* and c. 95% of Greek MSS, to adopt one of a number of other readings that possesses only a tiny fraction of MSS evidence, is very unfortunate.

740 Matthew 8:32; 9:24; 22:24, 27; 26:35; Mark 5:35, 39; 9:26; 12:19-22; 15:44; Luke 8:42, 52-53; 16:22; 20:28-32, 36; John 4:47, 49; 6:49-50, 58; 8:21, 24, 52-53; 11:14, 16, 25-26, 32, 37, 50-51; 12:24, 33; 18:32; 19:7; 21:23; Acts 7:4; 9:37; 21:13; 25:11; Romans 5:6-8, 15; 6:2, 7-10; 7:2-3, 6, 9; 8:13, 34; 14:7-9, 15; 1 Corinthians 8:11; 9:15; 15:3, 22, 31-32, 36; 2 Corinthians 5:14-15; 6:9; Galatians 2:19, 21; Philippians 1:21; Colossians 2:20; 3:3; 1 Thessalonians 4:14; 5:10; Hebrews 7:8; 9:27; 10:28; 11:4, 13, 21, 37; Jude 1:12; Revelation 3:2; 8:9, 11; 9:6; 14:13; 16:3.

741 Matthew 4:16; 10:21; 15:4; 16:28; 20:18; 26:38, 66; Mark 7:10; 9:1; 10:33; 13:12; 14:34, 64; Luke 1:79; 2:26; 9:27; 22:33; 23:15, 22; 24:20; John 5:24; 8:51-52; 11:4, 13; 12:33; 18:32; 21:19; Acts 2:24; 13:28; 22:4; 23:29; 25:11, 25; 26:31; 28:18; Romans 1:32; 5:10, 12, 14, 17, 21; 6:3-5, 9, 16, 21, 23; 7:5, 10, 13, 24; 8:2, 6, 38; 1 Corinthians 3:22; 11:26; 15:21, 26, 54-56; 2 Corinthians 1:9-10; 2:16; 3:7; 4:11-12; 7:10; 11:23; Philippians 1:20; 2:8, 27, 30; 3:10; Colossians 1:22; 2 Timothy 1:10; Hebrews 2:9, 14-15; 5:7; 7:23; 9:15-16; 11:5; James 1:15; 5:20; 1 John 3:14; 5:16-17; Revelation 1:18; 2:10-11, 23; 6:8; 9:6; 12:11; 13:3, 12; 18:8; 20:6, 13-14; 21:4, 8.

6:23; 7:5; 2 Corinthians 3:7), and other New Testament writers (Matthew 4:16; Luke 1:79; John 5:24; 8:51-52; 1 John 3:14). Indeed, *thanatos* is the word employed for "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone . . . the second death" (Revelation 21:8; 2:11; 20:6). Not one clear New Testament text employs *thanatos* for a spiritual "death" experienced by the regenerate on earth when they are allegedly stuck in a Romans 7:14-25 type of life. Also, the verb *live* (ζάω) in Romans 8:13 promises eternal life to those who through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body. The verb is used 71 times by Paul and 142 times in the New Testament.[742] It is never used for a sort of spiritual life possessed only by an elite group of Christians, while it is employed (among other uses, such as the common sense of physical life) for the everlasting life possessed by all God's people by Paul and other New Testament writers (Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38-39; John 6:58; 11:25). The related noun for *life* (ζωή), which appears 39 times in Paul (cf. Romans 6:22-23; 8:2, 6) and 134 times in the New Testament,[743] is used the large majority of the time for eternal life[744] in Paul and the rest of the New Testament but is never used for a Christian life possessed only by some believers. Neither the words for *death* nor the words for *life* in Romans 6-8 are ever clearly used for a type of spiritual life possessed only by a certain group of higher-level Christians or for a type of death possessed only by a certain group of lower-level Christians.[745] Thus, all Christians, all

---

[742] Matthew 4:4; 9:18; 16:16; 22:32; 26:63; 27:63; Mark 5:23; 12:27; 16:11; Luke 2:36; 4:4; 10:28; 15:13; 20:38; 24:5, 23; John 4:10-11, 50-51, 53; 5:25; 6:51, 57-58, 69; 7:38; 11:25-26; 14:19; Acts 1:3; 7:38; 9:41; 10:42; 14:15; 17:28; 20:12; 22:22; 25:19, 24; 26:5; 28:4; Romans 1:17; 6:2, 10-11, 13; 7:1-3, 9; 8:12-13; 9:26; 10:5; 12:1; 14:7-9, 11; 1 Corinthians 7:39; 9:14; 15:45; 2 Corinthians 1:8; 3:3; 4:11; 5:15; 6:9, 16; 13:4; Galatians 2:14, 19-20; 3:11-12; 5:25; Philippians 1:21-22; Colossians 2:20; 3:7; 1 Thessalonians 1:9; 3:8; 4:15, 17; 5:10; 1 Timothy 3:15; 4:10; 5:6; 6:17; 2 Timothy 3:12; 4:1; Titus 2:12; Hebrews 2:15; 3:12; 4:12; 7:8, 25; 9:14, 17; 10:20, 31, 38; 12:9, 22; James 4:15; 1 Peter 1:3, 23; 2:4-5, 24; 4:5-6; 1 John 4:9; Revelation 1:18; 2:8; 3:1; 4:9-10; 5:14; 7:2, 17; 10:6; 13:14; 15:7; 16:3; 19:20; 20:4.

[743] Matthew 7:14; 18:8-9; 19:16-17, 29; 25:46; Mark 9:43, 45; 10:17, 30; Luke 1:75; 10:25; 12:15; 16:25; 18:18, 30; John 1:4; 3:15-16, 36; 4:14, 36; 5:24, 26, 29, 39-40; 6:27, 33, 35, 40, 47-48, 51, 53-54, 63, 68; 8:12; 10:10, 28; 11:25; 12:25, 50; 14:6; 17:2-3; 20:31; Acts 2:28; 3:15; 5:20; 8:33; 11:18; 13:46, 48; 17:25; Romans 2:7; 5:10, 17-18, 21; 6:4, 22-23; 7:10; 8:2, 6, 10, 38; 11:15; 1 Corinthians 3:22; 15:19; 2 Corinthians 2:16; 4:10-12; 5:4; Galatians 6:8; Ephesians 4:18; Philippians 1:20; 2:16; 4:3; Colossians 3:3-4; 1 Timothy 1:16; 4:8; 6:12, 19; 2 Timothy 1:1, 10; Titus 1:2; 3:7; Hebrews 7:3, 16; James 1:12; 4:14; 1 Peter 3:7, 10; 2 Peter 1:3; 1 John 1:1-2; 2:25; 3:14-15; 5:11-13, 16, 20; Jude 1:21; Revelation 2:7, 10; 3:5; 11:11; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 21:6, 27-22:2; 22:14, 17, 19.

[744] See Matthew 7:14; 18:8-9; 19:16-17, 29; 25:46; Mark 9:43, 45, 10:17, 30; Luke 10:25; 18:18, 30; John 1:4; 3:15-16, 36; 4:14, 46; 5:24, 26, 29, 39, 40; 6:27, 33, 35, 40, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 63, 68; 8:12; 10:10; 11:25; 12:25, 50; 14:6; 17:2-3; 20:31; Acts 2:28; 3:15; 5:20; 11:18; 13:46, 48; Romans 2:6; 5:17, 21; 6:4, 22-23; 7:10; 8:2, 6, 10; 11:15; 2 Corinthians 2:16; 4:10-12; 5:4; Galatians 6:8; Ephesians 4:18; Philippians 2:16; 4:3; Colossians 3:3-4; 1 Timothy 1:16; 4:8; 6:12, 19; 2 Timothy 1:1, 10; Titus 1:2; 3:7; James 1:12; 1 Peter 3:7, 10; 2 Peter 1:3; 1 John 1:1-2; 2:25; 3:14-15; 5:11-13, 16, 20; Jude 21; Revelation 2:7, 10; 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 21:6, 27; 22:1-2, 14, 16, 19.

[745] The affirmation of this sentence is not that, in every one of the hundreds of verses discussed, independently considered, such a sense, *were it already clearly established*, is impossible. Some—indeed, many—of the verses neither prove nor disprove the existence of such a sense. However, before one can

who are "in Christ," not a certain portion only, are characterized by a walk that is "after the Spirit" and not "after the flesh" (Romans 8:1). Those who characteristically walk after the flesh are unsaved and headed to spiritual death in hell, while those whose lives are characterized by a walk after the Spirit will, because they have been justified by faith alone and been given a new nature, receive eternal life. This exegetical fact means that the idea that a certain portion of Christians is described in Romans 7:14-25, while another group is described in Romans 8:1ff., is impossible.

Futhermore, the statements of 8:1-4 are tied into 7:14-25. Romans 8:1ff. is not set in contrast to 7:14-25, but explains it. "Therefore"[746] (8:1)—because of the truth of 7:14-25—there is no condemnation to those in Christ, those who walk after the Spirit, not after the flesh, having been set free by regeneration (8:2ff.). Unbelievers have no struggle with sin, since they have no new principle in them through regeneration, but believers have a new spiritual life so that they hate sin, delight in the law of God, and serve Him (7:15, 22, 25). Those with this new principle of life in them will be saved (8:1, 6, 10-11, 13-14) and will be different (8:1-4, 13-15). The development of the argument in Romans 7:14-8:1ff. demonstrates that the idea that one category of Christians is described by the second half of chapter seven and another category by chapter eight is false. Romans 7:14-25 describes the struggle in every true believer, in those who are "in Christ Jesus" and therefore "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (8:1), those who with their mind serve the law of God (cf. 12:2) and thank God through Christ Jesus for the progressive victory over sin the Spirit produces in them (7:25). Indeed, the closer a believer grows to God, the more the victory over sin described in Romans 6-8 is experientially manifest in his life, the more he will hate the indwelling sin that still remains in him, and the more passionately he will be able to concur with the lamentations of Romans 7:14-25 about what remains of his indwelling corruption. Romans 7:25-8:1ff.

---

conclude that a particular text speaks of a higher spiritual life that only some Christians possess, or a lower Christian life that is really "death" that an inferior sub-category of Christians possess, sound hermeneutics require that such an idea must be required and clearly established in at least one passage—otherwise eisegesis is being employed instead of correct exegesis. The ideas of eternal life and eternal death in hell very easily pass this test of required meaning in at least one passage (i. e., Romans 5:12-21). The higher life/lower "death" view does not, so it cannot be read into texts that, on their own, could go either way. A hermeneneutic that allows verses that do not *disprove* a particular notion to have that idea read into them would allow, not only a higher/lower Christian life/death notion, but the idea that the Bible employs "life" to speak of being alive when in a spaceshuttle orbiting the moon—after all, does, say, Luke 2:36 prove that Anna did *not* live with her husband for the seven years of their marriage in orbit?

[746] "ἄρα . . . marker of an inference made on the basis of what precedes . . . in declarative statement. . . . *so, then, consequently, you see*" (BDAG). "ἄρα: a marker of result as an inference from what has preceded . . . 'so, then, consequently, as a result.' οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα 'so, then, there is now no condemnation' Ro 8:1" (Louw-Nida, 89.46).

proves that 7:14-25 do not describe a hopeless,[747] flesh-controlled, sub-par Christian, but a Spirit-produced striving against indwelling sin, the normal Christian life of the apostle Paul and the rest of the regenerate.

---

747 Recognizing that all believers on earth experience Romans 7:14-25 does not lead to spiritual despair or to acceptance of a low level of Christian experience. Contrast the article on sanctification in *The Baptist Encyclopedia* (vol. 3; Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005) by William Cathcart:

> **Sanctification**. — Sanctification (ἁγιασμός) is separation from the world, purity of heart and life, holiness. The inspired truth of God is the instrument by which the soul is sanctified, and the Spirit of God is the author of that blessed work. It commences in the soul when the Comforter gives a new heart, and when he imparts that faith in Jesus which enables the believer to shake off the allurements and power of sin. Its *nature* is often misunderstood by Christians. In the unconverted man there is but one bent, one inclination, and it always points to some form of selfishness or sin. He forgets God, or only thinks of him to resist him. And though his conscience may occasionally remonstrate with him, yet he has but one purpose in life. The Christian *has two dispositions*: the controlling one is governed by love to Christ and hatred of sin; the inferior one is composed of the remains of his corrupt nature, and it is full of hatred to Jesus and a holy life. These opposite inclinations are found in some measure in every regenerated member of Christ's family, from the most perfect disciple, ready for heaven, to the most defective believer, just born of the Spirit. There never was a true believer on earth entirely free from the abiding evil of which Paul speaks in Romans 7:23: "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." This law of sin needs continual watching, and it needs resistless grace; and it only perishes in a child of God when death destroys the life of the body. Sanctification, after it is commenced by the new birth and a firm reliance upon Christ, consists in a constant growth in faith and in love to Christ; these developments of the religious life impose increased restraints upon our evil tendencies, and give additional power to our earnest and frequent prayers for grace to overcome every foe of Jesus within and around us. We should aim at *complete consecration* to God. . . . Paul says, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." When any creature was given to a Jewish priest to be offered up to God in sacrifice, nothing was retained by the worshiper, not even a portion of the hair or of the wool. A Jewish altar must be built not of hewn, but of whole stones (Joshua 8:31); the priest must not be deformed or injured: he must be a perfect physical man; and the sacrifice must be without blemish, and must be given whole to the priest. And we are required to present our bodies *a living sacrifice*, an enduring and complete offering to God. Sanctification is *a progressive work*. Paul says, "Leaving the principles (rudiments) of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection;" that is, unto the full development of Christian graces. An intelligent patriot, in a time of war, enlists; but though he loves his country, and has a strong body and a vigorous mind, he needs drilling to make him useful. Five thousand veterans could chase one hundred thousand warriors of his order. But let him be drilled for six months, and pass through two or three battles, and he is fitted for anything which the experienced and brave patriot can achieve. So the believer, as he journeys along the narrow way, learns more every day of the cunning and perseverance of sin, and of the power of grace to resist it; and while he may never be freed from the attacks of the tempter, nor from his internal weaknesses, till death, yet he may become a powerful veteran in watching, fighting, and routing sin; and he may become strong in the Lord and in the power of his might, so that sin shall never have dominion over him. A holy heart and life *give the richest pleasure*. When the believer falls he prepares for the most miserable doubts, and for bitter repentance. Soon he will be crying, "Has God forgotten to be gracious?" "Cast me not away from thy presence and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation and uphold me with thy free Spirit." And, besides, the chastising hand of God may fall heavily upon him and his, to make him renounce sin. But if he is only faithful to Jesus, grace equal to every trial will be given him; Jesus will walk with him in every furnace of affliction, and give him joy when the most acute anguish shall scourge others. So Paul was blessed in his sorrows, and as a result, he says, "We glory in tribulations also;" and so the martyrs have been favored as their bodies were subjected to the worst woes that human cunning could invent; the Saviour filled them with his love, and they had overflowing pleasures in their agonies. Holiness of heart *pleases God*. The sin of the angels drove them from heaven. The guilt of our first parents expelled them from Paradise. The sinful pride of Moses, when he smote the rock for water, shut him out of the earthly Canaan. We should follow after holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord, and without which our prayers will not be heard, for David says, "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me." It gives the world the noblest *testimony to the power of Christ*. A community of holy persons attracts the attention of all around them. Their purity of life and love to Jesus become proverbial, and with the greatest eloquence and success they preach

J. I. Packer discusses and critiques the Keswick position[748] set forth by Hannah W. Smith[749] and advocated by Steven Barabas[750] and others,[751] which is very similar to

---

the Cross of Jesus, even when they do not utter a word. In this way they keep the Saviour's words, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven."

Cathcart's recognition of the applicability of Romans 7:14-25 to all believers did not lead him to despair, or to a low level of Christian life, nor stop him from calling Christians to "complete consecration to God." Similarly, in a critique of Higher Life theology, Dr. Alvah Hovey wrote: "[T]he Christian is not left to contend with his evil nature by the simple force of holy purpose in his renewed heart, but . . . is assured of victory by the presence and power of the Spirit of Christ. Left to himself he would be no match for the strength of sin in his old nature; but by union with Christ he is not only set free from condemnation, but also strengthened with might by the Spirit, and set forward every day on the way to complete victory over sin" (pg. 68, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*). Such statements, by those who maintain the classic view of Romans 7:14-25 and of sanctification in general, are hardly the sentiments of hopeless despair.

[748] John Murray also points out a number of serious problems with the Keswick view of Romans 7:14-25:

> It is to be appreciated that the Keswick leaders, as a rule, interpret Romans 7:14-25 as depicting the experience of one who is a believer. But when they maintain that 'the experience of struggle and defeat here described is not the God-intended normal experience of Christians, but shows what happens when any person, regenerate or unregenerate, tries to conquer the old nature by self-effort' (p. 77 [Barabas, *So Great Salvation*]), then we must dissent on several grounds. It is a bold assertion to describe the struggle of Romans 7:14ff. as one of defeat and that categorically and without qualification. And where is the evidence to support the inference that this depicts the struggle which ensues when a person 'tries to conquer the old nature by self-effort' or that it 'is descriptive of a Christian *regarded in himself*, apart from active faith in Christ' (p. 78)? Are such protestations as 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man' (v. 22) and 'Consequently then I myself with the mind serve the law of God' (v. 25), the language of a Christian 'apart from active faith in Christ'? Finally, if, even on Keswick assumptions, we properly estimate the implications of the sin which still dwells in the believer, then the conflict, indeed the contradiction, delineated in Romans 7:14ff. is inevitable. Granting the presence of sin in any form or to any degree and granting that the person is regenerate, it is futile to argue that this conflict is not normal. Anyone imbued with sensitivity to the demands of holiness and who yearns to be holy as the Father in heaven is holy must experience the contradiction which Romans 7:14ff. portrays. A believer without this tension would be abnormal. The more sanctified the believer is, the more conformed he is to the image of his Saviour, the more he must recoil against every lack of conformity to the holiness of God. If we take seriously the contradiction which resides in the believer between the flesh and the Spirit, between sin and righteousness, between unholiness and holiness, how could it be otherwise? As long as sin remains there is contradiction within the saint, and it is contradiction without reservation. It is only by ignoring the reality of the contradiction that we can get away from the *necessity* of this inward conflict. The holier a regenerate person is the more conscious will he be of the gravity of the sin that remains and the more poignant will be his detestation of it. There is no need or place for a contrast between the exultant confidence of Romans 8 and the struggle of Romans 7:14ff. The more intense the conflict of Romans 7, the more the apostle gloried in the triumphing grace and hope of Romans 8 and of Romans 7 itself. And the more he gloried in the certitudes of Romans 8 and 7, the more he would be conscious of the contradiction which rested in his own bosom. It is only by evading the realities of sin and grace that we can escape from the stern realism of the conflict of Romans 7. There is a grand candour in this passage, the candour of inspired utterance. (pgs. 285-286, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 4, review of *So Great Salvation*, Barabas)

Both Murray and Packer effectively demonstrate that the Keswick view of Romans 7:14-25 is certainly false.

[749] Hannah W. Smith considered Romans 7:14-25 as a description of "the wearying and unsuccessful conflict with sin" from which one escapes in Romans "eight" (Letter, 1866, reproduced in the entry for February 14 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter; see also Letter to Miss Beck, August 25, 1878, reproduced in the entry for September 5). However, Mrs. Smith, as she meditated on the subject intending to write on it in the Quaker *Friend's Review*, recognized: "The Scriptures certainly say very little about there being two experiences in the Christian life. For the most part the Christian is evidently spoken of and looked upon as one who has actual possession of all the fullness of Christ's salvation." To deal with those who reject the Higher Life and second blessing theology because of

this lack of Scriptural evidence, she recommended: "The way to meet the arguments of those who say there is only one experience, is to ask them whether they individually and experimentally are enjoying the fullness of the gospel, whether they have habitual victory and uninterrupted peace . . . ask them . . . what are those Christians to do who don't possess this fullness, whose peace is not uninterrupted, and whose victories are alternated with defeats. . . . The experimental argument is the only one that will meet these opposers. 'Have you got it? If not, how are you going to get it; or if you have it, how am I to get it?'" The "wilderness," where Israel was "neither in Egypt nor in the Promised Land," represents the "7th of Romans, the wilderness experience of the Christian." This view cannot be proven by exegeting Scripture, but experience proved that it was true: "The truth is we have got to deal with facts, and the fact is that the majority of Christians do need and must have a second experience . . . It is hardly worthwhile for any one to tell those of us who have taken these two steps, that there is but one. We know better; and our own experience is far more convincing to us than a thousand theories" (Letter to Miss Beck, reproduced in the entries for September 5-6 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Thus, Hannah W. Smith recognized that only experience could establish the Higher Life theology—its opponents could not be answered with Scripture. It was clear, however, that the classical view of Romans 7 could not be correct, for it would lead to self-examination, watchfulness, and an abhorrance of remaining indwelling sin, while such feelings were not consonant with the end of the Higher Life—feeling happy—which required that one be careless about indwelling sin or ignorant of its presence by opposition to self-examination. Rather, one must practice the Quietism of Fenelon. Hannah wrote: "Give up all future self-reflective acts. . . . It is the rule of my life never to think over any past action. This . . . enables me to live continually in the present moment with God. Fenelon says, 'Make it a rule to put an end, at the close of every action, to all reflections upon it, whether of joy or sorrow. When we are no longer embarrassed by these restless reflections of self, we begin to enjoy true liberty. False wisdom, on the other hand, [is] always on the watch . . . [and] suffers severely whenever it is permitted to perceive the smallest speck of imperfection in self. The chagrin we feel at our own defects is often a greater fault than the original defect itself[.'] . . . Nothing so decidedly [contributes to] solid spiritual progress, as when one is able to view one's own failures without being disturbed" (Letter to Priscilla, January 22, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 9 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Surely the fact that Mrs. Smith's carefree happiness was hindered by the old view of Romans 7 indicated that it must be in error.

Hannah Smith advocated what became the Keswick view of Romans 7:14-25 in "the first article she ever published, in the *Friends Review*," proving that "George Fox" recognized that Romans 7:25a was the key to escape from the life of Romans 7:14-24, and that Christ "must live" the Christian life "for us" (excerpt from the *Friends Reivew* reproduced in the entry for February 17 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). The Keswick and Higher Life theology was good Quaker teaching, and Hannah W. Smith delighted to meditate upon and reference the writings of George Fox and other Quakers in her writings (e. g., Letter to Mother, March 18, 1867; Letter to Frank, April 4, 1871; Letter to Father and Mother, June 9, 1875, Letter to a Friend, May 18, 1879 reproduced in the entries for March 7, June 1, July 26 & September 14 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

750 "'Keswick' and the Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification." *The Evangelical Quarterly*, vol. 27 (1955) 153-167. Packer is reviewing the book *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention* by Steven Barabas. Note the analysis of this book in Appendix**get the number!!**) Packer's article is a devastating critique of Barabas' position overall: "There was thus no response from the Keswick faction which rebuffed the critique offered by Packer. It is widely agreed that Packer's review marked the end of the dominance of the Keswick approach among younger evangelicals . . . the theological weight of Packer's critique seemed to many to prove unanswerable." (pg. 79, *J. I. Packer: A Biography*, A. McGrath. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997). However, Packer's rebuttal has the serious weakness that Packer rejects (pgs. 160-161) what he calls "a mystical doctrine of personal communion with the Holy Ghost" and likewise opposes the idea that a "life in which the Holy Spirit plays no conscious part is sub-normal Christianity." Packer gives no verses from the Bible for his rejection of personal communion with the Holy Ghost (contra 2 Corinthians 13:14), but simply blows fellowship with Him off as being "magic" by a quote from B. B. Warfield. Packer's acceptance of a life in which the Holy Spirit plays no conscious part is a dangerous error in his doctrine of sanctification. One wonders if his vehement opposition to the

doctrine of conscious fellowship with the Holy Ghost stems from the incredible amount of quenching and grief the Spirit recieves from the liturgical and lifeless Anglican communion in which Packer ministers, a denomination that is filled to the brim with unregenerate people and apostasy. The serious error of Packer in downplaying the communion of the Holy Ghost, while widespread in modern Reformed circles, and recognized as a danger by some modern writers among the Reformed themselves (e. g., Bruce Waltke, professor of Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary, wrote: "Reformed doctrine . . . may lead to spiritual deadness by reducing Christianity to a rational system of thought rather than maximizing and realizing the essential ministry of the Holy Spirit in life" (pg. 22, "Evangelical Spirituality: A Biblical Scholar's Perspective." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31:1 (March 1988).) does not represent the uniform position of classical Reformed authors. When John Owen wrote *Of Communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,* and spent many pages detailing the believer's personal fellowship with the Holy Spirit, he embraced a theology of sanctification notably different from Packer. Consider also the warm embrace of communion with the Spirit by the Dutch Second Reformation Calvinist Wilhelmus á Brakel:

> [T]he Holy Spirit . . . transmi[ts] . . . the image of God [and] imprint[s] [it] upon the heart of man, who is re-created in this image. . . . The transmission of this image occurs by the operation of the Spirit of God, who imprints the image of God upon man, causing Christ to be formed in them. . . . This sealing, which confirms believers and assures them that they are partakers of the covenant of grace, occurs in various ways.
>
> First, this occurs when the Spirit reveals to believers that He dwells in them as in a temple. The bride requested, "set me as a seal upon Thine heart" (Song 8:6); that is, let me thus be imprinted upon Thy heart, that Thou wouldest continually think upon me and that my appearance would continually be before Thy eyes. In like manner the Holy Spirit sets Himself as a seal upon the heart of believers, making them conscious of His presence and indwelling, whereby He assures them as clearly and powerfully that they are partakers of the covenant of grace as if they were sealed with a seal. . . . Secondly, the Holy Spirit seals them by imprinting the image of God upon them, as well as by showing and revealing to them that the image of God is in them. He convinces them of the genuineness of their initial change, of their being ingrafted into Christ, of their faith whereby they truly received Christ and still do so daily both unto justification and sanctification. He convinces them of the genuineness of their insatiable desire to continually enjoy communion with God, of their spiritual life which, though feeble, is nevertheless genuine, and of their hatred for sin. He makes them aware how it wounds and grieves them when they perceive internal sin, imperfection in their performance of duty, as well as their failure to perform that which is good. He shows them that it is not only all their desire to be holy, but that their utmost effort is to do everything in faith, to be motivated by the love and fear of God, to live in childlike obedience, etc. The Spirit makes them conscious of all this, so that they perceive it in such a manner that they can neither deny it nor be deprived of its inherent comfort. "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God" (1 Corinthians 2:12).
>
> Having on the one side revealed this to them, He leads them, in the consciousness of this received grace, not only to the Word of God but also to the promises which are made to such persons as they are. He sheds light upon such texts and causes them to acknowledge the infallible truth expressed in them. In this condition He ushers them into the presence of God and by virtue of two propositions—one being deduced from the grace they possess and the other from the Word of God—causes them to come to the conclusion that they are most certainly the children of God and thus will become partakers of eternal salvation. By way of such reasoning, the Holy Spirit not only labors to give clarity and assurance concerning both God's grace in them and the promises of Scripture for them, but also takes an active part in the formulation of this conclusion. By granting much light, He causes them to be steadfast and assured in this conclusion. By His sealing power He impresses this reality so deeply upon their heart that they believe it with such certainty as if they saw it with their eyes and touched it with their hands—yes, as if they were already in possession of salvation itself. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Romans 8:16).
>
> Thirdly, the Holy Spirit also occasionally seals in an immediate manner by means of clear and powerful declarations within the heart, such as: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love; Thy sins are forgiven thee; Thou art an heir of eternal life," and similar passages. Such declarations occasionally occur by means of a Scripture passage which is powerfully applied. At other times this can occur without a specific text, bearing in mind that such a declaration will always be in agreement with Scripture, it being the touchstone for such a declaration. This immediate sealing does not only result in the confirmation of their spiritual state, but the Holy Spirit grants them the immediate enjoyment of the matter itself, which results in peaceful serenity, a pleasant and sweet frame of mind, and an exhilarating joy. This causes such a person to be saturated with love, be in a holy frame of mind, be lifted up in the ways of the Lord, be ready to heroically do battle with the enemy, and walk in the way of God's commandments. The bride refers to this as being

kissed. "Let Him kiss me with the kisses of His mouth: for Thy love is better than wine" (Song 1:2). She further testifies, "He brought me to the banqueting house, and His banner over me was love," etc. (Song 2:4-6). Such was David's desire, "say unto my soul, I am thy salvation" (Psalm 35:3). It is this blessing which Christ promises to believers. "I will love him, and will manifest Myself to Him. We will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John 14:21, 23).

One should know, however, that, although all believers are sealed, [they do not enjoy experiential fellowship with the Spirit] with equal clarity. (pgs. 187-190, *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, vol 1. It should be noted that experiential communion with God the Father, Son, and Spirit is not a doctrine that requires allegorization of the Song of Solomon for Scriptural support.)

Indeed, Warfield himself, whom Packer quotes for his opposition to communion with the Holy Ghost, makes many affirmations affirming the reality and centrality of such communion. For example, Warfield affirmed:

> For the right interpretation of Scripture there are, of course, requisite all sorts of human preparations, knowledges, fitnesses (general and spiritual training, knowledge of languages and history, etc.); but the essential qualification is, nevertheless, faith and life in communion with the Holy Ghost, who teaches us to understand the complete harmony of Scripture, even in the apparent contraditions of Scripture[.] . . . For the Holy Spirit leads all those who are of believing heart, and who call. on Him for the purpose of receiving enlightenment only from Him, into all truth. ("The Westminster Doctrine of Holy Scripture," in *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work*, vol. 6 of *Works*)

Warfield similarly wrote:

> We may of course speak of a mystical aspect of Christianity, and we may even speak of the doctrine or rather the experience of the Holy Ghost, as the real truth of mysticism. The term "Christ-mysticism" may have a good meaning . . . [although it] may also be gravely misleading. . . . [H]ad only all Christians understood, and lived up to their belief in the Holy Ghost, they would all have been mystics[.] . . . All Christians . . . actually are "mystics" in the sense [that] . . . communion with God is of the very essence of Christianity: Paul tells us in so many words, that "if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His." No man is a Christian who has not the experience of the indwelling Christ. (Review of *Mysticism and Modern Life*, John Wright Buckham, in *Critical Reviews*, vol. 10 of *Works*. Quote marks have been removed.)

Enjoyment of the communion of the Holy Ghost (2 Corinthians 13:14), contrary to the affirmations of Packer, is not only characteristic of better Reformed writers, but it indubitably characterizes historic Baptist theology as well, for conscious, experiential communion with the Trinity is not "magic," but the plain teaching of Scripture. When "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us" (Romans 5:5), conscious, experiential fellowship is in view. "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Galatians 4:6; Romans 8:15)—what is this but experiential fellowship? The Apostles could say, "truly our fellowship *is* with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ," a fellowship as experiential as their fellowship one with another (1 John 1:3). Christ promises: "[H]e that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. . . . I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. . . . If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John 14:18-23). Does Christ manifest Himself to the believer, and come with His Father to abide with the believer, without conscious, experiential fellowship with his beloved redeemed one? To "know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge" (Ephesians 3:19) cannot be merely intellectual, but also experiential. When Christ comes in to the believer, to sup with him, experiential fellowship is clearly in view (Revelation 3:20). Packer's affirmation that a life in which the Holy Spirit plays no conscious part is not sub-normal Christianity is extremely dangerous and entirely erroneous.

It is also amazing that Packer will oppose Keswick with tremendous vehemence, while employing far softer language for the by any reasonable measure far more serious errors of charismatic fanaticism and soul-damning Romanism and theological modernism. Packer will hope that he has heard the "last gasp" (pg. 124, *Keep In Step With The Spirit*) of the Keswick doctrine, but never expresses such a hope for modernism, Romanism, or the charismatic movement. He indicates that "hatred of the cruel and tormenting realities of overheated holiness teaching [Keswick] remains in his heart to this day" (pg. 129), but expresses no such sentiments about the doctrines of modernists and Romanists, calling such non-evangelicals "other Christians" (pg. 126), and speaks of a "world church—Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican, and nonepiscopal Protestant" (pg. 139) all together. When asked if he is "for or against the charismatics," he will not say he is against them (pg. 141), but will call the charismatic movement "evangelicalism's half-sister" (pg. 141) declare that his "experiences in fellowship with charismatics have almost all been good" (pg. 143), praise fleshly and worldly charismatic "worship" as "deeply cleansing and

invigorating" (pg. 146), affirm that charismatic tongues should not be condemned as a private prayer language (pg. 152) but are a "good gift of God" (pg. 169), and that their alleged exorcism ministries are "salutary for many" (pg. 158). Packer will state his certainty that "charismatic renewal is certainly central at present in God's purposes of revitalizing his church . . . it [is] plain at once that God is in it" (pg. 147, 150) although Packer knows full well that "current charismatic phenomena do not fully correspond to those of 1 Corinthians 12-14" (pg. 149), their "tongues" are "not language" (pg. 168) and "cannot be confidently equated from any point of view with New Testament tongues" (pg. 179), and, indeed, "the theology most commonly professed within the movement to account for its own claimed distinctives is deeply unbiblical" (pg. 161) and "cannot be established from Scripture" (pg. 163), and their "healings" and "prophetic" gifts are not those of the New Testament (pgs. 171-174). Although Packer knows charismatic doctrines are deeply unbiblical, they should not be "dismiss[ed] as eccentric, neurotic, or even demonic" (pg. 150). Indeed, Packer affirms, all "stand condemned" who do not "thank God for all the new life . . . of which the charismatic movement has been the human channel," for we should "not [move] away from . . . the charismatic renewal" (pg. 194). Charles F. Parham, "father of the modern Pentecostal movement," (pg. 23, *Tongues in Biblical Perspective*, Charles R. Smith), although a fanatic, false prophet (e. g., pgs. 33ff., 60, 77, etc., *The Everlasting Gospel*, Parham), hell-rejector (pgs. 51ff, 92ff, *ibid*), and Ku Klux Klan commendor (pg. 190-191, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson), who although "arrested for the grossest immorality, a form of immorality for which we have no name in our English language, though it is described in the first chapter of Romans" (pg. 34, *The Tongues Movement*, Louis S. Bauman, rev. ed. Winona Lake, IN: Brethren Missionary Herald, 1963; cf. pgs. 140, 142, 272-273, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson, where Torrey and others affirmed that Parham was guilty of sodomy), had greater discernment about the tongues movement than J. I. Packer. Ten years after Parham initiated modern "tongues" in 1901, he wrote:

> Two-thirds of this tongue stuff over the country is not Pentecost. . . . [there are] no real languages, [but] fleshly controls of spiritualistic origin[.] . . . the real Pentecost [is] not chattering or jabbering . . . Hear this: three-fourths of the so-called Pentecosts in the world are counterfeits, the devil's imitation to deceive the poor earnest souls. . . . Many hundreds, in seeking Pentecost . . . were ripe for hypnotic influence. . . . Two-thirds of the people professing Pentecost are either hypnotized or spook-driven, being seized in the first place by a false spirit or coming under the control of one afterward . . . [many are] demon-controlled. . . . They plead the blood, and claim to be Jesus, giving messages, and imitate every gift of the Holy Spirit and Pentecostal tongues[.] (*The Everlasting Gospel*. Baxter Springs, Kansas: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1911, pgs. 31, 55, 72, 120-121)

While Parham is too low, by a third or a fourth respectively, in his estimate that two-thirds or three-fourths of modern Pentecostalism's supernatural experiences are fakes or demonic, he has far more wisdom than Packer, who recognizes that modern charismatic phenomena are not those of Scripture but nonetheless claims that they are from God. Packer should also have considered the testimony of Pentecostal historians that tongues speech had its roots in demon possession as practiced in pagan African religions:

> [I]t is far easier not to deal with the fact that the tradition of violent possession, (which is the same as spirit-possession) associated with the earliest camp meetings is far more African that European, and hence there is reason to hold that, in part at least, it was inspired in the whites by their contact with Negroes. . . . [T]he phenomenon of spirit possession [i]s a type of highly emotionalized religions and ecstatic experience commonly designated by such terms as "filled with the Holy Ghost," "lost in the Spirit," speaking in tongues and rolling." Spirit possession by a deity is the outstanding manifestation of West African religion[.] . . . [T]he slaves were not completely stripped of their culture upon their arrival in America. A number of "Africanisms" survived . . . such as spirit possession, the dance, and shout songs[.] . . . It may be categorically stated that black pentecostalism emerged . . . [with a] view of religion that had its roots in African religion. . . . William J. Seymour . . . was to contemporary pentecostalism what Luther was to the Reformation, a major catalyst . . . Seymour's Azusa Street revival was the torrential downpour that created a major worldwide flood. . . . [B]lacks initiate[d] the Azusa Street meeting . . . [d]irectly or indirectly, practically all of the Pentecostal groups in existence can trace their lineage to the Azusa Mission. . . . Seymour, W. E. Fuller, first overseer of the black wing of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church of the Americas, C. H. Mason, founder of the Church of God in Christ, and G. T. Haywood fo the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, were the sons of emancipated slaves. Their . . . view of religion had its roots in African religion. . . . [T]he influence of African spirit possession on those black pentecostal pioneers who were born as slaves in the American South . . . is a much-neglected and often misunderstood phase of the story (pgs. 123-124, 137-139, "Black Origins of the Pentecostal Movement," Leonard Lovett, pgs. 123-141 of *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. Lovett "served as the pioneer dean of the . . . official seminary for . . . the Church of God in Christ . . . the largest black pentecostal denomination" (pg.

123). Some quotations by Lovett of other sources have had their quotation marks removed; see the Lovett's article for documentation and further source material).

If Keswick theology is a stovetop worth of "overheated holiness teaching," charismatic fanaticism is a city-engulfing inferno of it, but Packer treats its demonic character with the sinful gentleness of David toward murderous Absalom. He will condemn Keswick "quietism" (pg. 127) which he notes developed in connection with the Romanist mystical Quietist "Madame Guyon" (pg. 230), yet will positively comment on pagan Romanist "mystical prayer" (pg. 180) which developed from Quietists and "mystic writers . . . including the Anglican William Law, the Roman Catholics Molinos, Fénélon, Gaston de Renty, Francis de Sales, and Madame Guyon" (pg. 111). Packer will manifest no vehement opposition, but quote positively, unregenerate modernists and neoorthodox writers such as "Karl Barth" (pg. 54) or "J. V. Taylor," who Packer affirms has "finely said" that "it does not matter . . . whether the Christ who fills our vision is the historical Jesus" (pgs. 35-38). Packer praises "profound and perceptive treatments of the spiritual life . . . [with qualities of] spiritual sensitiveness and moral integrity that modern evangelical writing on holiness has not begun to match" by "Roman Catholics, high Anglicans, and medievalists of all persuasions" (pg. 85). Paul, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, was more in step with the Spirit than is J. I. Packer when the Apostle anathematized (Galatians 1:8-9) those who hold to the heresies espoused by modernism and Romanism. "Packer had no doubts about what needed to be done with the old Keswick teaching . . . he wanted 'to kill it dead,'" (pg. 77, *J. I. Packer: A Biography*, McGrath), yet he repudated the plain Biblical doctrine of separation (Romans 16:17; 2 Thessalonians 3:6) for "the merits of collaborating with other Christians [?] who were not evangelicals" (pg. 158, *ibid*.), he wrote a book with Anglo-Catholics (pg. 155, *ibid*.), said: "I cannot see that anything Scripture says, in the first chapters of Genesis or elsewhere, bears on the biological theory of evolution one way or the other . . . [to be a] theistic evolutionist . . . [does not make one] not an evangelical" (pg. 200, *ibid*.), affirmed that "non-charismatic evangelicals . . . [should] relate to . . . charismatics . . . in strongly positive terms" and make a "strong affirmation of the divine authenticity of characteristic charismatic experiences" (pgs. 245, 247 *ibid*.), "invited . . . evangelicals and Catholics . . . to ally themselves for the work of Christian mission" since "on both sides of the Reformation" Protestants and Papists "trust and love the Lord Jesus Christ" (pgs. 271, *ibid*.), and consequently to "Protestantism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Roman Catholicism . . . Packer offered . . . a vision of a 'transcendent new togetherness['] . . . in the face of opposition from fundamentalists" (pg. 272, *ibid*.). Since good Roman Catholics are "true Christians," Packer believes in bringing "together on the same platform catholics [both Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics], charismatics, and evangelicals, all united" (pg. 277, *ibid*.). While such a union involves the abandonment of the necessity of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone, "Packer insisted that it is not 'any theory about faith and justification' which brings salvation to people," since requiring "notional soundness and precision" on justification by faith alone is "near to being a cultic heresy" (pg. 273, *ibid*.), a view of justification closer to that of Paul's anathematized opponents in Galatians than that of the Apostle (Galatians 1:8-9).

Packer does not do well at all to call the militant defense of and separation over justification by faith alone "near to a cultic heresy," nor does he well when he wants Keswick theology dead but will appraise positively or not condemn and certainly not separate over far more serious charismatic, modernist, and Romanist heresies.

751 Andrew Murray wrote: "A good many Christians are living a low life, a life of failure and of sin, instead of rest and victory . . . they give way to despair. . . . It is the state of the regenerate man in Romans 7. There you will find the Christian man trying his very utmost to live a holy life. God's law has been revealed to him as reaching down into the very depth of the desires of the heart, and the man can dare to say: 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man. To will what is good is present with me. My heart loves the law of God, and my will has chosen that law.' Can a man like that fail, with his heart full of delight in God's law and with his will determined to do what is right? Yes. That is what Romans 7 teaches us. . . . a wretched Christian life, without joy, or strength, or victory. . . . [I]n this passage (Rom. 7:6-25) the name of the Holy Spirit does not occur once, nor does the name of Christ occur. The man is wrestling and struggling to fulfill God's law. Instead of the Holy Spirit and of Christ, the law is mentioned nearly twenty times. In this chapter, it shows a believer doing his very best to obey the law of God with his regenerate will. Not only this; but you will find the little words, *I, me, my,* occur more than forty times. It is the regenerate *I* in its impotence seeking to obey the law without being filled with the Spirit." (pgs. 29-31, 36, *Absolute Surrender*, Andrew Murray).

the position of Chafer,[752] and which Pentecostalism took over from its Keswick parent,[753] and argues against it:

One notes that Romans 6 also contains no mention of the Holy Spirit, nor, for that matter, do Romans 2-4, 10, 13, or 16, but Andrew Murray and other advocates of the Keswick theology would hardly affirm that sanctification as described in Romans 6 is possible without the Holy Spirit, and nobody who believes the gospel would affirm that justification is possible, as described in Romans 3-4, without the convicting and drawing work of the Spirit. Very few would draw any conclusions from the fact that the title "Christ" is absent from Romans 4 & 11, or "Jesus" absent in Romans 9, 11-12. Furthermore, it simply is false when Murray says: "[I]n this passage (Rom. 7:6-25) the name of . . . Christ . . . does not occur." Was Paul's conclusion to his discussion in Romans 7:25 too obscure, or too hard to notice? The summation of the whole matter in Romans 7:14-25 is progressive deliverance through Jesus Christ, who is specifically named: "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin" (Romans 7:25). Did Murray read the passage to which he referred? However, Murray is not at all alone in exegetical gymnastics among Higher Life advocates in Romans 7. Many Keswick and Higher Life writers treat Romans 7:25a as the conclusion of Romans 7:14-25, as Paul's actual conclusion in Romans 7:25b is very difficult for the Keswick view of the passage to explain. Thus, e. g., William Boardman spends an entire chapter of his *The Higher Christian Life* (pgs. 264-280) explaining how one escapes from Romans 7 and enters into Romans 8 when one passes into the Higher Life, making Romans 7:25a the centerpiece of his argument (although he does not exegete the passage, just proof-texts Romans 7:25a and argues from testimonials). Boardman even makes the astonishing affirmation that advocates of the orthodox view of Romans 7 "always clip this graphic chapter . . . to make it suit their experience" (pg. 277, *ibid*) because they, Boardman claims, view Romans 7:24 as the end of the chapter, while in truth 7:25a "closes" the chapter "with the exultant note of deliverance" (pg. 277, *ibid*)—the fact that Romans 7:25b actually is the end of Romans 7 is not even mentioned! Likewise, Romans 7:25a is treated as the end of Romans 7 in the preaching at the Oxford Convention (pg. 129, pg. 291, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

W. H. Griffith Thomas quotes, as paradigmatic of the Keswick position on Romans 7:14-25, Evan Hopkins making the same argument about Paul referring to himself but not to Christ or the Holy Spirit on pgs. 275-276 of "The Victorious Life" (I.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:303) July 1919, 267-288, referencing pg. 49 of Hopkins' *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life*. William Boardman also taught that "the mass of Christians were quite satisfied to go on in the usual way, and live in the seventh of Romans, instead of stepping on into the eighth," as the minority do who have entered the Higher Life; these have discovered the secret that "one may step out of the 'wretched man' experience, in which the mass of God's people are living, under bondage to law, into the glorious liberty of the eighth of Romans" (pg. 93, 139, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman; cf. also pgs. 182-183, 263ff., *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman). The traditional view of Romans 7:14-25 "involves one in endless difficulty and monstrous absurdity" (pg. 140, *ibid*). On the contrary, the alleged Keswick contrast between a flesh-dependent person who has not learned the secret of the Higher Life in Romans 7:14-25 and one who has found out the Keswick secret in Romans 8 simply does not fit the development of the book of Romans, but is an arbitrary idea that must be read into and which distorts the text.

[752] Absolute unity on the doctrine of sanctification among speakers at the Keswick convention from its origin until the present time does not exist, although certain historical trajectories can certainly be traced. Assertions by Packer, Barabas, and any other writer on sanctification should be evaluated based on the accuracy of their Scriptural content. Neither the Reformed position as represented by Packer nor the Keswick position as represented by Barabas presents a doctrine of sanctification wholly correct or wholly in error. One major danger in Packer's Reformed doctrine is a neglect of the the Biblical fact of a distinction between the believer who is right with God and the one who is not so (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:27-29), while a major danger of the Keswick position as presented by Barabas is its neglect of the actual change within the believer's nature through Spirit-produced mortification and vivification.

[753] See, e. g., pgs. 261-262 of Myer Pearlman's Pentecostal classic, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*. Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, rev. ed., 1981. Following his Keswick progenitors, Pearlman

Keswick scouts the Augustininan[754] view that Romans vii reflects Paul's normal, everyday experience, on the ground that it records only "heart-breaking defeat" (p. 76), "ineffectual struggle" (pg. 81), "spiritual stalemate," (p. 82).[755] This, Keswick affirms—rightly—is not the New Testament picture of healthy Christian life. Dr. Barabas quotes with approval the remark that "if normal Christian experience does not rise any higher than that, then we must change our Lord's invitation to read, 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will tell you how to be wretched . . . !'" Instead, Keswick affirms that verses 7-25 show "what happens when any person, regenerate or unregenerate, tries to conquer the old nature by self-effort" (p. 77), i. e. without the use of the Keswick technique of consecration and faith. "The key to the interpretation," it is suggested, "is found in the frequent repetition of 'I,' while there is not a single mention of the Holy Spirit. . . . In chapter viii, however, where there are at least twenty references to the Holy Spirit and the 'I' drops out, there is a triumphant note throughout." Normal Christian living, therefore, is not in Romans vii, but in Romans viii, "and is experienced as the Holy Spirit by His counteractive power is permitted to have His way" (p. 82).[756]

---

concludes that with the "cry of triumph" of Romans 7:25a Paul "enter[s] the wonderful eighth chapter" of Romans, entirely ignoring Paul's actual conclusion in Romans 7:25b.

[754] Augustine of Hippo taught baptismal regeneration, that outside of the visible institution of the Catholic denomination there is no salvation, and many other damnable heresies. Biblical sanctification should not be termed "Augustinian," since it did not originate with a man who taught a false gospel and consequently could not possibly have the right doctrine of sanctification. Modern evangelical defences of an allegedly Augustinian view of sanctification should consider if it is wise to associate with Augustine's sacramentalism and other errors, such as his denial of the possibility of assurance of salvation: "In the treatise *On Rebuke and Grace* Augustine postulated that the number of the elect was fixed in such a way that it could neither be increased nor diminished, though the identity of the elect was hidden. This led him to conclude that no one could be sure of his own salvation: 'for who of the multitude of believers can presume,' he asked, 'so long as he is living in this mortal state, that he is in the number of the predestinated?' [pg. 39-40, *On Rebuke and Grace*; Chapter 40, "No One is Certain and Secure of His Own Predestination and Salvation," in *Church Fathers — The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series*, vol. 5, "Augustin: Anti-Pelagian Writings, ed. Philip Schaff]" (pg. 189, *The True Image*, Philip E. Hughes). Augustine tied his denial of the possibility of assurance to an affirmation that a true believer can lose salvation and fall out of a state of saving grace: "For on account of the usefulness of this secrecy, lest, perchance, any one should be lifted up, but that all, even although they are running well, should fear, in that it is not known who may attain, — on account of the usefulness of this secrecy, it must be believed that some of the children of perdition, who have not received the gift of perseverance to the end, begin to live in the faith which worketh by love, and live for some time faithfully and righteously, and afterwards fall away, and are not taken away from this life before this happens to them. If this had happened to none of these, men would have that very wholesome fear, by which the sin of presumption is kept down, only so long as until they should attain to the grace of Christ by which to live piously, and afterwards would for time to come be secure that they would never fall away from Him" (Chapter 40, "No One is Certain and Secure of His Own Predestination and Salvation," *ibid*).

[755] [Packer states in a footnote:] So Moule, who characterizes it as "a stern but on the whole disappointing conflict[.]" . . . Moule, *The Epistle to the Romans*, *ad* vii. 7-25.

[756] Packer, earlier in his article (pgs. 161-162), dealt with the idea of sanctification merely as counteraction which can be turned on or off instantaneously and completely by an act of faith and consecration or a lapse thereof:

> When . . . Keswick teachers turn to the question, how we may do God's will, what they say amounts to this: that we must pass back to the Spirit the duty He has shown us to be ours, for Him to do it in our place. . . . [I]nstead of working through our conscious personal life, the Spirit stands over against it. . . . [The Keswick] doctrine is that the Spirit's power . . . is placed at the Christian's disposal, to "use" (by an act of renewed consecration and faith) whenever temptation arises. Energetic resistance to sin is decried, for "deliverance is not attained by struggle and painful effort, by earnest resolution and self-denial" (p. 90); instead, the Christian "is to hand over the fleshly deeds of the body to the Spirit for mortification. . . . He is then to stand in faith. . . . It is the Holy Spirit's responsibility to do the rest" (pg. 107). If I do anything to defeat sin, sin will defeat me; but if I do nothing beyond appealing to the Spirit to defeat it for me, instantaneous victory is assured. The Spirit's work of repelling the assaults of sin in my heart is thus *vicarious* in exactly the same

It seems impossible to pronounce this exegesis a success. It is arbitrary and gratuitous. There is nothing in the text or context to suggest it. It has to be read into Paul's words, for it cannot be read out of them. "So then," Paul sums up (vii. 25), "with the flesh [I serve] the law of sin." He means, glosses Moule (*Comm[entary on Romans,* on 7:14-25]), "wherever and whenever I 'revert' to the life of self." But this limiting gloss is nowhere in the text. Again, the Keswick "key" to the passage is quite unplausible; for Paul, so far from opposing the Christian's working to the Spirit's, as if the one excluded the other, constantly treats the second as the ground of, and incentive to, the first (Philippians ii. 12-13, etc.). Moreover, Keswick, on this showing, completely misrepresents the . . . view [that Romans 7:14-25 is a description of the normal Christian life] which it rejects. There is nothing in the passage to warrant the description of Paul's conflict with sin as *heart-breaking defeat, stalemate,* or *inffectual* striving. These epithets could be justified only if it were true that there are no degrees of deliverance, so that anything less than complete victory is complete defeat. But this is just what is in dispute, and ought not to be taken for granted. The truth plainly is, that Keswick exegetes were already prepossessed with the idea that healthy Christian life is a "maintained condition" (pp. 72, 83) of complete victory over known sin before they came to study Romans vii; and it was this cramping assumption that compelled them to read the chapter statically instead of dynamically. Hence they found in it nothing more than a confession of failure; for their preconception exluded from it altogether the idea of *progress*, in which [other] expositors find the real key to its meaning. In actual fact, writes Dr. Warfield, this passage "depicts for us the process of the eradication of the old nature . . . what is really in the chapter is divine grace warring against, and not merely counteracting but eradicating, the natural evil of sin . . . the working of grace is by process, and therefore reveals itself at any given point of observation as conflict."[757] The deliverance which grace effects is never final in

---

sense as was Christ's work of bearing the penalty of sin on His cross. In each case what I was bound to do is done in my stead by Another, and in each case my cooperation is absolutely excluded. This is express quietism, but it differs from other forms of quietism in that the whole process is represented as being under my control. . . . In this doctrine of "power" . . . [Packer cites Warfield, *Perfectionism*, II, p. 609, as stating that] the analogy of a material force is most unpleasantly suggested. . . . God stands always helplessly by until man calls him into action by opening a channel into which his energies may flow. It sounds dreadfully like turning on the steam or the electricity. [Packer continues,] [t]here is no question that this is a true bill. Yet it is not easy to see how else Keswick teachers could express themselves; for this is how, on their own premises, they must think of the matter. If I regulate the sanctifying process by the degree of my own willingness to be sanctified, and if the Spirit in sanctification works, not through my own conscious working but apart from it, so that my part is not to work with Him, but to cease working and set Him to work alone, then it is exactly like turning on the steam or the electricity. We do not, therefore, overstate the difference between the [true] and the Keswick doctrines when we contrast them thus: according to the first, the Holy Spirit uses my faith and obedience (which He Himself works in me) to sanctify me; according to the second, I use the Holy Spirit (whom God puts at my disposal) to sanctify myself. It should be superfluous to point out that such doctrine is . . . unscriptural [and] irreligious.

In a footnote (pg. 161), Packer deals with Dr. Barabas' denial that his position teaches quietism, "on the ground that intense activity in using the means of grace is necessary to keep up one's consecration and to maintain faith. But such activity, as is explicitly stated in the passage from Bishop Moule which he quotes, is merely *preparatory:* "the temptation of the hour will be met less by direct efforts of the will than by indirect"—i. e., by handing the matter over to the Spirit and *ceasing to act in it oneself.* This is the quietism of Keswick teaching. Moule knew very well what he was teaching, and in *Veni Creator* (p. 197) describes the believer's part in sanctification as "a blessed and wakeful Quietism." In a second footnote (pg 162), Packer states that "it is worthy of remark that even so able a . . . theologian as Moule could not, having once adopted Keswick thought-forms, avoid expressing himself in [the] Pelagian way [where God stands helplessly by until the believer decides to turn on His power like the steam or electricity]. . . .[Moule wrote,] "It is not that God is not sufficient. . . . But the man does not always adequately *use* God" (*The Epistle to the Romans, ad* vii. 7-25). Note that the analogy of the Higher Life as "making the junction between the machinery and the steam-engine," so that with the steam connected, one "goes easily and without effort," was explicitly employed at the Oxford Convention (pg. 291, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

[757] [Packer cites] *Perfectionism*, II, pp. 583f. [by B. B. Warfield].

> this world, but is continuous and progressive. And all that Paul actually says in verses 14-25 is that at present his intention always exceeds his achievement,[758] that though he would be perfect he is always something less than perfect, and that he longs for the day when by Christ's power sin will have been rooted out of hiim completely and his reach will no more exceed his grasp (vii. 24; cf. vii. 23).
>
> The new exegesis, then, is not preferable to the old. It appears to be the result of reading Romans vii in the light of a preconceived and unproven theory which excludes any sense of imperfect attainment from the healthy Christian consciousness. And its rejection means the rejection of [the Keswick conscept of sanctification as] complete counteraction as doubly erroneous; for our examination of Romans vii confirms us in the belief that the Christian's sanctification, while far less than complete, is far more than counteraction. It is nothing less than the progressive uprooting of sin within him by the conquering energy of the Spirit of God.[759]

Romans 7:14-25 is not a description of Paul before his conversion, nor of the Apostle in some sort of state of legal bondage from which he is delivered in Romans 8 to enter into a higher Christian life. The second half of Romans 7 depicts an aspect of Paul's normal Christian life, the aspect that relates the normal Christian life to the holy law of God, [760] and is in this respect a paradigm for the Christian life and growth of all believers.[761]

---

758 [Packer cites A. Nygren, *Romans* [1952], p. 243 as follows:] "He has in mind the tension which exists, in the Christian life, between will and action, between intention and performance."

759 "'Keswick' and the Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification," pgs. 164-166. Packer concludes his article by stating: "It has become clear how profoundly unsatisfactory the new [Keswick] tecahing is in comparison with the old. It is *Pelagian;* for, in effect, it makes the Christian the employer, and the Holy Spirit the employee, in the work of sanctification. It is *shallow*; for it externalizes sanctification, reducing the Spirit's work to the mere preventing of sinful acts and excluding from it altogether the positive renewal of the agent's person. As such, it is a *depressing* message for the Christian; for what a regenerate man, as such, desires most of all for himself is, not freedom from conflict and tension as an end in itself, but freedom from the pollution and defilement of sin in his heart. ["]Oh for a *heart* to praise my God,/ A *heart* from sin set free!["] . . . is [the believer's] constant cry. And this, Keswick assures him, is precisely what he cannot even begin to have in this world. The law of sin can be counteracted in his life, but not in the slightest degree eradicated from his heart. On his dying day, his heart will be no purer than on the day of his new birth. We may suspect that the salvation proclaimed by Reformed theology [and other non-Keswick positions on sanctification that also avoid the errors of Reformed theology], which centers round a real, progressive purifying and renewing of his heart, will impress him as far greater and infinitely more desirable than its Keswick counterpart, which extends only to his actions and leaves his corrupt heart exactly as it was. Moreover, the Keswick message is *delusive*; for it offers a greater measure of deliverance from sin than Scripture anywhere promises or the apostles themselves ever attained. This cannot but lead either to self-deception, in the case of those who profess to have entered into this [post-conversion second] blessing, or to disillusionment and despair, in the case of those who seek it but fail to find it. In the latter case, according to Keswick, the reason for the failure is not that there is no such blessing to be had, but that the seeker's acts of consecration and faith were defective; and he is therefore directed to repeat them more thoroughly. It is unnecessary to dwell on the bondage and frustration to which such advice must lead.

"The Convention," Dr. Barabas assures us, "is not interested in academic discussions of theology and ethics, or even in adding to the store of Bible knowledge of those who attend, but simply and only in helping men to be holy." (p. 108). Perhaps it is this very unconcern that has caused the trouble. After all, Pelagianism is the natural heresy of zealous Christians who are not interested in theology. May we venture to suggest that the Convention would more effectively promote its avowed aim by reforming its tradition according to the Word of God?

760 Romans 7:14-25 "reproduces Paul's present theological self-knowledge as a Christian: not all of it, but just that part of it which is germane to the subject in hand—namely, the function of the law in giving knowledge of sin. (The other side of Paul's self knowledge, that given him by the gospel, is set out in

Application of the Exegesis of Romans 7:14-25

Since Romans 7:14-25, continuing into chapter 8, is a description of the normal Christian life, as seen in the godly Apostle Paul, a number of conclusions necessarily follow.

1.) You should beware of claims of Christian experience that allegedly are different and higher than Romans 7:14-8:4. A believer who affirms that he has reached a higher plane where he never has to struggle with sin is surely either self-deceived or a hypocrite, for he makes a claim to a level of Christian experience that exceeds any promised in the Bible for the believer's earthly pilgrimage. Any Christian on earth who thinks he has risen to a plane above one where he can regularly follow the model prayer's request, "forgive us our sins" (Luke 11:4), has allowed the deceitfulness of sin to very greatly lead him astray.

2.) While focusing on Christ, strive at all times to be aware of, on guard against, and strenuously opposing the motions of indwelling sin. To be unware of your remaining corruption is very dangerous and an indication of serious spiritual deficiency. Furthermore, if you convince yourself that you have reached a higher plane where you no longer struggle against sin, and where your desire for righteousness no longer exceeds the measure to which you have arrived at (Romans 7:15), you will seriously hinder your further progress in grace. The Lord Jesus promised: "Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled" (Matthew 5:6). You should be filled with a boundless hunger for greater holiness than you possess, and hate the fact that you still have such awful remains of corruption within you. God will bless such hunger

---

chapter 8.) The thesis of the paragraph [consisting of Romans 7:14-25], 'I am carnal, sold under sin,' is stated categorically and without qualification, not because this is the whole truth about Paul the Christian, but because it is the only part of the truth about himself that the law can tell him. What the law does for the Christian is to give him knowledge of the sin that still remains in him. When he reviews his life by the light of the law, he always finds that he has done less than the good that he wanted to do; thus he 'finds' and 'sees' that sin is still in him, and that he is still to a degree being taken captive by it (vss. 21-23). The wretchedness of the 'wretched man' thus springs from the discovery of his continuing sinfulness, and the knowledge that he cannot hope to be rid of indwelling sin, his troublesome inmate, while he remains in the body. He is painfully conscious that for the present his reach exceeds his grasp, and therefore he longs for the eschatological deliverance through which the tension between will and achievement, purpose and performance, plan and action, will be abolished" (pgs. 626-627, "The 'Wretched Man' in Romans 7," J. I. Packer).

[761] Many other views of Romans 7:14-25 have been invented. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to deal with every one of the unusual ideas people have thought up to explain the passage. It is sufficient to present the true view that Romans 7:14-25 speaks of Paul in his normal Christian life, as a paradigm for Christians in general, and compare this position with the common contrary views that the pericope deals with Paul as unregenerate or with someone living based on law apart from faith.

and thirst after righteousness by filling you ever the more with His holiness. Thinking that you have entered a state where you no longer need to hunger and thirst for greater holiness than you have will cause this blessed hungering and thirsting, and the Divine holiness that is imparted by means of it, to abate. Do not make the mistake of confusing a proper desire to resist and not hold on to any sin—a proper Christian sincerity and upright walk—with freedom from all conscious sin. How will becoming unconscious that your flesh is constantly lusting against the Spirit (Galatians 5:17) be of any spiritual benefit, rather than of certain spiritual weakness? Rather, you should grow in your hatred for your indwelling sin, and in your understanding of its lusting. Your ability to mortify indwelling corruption will be hindered if you pretend that it is perfectly counteracted or that its actions are in any way different from what they truly are.

3.) Humble yourself greatly because of your own vileness, wickedness, and worthlessness. Will you add, on top of all the sin you have already, that of pride and blindness to your own sinful condition?

4.) Recognize that it is a certain principle that, especially when you seek to do good, evil is then present with you (Romans 7:21).[762] Be especially on your guard against sin when you are engaged in especially spiritual activities, from public worship to personal devotions.

5.) Recognize that the closer you are to the Lord, and the more the Holy Spirit conforms you to the image of Christ, the greater this conflict against sin will become. Isaiah was especially conscious of his sin (Isaiah 6:4) when he saw Jehovah on His throne, high and lifted up (Isaiah 6). "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). The more His light shines upon you, the more you will see, hate, and strive against what darkness remains within you.

6.) Focus on the promise of spiritual victory that the Lord has given to you. The promise is not that you will, on earth, reach a place where spiritual warfare is no longer necessary, but that you can make continued and constant progress in the eradication of indwelling sin and growth in holiness. When Joshua and the armies of Israel were promised victory in the land of Canaan, they were not promised that all the heathen would be eliminated in a day, but that "the LORD thy God will put out those nations before thee by little and little, until thou be increased, and inherit the land" (Deuteronomy 7:22; Exodus 23:30). Nor was the Lord's covenant with Israel that all the Canaanites would remain, unweakened and defiant as ever, in the land, but simply be supressed so

---

762 Note the classic experiential exposition and application of this verse by John Owen in his *The Nature, Power, Deceit, and Prevalency of the Remainders of Indwelling Sin in Believers*.

that Joshua could forget that they were there, which would be no true victory at all. Rather, the promise was that Israel would, strengthened by Jehovah, win battle after battle and take into actual possession more and more of the land that was all already legally deeded to them. "There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life" (Joshua 1:5; cf. 1:1-9), for "[y]e are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4). As none of the strongholds of the heathen in Canaan could stand against Joshua, strengthened and led by Jehovah, so there is not a sin that you cannot make ever consistent progress against—indeed, the New Covenant in Christ's blood makes your progressive victory now, and ultimate victory in the future, an absolute certainty. So do not despair if the warfare is long, nor delude yourself into thinking that you can put down your weapons and rest at any point in this life. Rather, take to heart the promise made to Joshua: "Be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee: turn not from it *to* the right hand or *to* the left, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest. This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success. Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the LORD thy God *is* with thee whithersoever thou goest" (Joshua 1:7-9).

7.) Let the reality of your continued battle with sin in this life make your thoughts of and longing for heaven all the sweeter. Oh, to be free from even the presence of sin! "We shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). How wonderful will it be to find yourself perfectly conformed to the moral likeness of Christ, and enjoying unbroken fellowship with Him for all eternity! How glad you will be, then, for every battle fought, for every victory won! Press on, oh Christian pilgrim—victory is coming, and victory is secure. "Even so, come, Lord Jesus" (Revelation 22:20).

E. Excursus III: Does Galatians 2:20, Or Any Other Text of Scripture, Teach that Christ Lives the Christian Life Instead of the Believer?

Some have employed Galatians 2:20 to affirm that Christ lives the Christian life instead of the believer, or at least the believer who enters into[763] the Higher Life[764] or the

[763] None of the texts that are alleged as support for the doctrine that Christ lives the Christian life instead of the believer distinguish between an upper class of Christians who have entered into a Higher Life or second blessing and a lower class who have not done so. Galatians 2:20 is true for every Christian, and

every Christian has Christ as his life, is legally dead to sin, and has his life hid with Christ in God (Colossians 3:3, 4).

[764] For example, Hannah W. Smith, in line with her Quaker quietism, mysticism, and doctrine of the Inner Light and Voice, followed this view of Galatians 2:20, writing: "[H]ow few realize that as to themselves they are dead, and it is only Christ who is alive, and they in Him!" and affirming that the Inner Voice only gives "certain guidance" when one has recognized this secret (Letter to Abby, August 20, 1865, cf. Journal, July 22, 1859, reproduced in the entries for February 3 & January 19 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). "[W]e Quakers" can say to one another, "do not expect . . . ever to find yourself any better . . . [y]ou yourself will always be utterly vile, and ignorant, and corrupt, but Jesus is your life now. It is with you 'no more I' but Christ who lives in you. And isn't this glorious to lose your own life and find Christ's divine life put in its place" (Letter to Frank, May 30, 1871, reproduced in the entry for June 6 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). She knew that Christ was "not only the One who gives me life, but the one who lives it too . . . it is no more I who live but Christ who lives in me," so that since "Jesus is our life, of course our only work must be to keep from living our own life and let[ting] His life work in us. . . . [We are to] reckon ourselves dead and alive only in Christ. . . . Is our new nature anything more than Christ in us?" Thus, "I am dead, and . . . the only life I have now is His life," as she "by faith claim[s] His life as [her] own" and became "passive of choice and willingly" (Journal, 1867; Letter to Sister Mary, 1867; Letter to Mary, March 8, 1867, Letter to Priscilla Mounsey, March 15, 1874; Letter to Daughter, May 25, 1878, reproduced in the entries for February 24, 26, 27, July 10, & August 26 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter; cf. also the entries for March 1, 3). Thus, that "He would live my life for me" is "a genuine Quaker experience I am sure . . . a truth which the early Friends, and especially George Fox, rejoiced in . . . the secret of all their lives of devotedness and power . . . the secret of holiness" (Letter to Mother, March 18, 1867, reproduced in the entry for March 7 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). "[W]e are dead, really and truly dead, and the only life we have is 'Christ living in us.' . . . [W]e have no more independence of being . . . apart from Christ" (Letter to a Friend, March 27, 1867, reproduced in the entry for March 8, *ibid*). "I am sure the early Friends understood this, and when they spoke of 'the Seed' & 'the Light' etc. they meant Christ" (Letter to a Friend, Mary 28, 1867, reproduced in the entry for March 9, *ibid*; cf. the entry for March 10 & April 1). Thus, Mrs. Smith preached her Quaker quietism in sanctification based on her view of Galatians 2:20: "It is your own trying to live your life that is the greatest hinderance. Stop this, and let His life live in you . . . let Him be your indwelling life[.] . . . Then it will be easy to live right . . . no effort to live. . . . You are trying to live, and your life is nearly strangled with the effort. Give up trying, and let Christ, who is your life, live in you, and you will live easily and without effort" (pgs. 70-71, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

Hannah W. Smith's teaching on Galatians 2:20 became that of the Broadlands Convention and its successors, the Oxford, Brighton, and Keswick Conventions; thus, those at the first Broadlands Convention heard: "I know that Christ lives in me] . . . recognize that it is Christ and not *I* that lives in the soul" (pg. 121, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple). Broadlands knew that "the Christ-life" is present in all men because "Christ is the life of men, the Divine seed in every one" (pg. 178, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910); the Christ-life is simply the Quaker doctrine of the Divine Seed. An important proclamation of Broadlands from the first was that "it is Christ and not I that lives in the soul" (pg. 134, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). At Broadlands Mr. and Mrs "Temple [experienced] great joy as the result of this meeting [where] many [came to live] . . . the heavenly life . . . Christ's life . . . Christ Himself . . . living in these [bodily] tabernacles a supernatural life" (pgs. 130, 125, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple). The Keswick and Higher Life leader Evan Hopkins relates that he learned from the catalyst of the Keswick Higher Life movement, Hannah W. Smith's husband Robert Pearsall Smith, that "Christ . . . would live in him His own holy life" (pg. 159, *So Great Salvation,* by Steven Barabas; pg. 15, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck). Mr. Smith taught Hopkins that Christ "would do *all,* and would live in [the Christian] His Own Holy Life—the only Holy Life possible to us" (pgs. 52-55, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie; italics in original.). Indeed, as Robert P. Smith

preached at the Brighton Convention, "Christ . . . is living His life in us . . . Christ's own glorious life in Heaven is to be lived down here in these poor, mortal bodies," based on Galatians 2:20—a doctrine which Mr. Smith associated with the Faith Cure. Thus, Smith taught that those who experience the Christ-life "will have power to work all [their] days for the Lord Jesus" and "will not wear . . . out" but "live as children do," their "youth . . . renew[ed] . . . like the eagle's" (pg. 338, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; cf. pg. 84 for Mrs. Smith's preaching of the Christ-life; cf. also pgs. 118, 152, 220, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.). William Boardman likewise taught that Galatians 2:20 teaches that "Christ . . . [is] dwelling in [the believer] to do His work, and to live His life in and by them," and since Christ is the one who is living, not the believer, and Christ is perfectly holy and healthy, based on Galatians 2:20 "[m]en and women [can be] . . . so used by the Spirit, that He can use them as the Father used the Son, and as the Son used His apostles," so "that He might use them in defeating the devil in the souls and bodies of all who are willing to hear and heed the Word," in a flourishing ministry of Higher Life sanctification and Pentecostal healing (pgs. 225-226, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman), a belief which permeated the later Keswick and Pentecostal movements. Jessie Penn-Lewis wrote: "Galatians 2:20 . . . 'No longer I' is the very central point of deliverance . . . the man himself retiring . . . to make room for the Risen Christ to dwell in him and live his life for him! . . . This is the deliverance of Calvary . . . it draws the believer . . . out of sight into the crucified Lord, making way for the Christ Himself to possess the earthen vessel and manifest His life and power" (pgs. 66-70, Pg. 74, *The Warfare With Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis). A. B. Simpson wrote: "[The believer's] life has been superseded by the very life of Christ Himself. 'Not I,' nay, not even the new and heaven-born I, but 'the Christ that liveth in me.' . . . [T]he Christ who lived of old is living again in me, thinking in my thoughts; choosing in my will; trusting in my faith; loving in my heart; triumphing in my victories, and covering my insufficiency with His glorious all-sufficiency. . . . Are we living the Christ life rather than trying to live a Christian life?" ("Spiritual Talismans" (*Alliance Weekly*, June 14, 1919, 178-179). Watchman Nee preached that "the secret of the overcoming life . . . is to let Christ live in our stead, according to Paul's testimony in Galatians 2:20" (pg. 131, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation in the Present Age*, by Witness Lee); indeed, Nee went to the point of affirming that Christ is the one who not only lives instead of the believer, but that Christ believes instead of the believer: "When we believe and receive the Son of God, not only His life but His faith too enters into us. Hence we may live by *His* faith" (pg. 29, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Watchman Nee. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1977). Modern Keswick advocate John R. Van Gelderen writes:

> Keswick . . . was for the deepening of spiritual life. To accomplish this purpose a definite theological position was taught—sanctification by faith, sometimes called holiness by faith. The focus of the theology was on Christ as one's life. This was sometimes called 'The Higher Life' or 'The Deeper Life' or 'The Victorious Life.' . . .[T]he 'Higher Life' . . . is a Life. That Life is a Person, and His name is Jesus! Jesus is the 'Higher Life.' Jesus is the 'Deeper Life.' Jesus is the 'Victorious Life.' How can it be otherwise? Sanctification or holiness by faith is simply accessing the 'Holy Life' by faith. It is 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me . . . by faith' (Gal. 2:20). Holiness by faith is accessing the Holy Life of Jesus to empower holy living and serving. . . . Keswick teaches that just as justification is by faith, so also sanctification is by faith. . . . Faith for victory means you are depending on the victorious Life of Christ to enable you to obey. It is not a matter of you trying to live the Christian life . . . Jesus Christ is the only one who can live the Christian life! Jesus is the Christian Life. . . . Jesus is the Victorious Life, the Higher Life, the Deeper Life, the Spirit-filled Life, the Revived Life, the Hidden Life,—the Christ-Life! To us, when holiness by faith—the Holy Life accessed by faith—is attacked, the attack is ultimately on the indwelling Life of Christ" ("Keswick: A Good Word or a Bad One?" http://www.bcmedu.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=73&Itemid=138).

VanGelderen wrote elsewhere:

> Receiving the Holy Life of Jesus opens the way for accessing the Holy living of Jesus. . . . The Lord Jesus, the Holy One, moved into you at salvation to live His life, not yours. . . . The Christian life is a *life*—a person—and His name is Jesus. Jesus Christ is *the Christian Life*. Therefore, no one can live the Christian life but Christ. . . . Christ [is] the *Christian Life* Himself . . . [and He] moved in to impart to you that very life so that you can live, yet not you, but Christ in you, the Christian life. . . . [T]here is hope for holiness by means of the Holy One living out His holy life in and through you. . . . [H]oliness is not something you accomplish but rather that which you allow . . . a matter of dependence on the one whom you are allowing to work His holiness in and through you. . . . Faith is the one thing you can do . . . faith is not a work[.] . . . Personal holiness is not imitating moral motions. Personal holiness is accessing the Person of holiness by

Christ-life.[765] It is difficult to figure out what the meaning is of such an affirmation; it would seem to lead to either the heresy of the absolute perfection of the believer in his will, nature and in all his acts, for Christ considered in His human nature is absolutely perfect in His will, nature and His acts, or to the heresy that Christ fails and Christ sins when the believer sins,[766] since, allegedly, Christ, not the believer, is living the believer's life.[767] Happily, since Galatians 2:20 never states that Christ lives the Christian life instead of the believer, neither heresy has any support whatsoever from the text. The verse affirms that 1.) Paul was crucified with Christ, 2:20a. 2.) Nevertheless, he was spiritually alive; the apostle had spiritual life, that he "might live unto God," Galatians 2:19; 2:20b. 3.) The "I" who was now alive was not the same "I" as before Paul's conversion (cf. Romans 7:17), in that Paul was no longer an ungodly, unregenerate person, a natural man and a slave of the old covenant, as he was when he was under the

---

> faith to live His holy life through your personality. . . . The provision for holiness is perfect. It has to be—His name is Jesus. It is our consistent access of Him that is sadly imperfect. (pg. 14, "Holiness by Faith in Jesus," by John R. Van Gelderen. *Revival* magazine, Issue 12 (2011). Germantown, WI: Revival Focus Ministries, Inc.)

The Keswick affirmation that when one is "filled with the Holy Spirit . . . the Holy Spirit has absolute possession and control of our spirit. . . . [The] human personality . . . is . . . controlled by a divine personality; . . . the human personality is brought under the domination and control of the Holy Spirit" (pgs. 143-144, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas) appears to provide the third Person of the Trinity the same sort of "absolute . . . control" of the human personality that is ascribed to Christ when it is affirmed that the Son of God lives the Christian life instead of the believer.

765 In the Higher Life movement, the doctrine that Christ lives the Christian life, while the believer simply passively trusts or abides, is the "Christ-life"; "The Christian life is a large, generous Christ-life that lives itself" (pg. 181, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; cf. pgs. 158, 168).

766 Hannah W. Smith, while usually restricting sinless perfection to the human spirit, so that she did not quite reach a claim of the literal perfection of Christ that was the necessary consequence of her Higher Life theology, did nevertheless affirm that those who have had the "definite experience" of "a heart made pure by faith" are "created pure and holy" so that "temptations will come" only "from without," not from within—an idea, however contrary to the Bible, that makes it much easier to follow the guidance and revelations of an Inner Voice—at least until they cease the moment-by-moment Higher Life walk, at which time, somehow, "nothing but impurity remains," although "the carnal nature" had "been cast out" at the time of the second blessing. She did, however, have to confront the question, "How can we sin if we are made and kept pure in heart?" a question to which she had only a very unsatisfactory answer (see Letter to Anna, September 6, 1871, reproduced in the entries for June 17-18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter; cf. the entry for June 22).

767 One cannot avoid these heretical implications by simply affirming that the believer fails to perfectly access the Lord Jesus' personal life, and for this cause the Christian still sins, for this accessing of Christ must be part of the Christian life—indeed, according to the advocates of the view that the Lord Jesus lives the Christian life, accessing the Savior is the essence of Christian life. How then, can Christ fail to do this accessing for the believer, but be the One who lives the Christian life? Yet further, what can such a notion possibly mean—is Christ accessing Himself as He allegedly lives the Christian life? The idea that Jesus Christ lives the Christian life, not the Christian, has other severe problems as well; for example, the Lord Jesus, as He is in heaven, does not live by faith, as He has personal sight of all the glory of God, so the Christian on earth would not have to live by faith. Indeed, the idea that the Lord Jesus lives the Christian life instead of the believer is either abominable heresy or mystical gobbledygook that cannot be given any clear propositional content. It certainly does not help the believer live a holy life.

law (Galatians 2:19). He was now dead to sin and alive to God (Romans 6:10-11). The good in his life was not sourced in himself, but in the grace of God (1 Corinthians 15:10). He now had a new principle within him and was a new man, Galatians 2:20c. 4.) Christ now indwelt Paul, and was the source of spiritual life and strength for him, 2:20d. 5.) The Apostle now lived his natural life in his body by faith in Christ, 2:20e. 6.) Christ loved Paul, and died for him, 2:20f.

The "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me"[768] in Galatians 2:20 does not mean that Paul actually did not live the Christian life and the Lord Jesus lived it instead of him. Such a conclusion would neglect the fact that Paul specifically says "I live." Furthermore, Paul does not say, "Christ liveth *instead of* me," but "Christ liveth *in* me."[769] The "yet not I" clause means simply that Paul did not have strength sourced in himself to follow the Lord, but he received grace from Christ to enable him to "work out [his] own salvation with fear and trembling [since] it is God which worke[d] in [him] both to will and to do of *his* good pleasure" (Philippians 2:12-13). Paul personally "strived" to serve the Lord, but nonetheless his service was what "Christ hath . . . wrought by [him]" (Romans 15:20, 18). Parallel Pauline texts shed much light on the "not I, but Christ" portion of Galatians 2:20:

1.) "And unto the married I command, *yet* not I, but the Lord, (οὐκ ἐγώ, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ Κύριος) Let not the wife depart from *her* husband." (1 Corinthians 7:10). Paul certainly did command the wife not to depart from her husband. He was very active in making this command. However, more importantly, it was God Himself who made the command through Paul. It would be poor exegesis to conclude from this verse that Paul himself did not really command wives not to leave their husbands because the command was sourced in God.

2.) But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which *was bestowed* upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me (οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί)" (1 Corinthians 15:10). Obviously God's enabling grace strengthened Paul to work, and all the glory for Paul's labor was given to the grace of God, as is evidenced by the "yet not I, but the grace of God" affirmation. Nonetheless, Paul labored very actively and fervently, indeed, "more abundantly than . . . all." It would be poor exegesis to conclude from this verse that Paul really did not labor at all because his ability to labor came from God.

---

768 ζῶ δέ, οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός.

769 That is, the preposition ἐν, rather than ἀντί or ὑπέρ, is employed.

3.) "Now then it is no more I that do it (transgress; νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό), but sin that dwelleth in me . . . . Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me (οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία)." (Romans 7:17, 20; cf. Romans 7:14-25). Before Paul was converted, his entire being consented to and produced nothing but sin. His statement in Romans 7:17, 20 means that the sins that he did as a regenerate person no longer proceeded from the unified desire of his whole person. Rather, Paul's transgressions were now sourced in the remnants of sinfulness that remained within him. Nonetheless, whenever Paul sinned, the Apostle was by no means passively employed by some exterior agent moving him unconsciously to transgress—he still chose to do so himself.

4.) The Old Testament, and other New Testament texts,[770] present a similar picture. Joseph tells his brothers in Genesis 45:8: "So now *it was* not you *that* sent me hither, but God (עַתָּה לֹא־אַתֶּם שְׁלַחְתֶּם אֹתִי הֵנָּה כִּי הָאֱלֹהִים; LXX, νῦν οὖν οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἀπεστάλκατε ὧδε ἀλλ᾽ ἢ ὁ θεός): and he hath made me a father to Pharaoh, and lord of all his house, and a ruler throughout all the land of Egypt." Joseph's "not you . . . but God" statement does not mean that Joseph's brothers did not sell him into slavery (cf. 45:5, "ye sold me hither"), but simply that God was the ultimate sovereign source of his being sold. In Exodus 16:8, "Moses said . . . [T]he LORD heareth your murmurings which ye murmur against him: and what *are* we? your murmurings *are* not against us, but against the LORD,"[771] but the affirmation that Israel's grumbling was ultimately against Jehovah certainly did not mean that when "the whole congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness" (Exodus 16:2) they did not really murmur against Moses and Aaron.

---

770 For example, Christ tells persecuted believers: "But when they shall lead *you*, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost" (ὅταν δὲ ἀγάγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε, μηδὲ μελετᾶτε· ἀλλ᾽ ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον. Mark 13:11; cf. Matthew 10:19-20; Luke 12:11-12; 21:14-15). The Lord Jesus' statement, "it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost," did not mean that the persecuted saints in question did not actually open their mouths and consciously speak; rather, they indeed spoke, but the Spirit directed them and guided them. Thus, the Lord could command, "speak ye," for the very reason ("for") that their words did not originate in themselves ("it is not ye that speak") but in God the Spirit. Note the following related texts: Matthew 10:40; Mark 9:37; Luke 10:16; John 12:44; 13:20; Romans 13:2; 1 Thessalonians 4:8.

771 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה . . . בִּשְׁמֹעַ יְהוָה אֶת־תְּלֻנֹּתֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר־אַתֶּם מַלִּינִם עָלָיו וְנַחְנוּ מָה לֹא־עָלֵינוּ תְּלֻנֹּתֵיכֶם כִּי עַל־יְהוָה׃

καὶ εἶπεν Μωυσῆς . . . διὰ τὸ εἰσακοῦσαι κύριον τὸν γογγυσμὸν ὑμῶν ὃν ὑμεῖς διαγογγύζετε καθ᾽ ἡμῶν ἡμεῖς δὲ τί ἐσμεν οὐ γὰρ καθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ γογγυσμὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν ἀλλ᾽ ἢ κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Similarly, Paul's "not I, but Christ" statement in Galatians 2:20 means that the source of the Christian life that Paul lived was not his own inherent ability or strength, but Christ's grace and power. The Apostle's declaration models the pattern set by his Savior, that Son of Man who stated "I can of mine own self do nothing" (John 5:30) and "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise" (John 5:19). The Lord Jesus, in His human nature, was entirely submissive to and dependent upon the enablement He received beyond measure from God. One sees, however, extremely active labor for the Lord in the incarnate Christ. The Divine Person of the Son also did not work independently of the Person of the Father, but nonetheless the Son of God actively did whatsoever He saw the Father do.

In Galatians 2:19-21 Paul is proving that he is dead to the law (2:19a) and not trusting in the law for salvation and frustrating the grace of God by so doing (2:21) but instead is living unto God (2:19b, 2:20). He is not proving that somehow he does not live the Christian life but Christ lives it instead. Paul and all Christians are given strength and grace from Christ, apart from whom they can do nothing good, John 15:5, and they are to live by faith. Certainly the facts of the saint's union with Christ, the Savior's indwelling presence, the spiritual life that is derived from Him, and the power He gives believers to will and do of His good pleasure are glorious truths worthy of that joyful acceptance and humble meditation that results in loving, faith-based obedience. However, to go beyond the actual declarations of Galatians 2:20 to say that the believer does not live the Christian life but Christ Himself does it instead is to make the verse affirm what it does not say and thus grieve the Spirit and displease Christ. Such an affirmation also confuses the Christian who believes it, hinders his sanctification, and opens the way to serious Christological error. The glorious truths of Galatians 2:20 should neither be minimized and ignored nor turned into something other than they are by illegitimate extrapolation.

A few other passages can be employed to attempt to support the doctrine that the Lord Jesus Christ lives the Christian life instead of the believer. However, no text in Scripture actually affirms such a proposition. 2 Corinthians 4:10-11 refers to "the life . . . of Jesus." However, the reference is to spiritual life produced by and sourced in the Lord Jesus, not to the Lord Jesus Himself personally living the Christian life instead of the Christian. Paul speaks of the spiritual life produced by the Lord Jesus in him in connection with the renewing of his inner man (2 Corinthians 4:16)[772] and associated

[772] Similarly, the "life of God" (Ephesians 4:18) for the believer is freedom from the sins of the unregenerate (4:16-18), putting off the old man and putting on the new man, having God renew the spirit of his mind, living a holy and righteous life, telling the truth and having holy speech instead of lying and

with the physical suffering and persecution through which he was troubled, distressed, and persecuted (4:8-9), was being always delivered to death (4:11), had his outward man perishing because of affliction (4:16-17), and thus bore in his body "the dying of the Lord Jesus" (4:10).[773] The believer's spiritual life is unquestionably produced, sustained, and increased by Jesus Christ. The Lord Jesus, and the entire Godhead, alone receive the glory for all the believer's spiritual life and growth, as the Author and Sustainer of all; "the excellency of the power [is] of God, and not of us" (2 Corinthians 4:7). This fact is weighty and wondrous truth. It differs, however, from the unscriptural affirmation that the Lord Jesus Christ actually lives the Christian life instead of the Christian living the Christian life.

Colossians 3:4 speaks of "Christ, *who is* our life." Again, the passage makes no reference whatsoever to Christ living the Christian life instead of the Christian living the Christian life. The verse indicates that all believers, not a minority only that have found a secret Higher Life, but all who will "appear with Him in glory" (3:4),[774] are in union with and identified with Christ, have their lives hid with Christ in God (3:1-3), and will consequently be with Him when He returns to bring in the Kingdom. The Lord Jesus is the One who guarantees them eternal life, and is the Author of all spiritual life and blessings to them, and, indeed, the One who gives them all blessings and good things of every kind whatsoever. However, Colossians 3:4 does not teach that Jesus Christ lives the Christian life instead of the believer, much less that Christ lives the Christian life for an elite minority of believers that have discovered a Higher Life.

---

having ungodly speech, and so on (4:20ff.). The believer does not have the personal life of the eternal Trinity living the Christian life instead of him.

[773] Note that one who wished to make "the life . . . of Jesus" (ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 4:10-11) into the personal life of the Lord Jesus Christ would have great difficulty in making Paul's experience of "always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus" (πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, 2 Corinthians 4:10) into the Apostle enduring the physical and personal death of the Lord Jesus.

[774] None of the texts that indicate that the believer's spiritual life is derived from the Lord Jesus, and abused to affirm that Christ Himself lives the Christian life, support the notion that a certain higher class of Christians lives a "Christ-life" at a higher plane, while another mass that have not learned the alleged spiritual secret live a life at a lower plane. Colossians 3:4 and Galatians 2:20 are true for all believers, not a special few. It is true that only some believers experience the kind of persecution that the Apostle Paul mentioned in 2 Corinthians 4, but this fact provides no assistance to those who affirm that Christ lives the Christian life, as they generally study devotional literature promulgating their theological notions to leap to the higher plane of the "Christ-life" rather than seeking to be persecuted.

It is also noteworthy that Colossians 3 also says nothing about a single faith decision whereby certain believers allegedly access Christ to live the Christian life for them. Rather, the truth of Colossians 3:4 produces commands to think on heavenly things (3:2), put sin to death (3:5), cease from anger and dishonesty (3:8-9), practice holy deeds (3:12), forgive (3:13), love (3:14), be thankful (3:15), fill oneself up with Scripture (3:16), and so on.

Parallel passages illustrate the sort of eisegesis required to make Colossians 3:4 teach the doctrine that Christ lives the Christian life while the Christian does not. Deuteronomy 30:20 states: "The LORD thy God . . . is thy life, and the length of thy days, that thou mayest dwell in the land which the LORD sware unto thy fathers." Does this passage affirm that the Lord lived the Jewish life instead of the children of Israel, and that He also lived out the length of their days in Canaan instead of them (whatever that could possibly mean)? Or does the passage rather teach the obvious truth that God was the One who gave the children of Israel life and length of days? Deuteronomy 32:46-47 commands: "Set your hearts unto all the words which I [Moses] testify among you this day, which ye shall command your children to observe to do, all the words of this law. For it *is* not a vain thing for you; because it *is* your life: and through this thing ye shall prolong *your* days in the land." Does this passage mean that the children of Israel did not live the Jewish life, but the law lived the Jewish life instead of them, because the text says "this law . . . is your life"? Does it prove that the Jew cannot and must not live the Jewish life, but only the Pentateuch can live the Jewish life? Or does the text, rather, obviously mean that obedience to the Law of God would lead Israel to live a long time in the land of Canaan? What exegesis fits the obvious meaning of texts such as Psalm 27:1 ("The LORD *is* my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the LORD *is* the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?") and Psalm 42:8 ("*Yet* the LORD will command his lovingkindness in the daytime, and in the night his song *shall be* with me, *and* my prayer unto the God of my life.")? The ideas read into—not out of—Colossians 3:4 about Christ living the Christian life are impossible in other Biblical texts that contain similar phraseology.

It is an inexpressibly glorious truth that Christ, as God, possesses self-existent life, and that He as the God-Man[775] is the fountain and source of the believer's derived eternal spiritual life.[776] Life supplied by Christ and in union with Him (Colossians 3:1-4)

---

[775] Compare John 6:57; 14:19; the Theanthropic life of Christ as Mediator is derived from the Father, and, as the Theanthropos, He communicates life to His own.

[776] "When our Lord said, 'I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing' (John 15:5), He certainly meant that the vital union between Him and his people is something more than that which may subsist between disciples and their master, — a union including merely trust, congeniality, and affection. The influence to which the fruitfulness of the believer is attributed is something more than the influence of the truth which He taught; however that truth may be applied or enforced. Their abiding in Him, and He in them, is something more than abiding in the profession and belief of the truth. Christ is the head of the Church not merely as its ruler, but as the source of its life. It is not I, says the Apostle, that live, 'but Christ liveth in me' (Galatians 2:20). 'Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?' (2 Corinthians 13:5). It is from Him, as the same Apostle teaches us, that the whole body derives those supplies by which it lives and grows (Ephesians 4:16). 'Because I live, ye shall live also' (John 14:19). 'I am the resurrection, and the life' (John 11:25). 'I am that bread of life' (John 6:48). 'He that eateth my

is the basis for the mortification of indwelling sin (Colossians 3:5). It is certainly true that the Lord Jesus is the Author, Preserver, Upholder, and Finisher of the Christian's spiritual life. Such life is communicated to the believer by Christ, with whom the saint has come into an intimate mystical union. Furthermore, the believer must trust in and obey Christ if he wishes to grow in grace. However, it is false and dangerous to pure doctrine and a holy life to teach that Christ lives the Christian life instead of the believer. Benjamin B. Warfield correctly wrote:

> [T]he believer . . . is made alive in Christ—and it is *he* that is made alive. It is not only that he has Christ in him and Christ is living, but it is he himself that is living, for Christ has made him alive: yes, he has life in himself (John 6:53). It is not true that [t]he believer is portrayed as a man in himself spiritually dead, indwelt through the Spirit by Jesus Christ, who is his spiritual life[.] [Rather, he] is portrayed as a man who is spiritually alive, in whom Jesus Christ the source of all his life, dwells by His Spirit. The man himself is saved, and his new holiness is *his* holiness. It is a grave error to suppose that the living Christ can dwell within us without imparting life to us. He *quickens* whom He will: and he whom He quickens, lives."[777]

Biblical and historic Baptist truth recognizes the glorious fact of union with Christ and the need to seek strength from Him by faith. The Christian grows in personal holiness as he is quickened by that Divine-human Savior with whom he has been united. Such truth must not be corrupted by unscriptural additions or subtractions, such as the idea that the believer does not personally become holy as he lives for God, but that Christ Himself actually lives the Christian life instead of the believer.[778]

F. Excursus IV: Hebrews 3-4 As An Alleged Evidence For Perpetually Sinning Christians

---

flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him' (John 6:56). 'This is that bread which came down from heaven: … he that eateth of this bread shall live forever' (John 6:58). 'We shall be saved by his life' (Romans 5:10). 'The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit" (1 Corinthians 15:45). 'As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself' (John 5:26). 'Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him' (John 17:2). 'Your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.' (Colossians 3:3, 4). The Scriptures, therefore, plainly teach that there is a vital union between Christ and his people; that they have a common life analogous to that which exists between the vine and its branches, and between the head and members of the body. The believer is truly partaker of the life of Christ" (*Systematic Theology*, by Charles Hodge, part. 3, Soteriology. Chapter 14, "Vocation.").

777 pg. 557, *Perfectionism*, *vol. 2,* Chapter 4, "The 'Higher Life' Movement." Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003; reprint of 1932 Oxford ed.

778 The idea that Christ's own personal holiness is imparted to Christians has properly been rejected by Baptists as unbiblical. In the words of the London Baptist Association in 1704, "It is the opinion of this Assembly that the doctrine of sanctification by the impartation of the holiness of Christ's nature does, in its consequences, render inherent holiness by the Holy Spirit unnecessary, and tends to overthrow natural, as well as revealed religion" (pg. 171, Chapter 8, *Bye-Paths in Baptist History*, J. J. Goadby. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection* CD, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005).

Some affirm that when Hebrews 3-4 speaks of unbelieving Israel wandering in the wilderness for forty years, so that their "carcases fell in the wilderness" (Hebrews 3:17), the text pictures people who are saved but never begin the process of Christian growth, which is alleged to originate typologically only with Israel's crossing the Jordan River into Canaan.[779] Thus, Hebrews 3-4 is alleged to demonstrate that some saved people live and die in perpetual carnality and sin, acting in every way like the unconverted. Such a conclusion faces severe problems.

First, typology should never be used to question or overthrow plain passages of Scripture. The many plain texts that affirm that all believers will be progressively sanctified cannot be overthrown because of conclusions derived from typology.

Second, Jude indicates that the Israelites who died in the wilderness do not picture perpetually carnal saved people, but lost people who are eternally damned. Speaking of unconverted false teachers who are "ordained to . . . condemnation" (v. 4), Jude writes: "I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not" (v. 5). He continues by comparing these people who are "ordained to . . . condemnation" and who "believed not" to "the angels which kept not their first estate,

---

779 For example, Hannah W. Smith described "Hebrews 3 and 4" as "the rest of faith, now in this present life" (Letter to Sister, 1867, reproduced in the entry for February 15 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter), and she "long[ed] unspeakably to show . . . every child of God whose feet are still wandering in the wilderness . . . the way to the promised land" by means of the Higher Life (Letter to Anna, November 10, 1871, reproduced in the entry for June 24 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). The "wilderness," where Israel was "neither in Egypt nor in the Promised Land," represents the "7th of Romans, the wilderness experience of the Christian. . . . It is hardly worthwhile for any one to tell those of us who have taken these two steps, that there is but one. We know better; and our own experience is far more convincing to us than a thousand theories," that is, experience is better than the conclusions of grammatical-historical exegesis (Letter to Miss Beck, reproduced in the entry for September 6 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). The two experiences in my own life have been equally marked." Similarly, "American Higher Life writer, Miss Ruth Paxson, who addressed the women's meetings at Keswick on a number of occasions, compares, as Keswick speakers have often done, the defeat and failure of . . . Christians . . . making no advance or increase at all . . . to the wilderness wanderings of the children of Israel. 'The vast majority of Christians stop short in their experience of the blessings of salvation with the joy of forgiveness of past sins and with the hope of Heaven in the future. But the present is a forty-year wilderness experience full of futile wanderings, never enjoying peace and rest, never arriving in the promised land.' This . . . is a legitimate conclusion. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews draws such an analogy. 'Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. . . . Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief' (Hebrews 4:1, 11)" (pg. 68, *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*, by Steven Barabas; cf. also pgs. 59-60). Compare Boardman's belief that those who are justified but have not yet entered the Higher Life are experiencing "the wanderings of the wilderness life . . . before reaching the Land," so that they must enter into "a present rest remaining for the people of God; a rest from burdens and cares," based on Hebrews 3:15 (pgs. 56, 167, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman; also pgs. 140-142, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman).

but left their own habitation, [who are] reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (v. 6) and to the sodomites who, "giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" (v. 7). The people who did not believe and who died in the wilderness are suffering in eternal fiery torment with demons and sodomites. They are not saved people who just never started living for Christ. What the context of Jude 4-7 requires also receives support from the fact that the unbelievers of v. 5 are "destroyed" (ἀπόλλυμι). This verb, while it does not absolutely require eternal damnation in hell (cf. Romans 14:15; 1 Corinthians 8:11; also Matthew 9:17; 8:25; 2:13, etc.), is very commonly used for the everlasting perdition of the lost (Matthew 10:28; Luke 13:3, 5; John 3:15-16; 10:28; 11:50; 17:12; Romans 2:12; 1 Corinthians 1:18; 2 Corinthians 2:15; 4:3; 2 Thessalonians 2:10; 2 Peter 3:9, and many other texts, including, notably, Jude 11).

Finally, in Hebrews 3-4, those who died in the wilderness picture lost people, not saved people who just never grew. First, God has "wrath" (ὀργή) against those who die in the wilderness (Hebrews 3:11; 4:3). The lost face the wrath (ὀργή) of God, the "wrath to come" (Matthew 3:7; Luke 3:7), since "the wrath of God abideth" on them (John 3:36), and they treasure up to themselves "wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Romans 2:5; cf. 1:18; 2:8; 3:5) as the "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction" (Romans 9:22), the "children of wrath" (Ephesians 2:3; cf. 5:6; Colossians 3:6), facing the coming "wrath of the Lamb . . . the great day of his wrath" (Revelation 6:16-17; cf. 11:18), for they "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and . . . be tormented with fire and brimstone . . . the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever" (Revelation 14:10-11), facing "the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God" (Revelation 19:15; 11:18; also 1 Thessalonians 2:16). In contrast, believers, "being now justified by [Christ's] blood . . . shall be saved from wrath through him" (Romans 5:9), since "Jesus . . . delivered [them] from the wrath to come" (1 Thessalonians 1:10), and "God hath not appointed [them] to wrath, but to obtain salvation by [the] Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thessalonians 5:16). God's wrath against the people who die in the wilderness in Hebrews 3-4 indicates that they were unconverted lost sinners.

Second, the individuals in question in Hebrews 3-4 had "an evil heart of unbelief" (καρδίᾳ πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας) (Hebrews 3:12). Evil, unconverted men have evil hearts, while saved people have renewed hearts (Matthew 12:35; Luke 6:45; cf. Ezekiel 36:26). Furthermore, while the rest of the New Testament does sometimes employ ἀπιστία in connection with Christ's disciples (e. g. Matthew 17:20), Paul uses the noun only for the unconverted (Romans 3:3; 4:20; 11:20, 23; 1 Timothy 1:13; the other two references are

those in question, Hebrews 3:12, 19). The "evil heart of unbelief" that the individuals discussed in Hebrews 3-4 possessed led them to departing, to apostasy from (ἀποστῆναι, Hebrews 3:12) God. The verb *depart/apostatize* in Hebrews 3:12 is also employed in 1 Timothy 4:1: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some *shall depart* from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils" (cf. also Luke 8:13; 13:27). While the verb can be used for believers who depart from or fail to complete a task (cf. Acts 15:38), nowhere does the New Testament state that saved people depart from God. Thus, to affirm that regenerate individuals have "an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God" (Hebrews 3:12) is extremely problematic. Nor is the problem alleviated by the fact that the warning of Hebrews 3:12 is addressed to "brethren" (3:12)—Paul was a Jew, and he wrote Hebrews to his Jewish brethren (cf. Acts 1:16; 2:29, 37; 3:17, 22; 7:2, 37; 13:15, 26, 38; 22:1; 23:1, 5, 6; 28:17, 21; Romans 9:3). Clearly, just as many of Moses' Jewish brethren in the wilderness were unregenerate, so many of Paul's Jewish brethren warned in the book of Hebrews were unregenerate, and thus had evil hearts, were in unbelief, and departed from the living God.

Third, the individuals in Hebrews 3-4 were warned about being "hardened through the deceitfulness of sin" (Hebrews 3:13; cf. 3:8, 15; 4:7). In the texts outside of the book of Hebrews, however, those who are hardened are unsaved Christ-rejectors (Acts 19:9) whom God will not show mercy (Romans 9:18). The hardening terminology in Hebrews suits the unconverted, those who "after [their] hardness [σκληρότης] and impenitent heart treasurest up unto [themselves] wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Romans 2:5).[780] It does not suit the regenerate.

Fourth, Hebrews 3:18 states, "to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not?" The verb employed in Hebrews 3:18 for unbelief (ἀπειθέω) appears sixteen times in the New Testament (John 3:36; Acts 14:2; 17:5; 19:9; Rom 2:8; 10:21; 11:30-31; 15:31; Hebrews 3:18; 11:31; 1 Peter 2:7-8; 3:1, 20; 4:17), and always of the unregenerate. Those who are in unbelief have the wrath of God on them (John 3:36). No New Testament text states or implies that believers are in *apeitheo*, in unbelief or disobedience. Similarly, the related noun *unbelief* or *disobedience* (ἀπείθεια) found in Hebrews 4:6, 11 is employed in the New Testament for the unregenerate alone (Romans 11:30, 32; Ephesians 2:2; 5:6; Colossians 3:6;

[780] Note also σκληροτράχηλος, Acts 7:51. The force of this particular argument is weakened, however, by the clear application of σκληροκαρδία to believers (Mark 16:14), not just to unbelievers; cf. also Matthew 19:8; Mark 10:5.

Hebrews 4:6, 11). Likewise, the related adjective *unbelief* or *disobedience* (ἀπειθής) limits such unbelief and rebellion to the unregenerate (Luke 1:17; Acts 26:19; Romans 1:30; 2 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:16; 3:3). The adjective *apeitheis*, the noun *apeitheia*, and the verb *apeitheo*, "unbelief," all demonstrate that those who do not enter the rest of Hebrews 3-4 are unregenerate.

Fifth, Hebrews 4:2 states that "the gospel preached . . . did not profit [those who died in the wilderness], not being mixed with faith in them that heard *it*," indicating that those the people in question did not have "faith" (πίστις). The noun *pistis* appears 244 times[781] in the New Testament. Huge numbers of verses with the word refer to the saving faith of the regenerate (Romans 3:28; 5:1; Galatians 2:16; etc.). Only three of the 244 texts refer to the unsaved possessing *pistis*, each of them contrasting the saving faith that produces works with a dead "faith" that produces nothing (James 2:17, 20, 24).[782] None of the 174 instances of *pistis* in the Pauline epistles speaks of it as a possession of an unsaved person.[783] Since faith is the possession of the regenerate, the people who had no faith in Hebrews 3-4 are not saved people who just never grew and need revival; they are lost people who are dead in trespasses and sins.

Sixth, when Hebrews 4:3 states, "we which have believed do enter into rest" (εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες), the aorist participle *believed* naturally speaks of the single act of saving faith, through which all the saved enter into spiritual rest, rather than a moment-by-moment continuing faith decision to possess a post-conversion higher Christian life that allegedly enables a believer to begin

---

781 The complete list is: Matthew 8:10; 9:2, 22, 29; 15:28; 17:20; 21:21; 23:23; Mark 2:5; 4:40; 5:34; 10:52; 11:22; Luke 5:20; 7:9, 50; 8:25, 48; 17:5-6, 19; 18:8, 42; 22:32; Acts 3:16; 6:5, 7-8; 11:24; 13:8; 14:9, 22, 27; 15:9; 16:5; 17:31; 20:21; 24:24; 26:18; Romans 1:5, 8, 12, 17; 3:3, 22, 25-28, 30-31; 4:5, 9, 11-14, 16, 19-20; 5:1-2; 9:30, 32; 10:6, 8, 17; 11:20; 12:3, 6; 14:1, 22-23; 16:26; 1 Corinthians 2:5; 12:9; 13:2, 13; 15:14, 17; 16:13; 2 Corinthians 1:24; 4:13; 5:7; 8:7; 10:15; 13:5; Galatians 1:23; 2:16, 20; 3:2, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 22-26; 5:5-6, 22; 6:10; Ephesians 1:15; 2:8; 3:12, 17; 4:5, 13; 6:16, 23; Philippians 1:25, 27; 2:17; 3:9; Colossians 1:4, 23; 2:5, 7, 12; 1 Thessalonians 1:3, 8; 3:2, 5-7, 10; 5:8; 2 Thessalonians 1:3-4, 11; 2:13; 3:2; 1 Timothy 1:2, 4-5, 14, 19; 2:7, 15; 3:9, 13; 4:1, 6, 12; 5:8, 12; 6:10-12, 21; 2 Timothy 1:5, 13; 2:18, 22; 3:8, 10, 15; 4:7; Titus 1:1, 4, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:15; Philemon 1:5-6; Hebrews 4:2; 6:1, 12; 10:22, 38-11:1; 11:3-9, 11, 13, 17, 20-24, 27-31, 33, 39; 12:2; 13:7; James 1:3, 6; 2:1, 5, 14, 17-18, 20, 22, 24, 26; 5:15; 1 Peter 1:5, 7, 9, 21; 5:9; 2 Peter 1:1, 5; 1 John 5:4; Jude 1:3, 20; Revelation 2:13, 19; 13:10; 14:12.

782 Note, however, the statements in Matthew 17:20; Mark 4:40; Luke 8:25; 17:6. None of these texts, though, speak of unsaved people possessing *pistis*.

783 Romans 1:5, 8, 12, 17; 3:3, 22, 25-28, 30-31; 4:5, 9, 11-14, 16, 19-20; 5:1-2; 9:30, 32; 10:6, 8, 17; 11:20; 12:3, 6; 14:1, 22-23; 16:26; 1 Corinthians 2:5; 12:9; 13:2, 13; 15:14, 17; 16:13; 2 Corinthians 1:24; 4:13; 5:7; 8:7; 10:15; 13:5; Galatians 1:23; 2:16, 20; 3:2, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 22-26; 5:5-6, 22; 6:10; Ephesians 1:15; 2:8; 3:12, 17; 4:5, 13; 6:16, 23; Philippians 1:25, 27; 2:17; 3:9; Colossians 1:4, 23; 2:5, 7, 12; 1 Thessalonians 1:3, 8; 3:2, 5-7, 10; 5:8; 2 Thessalonians 1:3-4, 11; 2:13; 3:2; 1 Timothy 1:2, 4-5, 14, 19; 2:7, 15; 3:9, 13; 4:1, 6, 12; 5:8, 12; 6:10-12, 21; 2 Timothy 1:5, 13; 2:18, 22; 3:8, 10, 15; 4:7; Titus 1:1, 4, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:15; Philemon 1:5-6; Hebrews 4:2; 6:1, 12; 10:22, 38-11:1; 11:3-9, 11, 13, 17, 20-24, 27-31, 33, 39; 12:2; 13:7.

doing good works. The other aorist participles of *believe* in Paul refer to the point action of the exercise of saving faith (Ephesians 1:13; 2 Thessalonians 2:12; cf. Jude 5), as do the significant majority of the aorists of *pisteuo* in Paul generally (Romans 3:2; 4:3, 17-18; 10:9, 14, 16; 13:11; 1 Corinthians 3:5; 15:2, 11; 2 Corinthians 4:13; Galatians 2:16; 3:6; Ephesians 1:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:4; 2 Thessalonians 1:10; 2:11-12; 1 Timothy 1:11; 3:16; Titus 1:3; Hebrews 4:3; 11:6).

Seventh, the references in Hebrews 3-4 to Psalm 95:7-11 prove that those that hardened their hearts and died in the wilderness typify the unconverted, as do other portions of the psalter where such people are affirmed to have "believed not in God, and trusted not in his salvation" (Psalm 78:22, 32). In Psalm 95:8, the warning is given: "Harden not your heart, as in the provocation, *and* as *in* the day of temptation in the wilderness." When the Old Testament speaks of those who harden (קָשָׁה) their hearts, or employs similar phraseology ("hardened their necks," etc.), the phrases regularly refer to the unconverted, and not one text clearly deals with saved people hardening (קָשָׁה) their hearts (cf. Exodus 7:3; Deuteronomy 2:30; 10:16; 2 Kings 17:14; 2 Chronicles 30:8; 36:13; Nehemiah 9:16-17, 29; Job 9:4; Proverbs 28:14; 29:1; Jeremiah 7:26; 17:23; 19:15. Note that each instance is in the Hiphil). Furthermore, the verb rendered "grieved" (קוּט) in Psalm 95:10 could also be translated "loathed" (cf. Ezekiel 6:9; 20:43; 36:31; Psalm 95:10; 119:158; 139:21; Job 8:14; 10:1); it is difficult to think that Jehovah *loathes*, possesses deep-seated abhorrance and detestation of, His beloved saints. Those who *tempt God* in the Psalter, as those did who perished in the wilderness (95:9), are unconverted (Psalm 78:18, 41, 56; 106:14). Similarly, the statement that those who perished "have not known [God's] ways" (לֹא־יָדְעוּ דְרָכָי) (Psalm 95:10) indicates that those in view are lost sinners, not saints (cf. Exodus 18:20; 33:13; Joshua 3:4; Judges 18:5; Job 21:14; 23:10; Psalm 25:4; 67:3; 95:10; 103:7; 143:8; Proverbs 3:6; 4:19; Isaiah 42:16; 59:8; Jeremiah 5:4-5). In Hebrews 3-4, those to whom God swore in His wrath that they would not enter His rest (Psalm 95:11; Numbers 32:10) are pictured as lost men, not saved people who do not produce fruit or who are not revived.

Anyone who employs Hebrews 3-4 to evidence that some saved people never grow, based on the example of the Israelites who did not believe God and wandered in the wilderness for forty years, errs seriously in his exegesis. Proper hermeneutics does not employ typology to mitigate or overthrow plain didactic statements in Scripture. Furthermore, Hebrews 3-4 presents the people who died in the wilderness as unbelievers under the wrath of God and headed for hell. Nothing in Hebrews 3-4 favors the idea that saved people can be perpetually ungodly and be dominated by sin, or that sanctification does not begin in the regenerate until a post-conversion second blessing takes place.

G. Excursus V: "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit" (Ephesians 5:18)[784]

Ephesians 5:18 states: "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit." In the context of Ephesians 5:15-17, Paul instructs the Christians at Ephesus to live wisely: to walk circumspectly, avoiding sin, while at the same time redeeming opportunities to serve the Lord. The "and" (καί) beginning v. 18 shows the connection of v. 18 to v. 15–17; the verse marks a transition from a general fact to a particular instance of walking wisely in daily life.

The first command of Ephesians 5:18 prohibits intoxication.[785] "Be not drunk" (μὴ μεθύσκεσθε) is a present imperative, a general precept forbidding growing drunk, as the prohibition of being unwise in v. 17 was also a general precept. As verse 17 did not indicate that the Ephesians were already unwise, so verse 18 does not indicate that the Ephesians were already getting drunk, which would have been a matter for church discipline. The root of the verb for drunkenness in v. 18, μεθύσκω, is one of a number of words that are related to inebriation. This particular verb not only prohibits the state of being drunk, but it also denounces here the process leading to drunkenness.[786] The verse does not allow any room for being intoxicated, since it prohibits the entire process which leads to becoming drunk, including the first glass and the first sip of alcohol.[787] The first drink a person takes puts him on that poisonous path toward becoming fully intoxicated. Furthermore, Scripture never states that one becomes drunk after a certain number of alcoholic beverages. Rather, after one drink, one is drunk to a certain degree; after two, one is drunk twice as much; after three, one is drunk that much more, and so on. The first drink affects one's understanding and actions. Even in things that are lawful, unlike alcoholic beverages (Proverbs 20:1), believers are not to be "brought under the power of any" (1 Corinthians 6:12); how much the more must they never give control of their minds and bodies to alcohol, rather than always retaining a "sound mind" (2 Timothy 1:7)? As in the Wisdom books of the Old Testament (Proverbs 23:29-35; 20:1),[788] abstinence from alcohol is enjoined.

---

784 καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία, ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν Πνεύματι,

785 For the possible background of the command of Ephesians 5:18a in the pagan worship of Dionysius, see "The Dionysian Background of Ephesians 5:18," Cleon L. Rodgers, Jr., *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136:543 (July 1979) 249-258.

786 As BDAG notes, μεθύσκω is the "causal [form] of μεθύω," *to be drunk*, and signifies "to cause to become intoxicated," a process that begins with the first sip of an alcoholic beverage. A number of texts in the NT, LXX, and other Koiné writings are consistent with μεθύσκω involving the process of becoming drunk in addition to the state of drunkenness itself. Note, e. g., the three present infinitives in Luke 12:45; also Proverbs 4:17; 23:21, LXX; in the Apocrypha, Sirach 1:16; 32:13; also Josephus, *War* 2:29 (2.2.5.29); Sibyl 7:18-21; however, compare also Philo, Alleg 2:29; in favor of moderate drinking, note the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Judah 14:1-8.

787 While this is the teaching of Ephesians 5:18, it is not affirmed that to avoid μεθύσκω Koiné speakers of Greek universally understood the verb as requiring total abstinence from alcohol.

788 Note Proverbs 23:31, LXX: μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ ἀλλὰ ὁμιλεῖτε ἀνθρώποις δικαίοις καὶ ὁμιλεῖτε ἐν περιπάτοις ἐὰν γὰρ εἰς τὰς φιάλας καὶ τὰ ποτήρια δῷς τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου

In modern English vernacular, *wine* solely indicates a fermented drink made from grapes. However, the Greek word οἶνος can be used to describe any form of the grape and does not always indicate that which is fermented;[789] the English word *wine* was also a generic term that could be used of both fermented and unfermented beverages in 1611 when the Authorized Version was translated.[790] Sometimes context indicates that *oinos* is grape juice (cf. Matthew 9:17; John 2:3; 1 Timothy 5:23), while at other times the word refers to that which is fermented (Mark 15:23). In Revelation 19:15, the phrase "the winepress of wine" (τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ οἴνου) appears, but it certainly is difficult to think that the wine was alcoholic the moment it was pressed out of the grapes (cf. Revelation 14:20). The *oinos* of Revelation 19:15 is immediately drunk by the nations as they immediately face the wrath of the Lord Jesus Christ and are destroyed upon His return, so *oinos* in this passage necessarily refers to a beverage which is immediately pressed out of a winepress and is immediately drunken—there is no time for fermentation, since the Lord Jesus Christ does not wait some period of time at His second coming to allow His enemies to successfully fight against Him, but He destroys them all immediately. The context of Ephesians 5:18a clearly indicates that the verse refers to fermented and intoxicating *oinos* which the Bible always forbids. The believer is to make no gateway for the consumption of any type of alcoholic beverage.

The next phrase of Ephesians 5:18a, "wherein is excess" (ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία), is often misunderstood as an explanation of what level of consumption of alcohol is permissible. One is allegedly permitted to drink fermented wine so long as it is not consumed to the point of drunkenness, which is assumed to be a fixed point, rather than a developing process. However, the idea "do not drink to excess" is not at all the teaching of the passage. First, the meaning of μεθύσκω undermines such an idea; the verb not only forbids the state of intoxication but also the process of becoming intoxicated, as

---

ὕστερον περιπατήσεις γυμνότερος ὑπέρου Be not drunk with wine; but converse with just men, and converse with them openly.

789 See pgs. 368ff., *The Use of Wine in the Old Testament*, Robert Teachout (Th. D. Diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1979; elec. acc. http://sites.google.com/site/thross7), for clear examples from classical and Koiné Greek where *oinos* is an unfermented beverage, contra BDAG. Teachout provides a powerful exegetical defense of the view that Biblical "wine" could be either unfermented or fermented and that Scripture requires total abstinence.

790 Thus, Bailey's *New Universal English Dictionary of Words, and of Arts and Sciences* (1730) stated: "Natural wine, is such as it comes from the grape, without any mixture or sophistication." (pg. 658). Juice does not come "from the grape" fermented. Thus, *wine* had the meaning of unfermented, as well as fermented grape juice. Likewise, John Kersey's *Dictionarium Anglo-Britannicum, or A General English Dictionary* (1708) declared: "Wine [is] a Liquor made of the Juice of Grapes, or other fruit. Liquor or Liquour, anything that is liquid: Drink, Juice, etc. Must, sweet Wine, newly press'd from the grape." (**verify quote at Google Books**). Wine was made of the juice of grapes and must is defined as "sweet wine, newly pressed from the grape." Further, B. N. Defoe's *A Complete English Dictionary* (1735) defined: "WINE, a Liquor made of the Juice of Grapes or other fruit. LIQUOR, anything that is liquid: Drink, Juice, Water, &c." **verify quote** *Wine* was not defined as fermented drink, but simply "the juice of grapes." Benjamin Martin's *Lingua Brittanica Reformata, or A New English Dictionary* (1748) stated: "WINE, 1. the juice of the grape. 2. a liquor extracted from other fruits besides the grape. 3. the vapours of wine, as wine disturbs his reason. LIQUOR, or LIQUOUR, any liquid thing, as water, juice, drink, etc." (pg. 1045).

The translators of the KJV, by uniformly rendering the Greek word *oinos* as *wine*, replicated the Greek word's reference to both fermented and unfermented juice with an English word that, in their day, was similarly general in reference.

noted above. Second, ἐν ᾧ modifies οἴνῳ, not, as advocates of "moderate" drinking affirm, the entire clause. The affirmation is not that there is excess in being drunk with wine, but that there is ἀσωτία in the *oinos* itself. In the only truly parallel syntactical structures to Ephesians 5:18 in the NT, the noun after the ἐν ᾧ + εἰμί describes the specific noun before it, not an entire clause.[791] Parallel texts in the LXX,[792] Josephus, and Philo support this view of the ἐν ᾧ.[793] Clear examples of the syntactical structure in

---

[791] John 1:47 Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile! εἶδεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ναθαναὴλ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ, Ἴδε ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης, **ἐν ᾧ δόλος** οὐκ ἔστι.

Acts 19:16 And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.

καὶ ἐφαλλόμενος ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ᾧ **ἦν** τὸ **πνεῦμα** τὸ πονηρόν, καὶ κατακυριεύσας αὐτῶν, ἴσχυσε κατ᾽ αὐτῶν, ὥστε γυμνοὺς καὶ τετραυματισμένους ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου ἐκείνου.

[792] Genesis 7:15: went in to Noe into the ark, pairs, male and female of all flesh in which is the breath of life.

Gen. 7:15 εἰσῆλθον πρὸς Νωε εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν δύο δύο ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκός ἐν ᾧ **ἐστιν πνεῦμα ζωῆς**

Deut 17:1 Thou shalt not sacrifice to the Lord thy God a calf or a sheep, in which there is a blemish, *or* any evil thing; for it is an abomination to the Lord thy God.

οὐ θύσεις κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου μόσχον ἢ πρόβατον ἐν ᾧ **ἐστιν** ἐν αὐτῷ **μῶμος** πᾶν ῥῆμα πονηρόν ὅτι βδέλυγμα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σού ἐστιν

Jer 23:28 The prophet who has a dream, let him tell his dream; and *he* in whom is my word *spoken* to him, let him tell my word truly: what is the chaff to the corn? so are my words, saith the Lord.

ὁ προφήτης **ἐν ᾧ** τὸ **ἐνύπνιόν ἐστιν** διηγησάσθω τὸ **ἐνύπνιον** αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν ᾧ ὁ λόγος μου πρὸς αὐτόν διηγησάσθω τὸν λόγον μου ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας τί τὸ ἄχυρον πρὸς τὸν σῖτον οὕτως οἱ λόγοι μου λέγει κύριος

Eze 24:6 Therefore thus saith the Lord; O bloody city, the caldron in which there is scum, and the scum has not gone out of, she has brought it forth piece by piece, no lot has fallen upon it.

διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος ὢ πόλις αἱμάτων λέβης ἐν ᾧ **ἐστιν ἰὸς** ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ ἰὸς οὐκ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτῆς κατὰ μέλος αὐτῆς ἐξήνεγκεν οὐκ ἔπεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν κλῆρος

Judith 5:23 For, say they, we will not be afraid of the face of the children of Israel: for, lo, it is a people that have no strength nor power for a strong battle

Judith 5:23 οὐ γὰρ φοβηθησόμεθα ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ισραηλ ἰδοὺ γὰρ λαὸς ἐν ᾧ οὐκ **ἔστιν δύναμις** οὐδὲ **κράτος** εἰς παράταξιν ἰσχυράν

Dan. 14:21 Then the king was enraged, and he seized the priests and their wives and children; and they showed him the secret doors through which they were accustomed to enter and devour what was on the table. [note here there is some difference between the RSV Apocrypha translation given and the LXX text below]

Dan. 14:21 καὶ ἐπῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον ἐν ᾧ **ἦσαν** οἱ **ἱερεῖς** καταγινόμενοι καὶ εὗρε τὰ βρώματα τοῦ Βηλ καὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ ἐπέδειξε Δανιηλ τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ ψευδοθύρια δι᾽ ὧν εἰσπορευόμενοι οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐδαπάνων τὰ παρατιθέμενα τῷ Βηλ

[793] Josephus, *Contra Apion* 1:198 (1.22.198) There is about the middle of the city, a wall of stone, the length of which is five hundred feet, and the breadth a hundred cubits, with double cloisters; wherein there is a square altar, not made of hewn stone, but composed of white stones gathered together, having each side twenty cubits long, and its altitude ten cubits. Hard by it is a large edifice, wherein there is an altar and a candlestick, both of gold, and in weight two talents; ἐνταῦθα δ᾽ ἐστὶ κατὰ μέσον μάλιστα τῆς πόλεως περίβολος λίθινος μῆκος ὡς πεντάπλεθρος εὖρος δὲ πηχῶν ρ΄ ἔχων διπλᾶς πύλας **ἐν ᾧ βωμός** ἐστι τετράγωνος ἀτμήτων συλλέκτων ἀργῶν λίθων οὕτως συγκείμενος πλευρὰν μὲν ἑκάστην εἴκοσι πηχῶν ὕψος δὲ δεκάπηχυ καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτὸν οἴκημα μέγα οὗ βωμός ἐστι καὶ λυχνίον ἀμφότερα χρυσᾶ δύο τάλαντα τὴν ὁλκήν

Philo: Alleg 3:4 And let us in the next place consider how any one is said to be concealed from God; but unless any one receives this as an allegorical saying it would be impossible to comprehend what is here stated. For God has completed everything and has penetrated every thing, and has left no one of all his

Ephesians 5:18 where the ἐν ᾧ modifies the entire previous clause rather than the noun immediately preceeding it are lacking. Furthermore, BDAG defines ἀσωτία as "reckless abandon, debauchery, dissipation, profligacy." The word appears elsewhere in Titus 1:6 (where the elder is not to be even accusable of *asotia* (KJV, "riot"), and 1 Peter 4:4, where large amounts of "riot" are in view. The word *excess* thus means to have a shameful abundance or to be indifferent to moral restraint. Fermented wine, in any amount, has passed the limits; it has gone too far. The KJV *wherein* is an English prepositional phrase *in which*, the antecedent being the word *wine*. People who take this word to mean "getting drunk is excessive" are misinterpreting it. The phrase is therefore describing the noun *wine*, not the verb *be drunk*. The understanding is this: "in wine is profligacy/excess."

The view that the ἐν ᾧ refers specifically to οἴνῳ has precedent in the Latin Vulgate and in the patristic period in the history of interpretation. The Vulgate in Ephesians 5:18 reads: *et nolite inebriari vino in quo est luxuria sed implemini Spiritu*. The connection between *vino* ("with wine") and *quo* ("which") is unmistakable in Latin, because the relative *quo* has the same neuter gender as *vino*, upon which it depends. Tertullian (A. D. 160-225) renders the text in exactly the same way: *et nolite inebriari vino, in quo est luxuria* ("And be not inebriated with wine, in which is voluptuousness."[794] Compare Jerome (who, of course, translated the Latin Vulgate), and identified the object "wine" as the item that has in it the "excess/riot": "She called to mind the cave in which Lot found refuge, and with tears in her eyes warned the virgins her companions to beware of 'wine wherein is excess;' for it was to this that the Moabites and Ammonites owe their origin."[795]

---

works empty or deserted. What kind of place then can any one occupy in which God is not? And Moses testifies to this in other passages, when he says, "God is in the heaven above, and in the earth beneath; and there is nothing anywhere but he."4 And in another place he speaks in this manner, "I stood here before you did."5 For God is of older date than any created being, and he will be everywhere, so that it cannot be possible for any one to be concealed from him: and what need we wonder at?

Leg 3:4 ἴδωμεν δὲ ἑξῆς, πῶς καὶ ἀποκρύπτεσθαι τις θεὸν λέγεται. εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀλληγορήσειέ τις, ἀδύνατον παραδέξασθαι τὸ προκείμενον· πάντα γὰρ πεπλήρωκεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ διὰ πάντων διελήλυθεν καὶ κενὸν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ἔρημον ἀπολέλοιπεν ἑαυτοῦ. ποῖον δή τις τόπον ἐφέξει, **ἐν ᾧ** οὐχὶ **θεός** ἐστι; μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις λέγων· "ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν αὐτοῦ." καὶ πάλιν· "ὧδε ἕστηκα πρὸ τοῦ σέ·" πρὸ γὰρ παντὸς γενητοῦ ὁ θεός ἐστι, καὶ εὑρίσκεται πανταχοῦ, ὥστε οὐκ ἂν δύναιτό τις ἀποκρύπτεσθαι

Laws 3:60 And when all these things are previously prepared, the woman with her head uncovered, bearing the barley flour in her hand, as has been already specified, shall come forward; and the priest standing opposite to her and holding the earthenware vessel in which are the water and the earth, shall speak thus:

Spec 3:60 τούτων δὲ προευτρεπισθέντων ἡ μὲν ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸ κρίθινον ἄλευρον κομίζουσα, καθάπερ ἐλέχθη, παρίτω, ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς ἀντικρὺ τὸ κεραμεοῦν ἀγγεῖον, **ἐν ᾧ ὕδωρ ἐστὶ** καὶ **γῆ**, ἀντικρὺ στὰς ἐπιλεγέτω τάδε·

794 Tertullian, *On Modesty* 17, cited pg. 163, *Wine in the Bible: A Biblical Study on the Use of Alcoholic Beverages*, by Samuele Bacchiocchi. Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 2001. Compare also Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, Book V:18: "(The apostle says further:) "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess," — a precept which is suggested by the passage (of the prophet), where the seducers of the consecrated (Nazarites) to drunkenness are rebuked: "Ye gave wine to my holy ones to drink." This prohibition from drink was given also to the high priest Aaron and his sons, "when they went into the holy place."

795 *To Eustochium,* Letter 108, Jerome.

In light of Ephesians 5:18, believers must totally abstain from consumption of alcohol. They must also abstain from selling it, giving it to others, owning companies that produce or distribute alcohol through stock or mutual funds, or providing any other support whatsoever to alcohol (Habakkuk 2:15). Furthermore, faithful churches must warn against and separate from those who hold to the error of the "moderate" consumption of alcohol. The position of Scripture—total abstinance—must be strongly set forth and contended for along with the rest of the faith (Jude 3).

After affirming that the consumption of alcohol in any degree is forbidden in Ephesians 5:18a, Paul sets up a contrast being made between being filled with wine and with the Spirit. Believers were not to be controlled by wine, but "filled with the Spirit" (5:18b).[796] The passive voice of "be filled" also indicates the supernatural Divine initiative in Spirit filling—the believer does not fill himself. The verb "filled" (πληρόω) indicates that believers are to be "fill[ed] to the full . . . fill[ed] up to the top . . . so that nothing shall be lacking to full measure"[797] with the Spirit. "Lit[erally] the term means 'to fill something completely' . . . [n]on-lit[erally] it means 'to fill with a content.' Pass[ively] [it means] 'to be filled with' something; the content may not be specified, the subj. itself is the content, "to fill completely."[798] The mind-altering control of alcohol was a model to be rejected by saints, sanctified ones. Nothing must control a believer's mind except God; an emphatic contrast between the control of wine and the control of the Spirit is established. To "be filled" can connote the idea of being "completely controlled and stamped by the powers which fill him."[799] One who is filled is characterized by that which fills him. One is controlled by Satan when the evil one fills a person's heart (Acts 5:3).[800] When "sorrow hath filled [one's] heart" (John 16:6),[801] or

---

796 Note the contrast between the accusation that the Spirit-filled believers in Acts 2 were filled with wine and the fact that they were actually filled with the Spirit, although the verb in Acts 2:13 for the filling with wine is not πληρόω but μεστόω. Note also Luke 1:15.

The Greeks likewise spoke of being "filled with wine" (cf. "ἐς ἄγγος ... βακχίου μέτρημα πληρώσαντες *having poured* wine into the vessel *till it was full*, E.*IT*954," *pleroo,* Liddell-Scott). Compare Jeremiah 13:13 (LXX): καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς τάδε λέγει κύριος ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ πληρῶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν ταύτην καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν τοὺς καθημένους υἱοὺς Δαυιδ ἐπὶ θρόνου αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τοὺς προφήτας καὶ τὸν Ιουδαν καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ιερουσαλημ μεθύσματι, "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will fill [in judgment] the inhabitants of this land, and their kings the sons of David that sit upon their throne, and the priests, and the prophets, and Juda and all the dwellers in Jerusalem, with strong drink."

797 πληρόω, *Thayer's Greek Lexicon*, Henry Thayer. Compare BDAG.

798 πληρόω, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Kittel, Bromiley, Friedrich.

799 "πληρόω also implies that a man is completely controlled and stamped by the powers which fill him[.] . . . There is in the term a strong element of exclusiveness or totality. The joy, knowledge etc. which fill the Christian shape his whole existence and imperiously claim his whole being" (πληρόω, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Kittel, Bromiley, Friedrich).

800 εἶπε δὲ Πέτρος Ἀνανία, διατί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον καὶ νοσφίσασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ χωρίου;
But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back *part* of the price of the land?

801 But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν καρδίαν.

evil fills one's heart (Ecclesiastes 9:3, LXX),[802] such exercise control over one's life. The result of being filled with wine is the surrender of control to the wine. The result of being filled with the fruits of righteousness is a life directed by righteousness instead of by unrigheousness (Philippians 1:11). The result of being filled with the Spirit is control by the Spirit in the believer's life.

Commonly, the Spirit is the content of the filling. One can see this by a comparison of the language of Acts 2:2, 4, where the filling of a house with wind (v. 2, ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οἶκον) is paralleled to the filling of people (the church, the house of God) with the Spirit (v. 4, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου). Filling for content is the use when the verb πίμπλημι is used of filling (Luke 1:15, 41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8; 6:3, 5; 7:55; 11:24),[803] when the noun πλήρης is used for filling (Luke 4:1; Acts 6:3, 5; 7:55; 11:24),[804] and in the only verse other than Ephesians 5:18 where πληρόω is used, Acts 13:52: οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χαρᾶς καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου. One should also consider Acts 5:3, εἶπε δὲ Πέτρος Ἀνανία, διατί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον καὶ νοσφίσασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ χωρίου; "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back *part* of the price of the land?" where the idea is that Ananias was controlled by Satan by means of the fallen angel's filling Ananias' heart with evil things. Thus, one would expect the same thing in Ephesians 5:18, namely, that the Spirit is the content of the filling.

Certain writers, especially advocates of Reformed theology, affirm that Ephesians 5:18 does not, like the texts in Acts, refer to the Holy Spirit as the content of the filling, concluding rather that the text should be rendered as "filled by the Spirit." Some affirm that every believer is, to one extent or another, Spirit-filled. For example, Daniel Wallace argues: "[W]e know of no clear examples in biblical Greek in which ἐν + the dative indicates content. We should, therefore, seek some other nuance in such instances, as in Eph 5:18. . . . To see ἐν πνεύματι here as indicating content is grammatically suspect (even though it is, in many circles, the predominant view). Only if the flow of argument and/or the lack of other good possibilities strongly point in the direction of content would we be compelled to take it as such. There are no other examples in biblical Greek in which ἐν + the dative after πληρόω indicates content."[805] Similarly, William Combs

---

802 τοῦτο πονηρὸν ἐν παντὶ πεποιημένῳ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον ὅτι συνάντημα ἓν τοῖς πᾶσιν καί γε καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπληρώθη πονηροῦ καὶ περιφέρεια ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐν ζωῇ αὐτῶν καὶ ὀπίσω αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς νεκρούς. There is this evil in all that is done under the sun, that there is one event to all: yea, the heart of the sons of men is filled with evil, and madness is in their heart during their life, and after that *they go* to the dead.

803 The complete list of NT texts is: Matthew 22:10; 27:48; Luke 1:15, 23, 41, 57, 67; 2:6, 21–22; 4:28; 5:7, 26; 6:11; John 19:29; Acts 2:4; 3:10; 4:8, 31; 5:17; 9:17; 13:9, 45; 19:29.

804 The complete list of texts is: Matthew 14:20; 15:37; Mark 4:28; 6:43; 8:19; Luke 4:1; 5:12; John 1:14; Acts 6:3, 5, 8; 7:55; 9:36; 11:24; 13:10; 19:28; 2 John 1:8.

805 Pgs. 374-5, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace. Cf. pg. 94. Wallace neglects to mention on these pages (although he discusses the category of dative of content on pg. 170) that πληρόω + a simple dative is used for content in Romans 1:29; 2 Corinthians 7:4. These examples, furthermore, are actually in Paul's writings, like Ephesians 5:18, and so they are more relevant syntactically than the examples in Luke-Acts for the syntax of Ephesians 5:18. Interestingly, Wallace himself translates Ephesians 5:18b as "be filled with the Spirit" on pg. 441 of his *Grammar*, despite his extensive argumentation elsewhere in his book that such a translation is incorrect.

argues: "[Ephesians 5:18] would be the only example we have in Greek literature if this really is 'filled with the Spirit,' and that is the content . . . there is no filling with the Spirit."[806] However, these conclusions are erroneous.

First, if one were to concede that ἐν + dative does not explicitly express content, but an instrumental/means idea, and thus expresses a parallel idea to the dative οἴνῳ, namely, means or instrumentality (cf. the instrumental/means ἐν Πνεύματι structures in Ephesians 2:18, 22; 3:16; cf. also Eph 6:18), it would not eliminate the possibility that one is filled with the content of the Spirit in Ephesians 5:18. While one is not to be drunk with wine, that is, by means of wine, but be filled by means of or with the Spirit, the person who is drunk is not simply drunk by means of wine, but is filled with wine in content. Furthermore, the category, using πληρόω, of dative of content, is employed by Paul in Romans 1:29 and 2 Corinthians 7:4.[807] Likewise, one is filled with the fulness of Christ by means of the Spirit, but one is also filled with the content of the Spirit. While "[b]elievers are to be filled *by* Christ *by means of* the Spirit *with* the content of the fullness of God,"[808] such a fact does *not* mean that believers are not also to be filled with the content of the Holy Spirit.[809] Indeed, being filled with the Holy Spirit is, since the Spirit is Himself God and in possession of the fulness of Deity, being filled with the fulness of God. Thus, even if one were to concede to the Reformed argument that πληροῦσθε ἐν in Ephesians 5:18 cannot syntacally signify content with a following dative, the conclusion that one is not to be filled with the Spirit does not follow.

However, there is no need to concede that πληροῦσθε ἐν + dative cannot be used to signify content. First, it is not especially significant to affirm that πληρόω + ἐν is not content elsewhere in the New Testament. A search for the verb followed by the preposition will only yield 7 verses (Luke 9:31; 22:16; John 17:13; Romans 8:4; Galatians 5:14; Ephesians 5:18; Colossians 4:12), six references other than Ephesians 5:18. In five of the six, πληρόω means "fulfilled" and thus is not especially related to the question of Ephesians 5:18.[810] The structure in Colossians 4:12 is also quite different. Thus, New Testament texts that truly parallel the πληρόω + ἐν of Ephesians 5:18 are very limited. Furthermore, Colossians 2:9-10 supports a content idea for filling in the believer, employing πληρόω + ἐν, by a comparison with the way that the content of the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ.[811] Second, the category exists, using πληρόω, of dative of content, which is employed by Paul, Romans 1:29; 2 Corinthians 7:4.[812] Similarly, the Liddell-Scott lexicon indicates that πληρόω is used with the "dat. [as] *to*

---

806 "Filling of the Holy Spirit," Dr. William W. Combs, Detroit Baptist Seminary lecture, Mid-America Conference on Preaching 2003 "The Ministry of the Holy Spirit," http://www.dbts.edu/5-1/5-12.asp#03.

807 Cf. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, pg. 170.

808 Pg. 375, Wallace, *Greek Grammar*.

809 Compare the conclusion of the *Word Biblical Commentary* on Ephesians 5:18: "Believers are to be filled by the Spirit and thus also filled with the Spirit."

810 πληρόω possesses the "fulfilled" idea from the idea of something being completely filled or completed; the step from being completed to being fulfilled was small.

811 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας; For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power.

812 See pg. 170, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace.

fill with." This category supports "filled with" in Ephesians 5:18. The use of πληρόω with the naked dative for content supports the use of πληρόω + ἐν + dative in Ephesians 5:18 as content.[813] While it is true that naked case usage and case usage after a preposition are not absolutely identical, they usually have substantial semantic overlap.

Third, in related Greek literature πληρόω + ἐν is followed by the content of the filling, parallel to Ephesians 5:18 as "be filled with the Spirit." Note Sirach 26:2: "A virtuous woman rejoiceth her husband, and he shall fulfil the years of his life in peace," γυνὴ ἀνδρεία εὐφραίνει τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ ἔτη αὐτοῦ πληρώσει ἐν εἰρήνῃ. Here the peace is the content of the filling, so parallel Greek syntax to Ephesians 5:18 specifying content is found in the LXX. Furthermore, the only usage of πληρόω + ἐν in the earliest patristic writers is found in Ignatius:

> Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the church of God the Father and of the beloved Jesus Christ at Smyrna in Asia, mercifully endowed with every spiritual gift, filled with faith and love, not lacking in any spiritual gift, most worthy of God, bearing holy things: heartiest greetings in a blameless spirit and the word of God. Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἠλεημένῃ ἐν παντὶ χαρίσματι, πεπληρωμένῃ ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ, ἀνυστερήτῳ οὔσῃ παντὸς χαρίσματος, θεοπρεπεστάτῃ καὶ ἁγιοφόρῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Σμύρνῃ τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐν ἀμώμῳ πνεύματι καὶ λόγῳ θεοῦ πλεῖστα χαίρειν (*Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans* 1:0).

Thus, the only documented instance in the earliest documents of Christiandom has πληρόω + ἐν expressing content, specifically being filled with the content of faith and love, which is reminicient of New Testament texts that parallel being filled with the Spirit and being filled with Spirit-produced virtues (cf. Acts 13:52; 6:3, 5). It is therefore not surprising that BDAG, on πληρόω, comparing Ignatius' statement to Ephesians 5:18: "With ἐν and dat. of thing ἐν πνεύματι *with the Spirit* Eph 5:18. ἐν πίστει καί ἀγάπῃ ISm ins." Thus, the standard Greek lexicon indicates that Ephesians 5:18b is properly rendered "filled with the Spirit."[814] Furthermore, later patristics also taught that Ephesians 5:18 speaks of being filled with the content of the Spirit.[815] The contention

---

[813] In the words of the *Expositor's Greek Testament* (ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, vol. 3. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, reprint ed., pgs. 362-363—some editing below in brackets):

In NT Greek . . . verbs that are followed by the simple dative sometimes vary it by a prepositional form, *e. g.,* [ὕδατι βαπτίζω] (Luke iii. 16) and ἐν ὕδατι (Matt. iii:11), παντὶ τρόπῳ (Phil i. 18) and ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ (2 Thess ii[i]. 16), etc.; and the formula πληροῦν or πληροῦσθαι ἐν is not wholly without analogy; cf. τοῦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου, [Eph] i. 23 above; and [πεπληρωμένοι] ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ [Note: the CT has eliminated the πληρόω in this verse] Col iv. 12, ,]" . . . The ἐν may be taken, therefore, as the instrumental, and the sense will be "filled *with* or *by* the Spirit." Some (*e. g.,* Ell., Alf.) . . . combine the ideas of *in* and *by,* supposing the unusual phrase to be chosen with a view to convey the fact that the Holy Spirit is not only the instrument *by* which the Christian man is filled, but that also *in* which he is so filled."

[814] The article on πληρόω in the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* likewise renders Ephesians 5:18b as "filled with the Spirit," while the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* notes: "πληρόω ἐν == "with" . . . is also attested," citing as support BDF §172.

[815] Thus, note Chrysostom, *Homily XIX on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians*:

> "But be filled," says [Paul], "with the Spirit."
>
> And is then this Spirit within us? Yes, indeed, within us. For when we have driven away lying, and bitterness, and fornication, and uncleanness, and covetousness, from our souls, when we are become kind, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, when there is no jesting, when we have rendered ourselves worthy of it, what is there to hinder the Holy Spirit from coming and lighting upon us? And not only will He come unto us, but He will fill our hearts; and when we have so

that πληρόω + ἐν cannot mean "filled with the Spirit" in Ephesians 5:18 because it "would be the only example we have in Greek literature"[816] is, therefore, very unconvincing. As in the book of Acts people were filled with the content of the Spirit, so in Ephesians 5:18 all saints are commanded to be filled with the Spirit.

Having the Spirit's presence in a special way is the idea behind the Old and New Testament doctrines of Spirit filling—each believer has God the Holy Ghost with and in him, and is to be full of His presence. The full presence of God the Spirit gives the believer His personal influence and enablement to walk wisely (Ephesians 5:15-17). Likewise, as a congregation grows to be made up of Spirit-filled individuals, so the assembly corporately grows to be full of holiness and of the special presence of God the Spirit, and thus is filled with the fulness of God Himself (Ephesians 3:19),[817] resulting in both a personal and corporate holy walk.[818]

As in sanctification there is the all-or-nothing aspect of an upright and sincere Christian walk that is free from any desire to consciously hold on to sin, so that some Christians are right with God while others are backsliding, and there is also the aspect of progressive renewal into the image of God, so the Spirit's special presence—His filling—is on one way all or nothing, and in another way something that can progressively increase or decrease. A backsliding believer is disobeying completely the present imperative,[819] requiring continuing and customary action, of "be filled" (πληροῦσθε) in

---

great a light kindled within us, then will the way of virtue be no longer difficult to attain, but will be easy and simple.

It would have been very surprising to patristics such as Chrysostom or Ignatius to discover that although they preached, taught, wrote, spoke, and thought in Greek, they did not have enough understanding of Greek syntax to know what modern English thinking and speaking critics of being filled with the Spirit know, namely, that πληρόω + ἐν does not indicate content.

816 "Filling of the Holy Spirit," Dr. Combs, Detroit Baptist Seminary lecture, Mid-America Conference on Preaching 2003 "The Ministry of the Holy Spirit," http://www.dbts.edu/5-1/5-12.asp#03.

817 Consider, in this regard, the imagery in Ephesians of the church as the "an holy temple in the Lord" in whom the individual members of the congregation "are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Ephesians 2:21-22, ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι.). In keeping with the New Testment picture of both indivdual believers (1 Corinthians 6:19-20) and the corporate congregation (1 Corinthians 3:16-17; 1 Timothy 3:15) as the temple of the Triune God, including God the Spirit, consider the Old Testament language of Jehovah "filling" His institution of worship, whether the tabernacle, the Solomonic temple, or the coming Millennial temple, with His special presence (Exodus 40:34-35; 1 Kings 8:10-11; 2 Chronicles 5:13-14; 7:1-2; Ezekiel 10:4; 43:5; 44:4; cf. also Haggai 2:7, where the temple of Herod would have the presence of the God-Man, Christ within it, and thus be filled with the glory of God). The Old Testament predicted also the eschatological filling of the whole earth with Jehovah's special presence (cf. Numbers 14:21; Psalm 72:19; Isaiah 6:3; 11:9; Habakkuk 2:14), as Ephesians indicates that "in the dispensation of the fulness of times [God the Father will] gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him" (Ephesians 1:10).

818 Thus, note the corporate aspect of Ephesians 5:19-21. However, Spirit filling does not affect actions in the congregation only, but also proper fulfillment of other roles in life by individuals as fathers, wives, children, masters, and servants (Ephesians 5:22-6:9).

819 Contrast the aorist imperatives in Matthew 22:32, "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers" (καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν), which the Jews did by their single culminating act of rebellion in crucifying the incarnate Messiah; cf. also Philippians 2:2, πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαράν. There are no present imperatives of πληρόω besides Ephesians 5:18 in the New Testament, while only one present imperative (in the active voice) is found in the LXX (Jeremiah 51:11/28:11) along with a handful of aorist imperatives (Genesis 1:22, 28; 9:1, 7; Psalm 70:8; 82:17).

Ephesians 5:18, while the believer who is right with God is enjoined to be continually filled all the more. In the context of Ephesians 5:18a, one is either entirely free from the control of wine or one is not, but for those who are not, there are degrees of drunkenness where control is more and more surrendered to intoxicants. The error that Ephesians 5:18a only prohibits excessive alcohol consumption, but allows "moderate" drinking that tolerates, to a lesser degree, the influence of alcohol over the believer, produces confusion in the command to be filled with the Spirit in Ephesians 5:18b. While the progressive aspect of Spirit filling, through which believers are to be ever the more full of the presence of the Holy Ghost and consequently ever the more under His control, can, to a certain extent, although improperly, be maintained against an alleged prohibition of excessive drinking that nevertheless allows some control by alcohol, the important all-or-nothing aspect of Spirit filling and consequent control is very poorly set in contrast with allegedly allowable degrees of control by alcohol. The command for total abstinence from wine in Ephesians 5:18a is excecedingly important context for the command in Ephesians 5:18b for believers to be filled with the Spirit.

In Acts 13:52,[820] the spiritual grace of joy, which is part of the fruit of the Spirit (Galatians 5:22), and the presence of the Spirit Himself, are connected; believers were "filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost." In one way, a believer is either full of spiritual joy, or he is not—a believer who is overtaken by sin loses fulness of joy as he loses the smiling face of his Redeemer. At the same time, the disciples of Acts 13:52 could grow yet more full of joy than they already were as they experienced yet sweeter communion with the God of joy—indeed, such was the prayer of Paul for the members of the church at Rome: "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost" (Romans 15:13). The consequence of such filling was that the Roman Christians would be "full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another" (Romans 15:14).[821] God would, Paul prayed, fill these saints with more and more joy and peace so that they would ever more abound in spiritual graces, until perfected at glorification and completely filled "with *all* joy and peace." Sanctification includes believers being "filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ" (Philippians 1:9-11)[822] and "filled with the knowledge of [God's] will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding" with the result that they "walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and

---

The μὴ μεθύσκεσθε of Ephesians 5:18a is also certainly a customary present imperative indicating a general precept—Christians are not to be getting drunk, and are to do so by totally abstaining from alcohol—although entire freedom from control by wine is certainly possible in this life in a way that being filled to the uttermost extent with the Spirit is not in this life (cf. Galatians 5:17), while predominant fulness and control and a state of being progressively filled is the current blessedness of all sincere and upright Christians.

[820] And the disciples were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χαρᾶς καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

[821] 13 ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου. 14 Πέπεισμαι δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν. (Romans 15:13-14)

[822] 9 καὶ τοῦτο προσεύχομαι, ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον περισσεύῃ ἐν ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει, 10 εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα, ἵνα ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, 11 πεπληρωμένοι καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης τῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον Θεοῦ.

increasing in the knowledge of God" (Colossians 1:9-10;[823] cf. Colossians 4:12, 17; 2 Thessalonians 1:11; 2 Timothy 1:4) as they are filled and completed as they receive of the Divine fulness (cf. Colossians 2:9-10a).[824] In contrast, the unregenerate, as they "wax worse and worse" (2 Timothy 3:13), progress to new bottoms in their universally possessed total depravity, as they are "being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness" and grow "full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity" and other sins (Romans 1:29).[825] Thus, all in Acts 13:52 were filled with the Spirit because they were saved and right with God, but they could grow even more full as that same Spirit drew them yet closer to God and transformed them the more into the likeness of Christ, who, as the perfect Man, was perfectly right with God and perfectly sinless, and thus "full of the Holy Ghost" to the highest degree (Luke 4:1).

Acts 6:3, 5, in a fashion similar to Acts 13:52, connects Spirit-produced spiritual graces with being Spirit filled.[826] The spiritual servant-leaders of the passage, the model for all deacons, are "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom" and "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 6:3, 5, 7:55[827]). They are to follow the pattern of Barnabas, who was "a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith" (Acts 11:24). As with the possession of full spiritual joy, Spirit-wrought faith (Galatians 5:22) and wisdom (Ephesians 1:17; 5:18-19; Colossians 1:9; 3:16; Exodus 31:3) either fill the Christian or not in one sense, but, in another, they are capable of growth and development.

Spirit filling may be illustrated by containers holding various amounts of water.[828] Unlike a glass full of water, one with only a small amount of water at the bottom, or one that is one-fourth full and is slowly leaking, certainly has water in it, but it is hardly filled with water. Similarly, a backsliding believer has the holy Spirit—for all believers are indwelt by Him (Romans 8:9)—but he is hardly filled with the Spirit. Likewise, all believers love Jesus Christ (1 Corinthians 16:22), but a backslider is hardly filled with Spirit-produced love (Galatians 5:22). On the other hand, some water storage vessels designed for camping trips or other similar purposes have the ability not only be filled to the brim but can, like an accordion, expand in their capacity when stretched, so that they have the ability not only be full to one level but, by the continued addition of water,

---

[823] Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παυόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ, 10 περιπατῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ·

[824] ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι.

[825] πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πορνείᾳ, πονηρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ, κακίᾳ· μεστοὺς φθόνου, φόνου, ἔριδος, δόλου, κακοηθείας· ψιθυριστάς,

[826] The noun πλήρης, instead of the verb πληρόω (Ephesians 5:18; Acts 13:52), is employed in Luke 4:1; Acts 6:3, 5; 7:55; 11:24.

[827] Acts 7:55 appears to involve the close presence of the Spirit that led the martyr to boldly preach the Word (Acts 7) so that the Spirit cut Stephen's hearers to the heart (7:54), as well as the Spirit's giving Stephen his dying vision of the exalted Christ, in addition to his generally being full of faith and the Spirit in his daily life (Acts 6:5).

[828] Compare 2 Kings 4:4 (LXX): καὶ εἰσελεύσῃ καὶ ἀποκλείσεις τὴν θύραν κατὰ σοῦ καὶ κατὰ τῶν υἱῶν σου καὶ ἀποχεεῖς εἰς τὰ σκεύη ταῦτα καὶ τὸ πληρωθὲν ἀρεῖς, "And thou shalt go in and shut the door upon thee and upon thy sons, and thou shalt pour forth into these vessels, and remove that which is filled."

expand to hold even more than they did before. In such a manner believers are to be filled with the Holy Spirit, and with the love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, and faith that He supernaturally produces within them.[829]

As God produces, through the Theanthropic Mediator and applied directly by the Holy Spirit, ever greater degrees of Christlikeness in believers who are right with God, they enjoy ever greater degrees of the special presence of the Triune God with them and are thus the more filled with the fulness of the one God who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Word made flesh, who is Himself "full of grace and truth"[830] (John 1:14), and who thus also receives from God the Father a measureless portion of the Spirit (John 3:34),[831] communicates to those who are united to Him by faith ever fuller measures of the Divine presence and moral attributes (John 1:17), so that they can testify, "of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace" (John 1:16).[832] It was the Father's ordination that in the God-Man should "all fulness dwell"; therefore in Christ "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and He can communicate of His Theanthropic fulness to those united to Him (Colossians 1:19; 2:9-10).[833] The Father grants (Ephesians 3:14) that, by means of the supernatural efficacy of the Spirit (Ephesians 3:16) sent by the ascended Christ (Ephesians 4:10; John 16:7), Christ dwells in an ever greater way in the hearts of those who are in His church (Ephesians 3:17),[834] they gain experiential knowledge of the love of God in Christ, and in this way they are "filled with all the fulness of God" (Ephesians 3:19)[835] by Christ who, anointed King in His mediatorial kingdom,[836] "ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things" (Ephesians

---

829 Compare Romans 15:29; Paul did not just want to come to the Romans in the indubitable "the blessing of the gospel of Christ," but in "the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ, ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι.

830 πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

831 ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεός, τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ λαλεῖ· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα.

832 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος.

833 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησε πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι . . . ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι.

834 "[F]aith is . . . living and active . . . which immediately appropriates the whole Christ. It can indeed increase and grow in that appropriation, but it nevertheless always has for its object the whole Christ and can never isolate him from his benefits nor can it isolate one benefit from the others. Sanctification, accordingly, both from the divine and the human side, is an organic process. The more Christ indwells us, the more we are strengthened in faith; and the more our faith increases, the more Christ communicates himself to us" (pg. 264, *Reformed Dogmatics*, Herman Bavink, vol. 4).

835 πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

836 "The mediatorial kingdom may be defined . . . as the rule of God through a divinely chosen representative who not only speaks and acts for God but also represents the people before God; a rule which has especial reference to the human race (although it finally embraces the universe); and its mediatorial ruler is always a member of the human race" ("The Greatness of the Kingdom," Part I, Alva J. McClain, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 112:445 (Jan 1955) p. 18). In the eternal state, "When the last enemy is put down by our Lord as the mediatorial king, when even death itself is abolished and complete harmony is established, then the purpose of his mediatorial kingdom will have been fulfilled. Then the Son will deliver up his kingdom to God the Father, to be merged into the eternal kingdom, thus being perpetuated forever, but no longer as a separate entity (1 Cor 15:24–28). This does not mean the end of the rule of our Lord Jesus Christ. He only ceases to reign as the mediatorial King in history. But as the only begotten Son, very God of very God, He shares with the other Persons of the Triune God the throne of the eternal kingdom. In that final and eternal city of God, center of a redeemed new heaven and earth, there is but *one* throne. It is

4:10).[837] The church, the assembly of immersed believers,[838] is Christ's "body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (Ephesians 1:22-23),[839] and the ascended God-Man communicates the Trinitarian Divine fulness to His body (Ephesians 4:15-16) by the Spirit. The ascended Mediator and Head of the church communicates to His body of the Divine fulness and full measure of the Spirit that He possesses, so that, by the Father's ordination and will and through the incarnate and ascended Son, the saints are filled by

---

called. 'the throne of *God* and of the *Lamb*' (Rev 22:3–5)" ("The Greatness of the Kingdom, Part IV: The Mediatorial Kingdom from the Acts Period to the Eternal State," McClain, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 112:448 (Oct 55) p. 310]. The four parts of McClain's series on the Kingdom in *Bibliotheca Sacra* (12:445 (Jan 55) p. 11-27; 112:446 (Apr 55) p. 107-124; 112:447 (Jul 55) p. 209-224; 112:448 (Oct 55) p. 304-311) are very helpful in understanding the concept of the mediatorial kingdom and its distinction from the eternal kingdom of God.

John Darby comments:

> When He has put all His enemies under His feet, and has given back the kingdom to His Father (for it is never taken from Him, nor given to another, as happens with human kingdoms), then the Son Himself is subject to Him who has put all things under Him, in order that God may be all in all. The reader should observe, that it is the counsels of God with regard to the government of all things which is here spoken of, and not His nature; and moreover it is the Son, as man, of whom these things are said. This is not an arbitrary explanation: the passage is from Psalm 8, the subject of which is the exaltation of man to the position of head of all things, God putting all things under His feet. Nothing, says the apostle, is excepted (Hebrews 2:8) save, as he adds here, that He is necessarily excepted who put all things under Him. When the man Christ, the Son of God, has in fact accomplished this subjugation, He gives back to God the universal power which had been committed to Him, and the mediatorial kingdom, which He held as man, ceases. He is again subject, as He was on earth. He does not cease to be one with the Father, even as He was so while living in humiliation on the earth, although saying at the same time "Before Abraham was, I am." But the mediatorial government of man has disappeared — is absorbed in the supremacy of God, to which there is no longer any opposition. Christ will take His eternal place, a Man, the Head of the whole redeemed family, being at the same time God blessed for ever, one with the Father. In Psalm 2 we see the Son of God, as born on earth, King in Zion, rejected when He presented Himself on earth; in Psalm 8 the result of His rejection, exalted as Son of man at the head of all that the hand of God has made. Then we find Him here laying down this conferred authority, and resuming the normal position of humanity, namely, that of subjection to Him who has put all things under Him; but through it all, never changing His divine nature, nor — save so far as exchanging humiliation for glory — His human nature either. But God is now all in all, and the special government of man in the Person of Jesus — a government with which the assembly is associated (see Ephesians 1:20-23, which is a quotation from the same Psalm) is merged in the immutable supremacy of God, the final and normal relationship of God with His creature. We shall find the Lamb omitted in that which is said in Revelation 21:1-8, speaking of this same period.
>
> Thus we find in this passage [1 Corinthians 15] resurrection by man — death having entered by man; the relationship of the saints with Jesus, the source and the power of life, the consequence being His resurrection, and theirs at His coming; power over all things committed to Christ, the risen Man; afterwards the kingdom given back to God the Father, the tabernacle of God with men, and the man Christ, the second Adam, eternally a man subject to the Supreme — this last a truth of infinite value to us (the resurrection of the wicked, though supposed in the resurrection brought in by Christ, not being the direct subject of the chapter). (*Synopsis of the Books of the Bible,* part 2; the New Testament; comments on 1 Corinthians, pgs. 46-49 (598ff.); elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 15: Classic Commentary Collection,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006)

[837] ὁ καταβάς, αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα). The "filling all things" of Ephesians 4:10 relates to Christ's victory and rule over creation in His mediatorial kingdom as He puts all enemies beneath His feet and spreads the reign of God throughout the whole creation, and thus fills the creation with the special Divine presence and blessing, bringing it to its fulfillment and completion in God through Christ.

[838] Since justifying faith is a prerequisite to Scriptural baptism, no unregenerate person is truly a church member, even if he has been dipped in water upon profession of his (spurious) faith, and so only regenerate persons are genuinely part of the body of Christ.

[839] τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου.

the Spirit with the fulness of the Trinity, and thus are also filled with the Spirit Himself (Ephesians 5:18), as the Holy Ghost is Himself true God, in full possession of the undivided Divine essence by virtue of His eternal procession from the Father and the Son. This spiritual union, communion, and participation with God results in the believer's growing inward and outward holiness; being filled with the fulness of God results in the Christian becoming a holy being filled with holy attributes and "full of good works" (Acts 9:36; cf. Colossians 1:9; 4:12). Such is the glorious fruit of being filled by and with the Holy Spirit.

The New Testament also associates being filled with and therefore controlled by the Spirit with the Spirit's giving supernatural enablement for specific tasks, both through miraculous abilities in the first century and supernatural enablements for the entirety of the dispensation of grace, although the employment of a different Greek verb[840] for this sort of supernatural endowment sets this type of Spirit filling apart from that of Ephesians 5:18 and the texts in Acts discussed above. Ordained to be a prophet, John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb (Luke 1:15) for the work of his prophetic ministry. The Spirit filled Elizabeth (Luke 1:41) and Zecharias (Luke 1:67) in association with their giving forth inspired prophecy, and after Christ baptized the church with the Holy Spirit in Acts 2, her members were filled with the Spirit and thus enabled to miraculously speak foreign languages (Acts 2:4). Not only were specifically miraculous abilities given through this type of Spirit filling, but the Spirit filled and thus supernaturally empowered non-miraculous Christian work by believers who were right with God. Thus, believers were filled with the Spirit to boldy preach the gospel (Acts 4:8), the entire congregation at Jerusalem was supernaturally empowered to be preaching the Word with boldness because of Spirit filling for that purpose (Acts 4:31), and Paul was filled with the Spirit (Acts 9:17) in connection with Christ's ministerial call to him to boldly preach the gospel to many nations as the Apostle to the Gentiles (9:15-16). Miraculous and non-miraculous supernatural filling could also be connected, as the Spirit-filled Paul both to non-miraculously rebuke and preach with boldness, and also to miraculously prophesy (Acts 13:9-12).

The connection of Spirit filling with supernatural ability to perform specific tasks stands in direct continuity with the Old Testament doctrine of Spirit filling.[841] God "filled" Bezaleel and those helping him "with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship" so that they could complete the Divinely ordained task of building the tabernacle and all the rest of the "service of the sanctuary" (Exodus 31:1-6; 36:1-2). Both builders and those designing priestly garments were "filled with the spirit of wisdom" (Exodus 28:3; 35:25-35). Similarly, when Moses consecrated Joshua as the new leader of the children of Israel, "Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him: and the children of Israel hearkened unto him, and did as the LORD commanded Moses" (Deuteronomy 34:9).[842]

In conclusion, the New Testament does indeed command believers to be "filled with the Spirit" in Ephesians 5:18. Rather than being filled with and consequently

---

840 That is, πίμπλημι.

841 The relevant Old Testament passages employ the verb מָלֵא in conjunction with רוּחַ.

842 Micah 3:8 is similar to the passages in the text; however, in it the prophet does not specifically affirm that he is filled with the Spirit, but filled with power by means of the Spirit.

controlled by wine, believers are to totally abstain from alcohol, which inherently contains within it the quality of riotousness, and instead be filled with the Spirit, which results in His Divine control in the believer's life. In continuity with examples in the Old Testament, New Testament examples indicate that there is a type of Spirit filling that provides supernatural enablement for specific tasks, most notably, for the course of the church age after the cessation of miraculous gifts, ability to boldly preach the Word and gospel of God. Believers appropriately look to the Lord for such repeated fillings and consequent enablement as they seek to advance the work of Christ's kingdom. However, Ephesians 5:18 speaks specifically not of the Spirit's enablement for specific tasks, but of believers being continuously filled in an ever greater measure with the Holy Spirit. The backslidden believer is not filled with the Spirit any more than he is filled with Spirit-produced joy, faith, love, or other graces, while every surrendered believer, all Christians who are right with God, are filled with the Spirit, and, as they draw ever closer and are transformed ever the more into the image of God, can expect to be ever the more abundantly filled with and consequently controlled by that Holy Ghost who Himself possesses, with the Father and the Son, the very undivided fulness of the Triune God.

Being filled with the Spirit is essential for obedience in the Christian life of the sort explained in Ephesians 5:19-6:9.[843] Edifying speaking and singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs (5:19), giving thanks (5:20),[844] and the mutual submission and obedience to family and social roles (5:20, 5:21-6:9) are based on being filled with the Spirit. Husbands, wives, children, parents, employers, and employees must be filled with the Spirit to properly fulfill their roles. Furthermore, the Spirit filled believer will also "let the word of Christ dwell in [him] richly in all wisdom" (Colossians 3:16). Scripture dwelling richly in the believer will also bring him the rich presence of the indwelling Spirit (Romans 8:11; 2 Timothy 1:14) and whole Trinity (2 Corinthians 6:16),[845] for the rich dwelling of the Spirit in the Christian is being filled with the Spirit, and the rich dwelling of the Trinity in the believer is being filled with the fulness of God.

The necessity of being filled with the Spirit is part of historic Baptist doctrine and practice. Describing the pre-Reformation Baptist group, the Paterines, Jarrel wrote: "In the midst of a people thus professing to be filled with the spirit, and whose pope was the Holy Ghost himself, none of the existing officers of the [Roman Catholic] church could

---

843 Thus, the participles λαλοῦντες, εὐχαριστοῦντες, and ὑποτασσόμενοι of 5:19-21 are dependent upon the πληροῦσθε of 5:18, and the teaching of 5:22-6:9 is connected by the ὑποτάσσεσθε of 5:22 with the ὑποτασσόμενοι of 5:21, so that the entire passage flows out of the πληροῦσθε ἐν Πνεύματι of 5:18. Ephesians 5:22-6:9 is not introduced by a conjunction, as are previous divisions of Ephesians back to 1:3, supporting the continuitiy of thought of 5:22-6:9 with the requirement and development of walking in wisdom in 5:15-19.

844 Compare Ephesians 5:18, 20 and 1 Thessalonians 5:18, 19: "be filled with the Spirit . . . giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ"/"In every thing give thanks: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you. Quench not the Spirit." Quenching the Spirit and being filled with the Spirit are opposites.

845 Thus, ἐνοικέω is found in Colossians 3:16; Romans 8:11; 2 Timothy 1:14; 2 Corinthians 6:16. All believers are indwelt, but not all have the Godhead's presence "richly," even as all believers have the Word of Christ in them (cf. John 5:38), but not all let it dwell in them richly (Colossians 3:16). The rich presence of the indwelling Trinity will also produce a believer having "unfeigned faith" dwelling in him (2 Timothy 1:5, the final ἐνοικέω text in the NT).

exercise any of their hierarchal prerogatives."[846] After the Reformation, in 1653, the Baptist church in Leith, England, wrote to the Baptist church at Hexham, "Dearly beloved Brethren, — We salute you in our Lord Jesus Christ, wishing grace, mercy, and peace may be multiplied unto you, through the knowledge of the Father, that you may have the full communications of grace and of the love of God shed abroad in your hearts, being filled with the Spirit of truth; and may grow up in all things into him who is your head, and may approve yourselves to be persons making it your great study to honour God in your generations; that so you may be [the occasion] of joy unto all God's people, and may indeed appear to be trees of righteousness of the Lord's own planting." The letter was written because the Leith church was "refreshed to hear of that eminent work of God that hath sprung up amongst you in these parts, in that he has pleased to add unto his church daily such as shall be saved."[847] The great American Baptist pastor John Leland connected "Christian piety" and being "filled with the spirit."[848] G. W. Joiner, who pastored a variety of American Baptist churches in the mid to late 19th century, considered it his "great joy" to be "filled with the Spirit."[849] In the same time period, the Baptist "Dr. Webb . . . [b]eing filled with the Spirit . . . preached with much power."[850] B. H. Carroll, Baptist pastor, professor of theology and Bible at Baylor University and Seminary from 1872-1905 and professor and president of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary from 1908-1914, wrote: "[In Ephesians] 5:18 . . . [t]here are two kinds of intoxication, one of wine and one of the Holy Spirit. I have seen people under the intoxication of the Spirit. . . . Whenever we want to be stimulated, we should go off and pray. As we are infilled with the Spirit, we become enthusiastic; a divine afflatus rests upon us, enabling us to think thoughts that breathe, to speak words that burn and to sing songs that have more convincing power than the sermon. That is spiritual intoxication."[851] Modern Baptists should follow the godly example of their forefathers and continue to preach and experience the glorious truth of Spirit filling today.

The command, "be filled with the Spirit," and the fact that God deigns to fill His people with the Spirit, should drastically change your life. Be amazed, oh heavens, and be awestruck, oh earth—the infinite God—the high and holy One who inhabits eternity—wishes for men to partake of Himself! He blesses His people with all spiritual blessings now, works all things together for their good, and guarantees them the infinite happiness of an eternity with Him, and He wills that they know His special presence even while,

---

846 Pg. 107, Chapter 13, *Baptist Church Perpetuity,* W. A. Jarrel. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

847 Pgs. 232-233, *Records of the Churches of Christ*, by Edward B. Underhill. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

848 Pg. 479, Chapter 40, "Which Has Done the Most Mischief in the World, the Kings-Evil or Priest-Craft?" in *The Writings of the late Elder John Leland,* by L.F. Greene. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

849 Pg. 250, "Biographical Sketches," in the "Texas Historical and Biographical Magazine," vol. 2, by J. B. Link. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

850 Pg. 94, Chapter 13, *The Baptist History of South Dakota,* by T.M. Shanafelt. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005. The event recorded took place during a preaching meeting in 1874.

851 Pgs. 89-90, *An Interpretation of the English Bible: Colossians, Ephesians, and Hebrews*, by B. H. Carroll, ed. J. B. Cranfill. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1948. Elec. acc. AGES Christian Library Series, Vol. 11, B. H. Carroll Collection. Rio, WI: 2006.

sinners though they are, they walk upon this fallen and rebellious earth. Indeed, He not only makes His fulness available to them, but positively enjoins them to be full of His presence, to be filled with His Spirit and the fulness of God. Who would refuse this? What awful evil it is to not be filled with the Spirit! Is it not immeasurable ingratitude, stubbornness, pride, rebellion, and wickedness to refuse to be filled with the Spirit? Is it not to exalt one's self and own way against God, and by preferring self and sin to God and His presence, an act of the most awful idolatry and creature worship? What crimes are these that you have committed, oh Christian, by your refusal, so often, to be filled with the Spirit? And how great is your sin of not pursuing an ever greater fulness of the Spirit and the Triune God! Why are you not much further along than you are now? Why is your communion with Him and knowledge of His presence so miserably feeble? Will you not, in tears, greatly humble yourself and seek to be filled with the Spirit? For—despite all your crimes—your Triune God yet loves you with an infinite and unchangeable love, and still offers and bids you to be filled with the Spirit and the fulness of God. His provision has not been taken away, but is provided for you still.

You should diligently search your heart and be sure that you are right with God, so that you can enjoy the wonderful provision of being filled with the Spirit, as commanded in Ephesians 5:18. Since Spirit filling results in Spirit control, you should also detest and flee from alcohol and any and every other thing that would displace the control of the Lord the Spirit from mind-controlling video media, to worldly and fleshly contemporary "Christian" music, to the false spirits and false, mindless, fanatical, Spirit-quenching worship associated with Pentecostalism and the charismatic movement. Do you want the Spirit of God, or the spirits of devils? Be filled with the Spirit, and reject with horror such productions of evil spirits. Do not be decived by whatever high talk of the Spirit such pseudo-Christianity employs. Do not let anything contest the control of the Holy Spirit over your life. You must not only abstain from consuming wine yourself, but abstain from selling, commending, or giving it to others (Habakkuk 2:15), and rather warn about its evil nature, as a substance that has within its very nature riotousness and wickedness. Be wise, and understand the will of the Lord. Abstain from beginning the process that leads to drunkeness, and be filled with the Spirit.

Furthermore, you should trust the Lord for supernatural enablement to boldy preach the gospel and engage in spiritual work in general. Be filled with the Spirit, both as a mark of your Christian life, and also by being empowered for His specific assistance in the advancement of the Kingdom. Will you seek to defeat the world, the flesh, and the devil in your own strength? Pray for boldness, and trust God to give you the special enablement of the Holy Ghost as you open your mouth to pointedly preach the Word, fearing God alone, not man (Acts 4:31). Do not fear persecution and opposition—rather, rejoice if you are counted worthy to suffer for Christ's name (Acts 5:41). Do not disobey God and fail to boldly confess Christ (Matthew 10:32) because of what appears to be insuperable hardship. Do not those who have stood firm in such trials tell you that they enjoyed the special presence of the Lord with them at that time? Did they not tell you that they experienced the blessed reality of the special guidance of the Holy Ghost (Mark 13:11)? Indeed, if you have endured such tribulations yourself, do you not know by experience how wonderfully true the special presence of the Spirit is? Will you miss such a glorious blessing out of fear of mortal men?

What is more, let those in particular who are pastors and teachers recognize the absolute necessity of Spirit filling and enablement for their successful ministry. The souls of Christ's flock, those of countless unconverted people, and the future of the kingdom of God advances or falls as the ministers of Christ either have or lack a Spirit-empowered ministry. The stakes are incomprehensibly high. A pastor who is not Spirit-filled is an awful spiritual disaster. Oh Christian worker, oh man of God, called to preach the Word and the gospel of Christ—will you not, of all men, be filled with the Spirit?

Furthermore, a pastor who is filled and thus empowered will boldly preach all the truth, emphasizing the specific sins of those in his audience (John 7:26; Acts 2:36-37; 4:1-13; 7:51-55). He will not hold back for pragmatic considerations, or out of the fear of man. He will not tickle ears, but will be able to testify of himself what was true of Christ: "I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O LORD, thou knowest. I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy lovingkindness and thy truth from the great congregation" (Psalm 40:9-10). The truly Spirit-filled preacher will not conceal or refrain from setting forth one tittle of God's truth.

Finally, treasure the church—the congregation of Christ, His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. God has not designed you to be filled with the Spirit and grow in experiencing the special presence of the Trinity on your own (Ephesians 5:19-21). The fulness of Christ's presence is not experienced by listening to a preacher on T. V. or on the radio, by attending a parachurch Bible study, or by attending the services of a denominational system other than the church Christ started in the first century. No, Christ's temple—the place where His glory is especially manifested and His presence known—is your local, visible, Bible-believing and practicing Baptist church. Are there some people there who are harder to get along with than others? It is no matter—Jesus is there in a special way. Are the leaders, although admittedly godly and spiritually qualified men (1 Timothy 3), less than perfect? So were the Apostles themselves—fit into the church, and let Christ nourish and strengthen you as Head of His body, the assembly (Ephesians 4:15-17; Colossians 2:19). You have the glorious privilege and command of being filled with the Spirit—fulfill your personal and corporate responsibility, that it might be so.

H. Excursus VI: Is Fallen Man's Obligation To Obey God Limited To His Ability To Do So?

Various perfectionistic theologies of sanctification affirm that man's obligation to obey God is limited to his ability to do so.[852] They argue that God would not be fair were

[852] Examples of this idea include Wesley's argument: "Christian perfection . . . [is a state in which people] love God with all their heart, and all men as themselves, [and thus] are Scripturally perfect. And surely such [people on earth] there are; otherwise the promise of God would be a mere mockery of human weakness. Hold fast to this" (cited pg. 123, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875). Likewise in the Oberlin theology: "The sinner has all the faculties and natural attributes requisite to render perfect obedience to God. All he needs is to be induced to use these powers and attributes as he ought" (pgs. 271-272, *Finney's Systematic Theology*, Charles Finney). Indeed, "Finney's theology and 'new measures' rested on 'a doctrine of plenary ability'—the notion that all that is

He to require of man more than he has the ability to perform. Consequently, fallen men have the ability to obey all that God requires of them. This plenary ability to obey is often ascribed to both unregnerate and regenerate individuals, but is sometimes limited to the latter by certain of its advocates.

Is it true that God would be unjustly mocking fallen man if He demanded and obliged him to obey beyond his ability? No text in the Bible teaches such a doctrine.[853]

---

obligated of us we are able to perform and that obligation is limited by ability'" (pg. 466, *The Theology of B. B. Warfield*, Fred G. Zaspel). Likewise, "in the seventeenth century . . . the Socinians argued that God cannot require of human beings something that he does not provide," (pg. 279, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, by Richard Muller, vol. 1) an affirmation that led them to affirm that heathen with no knowledge of Christ could be saved (contra John 14:6; Acts 4:12) since they were not able to hear the gospel (pgs. 279, 285, *ibid*.). The Wesleyan and Oberlin perfectionist argumentation equating obligation and ability carried over into the Keswick theology through the teaching at the Broadlands Conference and its successors. As Hannah W. Smith taught at Broadlands: "God commands us to believe, and we can and must believe. God's commands are not grievous, but they would be if He commanded what we could not do. He always provides the power to obey" (pg. 128, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Thus, Broadlands consistently taught that "God gives us power to fulfill what we owe" (pg. 188, *ibid*). At the Oxford Convention Scriptural commands were "pressed upon us as a command, and therefore a promise" (pg. 333, Pg. 291, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874); consequently, "*God's commandment is His enablement*. Whatever is believed or suspected to be opposed to His will and to our well-being should be, and can be, renounced, and abandoned at once and for ever. Because it *should be*, it *may be*. This is essentially Keswick teaching" (pg. 92, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Its Method, and Its Men*, ed. Harford, emphasis in the original).

[853] One might allege that Philippians 4:13 supports the idea the idea that man's obligation and ability are coextensive. In the verse, Paul states: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." The fact that that the verse is not absolutely unlimited in its significance is obvious from the fact that Paul is not making a claim to either independent omnipotence or an omnipotence derived from Christ. Omnipotence is an incommunicable Divine attribute. The nature of the limitation of the "all things" is apparent from the context of v. 10-14; Paul is claiming that he can stand, by Christ's strength, whatever "affliction" (v. 14) the Lord allows to come his way; he can be "content" in whatever state of "want" he is in (v. 11), for he says: "I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: every where and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need" (v. 12). Philippians 4:13 teaches the blessed fact that Christ strengthens believers to endure whatever afflictive circumstances He allows in their lives. The verse does not establish the unbiblical notion that man's obligation to obey God is limited to his fallen ability to do so.

Matthew Poole commented on Philippians 4:13: "Having written of the great things he had learned, that it might not be attributed to his proud conceit, or give occasion to any others' vanity to boast, (as he had recourse before to the Divine efficiency to will and do, Philippians 2:13), [Paul] rests solely for power upon Christ, being found in whom, when he saith he *can do all things,* we are not to understand it absolutely, but restrictively to the subject matter he had before mentioned in the precedent verses, intimating he could by the Lord's help use well both prosperity and adversity: or, all those things the Lord called him to and put him upon. Not, as the papists urge, that any mere man since the fall is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God; but that he by faith being united to Christ, by the power of his Spirit dwelling in him, hath in the Lord righteousness and strength, Isaiah 45:24; and thereupon hath a sincere respect to all God's commands, as David had, Psalm 119:6; so also had Zacharias and Elisabeth, Luke 1:6; in opposition to Pharisaical obedience: not by any power he had of himself, but through Christ strengthening of him, so that God would accept of his sincere performance (though not every way perfect) of what was incumbent on him."

The fact that mankind, by its own fault, has sinned in Adam and has a sinful nature, and is thus unable on earth to meet the Divine standard of perfect holiness required by God, illustrates and aggravates human fault rather than providing any ground to ascribe fault to the Holy One, the just Judge of all the earth.[854] The idea that human obligation is limited to ability is clearly unscriptural. Were this idea true, Pelagianism would necessarily follow—lost men would, contrary to the affirmations of Scripture (John 6:44, 65), not be enslaved to sin but have the ability to turn to God of themselves. The fact that the unregenerate can commit the unpardonable sin, that is, resist the Holy Spirit to the point that He will no longer draw them to Christ, so that it becomes thenceforth "impossible to renew them again unto repentance" (Hebrews 6:4-6; John 12:32; Matthew 12:31-32) would have to be removed from the realm of Biblical doctrine. Since God's standard is absolute sinless perfection (Matthew 5:48; 1 Peter 1:15-16), both the unregenerate and the regenerate would have the ability to instantly become, at any given moment, literally sinless in their nature, words, thoughts, and acts. The fact that the saints are commanded universally to pray for the forgiveness of their sins (Matthew 6:12-13), that if anyone affirms that he has no sin he is deceived and not of the truth (1 John 1:8-10),[855] that

---

854 "[L]et it be pointed out that this impotency to measure up to the requirements of God is no mere innocent infirmity, but a highly culpable thing, which greatly aggravates our vileness and adds to our guilt. Our inability to measure up to the standard of personal piety which God has appointed, lies not in a lack of executive power or the needful faculties, but in the want of a willing mind and a ready heart to practice true holiness. If men in a natural state had a hearty love and liking to true holiness, and a fervent and sincere endeavor to practice it, and yet failed in the event, then they might under some pretense plead for this excuse (as many do), that they are compelled to sin by an inevitable necessity. But the fact is that man's impotency lies in his own obstinacy—"Ye will not come to Me" (John 5:40) said the Lord Jesus. Inability to pay a debt does not excuse a debtor who has recklessly squandered his estate; nor does drunkenness excuse the mad or violent actions of a drunkard, but rather aggravates his crime. God has not lost His right to command, even though man through his wickedness has lost his power to obey. Because the flesh "lusteth against the Spirit" (Galatians 5:17), that is far from an extenuation for not being in subjection to Him. Because "every one that doeth evil hateth the light," that is far from justifying them because they "loved darkness" (John 3:19, 20); yea, as the Savior there so plainly and solemnly states, it only serves to heighten their criminality—"This is the condemnation." Then "How much more abominable and filthy is man, which drinketh iniquity like water?" (Job 15:16) that cannot practice holiness because he will not" (pgs. 43-44, *Doctrine of Sanctification*, Arthur W. Pink).

855 "It has, indeed, been suggested to the writer by a professor of 'the higher life,' that John may have referred in verse eigh[t] to a self-righteous person, who might say, 'I have no sin to be forgiven,' meaning, 'I have never sinned.' But it is evident that this letter of the apostle was written to those who were Christians by profession at least, while the language just used would have been an utter and outspoken rejection of Christianity. There is no evidence that any were admitted to the apostolic churches save those who trusted, or professed to trust, in Christ for the pardon of their sins; but there is evidence that some in the churches adopted the Antinomian view, that as Christians they were not under law, but under grace, and therefore could not sin. Against this perversion of the truth Paul had to contend earnestly; but against such a doctrine as the one supposed, namely, that some in the churches claimed that they had *never* sinned, there is no warning or argument in his letters" (pg. 90, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, by Alvah Hovey).

"*there is* no man that sinneth not" (1 Kings 8:46),[856] including every one of the people of God on earth, and vast numbers of other Biblical declarations, including the commands a believer obeys partially but not completely (cf. Colossians 3:16),[857] would have to be ignored or twisted.[858]

---

856 Note that the affirmation of 1 Kings 8:46, and its parallel passage 2 Chronicles 6:36, is not merely that all men, some of whom never consciously or willfully sin, have some remnant of indwelling sin in them. The sin which the passages affirms all men possess, is such that they can say: "we have done perversely, we have committed wickedness," or "we have sinned, we have done amiss, and have dealt wickedly," (1 Kings 8:47; 2 Chronicles 6:37), so that all men, including the people of God, actually sin and commit "transgressions wherein they have transgressed against" the Lord (1 Kings 8:50). All men on the earth, including the holiest believers, commit the sort of sins that make them worthy of the Deuteronomic curses, including, for Israel, exile from the promised land (1 Kings 8:47-48; Deuteromony 28:63-68), and, for all men, horrific earthly judgment and eternal damnation (Deuteronomy 27:11-28:68; Galatians 3:10). Nor was Solomon alone in his view of the universal transgression of men, including the people of God—Ezra affirmed that all the saints, to a man, committed acts worthy of the Deuteronomic curses (Ezra 9:6-7), as did Daniel (9:7-11). The Solomonic affirmation in prayer that all the people of God commit serious acts of sin is a model for the prayer of later believers through history, as evidenced not only by the examples of Ezra and Daniel, but by the Lord Himself (Matthew 6:12-13; Luke 11:4). Scripture does not teach the possibility of believers living a life without any sin or without any acts of known transgression.

857 "The answer that is made again and again [by perfectionists to the doctrine that sanctification is progressive, and many commands in the Bible are obeyed partially and in a progressively greater way, is]: Is not Christ able to sanctify us immediately as well as progressively? But it is manifest that the question simply brings us to the . . . problem of accounting for the origin and permitted continuance of evil in the world. Has not Christ power enough to prevent every man and woman and child now in the world, and every man and woman and child that shall be in it till the end of time, from every committing a sin in thought or word or deed? Doubtless he has sufficiency of power. But his infinite wisdom sees reasons, which are to us inscrutable, for not putting forth his power that that effect. And then our opponents should consider that even they do not venture to say that the sanctification of the believer is absolutely complete" (pg. 266, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280).

858 "The [true] doctrine . . . is, that sanctification is never perfected in this life; that sin is not in any case entirely subdued; so that the most advanced believer has need as long as he continues in the flesh, daily to pray for the forgiveness of sins.

The question is not as to the duty of believers. All admit that we are bound to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect. Nor is it a question as to the command of God; for the first, original, and universally obligatory commandment is that we should love God with all our heart and our neighbour as ourselves. Nor does the question concern the provisions of the Gospel. It is admitted that the Gospel provides all that is needed for the complete sanctification and salvation of believers. What can we need more than we have in Christ, his Spirit, his word and his ordinances? Nor does it concern the promises of God; for all rejoice in the hope, founded on the divine promise, that we shall be ultimately delivered from all sin. God has in Christ made provision for the complete salvation of his people: that is, for their entire deliverance from the penalty of the law, from the power of sin, from all sorrow, pain, and death; and not only for mere negative deliverance, but for their being transformed into the image of Christ, filled with his Spirit, and glorified by the beauty of the Lord. It is, however, too plain that, unless sanctification be an exception, no one of these promises besides that which concerns justification, is perfectly fulfilled in this life. Justification does not admit of degrees. A man either is under condemnation, or he is not. And, therefore, from the nature of the case, justification is instantaneous and complete, as soon as the sinner believes. But the question is, whether, when God promises to make his people perfectly holy, perfectly happy, and perfectly glorious, He thereby promises to make them perfect in holiness in this life? If the promises of happiness and glory are not perfectly fulfilled in this life, why should the promise of sanctification be thus fulfilled? It is, however, a mere question of fact. All admit that God can render his people perfect before death as well as after it. The only question is, Has He promised, with regard to

The Baptist professor and college president Alvah Hovey[859] commented on the idea that the obligation of sinful man is limited to his ability as follows:

> [M]oral weakness does not reduce moral obligation. If it did, Satan would be under almost infinitely less obligation to love God than Gabriel, and, the farther any being advanced in sin, the less of service would be due from him to his Maker. The law, as a standard of right and duty, has not been modified by the work of Christ: it has rather been honored and sustained. The theory of one law for angels, another for Adam before the fall, and still another for believers in Christ, is without any foundation in the Word of God. It is impossible to doubt that the law for all moral beings, in all worlds, is one and the same. To love God with all the spiritual ardor and energy of their undivided being is their simple duty. . . . Do any Christians live without sin in this world? All are commanded to do so by an authority inseparable from their moral being[.] . . . This voice forbids every feeling, purpose, and act that is wrong, and enjoins perfect and perpetual rectitude in heart, as well as in life. . . . [T]he law of God, as set forth in the Bible, require[s] of all a life without sin. . . .
>
> Of what use are precepts and exhortations, it is asked, if Christians are never to comply with them? [The perfectionist argues that] [t]he law was given to Christians to be obeyed, and it is surely safe to conclude that it will be obeyed by some in this life.[860] . . . To this it must be answered that it is manifestly unsafe to infer the moral perfection of even a few Christians from the circumstance that all are commanded or exhorted to be perfect. It would be quite as logical to assume that all Christians obey the law completely from the hour of their conversion, as to assume that some obey it thus for a month or a year. But the premise warrants neither conclusion. If a moral law be given by the Most High, it must naturally be a perfect rule of right, whether it be

---

sanctification alone, that it shall be perfected on this side of the grave? and, Do we see cases in which the promise has been actually fulfilled? The answer given to these questions by the Church . . . is in the negative. So long as the believer is in this world, he will need to pray for pardon." (*Systematic Theology*, Charles Hodge, 3:18:7)

859 Dr. Hovey pastored a Baptist church in New Gloucester, Maine, and then taught Hebrew, church history, theology, and Christian ethics at the Newton theological institution, a Baptist college, for a number of decades, starting in 1849. He became the president of the college in 1868, the year he also became a member of the executive committee of the American Baptist missionary union, a position he held until 1883. He was also the general editor of the *American Commentary on the New Testament* series.

860 Thomas Smith discusses this particular argument, as made by Oberlin perfectionst Asa Mahan:

> Dr. Mahan argues from the precepts and the prayers of Scripture that perfection must be attainable in this life. He finds, for example, such a precept as [Matthew 5:48], and such a prayer on behalf of Christias as that of the apostle, "The God of peace . . . make you perfect in every good work, to do his will." [Hebrews 13:20-21; note that the progressive nature of the perfecting, indicated in the "working in you that which is wellpleasing in His sight" (ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ) clause, is overlooked.] Is it conceivable, [Mahan] asks, that our Lord would have given such a precept [as Matthew 5:48], unless in some way it could be fulfilled by those to whom he addressed it; or that the apostle should have been inspired to utter such a prayer, unless He that inspired the prayer had been willing to answer it? In answer to this, it may probably be enough to say that surely God's right to require is not impaired by the inability that we have brought upon ourselves to render the service that is due to him. Dr. Mahan is well enough acquainted with the ordinary view of such texts, that the Chrsitian has set before him the standard of absolute perfection, and that he is required to strive to come ever nearer and nearer to it; and that he shall assuredly, by the grace of God, ultimately attain to it. Now, will he have the goodness, without admitting that this view is correct, to make the supposition that [if] it were correct[,] would not all such precepts and prayers be easily explicable in accordance with that supposition? But now let us, on the other hand, suppose that his view is correct, what follows, but that a great portion of the Scriptures is wholly inapplicable to a large, and ever enlarging [as more people achieve perfection through the teaching of Mahan and other perfectionists], number of beleivers? As the law is for the disobedient, surely precepts and exhortations are for the imperfect. Was there no one amongst the disciples on the mount, no one among those Hebrews who had been illuminated, and had endured a great fight of afflictions, who knew in themselves that they had in heaven a better and an enduring substance,--no one amongst all these who had attained such perfection as Dr. Mahan and his friends have attained? If there were but one such, he might have said, he must have felt, O Lord, this precept is not for me; O Paul, this prayer is not for me. (pgs. 275-276, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280)

kept by many or by none. Nor can it be pronounced useless, though it be kept by none, It may be of great service because it reveals the right, or what Christians ought to be and to do, and because it shows to those who are saved by Christ the degree of sin in their hearts and lives, together with the wonderous grace of God to his wayward children. . . . [Nor is it valid when it is] suggested that, if none of them are sanctified fully before the hour of death, it must be because God is either unable or unwilling thus to sanctify them . . . [in light of the fact that 1 Thessalonians 4:3 states,] "This is the will of God, your sanctification."[861] . . . [For] are we not assured by the same apostle that it is the will of God that "all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Timothy 2:4)? And would it not be hasty reasoning to conclude from this language that all men will be saved? Besides, it may be truly said, that God wishes not only that some Christians, but that *all* Christians, and indeed all moral beings in the universe, should be wholly free from sin, from this instant onward through eternal ages; nay, that he has always wished this in respect to all such beings; but we do not therefore conclude that there will be no more sin, or that there never has been sin. . . . [Texts such as 1 Thessalonians 4:3] se[t] forth what Christians ought to do in obedience to the will of God, not what he proposes to do in their hearts [at some instant in this life]. Yet in doing this they have the gift and aid of the Holy Spirit."[862]

Likewise, B. B. Warfield explained the necessary consequences of the doctrine that human moral obligation is limited to his fallen ability:

To be perfect, [according to the doctrine that obligation is limited to ability, a sinner] does not [need] to love as God loves — in whose love all righteousness is embraced — or as the angels love, or as Adam loved, or even as any better man than he loves. He only requires to love as he himself, being what he is, and in the condition in which he finds himself, can love. If he loves all he can love in his present condition, he is perfect. No matter how he came into his present condition; suppose if you will that he came into it by a long course of vice, or by some supreme act of vice, it makes no difference. His obligation is limited by his ability; we cannot say, he ought to do more than he can do; if he does all he can do, he has no further obligation, he is perfect. The moral idiot . . . is as perfect as God is: being a moral idiot, he has no moral obligation; when he has done nothing at all he has done all that he ought to do: he is perfect. God Himself cannot do more than all He ought to do; and when He has done all He ought to do, He is no more perfect than the moral idiot is—although what He has done is to fulfil all that is ideally righteous and the moral idiot has done nothing.

In this conception the law of God, complete obedience to which is perfection, is made a sliding scale. It is not that perfect rule, which as the Greeks say, like a straight-edge, straight itself, measures both the straight and the crooked; but a flexible line which follows the inequalities of the surface on which it is laid, not molding it, but molded by it. Obligation here is interpreted in terms of ability with the result that each man becomes a law to himself, creating his own law; while the objective law of God, the standard of holiness in all, is annulled, and there are as many laws, as many standards of holiness, as there are moral beings. . . . There is no such thing as a universal obligation of the law . . . or indeed as a universal law, binding on all alike, to create a universal obligation. Each man's obligation is exhausted in the law which his own ability creates for him; . . . the requirements of the law [being reduced] to the moral capacity of sinful men, [and] adjust[ed] in detail [down] to the moral capacity of each individual sinner . . . has the effect of making our

---

[861] Snodgrass further observes concerning 1 Thessalonians 4:3: "That full provision is made for consummating the work of sanctification, as well as for its commencement and progress, is not doubted by any. All evangelical Christians agree that when the Apostle says, 'This is the will of God, even your sanctification,' he has in view the entire deliverance of those who embrace the Gospel from the power and pollution of sin. . . . But the certainty of an event, and the time at which we are authorized to expect it, are two different things. And the question now arises, Are we authorized to believe that God will ever consummate the sanctification of his people within the limits of the present life [rather than at their glorification?]" (pgs. 18-19, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*). Snodgrass rightly answers this question in the negative.

[862] Pgs. 62, 73-75, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures,* by Alvah Hovey.

sin the excuse for our sin, until we may cease to be sinners altogether by simply becoming sinful enough. . . . [T]he acquisition of unconquerable habits of evil, by progressively destroying obligation, renders perfection ever easier of acquisition by constantly reducing the content of the perfection to be acquired; and [thus] one of the surest roads to salvation [and perfection] is therefore to become incurably wicked.[863]

Similarly, William G. T. Shedd wrote:

The foundation of man's obligation to perfectly obey the Divine law, was the holiness and plenary power to good with which he was endowed by his Creator. Because God made man in his own image, he was obliged to sinless obedience. Moral obligation rested upon the union and combination of the so-called "natural ability" with the "moral." It did not rest upon the first alone. Not a will without any inclination, but a will with a holy inclination, was the basis of the requirement of sinless obedience. The possession of a will undetermined would not constitute man a moral agent. God did not make man without moral character, and then require perfect obedience from him. When man was created and placed under law, he was endowed not only with the faculties of a man, but with those faculties in a normal condition. The understanding was spiritually enlightened, and the will was rightly inclined. He had both "natural" and "moral" ability. He had real and plenary power to obey the law of God. In the beginning of man's moral existence, ability must equal obligation. And the ability did equal it. Kant's dictum: "I ought, therefore I can," was true of holy Adam and his posterity in him. If at the instant man came from the hand of God he had been unable to obey, he would not have been obligated to obey.

> "The law was not above man's strength when he was possessed of original righteousness, though it be above man's strength since he was stripped of original righteousness. The command was dated before man had contracted his impotency, when he had a power to keep it, as well as to break it. Had it been enjoined to man only after the fall, and not before, he might have had a better pretence to excuse himself, because of the impossibility of it; yet he would not have had sufficient excuse, since the impossibility did not result from the nature of the law, but from the corrupted nature of the creature. It 'was weak through the flesh' (Romans 8:3), but it was promulged when man had a strength proportioned to the commands of it." (Charnock: The Holiness of God.)

Obligation being thus founded upon the Creator's gifts, cannot be destroyed by any subsequent action of the creature. If he destroys his ability, he does not destroy his obligation. If man by his own voluntary action loses any or all of the talents entrusted to him, he cannot assign this loss as a reason why any or all the talents, together with usury, should not be demanded of him in the final settlement. [Note] Christ's parable of the talents. . . . Does not God, then, wrong man by requiring of him in his law that which he cannot perform? . . . No; for God so made man that he could perform it; but man through the instigation of the devil, by wilful disobedience deprived himself and all his posterity of this power.

1.) It is objected, that if man is unable to keep the law, he is not obligated to keep it. This depends upon the *nature* of the inability, and its *cause*. If man were destitute of reason, conscience, will, or any of the faculties of a moral being, he would not be obligated. If he were internally wrought upon by an almighty being, and prevented from obeying, he would not be obligated. If he were prevented by any external compulsion, he would not be obligated. If he had been created sinful, he would not be obligated. If he had been created indifferent either to holiness or sin, he would not have been obligated. None of these conditions obtain in the case of man. He was created holy, with plenary power to keep perfectly the moral law, and therefore was obligated to keep it. At the point of creation, ability and obligation were equal. But if after creation in holiness and plenary power, any alteration be made in the original ratio between ability and obligation by the creature's voluntary agency, this cannot alter the original obligation. If ability is weakened by an act of self-determination, obligation is not weakened. If ability is totally destroyed by self-determination, obligation is not destroyed. The latter is the fact in the case. There is a total inability, but it is not an original or created inability. It came to be by man's act, not by God's. "Man's inability to restore what he owes to God, an inability brought upon himself, does not excuse man from paying the satisfaction due to justice; for the result of sin cannot excuse the sin itself." (Anselm: *Cur deus*

863 Pgs. 42-43, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, Warfield.

homo, I. xxiv.)

The principle, that if a moral power once possessed is lost by the voluntary action of the possessor he is not thereby released from the original duty that rested upon it, is acknowledged by writers upon ethics. Aristotle (*Ethics*, III. v.) remarks that it is just in legislators[:]

> to punish people even for ignorance itself, if they are the cause of their own ignorance; just as the punishment is double for drunken people. For the cause is in themselves; since it was in their own power not to get drunk, and drunkenness is the cause of their ignorance. And they punish those who are ignorant of anything in the laws which they ought to know, and which it is not difficult to know; and likewise in all other cases in which they are ignorant through negligence; upon the ground that it was in their own power to pay attention to it. But perhaps a person is unable to give his attention? But he himself is the cause of this inability, by living in a dissipated manner. Persons are themselves the causes of their being unrighteous, by performing bad actions; and of being intemperate, by passing their time in drunken revels and such-like. When a man does those acts by which he becomes unjust, he becomes unjust voluntarily [that is by the action of his own will]. Nevertheless, he will not be able to leave off being unjust and to become just, whenever he pleases. For the sick man cannot become well whenever he pleases, even though it so happen that he is voluntarily sick owing to an incontinent life, and from disobedience to physicians. At the time indeed, it was in his own power not to be sick; but when he has once allowed himself to become sick, it is no longer in his power not to be sick; just as it is no longer in the power of a man who has thrown a stone to recover it. And yet the throwing of it was in his own power; for the origin of the action was in his own power. In like manner, in the beginning it was in the power of the unjust and the intemperate man not to become unjust and intemperate; and therefore they are so voluntarily. But when they have become so, it is no longer in their power to avoid being unjust and intemperate… And not only are the faults of the soul voluntary, but in some persons those of the body are so likewise, and with these we find fault. For no one finds fault with those who are disfigured and ugly by birth; but only with those who are so through neglect of gymnastic exercise, or through carelessness. The case is the same with bodily weakness and mutilation. For no one would blame a man who is born blind, or who is blind from disease or a blow; but would rather pity him. But everybody would blame the man who is blind from drunkenness, or any intemperance. For those faults of the body which are incur[red] [by our] own power originally, and which result from our own action, we are blamable." . . .

In secular commercial life, the loss of ability does not release from obligation. A man is as much a debtor to his creditors after his bankruptcy, as he was before. The loss of his property does not free him from indebtedness. He cannot say to his creditor, "I owed you yesterday, because I was able to pay you, but to-day I owe you nothing, because I am a bankrupt." It is a legal maxim, that bankruptcy does not invalidate contracts.

That obligation remains fixed and immutable under all the modifications of ability introduced by the action of the human will, is proved by the case of the drunkard, and the habit which he has formed. The drunkard is certainly *less* able to obey the law of temperance than the temperate man is. But this law has precisely the same claim upon him that it has upon the temperate. The diminution of ability has not diminished the obligation. If obligation must always keep pace with the changes in the ability, then there are degrees of obligation. The stronger the will is, the more it is obliged; the weaker it is, the less is it bound by law. In this case, sin rewards the sinner by delivering him from the claims of law. The most vicious man would be least under obligation to duty.[864]

Both the unregenerate and the regenerate are obligated to be as holy as God Himself, and no unconverted person, neither any believer before his glorification, will meet this Divine

---

[864] Shedd, *Anthropology* Chapter 5, pgs. 52-56. W. D. Snodgrass also effectively demolishes what he calls the "radical error, that the extent of our powers, fallen as we are, is the ground and measure of our obligation" (pgs. 21-27, 49-52, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*).

standard of absolute perfection. The idea that the sinner's obligation to God is limited to his ability is entirely contrary to Scripture.

I. Excursus VII: Are All Believers Disciples?

Some affirm that only certain believers are disciples. Discipleship is said to be a status that certain believers chose to enter into at some point after their conversion, so that, within the larger class of believers, a smaller, elite group of believers are disciples.[865] Others affirm that, while there are such things as false believers (cf. John 2:23-3:3; 12:42; Acts 8:13) and false disciples (John 6:60, 66; 12:4),[866] and neither all believers nor all disciples are equally spiritually strong (cf. Acts 14:22; 18:23), the Bible

---

[865] For example: "A primary reason, Keswick tells us, why so little progress in sanctification is made by Christians, is that so many of them have never really faced and yielded to the conditions of Christian discipleship our Lord lays down" (pgs. 123-124, *So Great Salvation*, by Steven Barabas; cf. *A Critical Analysis of the Discipleship Motif in the Keswick Movement*, Randall L. Von Kanel. Th. D. Diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.). Victorious Life writer Mark Trumbull, in his "tract called 'Subdued,'" affirms that "not more than one in a thousand of converted men attain to 'victory'—that is to say to the status of 'disciples.' The rest are satisfied to live on a lower plane" ("The Victorious Life," B. B. Warfield, in *Perfectionism* vol. 2. Warfield demolishes Trumbull's argument.). The Keswick and Victorious Life movements received their disjunction between believers and disciples from the Broadlands and Oxford Conventions led by Robert and Hannah Smith with the patronage of Lord and Lady Mount-Temple. After all, Lord Mount Temple was "not only a 'believer,' but a 'disciple'" (pg. 149, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890; also pg. 44, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). "Reference was made [at the Oxford Convention] to the difference between a believer of doctrines and a disciple . . . [some] called believers, could not be counted among th[e] disciples. Christians are called to be Christ's *disciples*," and believers at Oxford who had not yet taken that second step were urged to "become disciples" by post-conversion consecration (pgs. 293-294, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Italics in original.). The Oxford appeal assumes that those who "believe [Christian] doctrines, but still . . . have their own separate interests and pursuits," were saved by such an unrepentant and unsubmissive "faith"; believing doctrines is sufficient to make one a Christian. Such affirmations were natural for the Smiths, since they were both unregenerate, as were the Mount-Temples, and Mrs. Smith's "conversion" testimony was simply assent to a certain set of doctrinal formulations.

[866] Note that Simon the sorceror not only had a kind of belief, but he also assumed the mark of a disciple by getting baptized (Acts 8:13). Baptism is the outward mark of a disciple (Matthew 28:18-20), that is, of a believer (Mark 16:15-16). Nonetheless, he was still "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity" and was going to "perish" eternally unless he came to "repent" and was "forgiven" (Acts 8:20-23). Judas Iscariot is another example of a false disciple (Matthew 10:1, 4; John 12:4), and those "disciples" in Acts 19:1-7 were unregenerate until Paul preached the gospel to them and they were converted and baptized (contrast the practice with the already regenerate man Apollos, 18:25-28). The reality of professing believers who are still lost is presented throughout the Bible (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:34; 2 Corinthians 13:5; Titus 1:16; Hebrews 12:15; 2 Peter 2:1).

John 6:60-68 equates false believers with false disciples, and contrasts them with true believers or true disciples. The genuine people of God believe and are sure that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and cannot forsake Him, but false disciples can and do cease to follow Him.

nevertheless equates the categories of *believer* and *disciple*, so that all saved people, all believers, are disciples. This second position is the one taught in Scripture.

The Greek noun translated *disciple* appears 269 times in 253 verses in the New Testament,[867] while related words that shed further light on the nature of a disciple appear a number of additional times.[868] Generally, a *disciple* is a learner (Mark 9:31; Luke 11:1)[869] or follower, and a disciple of Christ is one who follows the Lord Jesus and follows or keeps His commandments (cf. Matthew 21:6; 26:19).[870] Scripture thus repeatedly records that Christ's "disciples follow him" (Mark 6:1; Matthew 8:23; Luke 22:39; John 18:15; 21:20). While, as is expected, not all of the 269 references to disciples specifically define the word, very strong exegetical evidence from many passages establish that one becomes a true disciple of Christ at the same moment that one becomes a true believer, so that discipleship begins at regeneration, and all the people of God, not some elite minority, are identified as disciples in Scripture. No verse in Scripture teaches that believers become disciples at a post-conversion crisis or that only some of the regenerate are disciples. Rather, it was the "disciples [who] were called Christians" (Acts 11:26). Disciples are Christians, and Christians are disciples.[871]

---

867 Μαθητής appears in Matthew 5:1; 8:21, 23, 25; 9:10–11, 14, 19, 37; 10:1, 24–25, 42–11:2; 12:1–2, 49; 13:10, 36; 14:12, 15, 19, 22, 26; 15:2, 12, 23, 32–33, 36; 16:5, 13, 20–21, 24; 17:6, 10, 13, 16, 19; 18:1; 19:10, 13, 23, 25; 20:17; 21:1, 6, 20; 22:16; 23:1; 24:1, 3; 26:1, 8, 17–19, 26, 35–36, 40, 45, 56; 27:64; 28:7–9, 13, 16; Mark 2:15–16, 18, 23; 3:7, 9; 4:34; 5:31; 6:1, 29, 35, 41, 45; 7:2, 5, 17; 8:1, 4, 6, 10, 14, 27, 33–34; 9:14, 18, 28, 31; 10:10, 13, 23–24, 46; 11:1, 14; 12:43; 13:1; 14:12–14, 16, 32; 16:7; Luke 5:30, 33; 6:1, 13, 17, 20, 40; 7:11, 18–19; 8:9, 22; 9:1, 14, 16, 18, 40, 43, 54; 10:23; 11:1; 12:1, 22; 14:26–27, 33; 16:1; 17:1, 22; 18:15; 19:29, 37, 39; 20:45; 22:11, 39, 45; John 1:35, 37; 2:2, 11–12, 17, 22; 3:22, 25; 4:1–2, 8, 27, 31, 33; 6:3, 8, 11–12, 16, 22, 24, 60–61, 66; 7:3; 8:31; 9:2, 27–28; 11:7–8, 12, 54; 12:4, 16; 13:5, 22–23, 35; 15:8; 16:17, 29; 18:1–2, 15–17, 19, 25; 19:26–27, 38; 20:2–4, 8, 10, 18–20, 25–26, 30; 21:1–2, 4, 7–8, 12, 14, 20, 23–24; Acts 1:15; 6:1–2, 7; 9:1, 10, 19, 25–26, 38; 11:26, 29; 13:52; 14:20, 22, 28; 15:10; 16:1; 18:23, 27; 19:1, 9, 30; 20:1, 7, 30; 21:4, 16.

868 The verb μαθητεύω appears four times (Matthew 13:52; 27:57; 28:19; Acts 14:21), and the nouns μαθήτρια and συμμαθητής appear once each (Acts 9:36; John 11:16).

869 See BDAG, Liddell-Scott, & Louw-Nida.

870 Similarly, a disciple of John the Baptist would follow him and his commands, Matthew 9:14; 11:2; 14:12; Luke 7:18-19; a disciple of the Pharisees would follow them and their commands, Matthew 22:15-16; cf. Mark 2:18; Luke 5:33; and a disciple of other false teachers would follow them and their commands, Acts 20:30. John sought to have those who followed him, who were his disciples, become followers or disciples of Christ, John 1:35-39; 3:26-30. The Lord Jesus organized His church before Pentecost in Acts 2 (Matthew 16:18; 18:17) out of those of John's disciples who had been saved and immersed by the Baptist, and then became His disciples. Christ's congregation of immersed saints practiced the ordinances of baptism (John 3:22; 4:1-2) and the Lord's Supper (Matthew 26:26-29; cf. Matthew 26:30 & Hebrews 2:12) before the descent of the Spirit in Acts 2.

871 In Acts 11:26, χρηματίσαι τε πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς explicitly equates the category *Christian* and *disciple*. Μαθητὰς functions as the subject of the infinitive χρηματίσαι, and Χριστιανούς is a predicate accusative in the construction (cf. pgs. 190-197, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics,* Wallace). Since this syntactical pattern is "similar [in function] to the nominative subject and predicate nominative construction, following the same principles for distinguishing [the subject and predicate words]" (pg. 190, *ibid.*), and the equivalent subject-predicate nominative

Disciples are not an elite order of especially consecrated believers because disciples are too often sadly lacking in consecration. Disciples can be chastened as those of "little faith" (Matthew 8:23-27) and can fail to have the kind of faith that is associated with God's powerful working (Matthew 17:14-21; Mark 9:14-29; Luke 9:18-19). They can act in pride (Mark 9:31-34). They can require Christ's correction (Matthew 19:13-14; 26:8-10) and rebuke (Luke 9:54-55), because they make Him "much displeased" (Mark 10:13-14). Disciples can fear to boldly confess Christ (John 19:38) although their faith does not stay perpetually hidden (19:39-40). Disciples can sleep instead of pray, give in to temptation and fear, and fail to unflinchingly stand for Christ (Matthew 26:40, 45, 56; Luke 22:45-46; John 18:15-27), although their faith does not fail and their repentant return to their Redeemer is as certain as are the answers to Christ's prayers for His own as High Priest (Luke 22:32) since Christ powerfully works in them through His Word to bring them back to Himself when they sin (22:60-62). Disciples can fail to grasp spiritual truth as they ought (Mark 7:18-19; 8:16-21; 9:32; John 4:31-35; 9:2-3; 11:11-13; 12:16) and even fail to pursue understanding as they ought when they fail to grasp it (Luke 9:45). While disciples—since they are believers and are therefore the recipients of a new heart—are going to be different from the unregenerate, they are not an elite subcategory of especially consecrated Christian. No text indicates that a special post-coversion act of consecration makes a believer into the higher category of disciple, nor that a certain amount of sin makes a disciple lose his status and return to a lower subcategory of believer. Rather, all believers, with both their Spirit-wrought change and their remaining indwelling sin, are identified as disciples.

Furthermore, disciples are never distinguished from the regenerate who are at a lower plane, but are regularly distinguished from hell-bound lost people. Disciples are contrasted with publicans and sinners (Matthew 9:9-13; Mark 2:13-17) from perishing multitudes (Matthew 9:35-38; Luke 19:36-38) and from the persecuting ungodly, (Matthew 10:22-27). Disciples are those who have been given spiritual truth and enter the kingdom of heaven, in contrast with the lost, who do not do so (Matthew 13:10-12; Mark 4:33-34; Luke 8:9-11). Disciples will feast with Christ in the consummation (Mark 2:18-19). Disciples inherit the kingdom of God (Luke 6:20) and their names are written in heaven (Luke 10:20-24). Disciples are Christ's spiritual brethren (Matthew 12:49-50; 28:7-10) and those who recognize Jesus as the Christ (Matthew 16:14-16, 20). Disciples

---

construction is a convertible, not a subset proposition, because μαθητὰς is articular and Χριστιανούς is a proper noun (pgs. 40-46, *ibid.*), the two categories *disciple* and *Christian* are explicitly equated as convertible terms. The "construction indicates an identical exchange . . . both nouns have an identical referent. The mathematical formulas of A=B, B=A are applicable in such instances. . . . There is complete interchange between the two [nouns]" (pg. 41, *ibid.*). *Disciple* = *Christian*, and *Christian* = *disciple*.

are Christ's little ones (Matthew 10:42); His little children (John 13:33) who cannot come into condemnation (13:33) are disciples (13:35), believers (14:1) who will have heavenly mansions (14:2-3) with the Lord Jesus. Disciples are those who bear fruit (John 15:8) and consequently are not burned eternally in the fires of hell (15:6). Disciples (John 16:7) are believers (John 16:27) and are therefore those who are promised the indwelling Holy Spirit (John 16:7-17; 14:16-18; cf. 20:19-22). Christian "brethren" are "disciples" (Acts 6:1-3; 9:17, 26-30; 14:28-15:1). Disciples are those who are not unsaved, but are "obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7). When Paul preached the gospel message that "by [Christ] all that believe are justified from all things, from which [they] could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13:39), those who "believed" received "eternal life" (13:48) and thus became "disciples" (13:50; cf. 14:1, 21-23). People who have had God "purif[y] their hearts by faith . . . disciples . . . through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ . . . shall be saved" (15:9-11). When people heard the gospel, they either became "disciples" or they rejected the Savior and "believed not" (Acts 19:9). Disciples (Acts 9:1) are those who are of the Christian "way" (9:2). Saul received a commission to persecute Christ's disciples (9:1-2), and he consequently persecuted all believers, all who "call on [Christ's] name" (9:14; cf. 9:19, 21, 25-27). Scripture clearly and regularly equates the categories of *believer* and *disciple*, promises those who are in these categories the same eternal felicity, and warns of eternal damnation for all who do not become disciples or believers.

The act of making disciples is expressed with the Greek verb *matheteuo*.[872] Making disciples (Matthew 28:19) takes place by preaching the gospel and having people come to repent (Luke 24:47) and believe (Mark 16:15-16), and thus receive the remission of sins (Luke 24:47; Mark 16:16; John 20:23), after which the believers or disciples

---

872 Discussing the verb μαθητεύω, BDAG comments:

μαθητεύω (s. μαθητής) . . . **1. *to be a pupil,*** with implication of being an adherent of the teacher

a. intr., *be* or *become a pupil* or *disciple* (Plut., Mor. 832b; 837c; Ps.-Callisth. 2, 4, 4 τινί; Iambl., Vi. Pyth. 23, 104 μ. τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ; schol. on Apollon. Rhod. Proleg. A a) τινί (Orig., C. Cels. 2, 9, 60) *of someone* (Ἰωσὴφ) ἐμαθήτευσεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ *Joseph had become a disciple of Jesus* Mt 27:57 v.l. [the word appears in the *TR* but not the critical Greek text]. Likew. as

b. pass. dep. (Just., A I, 15, 6; Hippol., Ref. 1, 2, 16) μαθητεύομαι *become a disciple* τινί: (Ἰ.) ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ Mt 27:57. γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τ. οὐρανῶν *a scribe who has become a disciple of the kgdm. of heaven* or *who has been trained for the kgdm.* Mt 13:52 (γραμματεύς 2b). Abs. IEph 3:1. μᾶλλον μαθητεύομαι *I am becoming a disciple more and more* IRo 5:1. This gave rise to a new active form (B-D-F §148, 3; Rob. 800)

2. to cause one to be a pupil, *teach,* trans. (AscIs 3:18 καὶ μαθητεύσουσιν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ πᾶσαν γλῶσσαν εἰς τὴν ἀν[ά]στασιν τοῦ ἀγαπ[η]τοῦ; Just., D. 53, 1 Χριστὸς . . . ἐμαθήτευσεν αὐτούς) *make a disciple of, teach* τινά *someone* Mt 28:19. ἱκανούς *make a number of disciples* Ac 14:21. Abs. ἃ μαθητεύοντες ἐντέλλεσθε *what you command when you are instructing* or *winning disciples* IRo 3:1.—ὑμῖν μαθητευθῆναι *become your disciples, be instructed by you* IEph 10:1 (cp. pres. subst. ptc. οἱ μαθητευόμενοι = οἱ μαθηταί Did., Gen. 69, 24; 245, 17; aor. ptc. αἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστῷ μαθητευθεῖσαι ἐκκλησίαι Orig., C. Cels. 3, 29, 24; Πολύκαρπος . . . ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων μαθητευθείς Iren. 3, 3, 4 [Harv. II 12, 4]).—DELG s.v. μανθάνω. M-M. EDNT. TW. Sv.

should be baptized (Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:16). The response to the preaching of the gospel is people becoming disciples by the new birth (Acts 14:21), for one is discipled "unto the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 13:52). As with the noun *mathetes*, the verb *matheteuo* indicates that one becomes a disciple by becoming a believer.[873] No text teaches or implies that disciples are an elite subcategory within a larger group of Christians.

John 8:30-32 indicates that disciples are those who have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ. The discourse of John 8 takes place in the Jerusalem temple (v. 2, 20, 59), where Christ debates and refutes the Pharisees in front of a watching audience. In 8:12-13 Christ addresses "the Pharisees" and they reply. He then responds in v. 14-18, they answer Him in v. 19, and He responds in v. 19, making it clear that they are lost in their sins (v. 19). This interaction between the Pharisees and the Lord continues in v. 20-29. Although now called "the Jews" (v. 22), Christ still debates the same Pharisaic opponents, for v. 21 ("then said Jesus again unto them") indicates He still speaks to the Pharisees of v. 13. Verse 24 ("therefore") also shows the interaction continues through v. 29. It is very apparent that these Pharisees are lost (v. 21, 23, 24); indeed, they will be responsible for Christ's crucifixion (v. 28). As the Lord preaches to and answers the Pharisees, many of those listening to His public disputation with them savingly believe on Him (v. 30-32).[874] The Lord then tells those who have now believed on Him that their initial justifying faith will evidence itself in perseverance (v. 31-32). In v. 33, the Pharisees ("they," as in v. 27) challenge Christ's address to His new disciples. The speakers in v. 33 are not the new converts—their words are nowhere recorded in the chapter—rather, the public disputation with the Pharisees found in the rest of John eight is continued from v. 33 through the end of the chapter. Thus, John chapter eight records a conversation between Christ and the Pharisees with others looking on and listening in. Some of the onlookers believed on the Savior and received His exhortation in v. 30-32,

---

873 The like is true of the related nouns μαθήτρια and συμμαθητής. However, these words appear only in Acts 9:36 and John 11:16 and consequently make only a rather limited contribution to the question of the equation of the category of believer and disciple. The verb μανθάνω, "to learn," is naturally employed with frequency for Christian growth (Philippians 4:11; 1 Corinthians 14:31) and for the acquisition of other sorts of information (Acts 23:27), but it likewise indicates that one becomes a "learner" or disciple of Christ at the moment of conversion (Matthew 11:26; John 6:45), and makes no division between Christians who learn of Christ and a supposed category of Christians who do not learn of Him.

874 The perfect tense form of "believe" in v. 31 (πεπιστευκότας) demonstrates that the aorist "believed" (ἐπίστευσαν) in v. 30 denotes saving faith in many of those hearing Christ speak. Those who "believed" or received what Christ said in v. 30 as true were the same group as those who savingly believed in v. 31-32. The perfect tense of πιστεύω is never used for spurious "faith" in unsaved people (John 3:18; 6:69; 8:31; 11:27; 16:27; 20:29; Acts 15:5; 16:34; 18:27; 19:18; 21:20, 25; 1 Corinthians 9:17; Galatians 2:7; 2 Timothy 1:12; Titus 3:8; 1 John 4:16; 5:10).

the only break in the dialogue, and one which occurs without a record of the response of those addressed. Christ said to those who had "believed," "ye . . . are my disciples" (John 8:31). The identification of the categories *believer* and *disciple* is explicit.[875] The specification that those the Lord Jesus addressed would evidence their status as true converts[876] by perseverance[877] does not undermine the His identification of believers as disciples. Christ does not say that those who believe would "become" disciples by continuing in His Word, but that those who "are" currently disciples because they have truly believed will evidence their regeneration by perseverance—they "are" saved people "if" they continue.[878] The "if . . . then" clause is an evidence/inference construction, so "the relation the protasis[879] [has] to the apodosis[880] is that of ground, or evidence . . . for example, 'If she has a ring on her left hand, then she's married.' Notice that the protasis is not the cause of the apodosis. In fact, it is often just the opposite."[881] Those who had become the Lord's disciples at the moment they believed in Christ would persevere; if someone did not do so, he never was a true convert.[882]

Mark 8:34-38[883] teaches that one who does not become a disciple of Christ will be eternally damned. In v. 34,[884] denial of self and taking up the cross is a representation of

---

875 Note further that John records in the following chapter that one who wished to become (*thelo* + *ginomai*) Christ's disciple came to believe on Him, John 9:25-30, 35-38.

876 ἀληθῶς μαθηταί.

877 Compare the section "The Certainty of Practical Sanctification For All The Regenerate" above.

878 Note also that John repeatedly refers to continuing faith in true disciples—they grow in faith as they continue to believe on Christ, John 2:11; 16:29-31; 20:8, 26-29. "[D]isciples . . . believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said" (John 2:22).

879 The *protasis* is the "if" portion of a conditional clause.

880 The *apodosis* is the "then" portion of a conditional clause.

881 Pg. 683, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, by Daniel Wallace.

882 A third class condition, rather than a first class condition, is employed in John 8:31-32 because the evidence of continuance was not yet present. Christ's admonition to those He had just brought to Himself accords with the greater framework of Biblical evangelistic methodology, so that His admonition to His new converts is good to give to any newly professed believer in the Lord. Those who profess faith should know what a "disciple indeed" looks like and have assurance of salvation promised to them if they evidence themselves as such (1 John 2:29; 3:7; 5:13). Christ's practice of telling new believers that true salvation will evidence itself in perseverance stands in radical contradistinction to the popular and totally unscriptural practice of a soulwinner providing immediate and unconditional assurance to all who have just professed faith. If the Lord Jesus conditioned assurance upon perseverance in His counsel to those whom He, in His omniscience, knew were genuinely converted, how much more should soulwinners, who are very far from omniscient, condition assurance upon perseverence when speaking to those who have newly professed Christ but may or may not have come to genuine faith!

883 34 And when he had called the people *unto him* with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. 35 For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it. 36 For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? 37 Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? 38 Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he

the sinner's coming to the point of saving repentance, with a resultant lifestyle of continued following of Christ.[885] As already indicated above, Christ's call to sinners to "follow me" (v. 34) was a call to discipleship, since the Lord's "disciples follow him" (Mark 6:1; Matthew 8:23; Luke 22:39; John 18:15; 21:20).[886] One who was bearing a cross in the land of Israel in Christ's day was on his way to the shameful and extremely painful death of crucifixion (John 19:17); thus, repentant faith in Christ involved losing one's life, that is, turning from his own way of living, exaltation of self and comfort, to surrender to Christ as unconditional Lord (Mark 8:35). The person who wishes to continue to live his own way, to "save his life," will eternally lose "both soul and body in hell" (Matthew 10:28, 39),[887] while one who turns from his own way, denying himself, taking up the cross, and losing his own life for the sake of Christ and the gospel, will save

---

cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. 34 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὅστις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. 35 ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν. 36 τί γὰρ ὠφελήσει ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, καὶ ζημιωθῇ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; 37 ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; 38 ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται αὐτόν, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων.

884 The Lord addresses "the people . . . with his disciples also" in v. 34. He teaches the unconverted multitudes, the "people" (ὄχλος), because v. 34-38 was a call for them to repent and receive salvation. He also addressed His disciples because believers should be reminded about the commitment to follow the Lord they made when they repented and believed the gospel, and because not only at the moment of conversion and regeneration, but "daily" believers are to take up the cross and follow Christ (Luke 9:23).

885 Note the aorists ἀπαρνησάσθω and ἀράτω, in contrast with the present imperative ἀκολουθείτω. Self-denial and cross-bearing certainly continues after the moment of saving faith, as the aorists are reasonably seen as ingressive (cf. Luke 9:23), but they nonetheless emphasize the point of the sinner's "turn[ing] to God from idols" (1 Thessalonians 1:9) as the command to "follow" in Mark 8 parallels the result of regeneration, "serv[ing] the living and true God; and . . . wait[ing] for his Son from heaven" (1 Thessalonians 1:9-10; note that the *turning* is similarly aorist, while *serving* and *waiting* are present tense forms).

886 Further texts that connect those who "follow" (ἀκολουθέω) Christ with the status of a disciple or of one who will have eternal life rather than eternal death are: Matthew 4:20, 22; 8:19, 22; 9:9; 10:38; 16:24; 19:21, 27–28; 20:34; Mark 1:18; 2:14; 9:38; 10:21, 28, 32, 52; 15:41; Luke 5:11, 27–28; 9:23, 49, 57, 59, 61; 18:22, 28, 43; John 1:37–38, 40, 43; 8:12; 10:4, 27; 12:26; 13:36–37; 21:19–20, 22; Revelation 14:4; 19:14. Many of the remaining texts, which speak of multitudes following Christ, including among them what was certainly a substantial number of unconverted persons (cf. Mark 2:15; Matthew 12:15; 19:2), describe those "disciples" (John 6:60, 66) who followed Christ for the wrong reasons (John 6:60-68) and thus were professedly His followers, although they "walked . . . with him" only for a time (John 6:66).

887 Compare the uses of ἀπόλλυμι in Matthew 10:28; Luke 13:3, 5; John 3:15-16; 10:28; 11:50; 17:12; Romans 2:12; 1 Corinthians 1:18; 2 Corinthians 2:15; 4:3; 2 Thessalonians 2:10; 2 Peter 3:9; Jude 5, 11. Note the following texts which, as in Mark 8:35, employ both ἀπόλλυμι and ψυχή: Matthew 10:28, 39; 16:25; Luke 17:33; John 12:25. While the ἀπόλλυμι and ψυχή combination does not of itself absolutely require a reference to eternal damnation (cf. Luke 6:9), the saying of Mark 8:35 is specifically tied to losing one's life in hell in Matthew 10:28, 39, and to gaining eternal life in heaven in John 12:25, so Mark 8:35 necessarily refers to eternal bliss or woe.

his life or soul (*pseuche*) by receiving eternal life. "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal" (John 12:25). To encourage the lost to give up their own way and surrender to Christ's Lordship for salvation, Christ reminds them that it profits them nothing if they would gain the whole world, but lose their souls (Mark 8:36-37). Those who, rather than being ashamed of their sins (Romans 6:21; contrast Romans 1:16; 2 Timothy 1:8, 12, 16) are ashamed to follow Christ and His Words in the evil and adulterous world will have Christ be ashamed of them at His return and be damned—for Christ is "not ashamed to call [true believers] brethren" (Hebrews 2:11), and "God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city" (Hebrews 11:16; Luke 9:26). No text in Scripture indicates that God will be "ashamed" of His people—He is not ashamed of them (Hebrews 11:16). Mark 8:34-38 clearly teaches that all saved people are disciples, and that one who refuses to become Christ's disciple will face an eternity in hell.

Mark 10:13-31 exemplifies the teaching of Mark 8:34-38. Christ told a man who wanted to "inherit eternal life" (10:17) to "take up the cross, and follow" Him (10:21). He refused to do so, because he was unwilling to forsake his riches, and so he did not inherit the kingdom of God (10:22-24). Indeed, the Lord Jesus taught that fallen man's attachment to sin is so strong that nobody will come to repentance and be saved apart from God's supernatural working (10:25-27). Those who do leave all to forsake all to follow Christ (10:28-29) become God's "children" (10:24) and will "receive . . . in the world to come eternal life" (10:30), having come to Christ as Lord and Savior with the faith of a little child (10:13-16). Matthew 19:16-30 supplements the record in Mark, indicating "eternal life" (19:16) is promised to those who "come and follow" Christ (19:21). Those who forsake all "inherit eternal life" (Matthew 19:29). Similarly, in Luke 14:15-35, Christ teaches that "whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath" (14:33, 26) to "bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple" (14:27, 33); those who refuse to put Christ before property (14:18-19) and people (14:20, 26) will not "eat bread in the kingdom of God" (14:15), but be "cast out" (14:35) of the eschatological feast of the saints (14:24) into hell,[888] while God rejoices over the repentance and salvation of those who become disciples in the way people rejoice over the recovery of a

[888] The verb "cast out" (βάλλω) in Luke 14:35, out of 125 instances in the New Testament, is never employed for a judgment where believers are cast out by God, but the lost are, over and over again, said to be cast (βάλλω) into the fires of hell (note Matthew 3:10; 5:13, 25, 29-30; 7:19; 13:42, 48; 18:8-9; Mark 9:42 (cf. vv. 41-48), 45, 47; Luke 3:9; 12:58; 14:35; Revelation 2:22; 12:4, 9, 13; 14:19; 18:21; 19:20; 20:3, 10, 14-15). Note as well the βάλλω & ἔξω texts Matthew 5:13; 13:48; Luke 14:35; John 15:6, where the lost are those who are cast out each time (the only remaining text with βάλλω & ἔξω, 1 John 4:18, does not speak of anything eschatological, whether judgment or deliverance).

lost sheep, coin, or son (Luke 15). Parallel passages confirm the plain teaching of Mark 8:34-38—disciples get eternal life, and those who do not become disciples are damned. This fact requires the identification of believers and disciples as a single class, the people of God.

Scripture is clear that all believers are disciples. The notion that, after regeneration, a smaller, elite group of believers choose to become disciples is entirely absent from Scripture. Disciples are regularly contrasted with the unregenerate, but never with an underclass of truly saved people who have not yet become disciples. When disciples sin or backslide, they are never said to lose their status as disciples and return to a supposed larger unconsecrated Christian underclass. The usage of the noun and verb forms for *disciple* make the equation of believers and disciples exceedingly plain. Indeed, the terms *Christian* and *disciple* are explicitly equated (Acts 11:26). Numerous passages of Scripture teach and affirm the truth that one becomes a disciple at the moment of saving faith, and that those who do not become disciples are unbelievers who will be damned. If only some Christians are disciples, then only some Christians get eternal life and escape hell, are adopted into the family of God, enter the kingdom of God, have faith in Christ, and have a new nature—in short, if only some Christians are disciples, only some Christians are Christians. The Bible is clear—a believer is a disciple, and a disciple is a believer.

Excursus VIII: What Does It Mean To Abide in Christ?

A Study of *Meno,* "To Abide," in the New Testament,[889] for the purpose of ascertaining its sense in John 15, and seeing what it means to *abide* in Christ. The vine pericope in John 15 is examined at the conclusion of the study, after the 120 uses of *meno* in the NT have been cataloged and commented upon. The OT background to the vine image is also examined.

Mt 10:11 And into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there **abide** till ye go thence.

---

889 Abiding is not merely a New Testament doctrine. In the Mosaic economy, the saints sang in their inspired songbook, "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place [מָעוֹן] in all generations" (Psalm 90:1). Before the incarnation of the Messiah it was already true that "He that dwelleth [יֹשֵׁב] in the secret place of the most High shall abide [יִתְלוֹנָן] under the shadow of the Almighty" (Psalm 91:1). One could say to an Old Testament saint: "Because thou hast made the LORD, *which is* my refuge, *even* the most High, thy habitation [מָעוֹן]; there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling" (Psalm 91:9-10; cf. 71:3). Jehovah had promised His Old Testament people: "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name *is* Holy; I dwell in the high and holy *place*, with him also *that is* of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones" (Isaiah 57:15). However, the analysis in this paper will be restricted to the New Testament doctrine of abiding revealed by the word μένω and expounded most fully in John 15.

εἰς ἣν δ᾽ ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθητε, ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστιν· κἀκεῖ **μείνατε**, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε.

Here the sense is "stay," or "dwell" there. This is consistent with a sense of "endure" or "remain" for *meno* in John 15.

Mt 11:23 And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have **remained** until this day.
καὶ σύ, Καπερναούμ, ἡ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθεῖσα, ἕως ᾅδου καταβιβασθήσῃ· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Σοδόμοις ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν σοί, **ἔμεινεν** ἂν μέχρι τῆς σήμερον.

Here the sense of "stay" or "endure" is very possible.

Mt 26:38 Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: **tarry** ye here, and watch with me.
τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου· **μείνατε** ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ.

Here "remain/stay" is the sense as well. Consider that this text contains an identical imperative to that in John 15. The disciples were to stay there, while, v. 39, Christ went away from them a little farther. The word, of itself, does not indicate that fellowship with Him is involved in remaining/abiding/staying. Certainly the necessity of fellowship with Christ is taught in many passages of Scripture, but if "abide" in John 15 possesses the same sense as "tarry ye" here, why cannot it be a command of Christian perseverance rather than a command for fellowship? Note that the Lord rebuked them for not "watching" (v. 40ff.) but not for not "tarrying" with Him, for they did stay there instead of going somewhere else, although they certainly had no sort of living fellowship with the Lord, for they were asleep.

Mr 6:10 And he said unto them, In what place soever ye enter into an house, there **abide** till ye depart from that place.
καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθητε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἐκεῖ **μένετε** ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε ἐκεῖθεν.

Here "remain/stay" in the sense of "dwell" is the idea. This use also is not one of living fellowship; one does not have fellowship with a house.

Mr 14:34 And saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: **tarry** ye here, and watch.
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου· **μείνατε** ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε.

See the note on Mt 26:38.

Lu 1:56 And Mary **abode** with her about three months, and returned to her own house.

Ἔμεινε δὲ Μαριὰμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡσεὶ μῆνας τρεῖς, καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.

Mary remained/stayed/lived in Elizabeth's house. Certainly Mary and Elizabeth had good fellowship, but they were both abiding in Elizabeth's house, not abiding in one another. Note the last part of the verse.

Lu 8:27 And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and ware no clothes, neither **abode** in *any* house, but in the tombs.
ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἀνήρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὃς εἶχε δαιμόνια ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν, καὶ ἱμάτιον οὐκ ἐνεδιδύσκετο, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ **ἔμενεν**, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν,

The man stayed/remained in the tombs, rather than in houses. No fellowship aspect appears in this usage either.

Lu 9:4 And whatsoever house ye enter into, there **abide**, and thence depart.
καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθητε, ἐκεῖ **μένετε**, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε.

Here also, the command was to remain/stay in the house. Here, as in many of the previous references, location is in view.

Lu 10:7 And in the same house **remain**, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.
ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ **μένετε**, ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ᾽ αὐτῶν· ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐστι. μὴ μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν.

The preachers were to remain/stay in this house while they were in that city, rather than moving from one house to another and exploiting everyone's hospitality.

Lu 19:5 And when Jesus came to the place, he looked up, and saw him, and said unto him, Zacchaeus, make haste, and come down; for to day I must **abide** at thy house.
καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν αὐτόν, καὶ εἶπε πρός αὐτόν, Ζακχαῖε, σπεύσας κατάβηθι· σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τ�ῳ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με **μεῖναι**.

The Lord Jesus was going to remain/stay in Zacchaeus' house. The Savior would be his guest that day. Certainly fellowship would go on, but this fact is not required by the word itself.

Lu 24:29 But they constrained him, saying, **Abide** with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to **tarry** with them.
καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτόν, λέγοντες, **Μεῖνον** μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐστί, καὶ κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα. καὶ εἰσῆλθε τοῦ **μεῖναι** σὺν αὐτοῖς.

Both the command and the fulfillment are to remain/stay with someone, to continue in his physical presence.

Joh 1:32 And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it **abode** upon him.
καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης λέγων ὅτι Τεθέαμαι τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ **ἔμεινεν** ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν.

Here, and in v. 33, *meno* indicates a location. In v. 32 the Spirit came to abide on the Lord, and in v. 33 the Holy Ghost continued to remain on the Savior. Both of these designate a location, not fellowship.

Joh 1:33 And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and **remaining** on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.
κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν· ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι, ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἐφ᾽ ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ **μένον** ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.

See the comments on John 1:32.

Joh 1:38 Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where **dwellest** thou?
στραφεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας, λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί ζητεῖτε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Ῥαββί (ὃ λέγεται ἑρμηνευόμενον, Διδάσκαλε), ποῦ **μένεις**;

Here *meno* is equivalent to *remain/stay.* The two disciples asked the Lord Jesus what house He was staying in.

Joh 1:39 He saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he **dwelt**, and **abode** with him that day: for it was about the tenth hour.
λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἔρχεσθε καὶ ἴδετε. ἦλθον καὶ εἶδον ποῦ **μένει**· καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ **ἔμειναν** τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην· ὥρα δὲ ἦν ὡς δεκάτη.

The uses in v. 39 are like those in v. 38; they remained/stayed with the Lord. Surely the disciples had fellowship with Christ while they stayed with Him, but this result is not involved in the verb *meno* on its own.

Joh 2:12 After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples: and they **continued** there not many days.
Μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς Καπερναούμ, αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐκεῖ **ἔμειναν** οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας.

The people specified in the text remained or stayed in the city.

Joh 3:36 He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God **abideth** on him.
ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ οὐκ ὄψεται ζωήν, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ **μένει** ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν.

The wrath of God stays or remains upon the unbelieving one.

Joh 4:40 So when the Samaritans were come unto him, they besought him that he would **tarry** with them: and he **abode** there two days.
ὡς οὖν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σαμαρεῖται, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν **μεῖναι** παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς· καὶ **ἔμεινεν** ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας.

The Samaritans asked the Lord to remain/stay with them, and so He did.

Joh 5:38 And ye have not his word **abiding** in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.
καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε **μένοντα** ἐν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε.

Here, when the Word remains or stays in one, it produces effects (although perhaps the statement that the Word did not remain in them is simply an affirmation of their ignorance of Scripture entirely, explaining hence the command of v. 39). See 8:31, where endurance in the belief and practice of the Word is indicated. Enduring obedience is associated with love for God, v. 42.

Joh 6:27 Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which **endureth** unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed.
ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν **μένουσαν** εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει· τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν, ὁ Θεός.

Spiritual food will continue/remain/endure/abide, unlike physical bread, which will perish. In relation to John 15, note that here *meno* is even rendered *endure.* The Online Bible version of *Thayer's Greek Lexicon* provides the following statistics for the translation of *meno:* KJV - abide 61, remain 16, dwell 15, continue 11, tarry 9, endure 3, misc 5; 120 (total).

Joh 6:56 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, **dwelleth** in me, and I in him.
ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἐν ἐμοὶ **μένει**, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ.

Here it looks like the spiritual union of remaining or staying in Christ, *en Christo*, is in view. The one who has spiritual fellowship with Christ, who believes in Him, who eats His flesh and drinks His blood, is in Christ, and Christ is in him. The spiritual union here would, based on other passages of Scripture, be unbreakable; one cannot be in Christ and then no longer be so. There is no command here to remain in the *en Christo* position; it

is a declarative statement. It looks like, contextually, this statement is something like, "He that believes in Me, remains in Me, and I in him."

Joh 7:9* When he had said these words unto them, he **abode** *still* in Galilee.
ταῦτα δὲ εἰπὼν αὐτοῖς **ἔμεινεν** ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.

The Lord remained/stayed in Galilee.

Joh 8:31 Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye **continue** in my word, *then* are ye my disciples indeed;
Ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους, Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς **μείνητε** ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἀληθῶς μαθηταί μου ἐστέ·

Christ commands the believing Jews to remain or stay in His Word. This appears to be perseverance in obedience to it. The verse does not establish any mystical idea in abiding. This is not to say that God does not do great things by His Spirit in His people through the Word, nor does it deny that He does in fact hold glorious communion with them (1 John 1:3); it is simply dealing with the much narrower question of whether John 8:31 proves that He does these things. One should note as well that this verse is a statement that only those who, having received a new nature by grace, continue to follow the Lord are truly converted; the verse does not make a distinction between some sort of higher Christian life as a disciple versus a lower "Christian" life of perpetual carnality is in view, rather than a distinction between the saved and the lost. Those who do not continue and are not "disciples indeed" do not "know the truth" and are not "free" (8:31-32). All believers know the truth, and no unbelievers know the truth (John 1:17; 14:6, 17; 17:17, 19; and this knowledge leads to a changed life as its certain result: "Every one that is of the truth heareth [Christ's] voice," John 18:37; and consequently becomes a true worshipper (John 4:23-24), follows Christ (John 10:27), and "doeth truth . . . that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God" (John 3:21). Furthermore, in the immediate context of John 8:31-32 (namely, in v. 36), and everywhere else in the New Testament, being made "free" is an event that takes place at the moment of regeneration (John 8:32, 36; Romans 6:18, 22; 8:2, 21; Galatians 5:1). While the believer is to renew his discipleship daily (Luke 9:23), the call of the Lord Jesus, "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Mark 8:34) is a call to repentance and faith, to conversion: "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it [eternally in hell]; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake [repent of his sin and his own life and way] and the gospel's, the same shall save it [will go to heaven]" (Mark 8:35). Those who do not become disciples lose their own souls eternally in the lake of fire (Mark 8:36). While there can certainly be false or unsaved disciples (John 8:31; 6:66) just like there can be false believers (John 2:23-25; cf. 3:1-21), every true believer is a true disciple, and every true disciple is a true believer.

The Lord Jesus Himself, who knew that He was speaking to true converts (John 8:30-31), gave them assurance based on the evidence of the new birth and new nature (John 8:31—a certainty in every truly converted person, John 17:17). How much the more should His people, who do not know infallibly what has gone on within a professed convert, follow His practice! Believers must not give assurance to those who claim conversion but manifest no change of life.

Joh 8:35 And the servant **abideth** not in the house for ever: *but* the Son **abideth** ever.
ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ **μένει** ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ὁ υἱὸς **μένει** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα·

The servant does not remain or stay in the house, but the Son does.

Joh 9:41 Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin **remaineth**.
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ ἂν εἴχετε ἁμαρτίαν· νῦν δὲ λέγετε ὅτι Βλέπομεν· ἡ οὖν ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν **μένει**.

The Lord Jesus tells those who oppose Him that their sins were remaining or staying upon them.

Joh 10:40 And went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized; and there he **abode**.
Καὶ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων· καὶ **ἔμεινεν** ἐκεῖ.

Christ remained or stayed in a location beyond Jordan where John had at first baptized.

Joh 11:6 When he had heard therefore that he was sick, he **abode** two days still in the same place where he was.
ὡς οὖν ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἀσθενεῖ, τότε μὲν **ἔμεινεν** ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπῳ δύο ἡμέρας.

After receiving the message mentioned, the Lord remained or stayed in His location for two further days.

Joh 12:24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it **abideth** alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.
ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀποθάνῃ, αὐτὸς μόνος **μένει**· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ, πολὺν καρπὸν φέρει.

The grain of wheat remains or stays on its own.

Joh 12:34 The people answered him, We have heard out of the law that Christ **abideth** for ever: and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? who is this Son of man?
ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος, Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς **μένει** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις ὅτι Δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;

The Christ remains or stays to rule forever.

Joh 12:46 I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not **abide** in darkness.

ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ **μείνῃ**.

The believer will no longer remain in darkness, but will be in the light instead.

Joh 14:10 Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that **dwelleth** in me, he doeth the works.
οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστι; τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ· ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ **μένων**, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα.

The Father has a position of being in the Son, and the Son is in the Father (see also v. 11). It is certain that the Father and Son have an ineffably deep fellowship, but what in the text indicates that "dwelleth" specifies this fellowship, rather than representing the ontological indwelling, the interpenetration of the three Persons in the Trinity?

Joh 14:16 And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may **abide** with you for ever;
καὶ ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα **μένῃ** μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,

The Spirit would come to remain/stay with the saints forever. See also v. 17.

Joh 14:17 *Even* the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he **dwelleth** with you, and shall be in you.
τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτό, οὐδὲ γινώσκει αὐτὸ ὑμεῖς δὲ γινώσκετε αὐτό· ὅτι παρ᾽ ὑμῖν **μένει**, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.

Here the Spirit is known because He dwells with, and shall be in, the saints. Dwelling or abiding is not synonymous with being known, but the Spirit's indwelling is the cause of fellowship. This verse does establish an explicit connection between fellowship and indwelling for the inward work of the Spirit. Perhaps a parallel to this in the earlier texts is found where the Lord Jesus stayed in someone's house; fellowship on that account would be a definite result. So knowing the Spirit because He dwells within is established here. "Ye know Him, because He dwelleth with you, and shall be dwelling in you." The Lord does not use *meno* of the relation of the Spirit within the Christian here; the Spirit who at that time was "with" them dwelt or abode with them; at the coming day when He would be within them, He would at that time dwell in them. The verse also supports the conclusion that believers also know the Father and the Son because both of them similarly dwell in the saints; cf. vv. 20, 23. Note the present tense use of *meno* in John 14:17.

Joh 14:25 These things have I spoken unto you, **being** *yet* **present** with you.
Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ᾽ ὑμῖν **μένων**.

While still remaining or continuing with the disciples on the earth, Christ said these things to them.

Joh 15:4 **Abide** in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it **abide** in the vine; no more can ye, except ye **abide** in me.
μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. καθὼς τὸ κλῆμα οὐ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐὰν μὴ **μείνῃ** ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ **μείνητε**.

This examination of each instance of the word *meno* in the New Testament is followed by a verse-by verse exposition of the vine pericope in John 15. Detailed comments on these verses will be found there. Here some general background to John 15 will suffice.

The Old Testament repeatedly presents the nation of Israel as Jehovah's vine, as well as comparing the nation to a vineyard (Isaiah 5), etc. The vine is to bring forth fruit—although Israel failed to do so, and thus was burned up, in contrast to those who abide in Christ as the vine in John 15. Israel's failure brought the nation into judgment. If all Israel was "in the vine," part of the metaphor, the metaphor was not limited to the genuinely converted. Consider:
Isaiah 5:1ff, then:
6 And I will lay it waste: it shall not be pruned, nor digged; but there shall come up briers and thorns: I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it. 7 For the vineyard of the LORD of hosts *is* the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant: and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry. (Isaiah 5:6-7)
21 Yet I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed: how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me? (Jeremiah 2:21)
10 Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard, they have trodden my portion under foot, they have made my pleasant portion a desolate wilderness. (Jeremiah 12:10)
16 Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit: yea, though they bring forth, yet will I slay *even* the beloved *fruit* of their womb. 17 My God will cast them away, because they did not hearken unto him: and they shall be wanderers among the nations. 1 Israel *is* an empty vine, he bringeth forth fruit unto himself: according to the multitude of his fruit he hath increased the altars; according to the goodness of his land they have made goodly images. (Hosea 9:16-10:1)
1 In that day the LORD with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that *is* in the sea. 2 In that day sing ye unto her, A vineyard of red wine. 3 I the LORD do keep it; I will water it every moment: lest *any* hurt it, I will keep it night and day. 4 Fury *is* not in me: who would set the briers *and* thorns against me in battle? I would go through them, I would burn them together. 5 Or let him take hold of my strength, *that* he may make peace with me; *and* he shall make peace with me. 6 He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root: Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit. 7 Hath he smitten him, as he smote those that smote him? *or* is he slain according to the slaughter of them that are slain by him? 8 In measure, when it shooteth forth, thou wilt debate with it: he stayeth his rough wind in the day of the east wind. 9 By this therefore shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged; and this *is* all the fruit to take away his

sin; when he maketh all the stones of the altar as chalkstones that are beaten in sunder, the groves and images shall not stand up. 10 Yet the defenced city *shall be* desolate, *and* the habitation forsaken, and left like a wilderness: there shall the calf feed, and there shall he lie down, and consume the branches thereof. 11 When the boughs thereof are withered, they shall be broken off: the women come, *and* set them on fire: for it *is* a people of no understanding: therefore he that made them will not have mercy on them, and he that formed them will shew them no favour. 12 And it shall come to pass in that day, *that* the LORD shall beat off from the channel of the river unto the stream of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel. 13 And it shall come to pass in that day, *that* the great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the LORD in the holy mount at Jerusalem. (Isaiah 27:1-13)

21 Thy people also *shall be* all righteous: they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified. (Isaiah 60:21)

1 And the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, 2 Son of man, What is the vine tree more than any tree, *or than* a branch which is among the trees of the forest? 3 Shall wood be taken thereof to do any work? or will *men* take a pin of it to hang any vessel thereon? 4 Behold, it is cast into the fire for fuel; the fire devoureth both the ends of it, and the midst of it is burned. Is it meet for *any* work? 5 Behold, when it was whole, it was meet for no work: how much less shall it be meet yet for *any* work, when the fire hath devoured it, and it is burned? 6 Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; As the vine tree among the trees of the forest, which I have given to the fire for fuel, so will I give the inhabitants of Jerusalem. 7 And I will set my face against them; they shall go out from *one* fire, and *another* fire shall devour them; and ye shall know that I *am* the LORD, when I set my face against them. 8 And I will make the land desolate, because they have committed a trespass, saith the Lord GOD. (Ezekiel 15:1-8)

Note in Ezekiel 15 that the vine that is good for nothing is cast into the fire and burned up, so that it will be useful in some way. The vine here represents the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who are associated with the people of God, naturally. They are burned up, in the sense that they are given over to various awful judgments for their sins. While this writer believes these judgments fall upon unconverted Israelites who are given over to judgment, thus, with those who are not genuinely part of the people of God, although they are such in name, one could also argue that this passage deals with converted individuals who were disobedient.

Consider Psalm 80:

1 <<To the chief Musician upon Shoshannimeduth, A Psalm of Asaph.>> Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest *between* the cherubims, shine forth. 2 Before Ephraim and Benjamin and Manasseh stir up thy strength, and come *and* save us. 3 Turn us again, O God, and cause thy face to shine; and we shall be saved. 4 O LORD God of hosts, how long wilt thou be angry against the prayer of thy people? 5 Thou feedest them with the bread of tears; and givest them tears to drink in great measure. 6 Thou makest us a strife unto our neighbours: and our enemies laugh among themselves. 7 Turn us again, O God of hosts, and cause thy face to shine;

and we shall be saved. 8 Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the heathen, and planted it.

It would appear that this deliverance of the vine from Egypt is a physical deliverance, but the spiritual is tied in with the physical for the nation of Israel.

9 Thou preparedst *room* before it, and didst cause it to take deep root, and it filled the land. 10 The hills were covered with the shadow of it, and the boughs thereof *were like* the goodly cedars.

This speaks of the physical spread of the "vine" through the land in the conquest of Canaan. Of course, this was also a time of spiritual revival and blessing for Israel.

11 She sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river. 12 Why hast thou *then* broken down her hedges, so that all they which pass by the way do pluck her? 13 The boar out of the wood doth waste it, and the wild beast of the field doth devour it.

Here, of course, the Psalmist describes the contraction of the nation at the hand of her enemies. Although Jehovah is the Shepherd of Israel, now the wild beasts are Israel's "shepherd" (*devour* is from the same verb as *to shepherd/feed*). This is a physical contraction, but it is a result of a spiritual affliction, as one can see from v. 18ff.

14 Return, we beseech thee, O God of hosts: look down from heaven, and behold, and visit this vine; 15 And the vineyard which thy right hand hath planted, and the branch *that* thou madest strong for thyself.

God is to view the children of Israel with mercy; yet the nation is still Jehovah's *ben,* His son (this is the word here rendered *branch.*). This would seem to favor the interpretation of John 15 where the burning is considered as a physical judgment on the disobedient believer; however, it is not inconsistent with a spiritual view, for the unconverted are cut off out of the true Israel of God, and Judas, to whom the passage in John 15 seems to allude in the branch that is cast off, was certainly unconverted. Consider as well that here the branch is Israel, but it also alludes to the Son of Man, the Lord Jesus, as the vine, for Israel was in the Lord (Isaiah 45:17, 24, 25) in the OT, as the saints are in Christ in the NT; so a comparison to John 15 is the more apt, for there the Lord is explicitly said to be the vine, yet the text bears reference to the saints, or the company of professed saints, as the members of the vine. So in Psalm 80 we can consider Israel as the vine, yet the Lord, the Divine Messiah, is not out of view.

16 *It is* burned with fire, *it is* cut down: they perish at the rebuke of thy countenance.

This is physical judgment upon the nation, metaphorically represented as a vine. There is no specific mention here of a remnant in the nation who is faithful and a portion that is unfaithful; the nation is viewed as a whole. Nevertheless, such an idea is not excluded; it is simply not mentioned.

17 Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man *whom* thou madest strong for thyself.

Through the Messiah, who was certain to become incarnate, the nation of Israel would find complete and ultimate deliverance, as they would in part through the human types of the Christ who sat on the throne of David.

18 So will not we go back from thee: quicken us, and we will call upon thy name.

The nation would find physical and spiritual deliverance when Jehovah would bless them for the sake of the Anointed One. Being quickened, they would receive spiritual blessing.

19 Turn us again, O LORD God of hosts, cause thy face to shine; and we shall be saved.

Spiritual blessing and physical deliverance are intimately united here.

These many Old Testament chapters and verses employing the vine metaphor are very important general background information to the metaphor in John 15. The verse-by-verse exposition of the chapter, once again, is found after the remaining instances of *meno* in the New Testament are evaluated.

Joh 15:5 I am the vine, ye *are* the branches: He that **abideth** in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing.
ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα. ὁ **μένων** ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος φέρει καρπὸν πολύν· ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν.

Joh 15:6 If a man **abide** not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast *them* into the fire, and they are burned.
ἐὰν μή τις **μείνῃ** ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, καὶ ἐξηράνθη, καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλουσι, καὶ καίεται.

Joh 15:7 If ye **abide** in me, and my words **abide** in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.
ἐὰν **μείνητε** ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν **μείνῃ**, ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν.

Joh 15:9 As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: **continue** ye in my love.
καθὼς ἠγάπησέ με ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς· **μείνατε** ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ.

Joh 15:10 If ye keep my commandments, ye shall **abide** in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and **abide** in his love.
ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, **μενεῖτε** ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου· καθὼς ἐγὼ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρός μου τετήρηκα, καὶ **μένω** αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ.

Joh 15:11 These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might **remain** in you, and *that* your joy might be full.
ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν **μείνῃ**, καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ.

All these instances in John 15:1-11 are examined at the end of this study.

Joh 15:16 Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and *that* your fruit **should remain**: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you.
οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε, καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν **μένῃ**· ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, δῷ ὑμῖν.

Your fruit, your good works, will continue; they will pass through the judgment. All truly converted individuals are changed by God and will bring forth good works (Ephesians 2:8-10). The fruit remaining for all the regenerate is a certain consequence of their election by God.

Joh 19:31 The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies **should** not **remain** upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and *that* they might be taken away.
Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐπεὶ Παρασκευὴ ἦν, ἵνα μὴ **μείνῃ** ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ (ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου), ἠρώτησαν τὸν Πιλάτον ἵνα κατεαγῶσιν αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη, καὶ ἀρθῶσιν.

The bodies were not to remain or stay on the cross.

Joh 21:22 Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he **tarry** till I come, what *is that* to thee? follow thou me.
λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω **μένειν** ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρός σε; σὺ ἀκολούθει μοι.

The question is if the disciple will continue, remain, or stay on earth until Christ returns.

Joh 21:23 Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he **tarry** till I come, what *is that* to thee?
ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ λόγος οὗτος εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ὅτι ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει· καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει· ἀλλ᾽, Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω **μένειν** ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρός σε;

Here it is the same thing—would that disciple continue, remain, or stay until Christ returns?

Ac 5:4 Whiles it **remained**, was it not thine **own**? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.
οὐχὶ **μένον** σοὶ **ἔμενε**; καὶ πραθὲν ἐν τῇ σῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπῆρχε; τί ὅτι ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο; οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

"While it remained, was it not remaining to you?"

Ac 9:43 And it came to pass, that he **tarried** many days in Joppa with one Simon a tanner.
ἐγένετο δὲ ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς **μεῖναι** αὐτὸν ἐν Ἰόππῃ παρά τινι Σίμωνι βυρσεῖ.

Here, Paul remained or stayed with Simon the tanner. Note that, although he was with him for many days, the aorist tense is used for his time with him. Of course, Paul also left later.

Ac 16:15 And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought *us*, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and **abide** *there*. And she constrained us.
ὡς δὲ ἐβαπτίσθη, καὶ ὁ οἶκος αὐτῆς, παρεκάλεσε λέγουσα, Εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ Κυρίῳ εἶναι, εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου **μείνατε**. καὶ παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς.

Here again the abiding, remaining, or staying is a aorist tense, yet it represents a stay of what was likely a significant period of time.

Ac 18:3 And because he was of the same craft, he **abode** with them, and wrought: for by their occupation they were tentmakers.
καὶ διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον εἶναι, **ἔμενε** παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰργάζετο· ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τὴν τέχνην.

Here Paul's abiding with these people is expressed with an imperfect form, unlike in the previous instances, where an aorist is used.

Ac 18:20 When they desired *him* to **tarry** longer time with them, he consented not;
ἐρωτώντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον **μεῖναι** παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἐπένευσεν·

Here again *abiding* is remaining/staying with people. It is aorist again.

Ac 20:5 These going before **tarried** for us at Troas.
οὗτοι προελθόντες **ἔμενον** ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρωάδι.

The brethren in Acts 20:4 were remaining or staying (imperfect tense) for Paul, Luke, and the rest of those coming from Troas.

Ac 20:15 And we sailed thence, and came the next *day* over against Chios; and the next *day* we arrived at Samos, and **tarried** at Trogyllium; and the next *day* we came to Miletus.
κἀκεῖθεν ἀποπλεύσαντες, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ κατηντήσαμεν ἀντικρὺ Χίου· τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον· καὶ **μείναντες** ἐν Τρωγυλλίῳ, τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον.

Luke, Paul, and the rest of their missionary band remained or stayed at Trygyllium for one day.

Ac 20:23 Save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions **abide** me.
πλὴν ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον κατὰ πόλιν διαμαρτύρεται λέγον ὅτι δεσμά με καὶ θλίψεις **μένουσιν**.

Bonds and afflictions are remaining, staying, or continuing yet for the Apostle.

Ac 21:7 And when we had finished *our* course from Tyre, we came to Ptolemais, and saluted the brethren, and **abode** with them one day.
Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῦν διανύσαντες ἀπὸ Τύρου, κατηντήσαμεν εἰς Πτολεμαΐδα, καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς **ἐμείναμεν** ἡμέραν μίαν παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς.

The aorist tense expression means, “They remained or stayed with them for one day.”

Ac 21:8 And the next *day* we that were of Paul’s company departed, and came unto Caesarea: and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was *one* of the seven; and **abode** with him.
τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἦλθον ἤλθομεν εἰς Καισάρειαν· καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τοῦ ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά, **ἐμείναμεν** παρ᾽ αὐτῷ.

Paul’s company remained or stayed with Philip the evangelist.

Ac 27:31 Paul said to the centurion and to the soldiers, Except these **abide** in the ship, ye cannot be saved.
εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις, Ἐὰν μὴ οὗτοι **μείνωσιν** ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, ὑμεῖς σωθῆναι οὐ δύνασθε.

Those trying to flee needed to remain, continue, or stay in the ship.

Ac 27:41 And falling into a place where two seas met, they ran the ship aground; and the forepart stuck fast, and **remained** unmoveable, but the hinder part was broken with the violence of the waves.
περιπεσόντες δὲ εἰς τόπον διθάλασσον ἐπώκειλαν τὴν ναῦν· καὶ ἡ μὲν πρῶρα ἐρείσασα **ἔμεινεν** ἀσάλευτος, ἡ δὲ πρύμνα ἐλύετο ὑπὸ τῆς βίας τῶν κυμάτων.

The forepart of the ship remained or stayed in the place where it had run aground.

Ac 28:16 And when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard: but Paul was suffered to **dwell** by himself with a soldier that kept him.
Ὅτε δὲ ἤλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ· τῷ δὲ Παύλῳ ἐπετράπη **μένειν** καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν, σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ.

Paul was allowed to remain or stay by himself.

Ac 28:30 And Paul **dwelt** two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him,
Ἔμεινε δὲ ὁ Παῦλος διετίαν ὅλην ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι, καὶ ἀπεδέχετο πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους πρὸς αὐτόν,

Paul remained or stayed at his own hired house for two years.

Ro 9:11 (For *the children* being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might **stand**, not of works, but of him that calleth;)
μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων, μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν, ἵνα ἡ κατ᾽ ἐκλογὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόθεσις **μένῃ**, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος,

God's elective purpose is to remain, continue, or abide unshaken.

1Co 3:14 If any man's work **abide** which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.
εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον **μένει** ὃ ἐπῳκοδόμησε μισθὸν λήψεται.

The works remain, stay, or continue, that is, they pass through the fire of judgment.

1Co 7:8 I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they **abide** even as I.
Λέγω δὲ τοῖς ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις, καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἐστιν ἐὰν **μείνωσιν** ὡς κἀγώ.

It is good for the widows and unmarried to remain or stay in their single state.

1Co 7:11 But and if she depart, let her **remain** unmarried, or be reconciled to *her* husband: and let not the husband put away *his* wife.
(ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ, **μενέτω** ἄγαμος, ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγήτω)· καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι.

"Let her," says Paul, "remain or stay in an unmarried state."

1Co 7:20 **Let** every man **abide** in the same calling wherein he was called.
ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ κλήσει ᾗ ἐκλήθη ἐν ταύτῃ **μενέτω**.

Let that man continue, remain, or stay in the same state in which he was when he was designated an heir of everlasting life.

1Co 7:24 Brethren, **let** every man, wherein he is called, therein **abide** with God.
ἕκαστος ἐν ᾧ ἐκλήθη, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τούτῳ **μενέτω** παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

In whatever state one finds himself, whether circumcised or not, in whatever job station, let him remain or stay in that position.

1Co 7:40 But she is happier if she so **abide**, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the Spirit of God.
μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν ἐὰν οὕτω **μείνῃ**, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην· δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν.

The widow under consideration is happier if she remains or stays unmarried after the death of her first husband.

1Co 13:13 And now **abideth** faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these *is* charity.
νυνὶ δὲ **μένει** πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα. μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη.

These three things continue, remain, or stay—faith, hope, and charity. While it has not been specifically mentioned in the previous verses, the nature of the *meno* itself does not require any sort of fellowship aspect to it. If one states that *abide* in John 15 includes fellowship, this conclusion must be made because of the nature of being in Christ and of of true Christianity (and these things do require fellowship), not because of the anything inherent in the word *meno.*

1Co 15:6 After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part **remain** unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.
ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείους **μένουσιν** ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἐκοιμήθησαν·

The greatest part remain, abide, or continue alive to the point in time indicated.

2Co 3:11 For if that which is done away *was* glorious, much more that which **remaineth** *is* glorious.
εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον, διὰ δόξης, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὸ **μένον**, ἐν δόξῃ.

Here the New Covenant, which remains, continues, or stays, is glorious.

2Co 3:14 But their minds were blinded: for until this day **remaineth** the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which *vail* is done away in Christ.

ἀλλ᾽ ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν· ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης **μένει** μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον, ὅ τι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται.

The blinding still continues or abides.

2Co 9:9 (As it is written, He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor: his righteousness **remaineth** for ever.
καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε τοῖς πένησιν· ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ **μένει** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

God's righteousness continues or stays.

Php 1:25 And having this confidence, I know that I shall **abide** and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith;
καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε τοῖς πένησιν· ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ **μένει** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

In this passage, Paul's "abiding" with the Philippians was his continuing with them, "coming to" them, and "seeing" them again; it was his bodily presence with them, rather than his death. (Note, on the side, that the idea that he could intercede for them after his death as a Catholic saint allegedly could do is not found at all—were this the case then after Paul's death he could be much more useful to the Philippians than he was now, but such is not the case.) Paul abode with them so that he could disciple the Philippians, but those actions were not inherent in his abiding itself. This should be considered in analyzing John 15 and the nature of abiding in Christ.

1Ti 2:15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they **continue** in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.
σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν **μείνωσιν** ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἁγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης.

The children abiding in or following the right path is the sense of *meno* here.

2Ti 2:13 If we believe not, *yet* he **abideth** faithful: he cannot deny himself.
εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς **μένει**· ἀρνήσασθαι ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται.

The Lord continues or remains faithful to His threatenings against unbelievers, for He cannot deny His holy nature. He is certain to condemn those who do not believe.

2Ti 3:14 But **continue** thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned *them*;
σὺ δὲ **μένε** ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης, εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνος ἔμαθες,

Timothy was to remain or stay faithful to what he had learned.

2Ti 4:20 Erastus **abode** at Corinth: but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick.

Ἔραστος **ἔμεινεν** ἐν Κορίνθῳ· Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενοῦντα.

Erastus remained or stayed in the city of Corinth, while Trophimus stayed at Miletum.

Heb 7:3 Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; **abideth** a priest continually.
ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ), **μένει** ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.

The Lord remains or continues to have the office of a priest continually.

Heb 7:24 But this *man*, because he **continueth** ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.
ὁ δέ, διὰ τὸ **μένειν** αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην.

The Lord Jesus Christ remains forever; He will always exist.

Heb 10:34 For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an **enduring** substance.
καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς κρεῖττονα ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ **μένουσαν**.

The heavenly substance will continue or remain forever.

Heb 12:27 And this *word*, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may **remain**.
τὸ δε, Ἔτι ἅπαξ, δηλοῖ τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετάθεσιν, ὡς πεποιημένων, ἵνα **μείνῃ** τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα.

The unshaken things may continue to be around.

Heb 13:1 **Let** brotherly love **continue**.
Ἡ φιλαδελφία **μενέτω**.

Let love abide or remain.

Heb 13:14 For here have we no **continuing** city, but we seek one to come.
οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε **μένουσαν** πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν.

Our city here does not remain.

1Pe 1:23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and **abideth** for ever.
ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου, διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ **μένοντος** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

The Word of God continues, remains, or endures forever. These are synonymns for "abide."

1Pe 1:25 But the word of the Lord **endureth** for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.
τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου **μένει** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

The Word remains, continues, or abides forever.

1Jo 2:6 He that saith he **abideth** in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.
ὁ λέγων ἐν αὐτῷ **μένειν** ὀφείλει, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιεπάτησε, καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτω περιπατεῖν.

In the previous verse (v. 5), those *en auto* are those who are truly converted, those in whom the love of God is perfected (perfect tense). This would suggest that abiding in Him, v. 6, is synonymous with being *en Christo,* that is, with genuine conversion. Consider that this is a present tense abiding. Cf. in John 15 the contrasting aorist and present tense usage of *meno.*

1Jo 2:10 He that loveth his brother **abideth** in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him.
ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ **μένει**, καὶ σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν.

Here again the contrast with v. 9, where he who hates his brother is now and always has been unconverted, indicates that abiding in the light (present tense again) is the mark of the converted individual.

1Jo 2:14 I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known him *that is* from the beginning. I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God **abideth** in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one.
ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, πατέρες, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, ὅτι ἰσχυροί ἐστε, καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν **μένει**, καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν.

This verse also looks like the abiding of the Word of God in people is a characteristic of true conversion. They were clean (perfect tense) through the Word of God which Christ had spoken (John 15:3) and His Words abode (aorist) in them (John 15:7).

1Jo 2:17 And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God **abideth** for ever.
καὶ ὁ κόσμος παράγεται, καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ **μένει** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

The one who does the will of God, the genuine convert, will continue to eternity in the presence of God, unlike the world and its lusts.

1Jo 2:19 They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would *no doubt* have **continued** with us: but *they went out*, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.
ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν· εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, **μεμενήκεισαν** ἂν μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν· ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν.

The pluperfect of *meno* here in this verse makes it clear that the elect do abide, remain, continue, or stay. They begin to do so at one point (conversion) with continuing results. The ones who do not abide are lost. This verse provides evidence that in John 15 *abide* is a synonym for *persevere* or *continue*. The evidence would only be undermined if one could prove from Scripture that people can genuinely abide and then cease to do so, be restored to doing so again, and cease to abide again, and continue to flip-flop back and forth, making abiding is an all-or-nothing matter rather than a matter of degree or a overall mark of believers. It is not possible to prove from the Bible that such flip-flopping takes place.

1Jo 2:24 **Let** that therefore **abide** in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall **remain** in you, ye also shall **continue** in the Son, and in the Father.
ὑμεῖς οὖν ὃ ἠκούσατε ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ἐν ὑμῖν **μενέτω**. ἐὰν ἐν ὑμῖν **μείνῃ** ὃ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἠκούσατε, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ υἱῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ **μενεῖτε**.

If the teachings given before this text remain or continue in the audience of 1 John, then they will continue or remain in the Son and in the Father, that is, they will be eternally saved, for they are *en Christo*. V. 24, "Let . . . abide," is a warning to avoid apostasy from the faith. Those who apostatize were never genuinely in Christ, but they had a certain sort of position in the Father and Son, it appears from the last clause here, as in John 15:2. *Remaining* or *abiding* in true faith and practice characterizes the audience; because they are those who abide, they will receive eternal life (v. 25).

1Jo 2:27 But the anointing which ye have received of him **abideth** in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall **abide** in him.
καὶ ὑμεῖς, τὸ χρῖσμα ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν **μένει**, καὶ οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε ἵνα τις διδάσκῃ ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ᾽ ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ χρῖσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων, καὶ ἀληθές ἐστι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι ψεῦδος, καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς, **μενεῖτε** ἐν αὐτῷ.

The Spirit, who indwells the elect, remains or continues in them, and He makes it certain that the elect will remain, continue, or persevere in true doctrine and practice.

1Jo 2:28 And now, little children, **abide** in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.

καὶ νῦν, τεκνία, **μένετε** ἐν αὐτῷ· ἵνα ὅταν φανερωθῇ, ἔχωμεν παρρησίαν, καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

This is a command to persevere in the faith; those who are ashamed before Him at His coming are lost people, not disobedient Christians, as v. 29 and the previous verses demonstrate.

1Jo 3:6 Whosoever **abideth** in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.
πᾶς ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ **μένων** οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτόν, οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν.

Abiding in him is being regenerate; since in Him there is no sin, v. 5, the one who is in Him does not continue in sin (v. 6; and abide is present tense). The contrast is not with a disobedient Christian, but a lost man (v. 6bff.).

1Jo 3:9 Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed **remaineth** in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.
πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ **μένει**· καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται.

Because the Holy Spirit, given at the moment of regeneration, remains (present tense) in the elect, they are not able to continue to commit sin. Those who are born of God "cannot sin," that is, cannot continue to sin.

1Jo 3:14 We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not *his* brother **abideth** in death.
ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν, ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφόν, **μένει** ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ.

The one who is not loving his brother is remaining, continuing, or persevering in a state of spiritual death, while the one who loves his brother abides in a state of spiritual life.

1Jo 3:15 Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life **abiding** in him.
πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστί· καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι πᾶς ἀνθρωποκτόνος οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἐν αὐτῷ **μένουσαν**.

Eternal life is not staying or remaining in the murderer.

1Jo 3:17 But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels *of compassion* from him, how **dwelleth** the love of God in him?
ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἔχῃ τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ θεωρῇ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχοντα, καὶ κλείσῃ τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, πῶς ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ **μένει** ἐν αὐτῷ;

The one who does not help his brother does not have love for God within him, and God does not love him with that love He has for the elect. Not having the love of God dwelling, remaining, or staying in one is being lost.

1Jo 3:24 And he that keepeth his commandments **dwelleth** in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he **abideth** in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.
καὶ ὁ τηρῶν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ **μένει**, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι **μένει** ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος οὗ ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν.

The one that keeps His commandments is a converted person. Scripture here equates "he who keeps His commandments" with "he who abides in Christ, and Christ abides in Him." Abiding is what all saved people do, then, and it is a synonym with the perseverance of the saints, with continuing, remaining, or enduring in true doctrine and practice. The evidence that He continues or remains with us is the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not only the possession of Christians who are not backslidden. This fact indicates that the entire verse deals with a saved/lost contrast, not an obedient/disobedient Christian contrast.

1Jo 4:12 No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God **dwelleth** in us, and his love is perfected in us.
Θεὸν οὐδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται· ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν **μένει**, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν.

Here again, the previous and subsequent context indicates that this love, which is the certain mark of regeneration (v. 7), and so is characteristic of all believers, is the subject under consideration. All believers love, therefore, God abides or dwells in all of them, and His love has been completed or perfected in them.

1Jo 4:13 Hereby know we that we **dwell** in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.
ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ **μένομεν** καὶ αὐτός ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν.

Here the believer's abiding in God, and God's abiding in him, is also a mark of conversion. All believers were given and continue to have (perfect tense) the Spirit, and He is the seal and testimony of that mutual indwelling or abiding. Abiding is not something that a special class of believers learn how to do, but a certain state of all of God's people.

1Jo 4:15 Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God **dwelleth** in him, and he in God.
ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ **μένει**, καὶ αὐτός ἐν τῷ Θεῷ.

Here again, the indwelling or abiding of God in the saint and of the saint in God is a mark of regeneration, not of subsequent progressive sanctification. The mutual association between the believer's dwelling in God and Christ and Christ's indwelling the believer is

also most noteworthy; all *en Christo* have Christ abiding in them; if Christ dwells in us, then we abide or dwell in Christ.

1Jo 4:16 And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that **dwelleth** in love **dwelleth** in God, and God in him.
καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχει ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν. ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστί, καὶ ὁ **μένων** ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν τῷ Θεῷ **μένει**, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ.

Here again, it is extremely clear that genuine conversion means that one abides in God and in love, and God abides in him. Nor can the advocate of abiding in Christ as (solely) an instrumentality for progressive sanctification which some believers may never possess argue that abiding in God and in Christ are two different things, for one can easily demonstrate that if one is in the Son he is also in the Father; this is also a necessary consequence of a proper and sound Trinitarian theology. Note the perfect tense forms for "we have loved and believed."

2Jo 2 For the truth's sake, which **dwelleth** in us, and shall be with us for ever.
διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν **μένουσαν** ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα·

The truth abiding, remaining, or dwelling in the saints was not a temporary state or condition, or dependent upon the struggles in practical sanctification, but a continuing character received permanently at regeneration.

2Jo 9 Whosoever transgresseth, and **abideth** not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that **abideth** in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.
πᾶς ὁ παραβαίνων καὶ μὴ **μένων** ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει· ὁ **μένων** ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗτος καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει.

Here it is obvious that the one who does not abide in correct doctrine is lost.

Re 17:10 And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, *and* the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must **continue** a short space.
καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτά εἰσιν· οἱ πέντε ἔπεσαν, καὶ ὁ εἷς ἔστιν, ὁ ἄλλος οὔπω ἦλθε, καί, ὅταν ἔλθῃ, ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ **μεῖναι**.

The seventh king will stay or remain in power for a short time.

The significance of *abide* as a synonym of *remain*, *continue*, *endure*, or *persevere* appears clear from an examination of the texts. While continuing with a person may often be connected with fellowship, the word itself does not signify any necessary personal communion. This fact is confirmed by an examination of the lexica.

The standard classical Greek lexicon provides the following definitions for various constructions of *meno*:

> I. *stand fast,* in battle . . . of soldiers . . . 2. *Stay at home, stay where one is* . . . b. *lodge, stay* . . . c. *stay away, be absent* from . . . and so abs., *to be a shirker,* . . . 3.

stay, tarry . . . *loiter, be idle* . . . 4. of things, *to be lasting, remain, stand* . . . *having no proper motion* . . . b. *remain* in one's possession . . . 5. of condition, *remain as one was,* of a maiden . . . generally, *stand, hold good* . . . of circumstances . . . of prosperity . . . *remain contented* with . . . *be content with* . . . of wine, *keep good* . . . 6. *abide* by an opinion, conviction, etc. . . . the party which *observes* an engagement . . . 7. Impers. c. inf., *it remains* for one to do . . . II. Trans., of persons, *await, expect* . . . esp. *await* an attack without blenching . . . of a rock, *bide* the storm . . . reversely of things, *awaits* him . . . 2. c. acc. et inf., *wait for,* . . . [as in] *wait ye for* the Trojans to come nigh? . . . they *waited for* evening's coming on . . . why *wait* to go? . . . I *wait,* i. e., *long*, to hear (Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. *Greek-English Lexicon,* 9th ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996).

One notices that there is no definition for *meno* as "hold communion with" or the equivalent out of the many significations listed.

The complete definition in the standard New Testament lexicon reads:

μένω (Hom.+) impf. ἔμενον; fut. μενῶ; 1 aor. ἔμεινα, impv. μεῖνον (Hv 3, 1, 9); pf. ptc. pl. μεμενηκότας 2 Macc 8:1; plpf. μεμενήκειν 1J 2:19 (on the lack of augment s. B-D-F §66, 1; W-S. §12, 4; Mlt-H. 190).

1. *remain, stay,* intr.

a. a pers. or thing remains where he, she, or it is.

α. of a location *stay,* oft. in the special sense *live, dwell, lodge* (Horapollo 2, 49 μ. alternating w. οἰκέω) w. ἐν and the dat. (Ps.-Demosth. 43, 75 μ. ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις; Vi. Aesopi G 12 p. 259, 6 P.) ἐν οἰκίᾳ Lk 8:27; ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ οἰκίᾳ Lk 10:7; J 8:35a; ἐν τ. οἴκῳ σου Lk 19:5. ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ *remain in the ship* Ac 27:31. μ. ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ J 7:9.—Ac 9:43; 20:15 v.l.; 2 Ti 4:20. κατὰ πόλιν *remain in the city* MPol 5:1 (Just., A I, 67, 3). W. an adv. of place ἐκεῖ Mt 10:11; Mk 6:10; Lk 9:4; J 2:12; 10:40; 11:54 (s. διατρίβω); Hs 9, 11, 7. ὧδε Mt 26:38; Mk 14:34; Hs 9, 11, 1. ποῦ μένεις; *where do you live?* J 1:38; cp. vs. 39 (Sb 2639 ποῦ μένι Θερμοῦθις; Pel.-Leg. 7, 27; Nicetas Eugen. 1, 230 H. ποῦ μένεις;). W. acc. of time (Demetr.: 722 fgm. 1, 11 Jac.; JosAs 20:8; Jos., Ant. 1, 299) J 1:39b; 4:40b; 11:6; Ac 21:7; D 11:5; 12:2. W. time-indications of a different kind ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε Mt 10:11. ὡς μῆνας τρεῖς Lk 1:56. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα J 8:35b. ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον Ac 18:20. W. prep. παρά τινι μ. *stay with someone* (Cebes 9, 2; Jos., Ant. 20, 54) J 1:39b; 4:40a; Ac 18:3 (*live with* is also prob.: Lucian, Timon 10); 21:7, 8. παρ᾽ ὑμῖν μένων *when I was (staying) with you* J 14:25. πρός τινα *with someone* Ac 18:3 D; D 12:2. ἐπί τινα *remain on someone* J 1:32f. σύν τινι *with someone* (4 Macc 18:9) Lk 1:56; 24:29b. Also μ. μετά τινος (Gen 24:55) Lk 24:29a; Hs 9, 11, 1; 3; 6; 7. καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν *live by oneself, in one's own quarters* Ac 28:16 (of what is called in Lat. custodia libera; s. BAFCS III 276, 364f; 384f). Of a corpse μ. ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ *stay (hanging) on the cross* J 19:31. Of a branch: ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ *remain on the vine,* i.e. not be cut off 15:4b. Of stones μ. ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ *stay on the road* Hv 3, 2, 9. Of stones that *remain* in the divine structure, and are not removed Hs 9, 13, 4; 9. Also in imagery τὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης μένει *the veil remains unlifted at the reading of the OT* (and hinders the right understanding of it) 2 Cor 3:14. Abs. Ac 16:15.

β. in transf. sense, of someone who does not leave a certain realm or sphere: *remain, continue, abide* (Pla., Ep. 10, 358c μένε ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσιν, οἷσπερ καὶ νῦν μένεις; Alex. Aphr., An. II 1 p. 2, 15 μ. ἐν ταῖς ἀπορίαις=remain overcome by doubts; Jos., Ant. 4, 185; TestJos. 1:3 ἐν τ. ἀληθείᾳ; Just., D. 8, 3 ἐν . . . τῷ τῆς φιλοσωφίας τρόπῳ) ἐν ἀγνείᾳ IPol 5:2; cp. IEph 10:3. ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ *remain in the teaching of Christ* 2J 9a; cp. vs. 9b (2 Macc 8:1 μ. ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ). ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ 1 Ti 2:15. μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες *continue in what you have learned* 2 Ti 3:14. ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ J 8:31. μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ *continue in my love* 15:9f; cp. 1J 4:16. ἐν τῷ φωτί 2:10. ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ 3:14. ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ J 12:46. Without ἐν AcPlCor 2:36. The phrase μ. ἔν τινι is a favorite of J to denote an inward, enduring personal communion. So of God in his relation to Christ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων *the Father, who abides in me* J 14:10. Of Christians in their relation to Christ J 6:56; 15:4ac, 5–7; 1J 2:6, 24c. Of Christ relating to Christians J 15:4a, 5 (Goodsp., Probs. 112–15). Of Christians relating to God 1J 2:24c, 27f; 3:6, 24a; 4:13. Of God relating to Christians 1J 3:24; 4:12f, 15.—Vice versa, of someth. that remains in someone; likew. in Johannine usage: of the word of God 1J 2:14. Of the words of Christ J 15:7b; cp. 1J 2:24ab. Of the anointing fr. heaven vs. 27. Of the love of God 1J 3:17. Of the seed of God 3:9. Of truth 2J 2. The possession is shown to be permanent by the expr. ἔχειν τι μένον ἐν ἑαυτῷ *have someth. continually, permanently* 1J 3:15; the word of God J 5:38. Instead of μ. ἔν τινι also μ. παρά τινι *remain with someone:* of the Spirit of truth J 14:17. Also of the wrath of God, μένει ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν *it remains upon him* 3:36.—GPercorara, De verbo ‘manere’ ap. Jo.: Div. Thomas Piac. 40, ’37, 159–71.

b. a pers. or thing continues in the same state (ParJer 7:37 ἔμεινε διδάσκων; ApcSed 11:13 ἀκίνητοι μένετε; Just., D. 90, and Lucian, Laps. 16 ἐν τῇ τάξει μ.) 1 Cor 7:20, 24. μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές *he remains a priest forever* Hb 7:3. αὐτὸς μόνος μένει *it remains alone* J 12:24. μενέτω ἄγαμος 1 Cor 7:11. ἀσάλευτος Ac 27:41. πιστός 2 Ti 2:13. ἀόρατος Dg 6:4. (μ̣ε̣ί̣νατε νικηταί· μεί̣ν̣[α]τ̣ε Ox 1602, 30f is a misreading; difft. AcPl Ha 8, 22//BMM recto 28=HTR 31, 79 n. 2, ln. 10; s. CSchmidt mg. on AcPl Ha 8, 22 [μ]ε̣γ̣ας ἐπ̣ίκειται πιρασμός; Borger GGA 137). ἀσκανδάλιστος μείνῃ ἡ . . . ἐκκλησία AcPlCor 1:16. μ. μετά τινος *remain in fellowship w. someone* 1J 2:19. Of one who has divorced his wife *remain by himself, remain unmarried* Hm 4, 1, 6; 10; 4, 4, 2. οὐχὶ μένον σοὶ ἔμενεν; *was it* (the piece of ground) *not yours, as long as it remained (unsold)?* Ac 5:4 (cp. 1 Macc 15:7 and s. OHoltzmann, ZKG 14, 1893, 327–36).—W. adv. (Just., A I, 29, 3, D. 58, 3 βεβαίως) οὕτως μ. *remain as one is* (i.e., unmarried) 1 Cor 7:40. ἀγνῶς B 2:3. μ. ὡς ἐγώ *remain as I am* 1 Cor 7:8.

2. to continue to exist, *remain, last, persist, continue to live,* intr.

a. of pers. (Ps 9:8 ὁ κύριος εἰς τ. αἰῶνα μ.; 101:13; Da 6:27; Just., D. 128, 4 ἄγγελοι . . . ἀεὶ μένοντες) ὁ Χριστὸς μ. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα *Christ remains (here) forever* J 12:34; cp. Hb 7:24; 1J 2:17. Of God AcPl Ha 2, 28; 9, 11. Pregnant *remain (alive), be alive* (Epict. 3, 24, 97; Diog. L. 7, 174; Achilles Tat. 8, 10. μένειν ἐν τῷ ζῆν Plut., Mor. 1042d; Eccl 7:15; Just., A I, 63, 17) J 21:22f; 1 Cor 15:6; Phil 1:25; Rv 17:10.

b. of things (Maximus Tyr. 4, 8b and Polyaenus 7, 34: γῆ μένει; Socrat., Ep. 31 [=33]; Hierocles 15, 454 ὁ πόνος παρῆλθεν, τὸ καλὸν μένει; Just., A I, 18, 2 αἴσθησις . . . μένει; Ath. 19, 2 μένει σύστασις) of a city ἔμεινεν ἂν μέχρι τῆς σήμερον *it would have lasted until today* Mt 11:23. μένουσα πόλις *a permanent city* Hb 13:14.—ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω *continue* 13:1 (JCambier, Salesianum 11, '49, 62–96).—J 9:41; 15:16. εἰ τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ *if the work survives* 1 Cor 3:14. ὕπαρξις Hb 10:34. δικαιοσύνη 2 Cor 9:9 (Ps 111:9). ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ Ro 9:11 (of God's counsel Ps 32:11). λόγος θεοῦ *endure* 1 Pt 1:23 (Just., D. 61, 2; cp. 1 Esdr 4:38 ἡ ἀλήθεια μένει). τ. ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τ. αἰῶνα vs. 25 (Is 40:8). ἡ βρῶσις ἡ μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον J 6:27. τὴν δύναμιν σου τὴν μένουσαν Rv 11:7 v.l. ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης Papias (2:4). τὸ μένον *what is permanent* (Philo, Leg. All. 3, 100.—Opp. τὸ καταργούμενον) 2 Cor 3:11. μένει πίστις, ἐλπὶς, ἀγάπη 1 Cor 13:13 (WMarxsen, D. 'Bleiben' im 1 Cor 13:13, OCullmann Festschr., '72, 223–29; on the eschatology cp. En 97:6–10 and s. the lit. on ἀγάπη 1a.—For the contrast πίπτει [vs. 8]—μένει cp. Pla., Crat. 44, 440a εἰ μεταπίπτει πάντα χρήματα καὶ μηδὲν μένει). Opp. σαλευόμενα Hb 12:27.

3. ***wait for, await,*** trans.

a. of pers.: *wait for* someone who is arriving (Hom.; Thu. 4, 124, 4; X., An. 4, 4, 20; Pla., Leg. 8, 833c; Polyb. 4, 8, 4; Tob 2:2 BA; 2 Macc 7:30; TestJob 11:1; Jos., Ant. 13, 19) τινά w. the place indicated ἔμενον ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρῳάδι *they were waiting for us in Troas* Ac 20:5.

b. of things, such as dangers or misfortunes that *await* or *threaten someone* (trag.; Kaibel 654, 9 κἀμὲ μένει τὸ θανεῖν; SibOr 4, 114 v.l. σὲ) θλίψεις με μένουσιν Ac 20:23.—Of the 118 passages in which μένω occurs in the NT, 67 are found in the Johannine writings (40 in the gosp.; 24 in 1J; 3 in 2J).—JHeise, Bleiben: Menein in d. Johan. Schr., '67; FHauck, TW IV 578–93: μένω and related words.—B. 836. DELG. M-M. TW (Danker, Frederick William (ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature,* 3rd. ed. (BDAG), Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

BDAG gives many objective definitions and analyses of the word, along with the interpretive statement that the word "is a favorite of J[ohn] to denote an inward, enduring personal communion." While *meno* is unquestionably associated with communion, personal relationship is not an inherent part of the word itself. For example, when the disciples abode in a house on their evangelistic journeys (Luke 9:4) or the Lord Jesus abode in Zaccheus' house (Luke 19:5), there doubtless was fellowship with the owners of the respective places of abode. Nonetheless, the word itself does not directly require the fellowship.[890] One thus notes that other lexica, such as The *Greek-English Lexicon of the*

[890] Compare the noun μονή, found in John 14:23: "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode [μονή] with him." It is very clear that fellowship with the Father and the Son will take place for the person who loves Them. Nevertheless, the word itself does not require this meaning, as in John 14:2 (the only other NT reference) it is the word for the "mansions" that believers will inhabit in heaven, and, while their abodes will doubtless be glorious dwellings, they will not have fellowship with their dwelling places,

New Testament Based on Semantic Domains by Johannes P. Louw & Eugene A. Nida, define *meno* as "to continue to exist — 'to remain, to continue, to continue to exist, to still be in existence. . . . to continue in an activity or state — 'to continue, to remain in, to keep on.' . . . to remain in the same place over a period of time — 'to remain, to stay. . . . to remain in a place and/or state, with expectancy concerning a future event — 'to await, to wait for.'" (13:89; 68:11; 85:55; 85:60). No definition of the word as *fellowship* or *communion* is listed. *Thayer's Greek Lexicon*[891] defines the word as "1. to remain, abide . . .1a) in reference to place . . . 1a1) to sojourn, tarry . . . 1a2) not to depart . . . 1a2a) to continue to be present . . . 1a2b) to be held, kept, continually . . . 1b) in reference to time . . . 1b1) to continue to be, not to perish, to last, endure . . . 1b1a) of persons, to survive, live . . . 1c) in reference to state or condition . . . 1c1) to remain as one, not to become another or different . . . 2) to wait for, await one." Here again, no definition of the word as a synonym for *fellowship* is listed.

Based on the study above, the exegesis of John 15:1-11 (cf. v. 16's use of *meno*) follows.

1 I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.
Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινὴ, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστι.

The Lord here sets up the comparison He will maintain through the following pericope. As the vine is the source of life for its branches, so Christ is the exclusive source and fount of spiritual life and fruit-bearing. The Father, like a husbandman or vinedresser, ensures greater fruitfulness by removing some branches and pruning others (cf. v. 2).

2 Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every *branch* that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.
πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπόν, αἴρει αὐτό· καὶ πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρον, καθαίρει αὐτό, ἵνα πλείονα καρπὸν φέρῃ.

The Lord's statement that branches "in me" can be removed is the best attempt in this text to affirm Arminianism. However, these branches are not those who have been regenerated and then fell away from that state—they are those who were never numbered among God's elect. All the elect will bring forth fruit, John 15:16, and, since they have the Holy Ghost in them, they will certainly abide, 1 John 2:27, or, employing two of the

---

although the bliss of heaven will center in communion with He who gave them their mansions. BDAG defines μονή as:

μονή, ῆς, ἡ (μένω; Eur., Hdt. et al.; ins, pap; 1 Macc 7:38; TestAbr s. below)

1. state of remaining in an area, *staying, tarrying* (Eur. et al.; OGI 527, 5; Philo, Mos. 1, 316) μονὴν ποιεῖσθαι *live, stay* (Thu. 1, 131, 1; BGU 742; Jos., Ant. 8, 350; 13, 41) J 14:23.

2. a place in which one stays, *dwelling(-place), room, abode* (Chariton 1, 12, 1 μονὴν ποιεῖν; Paus. 10, 31, 7; OGI 527, 5) of heavenly dwellings μοναὶ τῶν ἁγίων μου (TestAbr A 20 p. 104, 2 [Stone p. 56]) J 14:2 (OSchaefer, ZNW 32, '33, 210–17; understood in a transcendent sense: RGundry, ZNW 58, '67, 68–72). τῆς ἀμείνονος τυγχάνειν μονῆς *attain a better abode* ApcPt fgm. 2 p. 12, 22.—M-M. TW.

[891] *Thayer's Greek Lexicon*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1981. elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*, Ken Hamel.

synonyms of *abide* in the New Testament, they will certainly *continue* or *persevere* in Christ and in obedience. The fact that the Lord refers to these unregenerate individuals as *en emoi,* "in me," does not necessitate their genuine regeneration. All the nation of Israel were the seed of Abraham, but the unbelievers were cut off from the nation (Exodus 30:33; Leviticus 19:8; 20:17), so that, while nationally "in the Lord," only the believing seed is "in the Lord" in a deeper sense (Isaiah 45:17, 24-25). One could compare the interplay in Isaiah's *servant of the Lord* image between national Israel, the Israel of God, and the Lord Jesus (Isaiah 41:8; 44:1, 21; 45:4; 49:3-7; 52:13-53:12) or the Lord Jesus as the elect One and Israel as elect in Him (Isaiah 42:1; 45:4; 65:9, 22). The entire nation of Israel constituted the people of God, but in a deeper sense, only the believing Israelites, only the Israel of God, constituted the genuine people of God (Romans 9:6ff.; cf. 11:20). In the same way, all those who are members of the church are, in a certain sense, associated with the people of God; but they are not all regenerate.

The church at Corinth was the body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12:27), but some members of the church were unregenerate (1 Corinthians 15:12, 34; 2 Corinthians 13:5). Since the institution of the local church is the body of Christ, unregenerate church members are part of Christ's body, and thus are, in a certain sense, in Christ. Such, however, are not truly in Him, not truly united to Him, not genuinely *en Christo.* Contextually in John 15, Judas has just gone into outward apostasy, having left to betray the Lord to His enemies (John 13:26-30). He had been part of the pre-Pentecost church, that first church established by the Lord when He called the first baptized disciples to be with Him (John 1:35ff.); indeed, Judas had been an apostle in the Lord's church (Mark 3:13-19), although he was never chosen to everlasting life (John 6:64, 70-71; 12:4-6; 13:2).

The unregenerate "branch" in the Lord cannot bear (*pheron,* present tense) fruit because it has never had a living connection to Christ (John 15:5). It had an outward, non-living, fruitless connection (and thus the utter pagan is not in view, but the false professor, the unconverted church member), but not a living, genuine connection. Union with Christ always results in a change of life, in sanctification and holiness.[892] Therefore the branch without this living union is "taken away," that is, it is eventually cut off from even its outward connection to the church and people of God, as Judas was, and is cast into hell. The reference is not to a true believer receiving some kind of judgment; while the verb "take away" is regularly connected to the judgment of unbelievers in Scripture (Matthew 13:12; 21:43; 22:13; 24:39; 25:28-29; Mark 4:15, 25; Luke 8:12, 18; 11:52; 19:24, 26), believers are never said to be "taken away" by God in any of the 102 verses

---

892 "Sanctification, then, is the invariable result of that vital union with Christ which true faith gives to a Christian. 'He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit' (John 15:5). The branch which bears no fruit is no living branch of the vine. The union with Christ which produces no effect on heart and life is a mere formal union, which is worthless before God. The faith which has not a sanctifying influence on the character is no better than the faith of devils. It is a "dead faith, because it is alone." It is not the gift of God. It is not the faith of God's elect. In short, where there is no sanctification of life, there is no real faith in Christ. True faith worketh by love. It constrains a man to live unto the Lord from a deep sense of gratitude for redemption. It makes him feel that he can never do too much for Him that died for him. Being much forgiven, he loves much. He whom the blood cleanses, walks in the light. He who has real lively hope in Christ, purifieth himself even as He is pure (James 2:17-20; Titus 1:1; Galatians 5:6; 1 John 1:7; 3:3)" (pg. 15, *Holiness: Its Nature, Hinderances, Difficulties, and Roots,* J. C. Ryle, part 1. Pensacola, FL: Chapel Library, 2001 (repr. of London, 1879 ed.)).

where the verb is found in the New Testament (contrast John 16:22). Those "taken away" are the lost. In contrast, the Father, the husbandman (v. 1, cf. 1 Corinthians 3:9; Isaiah 5:1-2; 27:2-3) works with the branch that is vitally connected to the vine, and by "pruning" him brings about the result of even greater fruit-bearing. The fruit-bearing for the one with genuine spiritual life is certain, as is the fact that the unconverted will not bear fruit and will be cut off. We can see in this verse the perseverance of the saints, by divine grace, and the inability of the unregenerate to persevere (1 John 2:19). Verse two contrasts the false believer, represented by Judas, and the true believer, represented by the other eleven apostles, in the church.

One can note as well that it is taking the metaphor beyond what can be justified when an Arminian affirms that the branch that is cast off, representing the person who goes to hell, shows that truly justified people can fall from a state of justification, for the branch that bears fruit—the truly regenerate person, is also "purged" or pruned—which involves cutting off leaves and branches! If the lost man fell away from salvation because he was cut off from the vine, would not the fruit-bearing person be lost as well, because he also is purged or pruned?

3 Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.
ἤδη ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν λελάληκα ὑμῖν.

The Lord had stated in John 13:10 that His apostles were clean, but not all; but now Judas having been separated from the church, all to whom the Lord spoke were now clean. They were all washed (John 13:10, perfect tense) through the agency of the word spoken (here in v. 3, likewise perfect tense), so that they were justified by Christ's righteousness at the point of their faith in His promise, with continuing results in their eternal security. Consequently all that now remained was the work of progressive sanctification, of having their feet washed, 13:10, since they were clean every whit. *Clean* here and *purge* in v. 2 are the noun and verb forms, respectively, of *katharos*. There is a wordplay between the purging/cleansing of v. 2 and the cleansing of v. 3. This demonstrates that the instrumentality of the bearing of more fruit, as mentioned in v. 2, is the Word of God, v. 3, cf. John 17:17. The Word is the "pruning knife" (v. 2) which the Father employs to strengthen the believer to bear more fruit. Saints bear fruit as a result of their living, vital union to the Lord Jesus Christ, through the instrument of the Scriptures, the recorded, perfectly inspired and preserved record of Christ's Words. God the Father continues sanctifying (v. 2, *purgeth*) the one who has become clean (v. 3) through justification.

4 Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me.
μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. καθὼς τὸ κλῆμα οὐ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐὰν μὴ μείνῃ ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ μείνητε.

The aorist imperative "abide" here indicates the characteristic of the whole life of the saint, not a momentary action, or repeated points of faith-decisions to surrender to Christ; cf. the aorists of *meno* in Matthew 10:11; 26:38; John 1:32. Commenting on the like form in v. 9, A. T. Robertson in his *Word Pictures* stated that *meinate* is a "Constative

first aorist active imperative of *meno*, summing up the whole." A similar aorist for keeping Christ's commandments appears in John 14:15. Remaining, continuing, persevering, or abiding as a characteristic of the whole life is the mark of the genuine convert, John 8:31. He will abide because Christ and the Spirit dwell or abide in him, and thus make certain his continued perseverance or abiding, 1 John 2:24, 27. "Abide in me" means to continue in Christ's word and commandments, John 15:7 and 10, to remain united to Him. The true convert, because he is in Christ and Christ is in him, will persevere in unity with the Lord, and one would expect him to remain in unity with His church, which is His body, as well. There is also a connection between the second half of the command, "and I in you," v. 4, and Christ's words abiding in believers, v. 7. One notes that the imperative in v. 4 covers both halves of the abiding; saints are responsible for both the "abide in Me" and for the "and I in you." Advocates of the position that only Christians that have received the "higher life" abide typically do not say that Christ only indwells those on the higher plane—but here those that abide in Christ are those who Christ abides in Himself. It is noteworthy that the commands here are all plural, addressed to the corporate pre-Pentecost church. Is there not a corporate, assembly requirement here for the church to be abiding in Christ, and Christ in the assembly, and His Words in her, as well as an individual application to do the same? In any case, the individual aspect is certainly found in Scripture, 1 John 3:24—the individual who abides or dwells in Christ individually keeps His commandments by the power of the indwelling Spirit.

No spiritual fruit, no good works, are possible without a living union to Christ, without abiding or dwelling in Him, a state brought about by regeneration (cf. also Hosea 14:8; Galatians 2:20; Philippians 1:11). On its own, "the branch cannot bear fruit of itself," for the unregenerate man cannot in any way please God (Romans 8:7-8). However, saints can and do bear fruit, for they do abide or dwell in Christ.

That Christ commands His saints to abide or remain in Him does not require the possibility that they will fail to do so; rather, as has been demonstrated above, their continuing to abide is guaranteed by the Spirit's dwelling or abiding in them (1 John 2:24, 27). Only those who overcome will enter into life (Revelation 2:7, 10, 17, 26; 3:21), but all believers will overcome (1 John 5:5; 4:4). Their continuing to abide in Christ is as certain as Christ's continuing to abide or dwell in them.

Note that Christ was in them; contrast Judas, who had Satan in him (6:70; 13:27), and consequently went into open apostasy. Christ is in His saints, and there He controls them and leads them to do righteousness and continue faithful to His Words, so they will not go into apostasy, but will abide in Him. The Lord Jesus does this in part through His sending of the Spirit, the Paraclete, who is such a prominent part of the discourse of John 14-16 which surrounds the teaching of John 15:1ff. The Lord also guarantees the saints' perseverance through His high priestly ministry (John 17, the postcontext of John 15). Christ's High Priestly intercession guarantees believers both God's preservation of their souls unto eternal life (John 17:24) and their perseverance in obedience (John 17:17).

5 I am the vine, ye *are* the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing.
ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα. ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος φέρει καρπὸν πολύν· ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν.

The believer, who will abide (present tense) or remain faithful to Christ's Word and commandments as a pattern of his life, will bring forth much fruit; good works are the certain consequence of spiritual union with Christ (John 3:19-21; 8:31; 10:27; 12:24-26; Mark 8:34-36; Matthew 13:23; Romans 6:22; Galatians 5:18-24; Ephesians 2:10; Colossians 1:6). In contrast, the unregenerate man cannot bear any spiritual fruit or do any good works. The "much fruit" phrase is found here in v. 5 and in v. 8, as "more fruit" appears in v. 2 (and "fruit" with "more fruit" certainly looks like "much fruit"). The only previous appearance of the phrase in the New Testament is in John 12:24,[893] where "much fruit" is a result of Christ's death. Living union with the Christ who died and rose again, a position in the vine, results in the bearing of much fruit. Those who are united to Him bear much fruit and are disciples, saved people, John 15:8.

6 If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast *them* into the fire, and they are burned.
ἐὰν μή τις μείνῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, καὶ ἐξηράνθη, καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλουσι, καὶ καίεται.

The one who does not, as a summary of his life, abide (aorist tense), or continue faithful to Christ, is cast into hell fire, where he will be continually burned (present tense) for all eternity. The branch without genuine connection to the Lord pictures an unregenerate person with only an outward profession of Christianity. John 15:6 does not picture a loss of reward for a disobedient believer. Other than John 15:6, the verbs "cast forth" (*ballo*)

---

893 It should be noted that in John 12:24 the "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die" clause clearly refers to conversion, as is evident from v. 25 and parallel passages. The text is not about post-conversion growth in sanctification or power for Christian ministry by the believer's greater surrender to Christ as taught by Keswick leaders such as Watchman Nee (see *The Release of the Spirit;* cf. pg. 83, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee; pg. 183, *Against the Tide*, Angus Kinnear. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1973; for other Keswick leaders, see pgs. 274-280, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson; pg. 201, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford). The Keswick misinterpretation of John 12:24 follows the view of Hannah W. Smith, who ties John 12:24 into Romanist mysticism, deification, and a rejection of the total depravity of man:

> I see your difficulty in regard to that pessimistic view of human nature, and I don't agree with it anymore than you do. That was the old-fashioned theology[.] . . . [What] attracted me . . . was the profound philosophy . . . concerning the death of the selfish life in us. . . . [W]e are created human beings but are called to become divine beings. It is a question of moving out of a lower form of being into a higher. It is as if the choice were deliberately put before a monkey whether he would like to become a man. He is good enough as a monkey perhaps, but if he is to develop into a man he must consent to let the monkey nature die and must receive the man nature in its place. He must lose his own lower life in order to find his own higher life. . . . . We are good enough perhaps as human beings . . . but we want to be more than human, we want to become "partakers of the Divine nature," and the only way out of one life into another must be by the way of death and resurrection. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone." . . . Fenelon's whole teaching is to show us how to let the lower life die, and the higher life take its place. Doesn't this give you the clue? And doesn't it also answer your question as to what the "Higher Life" so called is? It is the divine life lived out practically, to put it in short. I'll send you my "Christian's Secret," which . . . contains my "views" on the subject. (Letter to Mary, October 9, 1881, reproduced in the entry for October 30 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter)

Certainly believers should surrender in ever fuller ways to God, but John 12:24 does not deal with this truth, but refers to the moment of repentant faith and conversion. The Keswick Higher Life theology of Hannah W. Smith and those who followed her is entirely absent from the passage. Hannah Smith's rejection of total depravity and acceptance of Roman Catholic mystical quietism and deification are in the sharpest conflict with the entire Bible.

and "burned" (*kaio*) are found together only in Revelation 8:8 and 19:20. Neither reference speaks of believers being cast forth or burned. Revelation 19:20 (cf. 20:11-15; 21:8, "the lake which burneth (*kaio*) with fire and brimstone"), however, demonstrates that the lost will be "cast (*ballo*) . . . into a lake of fire burning (*kaio*) with brimstone." Furthermore, out of 125 instances of the verb "cast forth" (*ballo*) in the New Testament, believers are never once said to be cast forth by God, but the lost are, over and over again, said to be cast (*ballo*) into the fires of hell (note Matthew 3:10; 5:13, 25, 29-30; 7:19; 13:42, 48; 18:8-9; Mark 9:42 (cf. vv. 41-48), 45, 47; Luke 3:9; 12:58; 14:35; Revelation 2:22; 12:4, 9, 13; 14:19; 18:21; 19:20; 20:3, 10, 14-15). Thus, the verse indicates that a lack of fruit is evidence of a non-living connection to the vine. The present tense of *ballo,* in "cast" them into the fire, refers vividly (cf. the present tenses in Matthew 3:10; 7:19; Luke 3:9; Revelation 2:22) to the unconverted being cast into eternal torment. The judgment of the lost in hellfire is associated with a similar plant and fruit-bearing image in John 15 as in Matthew 3:10; 7:19; Luke 3:9. These unregenerate, apostate, "withered" and fruitless branches (cf. Jude 12; Job 8:11-13; James 1:11), of which Judas is the contextual example, are often "cast forth" (also *ballo,* here aorist, as in Mark 9:45, 47; Revelation 20:15) in a certain sense in this life, through outward apostasy from the church, to which they had been outwardly united (cf. Matthew 13:47), whether voluntarily or through church discipline, but their ultimate rejection and separation from the elect will take place at the day of judgment. At that time the wheat and chaff, the branches truly united to Christ and those only professedly so, will be "gathered" (*sunago,* cf. Matthew 3:12; 13:30; 25:32; Luke 3:17) to their respective destinies of eternal joy or torment. The branches without union to Christ will glorify God's justice in their miserable damnation; they will not glorify God here by good works, but they will glorify His justice by their being burned eternally (Ezekiel 15:2-5; Romans 9:22).

Christ in this verse says "if a man" abide not, rather than "if ye abide not," for, Judas having been separated from them, the remaining disciples were all genuine believers.

7 If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.
ἀν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν.

This verse helps provide an understanding of the character of abiding in Christ; it is related to Christ's words abiding in one. Christ's own receive His words (John 17:8). Here again the aorist verb tenses represent the characteristic of a whole life. The promise, "ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done," shows that the Lord will answer the prayers of His children, as their prayers are directed by His Word. Consider as well that while all believers have Christ's words abiding in them, there can be different degrees of this abiding. All believers have received the Word, as Christ prayed for them (John 17:8), but they continue in it to different degrees, resulting in different degrees of fruitfulness.

8 Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.
ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε· καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί.

They already were His disciples, having become such at the moment of their conversion, but their bearing much fruit would evidence this. Fruit bearing is not an uncertain event; by bearing fruit, they "shall" certainly be His disciples in the future, as they certainly were at that time. The Father is certain to receive such glory from them, because the ones He has chosen unto life He has also chosen unto fruitfulness, v. 16. All believers bring forth fruit, and "every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire" (Matthew 3:10). This is the consistent teaching of the entire Bible (Matthew 3:8, 10; 7:16-20; 12:33; 13:8, 26, 21:19, 34, 41, 43; Mark 4:7-8, 29; 11:14; 12:2; Luke 3:8-9; 6:43-44; 8:8; 13:6-7, 9; 20:10; John 4:36; 12:24; 15:2, 4-5, 8, 16; Romans 6:21-22; Galatians 5:22 (contrast 5:19-21); Ephesians 5:9; Philippians 1:11; Hebrews 12:11; 13:15; James 3:17-18). For this purpose of fruit-bearing the Father prunes His saints, v. 2. Since they were good trees, with living connection to Christ, they would bear good fruit as evidence thereof (Luke 6:43-45). Those who are "disciples indeed" will abide, persevere, or continue in His Word, John 8:31.

9 As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love.
καθὼς ἠγάπησέ με ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς· μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ.

They were to abide or continue faithful, continue to love Christ, for "if any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha" (1 Corinthians 16:22). That the aorist of *meno* in this pericope represents a characteristic of what is true in general and at all times, rather than the simple action of a particular point in time, is evidenced in this verse. The Father's love for His Son is certainly something true always, not something restricted to a particular moment, but it receives an aorist in this verse, as does Christ's love for His elect, which is likewise unrestricted temporally; so we would expect the same sort of aorist for "continue/abide" here in relation to the action of the disciples.

10 If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love.
ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου· καθὼς ἐγὼ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρός μου τετήρηκα, καὶ μενω αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ.

Genuine converts will keep Christ's commandments, and thus evidence their continuing love for Christ, just as He continues to love them, John 14:21, 23. Christ's obedience manifested His love for the Father (cf. 14:31) and His Father's love for Him as the sinless Messiah and Mediator, and His eternal Son. The Savior showed He loved the Father by persevering or abiding obedience; so do the saints show their love. Saints abide in Christ (v. 4), in His love (v. 9), and keep His commandments (v. 10). Although these propositions are not strict equivalents, as the tense differentiations in vv. 9-10 between the keeping of the commandments and abiding in Christ's love, and the differentiation between the tenses for Christ's abiding in the Father's love and keeping His commandments demonstrate, they all go together. They are a package deal (cf. 1 John 3:24).

11 These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and *that* your joy might be full.
ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ.

This symbol of the vine was revealed by the Lord so that His joy might remain, continue, or abide in His saints, and they might have full joy. Both things are certain for the saint as a characteristic of life, for the aorist verbs are of the same sort as those earlier in the passage (cf. John 17:13; 16:24). Their abiding obedience and fellowship with their Lord would take place through the Comforter Christ would send upon leaving them, and as the Spirit would abide in them, He would bring them joy (Acts 13:52; Galatians 5:22).

All believers abide in Christ; they persevere in characteristic obedience to Him and fellowship with Him through His Word (John 17:17; Ephesians 5:26; 1 Peter 2:2). The glorious promise to saints, "ye shall abide in Him" (1 John 2:27), should motivate them to ever closer communion with their Lord. Being confident that He which began that good work of sanctification in them will continue it until they reach glory (Philippians 1:6), and that God will sanctify them, spirit, soul, and body (1 Thessalonians 5:23-24) and preserve them to the end (Jude 1; 1 Thessalonians 5:23; 2 Timothy 4:18), they can boldly plead the promises of God concerning their perseverance and sanctification with the Lord who has covenanted to perform those great works in them. Sanctification is their new covenant heritage and certainty (Hebrews 8:10-12)—the certainty of ultimate and absolute victory over sin in glory, and the certainty of God's working in them now both to will and do of His good pleasure (Philippians 2:13; Ephesians 2:10), provides them with a tremendous encouragement to strive for ever greater conformity to and communion with God (Philippians 2:12) and practical holiness of life.

J. Excursus IX: Regeneration and Sanctification Are Connected with the Renewal of the Whole Person, Body, Soul, and Spirit—Not With the Spirit Alone

Some have taught that in regeneration, the old human spirit is replaced with a new sinless human spirit, the old physical human body is entirely unchanged by regeneration, and progressive sanctification affects only the human soul, which is between the perfectly sinless human spirit and the perfectly sinful human body. This view typically reduces the terms "old man" and "new man" to "old human spirit" and "new human spirit."[894] The

[894] For instance, charismatic Word-Faith leader Kenneth Copeland wrote: "When the man is born again, his spirit became a new creature in Christ Jesus, but his mind and body were unchanged" (pg. 3, *Force of Faith*, Kenneth Copeland. Fort Worth, TX: Kenneth Copeland Publications, 1992). Jessie Penn-Lewis, following Andrew Murray, taught this position in her book *Soul & Spirit*. John A. MacMillan wrote: "The new birth brings the life of God into [the] human spirit . . . [i]t is in the renewed spirit that the Holy Spirit dwells . . . the blessed Spirit of God dwells in the . . . surrendered believer, not as another Person but as part of the very nature of the saint . . . 1 Cor. 6:17[.]" (pgs. 6-7, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, January 8, 1950). Watchman Nee "frequently shared that . . . the outer man must

idea that the entire person is not changed by regeneration and sanctification, but the human spirit alone is affected, cannot at all be maintained by Scripture. First, there is no Biblical support whatever for the idea that the "man," whether old or new, is only the "spirit." The terms old and new "man," just like other uses of the term "man," refer to the entire person, body, soul, and spirit. Second, no verse whatever states that the Christian's spirit is totally sinless, the Christian's body is totally sinful, and the Christian's soul is what changes. Third, Scripture teaches that progressive sanctification pertains to the believer's spirit, soul, and body.[895] Sanctification affects the spirit, for the

---

be broken that the inner man (the human spirit with the Holy Spirit) might be released" (pg. 117, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation in the Present Age*, by Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream, 1997). "In regeneration we get a new spirit," Nee taught, rather than being made new in every part (pg. 43, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee), and this new spirit is not able to sin (pg. 45, *ibid*). Some advocates of this position may enlarge the "old man" to include more than just the spirit. Nee also taught that "the new man . . . is the church" (pg. 162, *ibid*.). The position that only the spirit is regenerated passed into the Keswick theology, and from Keswick into the Word-Faith movement, from the doctrine of Deification affirmed as a corollary of the Quaker Divine Seed concept by Lord Mount Temple, founder of the Broadlands Conferences, and Hannah W. Smith. Mr. Mount-Temple prayed: "My Lord Jesus, as Thou didst take my humanity, I pray Thee impart to me Thy Divinity," and he stated that, as with the confession of Christ as one Person with a true Divine and a true human nature at Chalcedon: "I have to record my thanks . . . for deep Churchism at our Conferences . . . [and] for the knowledge that we are all two in one—two natures in one person . . . the Divine and the human" (pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890). Hannah W. Smith in particular and Broadlands in general connected the sinless spirit, the idea that "[w]ithin us is an intense life which nothing can touch . . . [o]ur law of life within," with "the germ of the Christ-life . . . the Divine seed in every one" (pgs. 178-181, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). At Broadlands, the idea that only "the human spirit," not the entire human person, was the "templ[e]" of God in which He dwelt, was associated with "Druidic philosophy" (pgs. 88-89, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

[895] "Sanctification . . . [is] real . . . not merely . . . imputed, as is righteousness. Holiness is not merely "accounted to men," so that they are treated as though holy, but they are made holy. Holiness becomes the characteristic of their natures. It is habitually exercised in their lives. It will eventually be possessed in perfection. It is real and in no sense only virtual. . . . It is of the whole nature. The renewed nature, given in regeneration, shows that sanctification includes the whole spiritual part of man. It is not to be confined to mere outward actions. God's spiritual nature demands not only spiritual worship, but holy spiritual emotions and affections; and these belong to the heart. Hence the need of inward conformity to his will and commands is so especially set forth in the New Testament, as to mark its teachings as essentially spiritual. We are also plainly taught that between the outward fruit, and the inward condition, is such a connection that the latter is the actual producing power of the former, and is manifested by it. Matthew 12:33-35; Luke 6:43-45.

But sanctification is to be extended to the body likewise. Its appetites and passions are to be controlled, wicked actions are to cease, and unholy habits to be put away, the members of the body are to be mortified, all filthiness of the flesh to be cleansed, good works are to be exhibited to mankind, and such high moral duties to be performed as are imposed upon Christians as obligatory towards each other and the world.

The Scriptures exhort to sanctification of the whole nature, both body and soul. See 2 Corinthians 7: 1; Ephesians 4:17-24; Colossians 3:5-10; 1 Thessalonians 5:23. That of the body alone is urged. [Likewise the] apostle tells the Ephesians about his prayers for their spiritual sanctification. Ephesians 1:17-19." (pgs. 3-4, Chapter 37, "Sanctification," *Abstract of Systematic Theology*, James Petigru Boyce. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006)

Christian must be "renewed in the spirit" (Ephesians 4:22) and can properly sing David's psalm (cf. Ephesians 5:19), "renew a right spirit within me" (Psalm 51:10). Sanctification affects the body (cf. Psalm 63:1), for the body of the believer is the temple of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:19), so were the body absolutely and unchangeably sinful in this life, the Holy Spirit would have chosen as His temple a house that is absolutely and unchangeably sinful. The believer's body is to be "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" (Romans 12:1)—such a command is impossible if the body is unchangeably sinful. Paul tells the Thessalonian Christians that the "will of God, even your sanctification," is "that ye should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour; not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles which know not God" (1 Thessalonians 4:3-5), so sanctification is here defined as having a holy body, one that does not commit fornication but is holy and pure. Scripture refers to the believer seeking to be "holy both in body and in spirit" (1 Corinthians 7:34), which would be senseless if the Christian's spirit is already sinless and the Christian's body is entirely sinful and unchangeable. Similarly, Scripture commands believers to "cleanse [themselves] from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God," (2 Corinthians 7:1), indicating that progressive sanctification, the perfecting of holiness and cleansing of the saint, pertains to both the body and spirit. The progressive renewal that begins with regeneration pertains to both the body and the spirit.[896] Fourth, Paul's prayer that God would "sanctify" the Thessalonian church members "wholly," that their "whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless" (1 Thessalonians 5:23), makes no sense unless progressive sanctification renews the whole person.[897] Fifth, Scripture regularly relates sanctification

---

[896] "Present sanctification affects the body, as it serves at the behest of one's dominant motives. The body's members decrease as servants of sin and increase as servants of righteousness as the *mind is continually renewed* by the Holy Spirit (Rom 12:2). This is the theological basis of the Pauline injunction, "Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the *flesh and spirit*" (2 Cor 7:1). The futility of the *mind* and its darkened *understanding* in its unsaved state led to "*sensuality* for the practice of every kind of impurity with greediness" (Eph 4:17–19). A depraved *mind* led the wicked to *do* those things which are not proper (Rom 1:28). Sanctification addresses both mind and body," although "the immaterial aspect of the Christian is the primary focus of present sanctification . . . because the immaterial aspect is the seat of the human personality." Furthermore, "[t]he promise of a transformed body [in ultimate or future sanctification] has as its underpinning the fact that just as we have borne the image of Adam in our unsaved state, we most assuredly will ultimately bear the image of Christ, the second man and last Adam—the Lord from heaven, in the resurrection (1 Cor 15:45, 47)" (pgs. 144, 149, *A Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity*, *Vol. 3: The Doctrines of Salvation, the Church, and Last Things*, McCune).

[897] "There was probably a threefold reference in the apostle's request [in 1 Thessalonians 5:23]. First, he prayed that all the members of the Thessalonian church, the entire assembly, might be sanctified [which, one notes, presumes a regenerate church membership]. Second, he prayed that each individual member might be sanctified entirely in his whole man, spirit and soul and body. Third, he prayed that each and all of them might be sanctified more perfectly, moved to press forward unto complete holiness. 1 Thessalonians

to the entire human person, body, soul, and spirit. The entire "new man" is being progressively[898] "renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Colossians 3:10). Sanctification does not pertain to one part of man only, but to the entire person (John 17:17; Acts 20:32; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 6:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:23; Hebrews 2:11). Finally, while Scripture alone, not history, is authoritative, advocates of a sinless spirit are in the company of "the Gnostics . . . [who] held . . . that the πνεῦμα in man was part of the divine essence, and incapable of sin,"[899] and according to the "Manichaean[s] . . . the spirit . . . is that essential core of man which is already redeemed, which no longer needs redemption."[900]

5:23 is almost parallel with Hebrews 13:20, 21. The apostle prayed that all the parts and faculties of the Christian might be kept under the influence of efficacious grace, in true and real conformity to God; so influenced by the Truth as to be fitted and furnished, in all cases and circumstances, for the performance of every good work. Though this be our bounden duty, yet it lies not absolutely in our own power, but is the work of God in and through us; and thus is to form the subject of earnest and constant prayer.

Two things are clearly implied in the above passage. First, that the whole nature of the Christian is the subject of the work of sanctification, and not merely part of it: every disposition and power of the spirit, every faculty of the soul, the body with all its members. The body too is "sanctified." It has been made a member of Christ (1 Corinthians 6:15), it is the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:19). As it is an integral part of the believer's person, and as its inclinations and appetites affect the soul and influence conduct, it must be brought under the control of the spirit and soul, so that "every one of us should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honor" (1 Thessalonians 4:4), and "as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity, even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness" (Romans 6:19). Second, that this work of Divine grace will be carried on to completion and perfection, for the apostle immediately adds, 'Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it' (1 Thessalonians 5:24). Thus the two verses are parallel with 'Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will finish it until the day of Jesus Christ' (Philippians 1:6). Nothing short of every faculty and member of the Christian being devoted to God is what he is to ever aim at. But the attainment of this is only completely realized at his glorification: 'We know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him" (1 John 3:2)—not only inwardly but outwardly: 'Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body' (Philippians 3:21)." Pgs. 70-71, *Doctrine of Sanctification,* chap. 9, Arthur Pink.

898 Note that the present participle *renewed*, ἀνακαινούμενον, specifies a continuing action.

899 pg. 51, *Systematic Theology: Anthropology*, Charles Hodge. Vol. 2; sec. 2:2. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003 (repr. ed.). It is also interesting that through the "Gnostics . . . the word ψυχικός, originally the opposite of πνευματικός, came to denote a new category midway between the πνευματικός and the σαρκικός" (γινώσκω, γνῶσις, etc. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. & ed. F. Bromiley).

The Word of Faith heresy also advocates an extreme trichotomy in which "man's 'true inner self' [is] fundamentally divine, residing exclusively in his spirit, in radical contradistinction to his body and soul, transmuted by demonic powers . . . [which is] characteristic of gnostic mythology. . . . Man is *not* a spirit being who possesses a soul and just happens to live in a body, as the [Word of] Faith teachers claim; rather, man is an integrated being of spirit, soul, and body" (Pg. 121, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell). And certainly it is horrible blasphemy to say: "God is spirit, soul, and body. You are spirit, soul, and body" (pg. 136, *God's Laws of Success*, Robert Tilton).

900 Pg. 176, *Christ in Christian Tradition, Reception and Contradiction: The development of the discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the beginning of the reign of Justinian*, vol. 2:1, Aloys Grillmeier, trans. Pauline Allen and John Cawte. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1987.

The affirmation in 1 Corinthians 6:17 that "he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" would only prove that the believer literally has the sinless spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ if in the previous verse "he which is joined to an harlot is one body" means that, when one commits fornication with a prostitute, one's body disappears and is replaced with the harlot's body. Furthermore, if the phraseology of 1 Corinthians 6:17 proves that the believer literally has Christ's sinless spirit instead of his own personal human spirit, then it would seem that all the members of the church at Philippi would have had only one human spirit to share among them all, and only one human soul, since Paul stated that they "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind [*pseuche*, soul] striving together for the faith of the gospel" (Philippians 1:27). The believers at Jerusalem would likewise have had only one soul among them all, and only one heart, for "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul" (Acts 4:32). For that matter, everyone in the tribe of Judah would have had only one physical heart, since "in Judah the hand of God was to give them one heart" (2 Chronicles 30:12). Similarly, the believers at Rome were to have among them all only "one mind and one mouth" (Romans 15:6). How they all were able to eat if they only had one mouth to share among them is hard to understand.

The fact is that the *old man* refers to the entirety of the unregenerate individual, and the *new man* refers to the entirety of the regenerate individual. The believer is changed in his entire being, body, soul, and spirit. Furthermore, while he unquestionably has a glorious spiritual union with Jesus Christ, his body, soul, and spirit are all still his own, and he does not have a sinlessly perfect portion of his being until glorification.

Excursus X: An Excerpt from "A Warning Exhortation Against Pietists, Quietists, and all Who in a Similar Manner have Deviated to a Natural and Spiritless Religion under the Guise of Spirituality," by Wilhelmus à Brakel[901]

[901] The text comes from pgs. 639-699 of "A Warning Exhortation Against Pietsts, Quietists, and all Who in a Similar Manner have Deviated to a Natural and Spiritless Religion under the Guise of Spirituality," chapter 43 in vol. 2 of *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, Wilhelmus à Brakel, trans. Bartel Elshout. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 1993. While Brakel originally wrote his work in 1700 to combat the Satanic pseudo-spirituality and mysticism of his day, the Roman Catholic and Quaker mysticism he spoke against left such a stamp upon later pseudo-spirituality that will be discussed in the following excurses that his penetrating insight is amazing and extremely timely. Nevertheless, the fine discernment expresssed by Brakel in this excerpt does not constitute an endorsement of whatever runs contrary to Scripture and Biblical, historic Baptist doctrine and practice in the Dutch *Nadere Reformatie* or Dutch Puritan movement.

Further, concerning Brakel's assault upon "pietism," Arie de Reuver notes:

> Brakel . . . as a writer may without any hesitation be regarded as a representative of pietism when he is measured by contemporary standards. The content that the term "pietism" had for him was different from what it carries today. . . . By "pietism," à Brakel means "fanaticism," which he associates with quietists, Quakers, and followers of David Joris, and which is reflected in figures like Böhme, De Molinos, Fénelon and also De Labadie. . . . [T]heir piety gives the pretension of spirituality but rests entirely on the natural

Among those who espouse blind popery—whose religion does not differ much from paganism—there have always been those who have rejected creature-worship and who have written much about *internal* religion, elevating this as highly as their natural intellect would permit them. These persons are referred to as *mystical writers* (that is, *hidden writers*) since the general public did not achieve such a level of contemplation, such elevation of spirit having been concealed from them. Today many are very fond of the word *mystical*, as if it implies a high level of spirituality. . . . [Such] have little to say about the Lord Jesus as being the ransom and righteousness of sinners—about how He, by a true faith, must be used unto justification and in approaching unto God, beholding in His countenance the glory of God, and practicing true holiness as originating in Him and in union with Him. . . . Numerous imaginations originating in empty minds, natural speculations, deceptions of Satan, dreams, and zealotry go under the name of mysticism . . . [including] the *Quakers*[.] . . .

[The Roman Catholic] Michael de Molinos . . . rejected all external exercises of religion and proposed that one need only be in a quiet and introverted frame God-ward in order to be irradiated by Him. . . . [He sought] the elimination of all external activity, including the activity of the intellect and any spiritual elation. This would consist in being totally divorced from self, being elevated above all things, being fully united with God, and in passive reflection to lose one's self fully in God, thus worshiping Him in pure love. This is how far the illusions and vain speculations of the natural man—who is void of the Spirit and ignorant of God—can go. Since he excluded all external and spiritual motions and promoted quietness in both areas, his followers, many of whom are to be found among Papists and various sects, are called *Quietists*, that is, *those who are quiet or at rest*.

Some years after Molinos, François de Salignac de Lamothe Fenelon, [Roman Catholic] Archbishop of Cambrai, published . . . *The Exposition of the Fundamental*

---

mind and is developed through fantasy and imagination. . . . [and the] mediatorship of Christ is disregarded by these "mystics." . . . [T]he "pietists" . . . procee[d] apart from and even against the written word of God. . . . Brakel . . . regards contemplation as completely legitimate. However, he wants to distinguish sharply between natural and spiritual contemplation . . . [the latter of which] contemplates God-for-us as he makes himself known in Christ as a reconciling Father. . . . natural contemplation leaves man as he is naturally, [while] spiritual contemplation lets him share increasingly in the divine nature. . . . [Furthermore,] the Spirit always directs people to Christ as their ransom and righteousness, and . . . he leads the believer in everything according to the word. . . . God . . . satisfies one engaged in spiritual reflection with extraordinary and further . . . revelations of himself, acording to his promises in John 14:21 and 23, and he allows [the soul] to see God more closely and experiece who God is and what he is to h[im] in Jesus Christ . . . [yet] contemplation is not the result of one's own activity and effort, but of divine illumination. It is entirely the Spirit who imparts this insight. But the Spirit does not work apart from Christ or from faith in the word. (pgs. 251-254, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation*, Arie de Reuver, trans. James A. De Jong)

Propositions of the Saints, or, Inner [Spiritual] Life). It is truly not a spiritual book. Fabricated spiritual matters—which are neither to be found in Holy Writ, nor in the practice of the saints—are elevated in a natural manner to as high a level as natural reflection can possibly bring them. He is of the same mold as Molinos and the previous mystical writers among the Papists. They teach a love (or lovelessness), a beholding of God and union with God to consist in some nonessential fancy contrary to the Word of God. This Word teaches us to behold God in the face of Christ as He reveals Himself in the work of redemption. As such God is known and believed by the truly regenerate and true believers. This renders them joy in, and love for, God, causing them to glorify God.

The difference between the self-denial, love, beholding of God, etc., of the mystics and of the truly godly consists in this: The mystics comprehend, say, and do everything according to their natural intellect, fantasy, and imagination, doing so without the Spirit. They do not make use of the Lord Jesus (that is, as a ransom, and righteousness unto justification and peace), as being the only way of approach unto God, and unto true and genuine sanctification. Such exercises and this way are hidden from them. Those, however, who are truly godly, regenerate, and who truly believe, live by faith and not by sight. In all things they make use of the Lord Jesus. They come to the Father by Him, accustom themselves to behold God in the face of Jesus Christ, do everything as in the presence of God, and walk before God's countenance in humility, fear, love, and obedience. These are the old paths. From this you can observe that the difference between the mystics and the truly godly is as the difference between imagination and truth; between being natural and without the Spirit and being led by the Spirit; between worldly and heavenly; between seeking an unknown God and serving the true God; and between being engaged without, and contrary to, the Holy Scriptures (dabbling with invisible things), and living according to the written Word of God. A truly godly person remains humble and serves God in Spirit and truth, and is thus kept from the temptation of entertaining high-minded and fabricated imaginations. . . .

I shall state and defend some propositions whereby the errors will be evident and whereby a believer, holding fast to those truths, will be delivered from their temptations.

PROPOSITION 1: *A Christian must have a great love for the truth; all splendid pretense void of love for the truth is deceit.* . . . [T]his truth is the seed of regeneration; that is, it is the means whereby man is drawn out of darkness into marvelous light. "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth" (James 1:18); "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Pet 1:23). He who therefore neither knows nor has the truth cannot be regenerated. If he is not regenerated, however, all his speaking about spiritual things is

but the work of nature and he is entirely devoid of the truth. . . . [T]he truth is the means, fountain, and rule from which holiness issues forth and according to which it must be regulated. Holiness is the loving observance of truth. "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ" (Eph 4:14-15). The Lord Jesus when praying for holiness for His own, beseeches that it may come about by the truth. "Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy word is truth" (John 17:17). If the heart is to be purified, it must occur by means of the truth. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit" (1 Pet 1:22). He who lives in sin is a slave and servant of sin. He who is set free from sin is set free by the truth—a truth comprehended and known well. "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). To live holily is to walk in the truth. "... even as thou walkest in the truth. I have no greater joy than to hear that my children walk in truth" (3 John 3-4). Someone who neither knows nor has the truth cannot be holy. Whatever he manifests is but the natural work of an unconverted person. Every step which deviates from the truth is impure and causes impurity in the way of holiness. . . . If we love the truth, we shall hate all that is opposed to the truth, however insignificant it may be[.] . . . One cannot trifle with the truth. It is too precious a gift from God[,] and God takes notice of how we deal with it. . . . [N]ot only is it contrary to God's will to have fellowship with error, but also with those who espouse error. . . . Thus, every [church] member must be on guard against intermingling with those who espouse false doctrine. Hear what the command is: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you" (2 Cor 6:14-15,17). If you stand in awe of God's majesty, if you tremble at His Word, and if the truth is precious to you, be on guard against false doctrine, false teachers, and for men who are mired in error, however attractive they may appear to be. Let your heart be governed by the exhortation of the apostle: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed" (2 John 1:10); that is, have no fellowship with him and avoid him so that you will not be drawn away from the truth by him in the least. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches

deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom 16:17-18).

How necessary it is to carefully heed this proposition! Compare yourself to this. Do you have such a tender love for the truth? Is it that precious to you? Do you joyfully give thanks to God for it? Do you live according to it? Do you engage in battle on its behalf? Do you indeed abhor all error and those who espouse it? Are you fearful and concerned about associating with such persons? If such is the case with you, then you are not in danger of being misled by the elevated language of [false teachers such as mystical quietists], for you will immediately perceive whether they have and promote either the truth or error, and whether they have love for the truth. . . .

PROPOSITION 2: *A Christian must have great love and esteem for the church*. . . . He who . . . view[s] the church from every dimension with a spiritual eye and heart, will not only be ignited with love for the congregation and, with ecstasy, stand in awe of the glory of the church, but he will also be provoked to holy wrath against all those who would dare to undertake anything which is detrimental to the church. The [comments] above will give sufficient reasons to be on guard against the delusions of [mystical quietists]. They exert every effort to ruin the church—if this were possible. They reject the church, church order, the divine commission of ministers, the ministry of the Word . . . [t]hey thus make themselves guilty of the abominable sin of despising the congregation of God. " . . . or despise ye the church of God" (1 Cor 11:22). He who despises the church of God despises God Himself and the riches of His goodness, and will not escape the judgment of God. Even though the one [Quietist] espouses this and another person again different heresies and errors, all of them holding to opinions of their own, they agree in this respect that their religion consists in stripping themselves as being nothing (in reference to God, that is), and in the contemplation upon an imaginary and fabricated God. They ascend in this as far as their natural perception will enable them, which to such darkened individuals appears as wondrous light and as being wondrously spiritual. Occasionally they come together to listen to someone speak of these matters. Their religion furthermore consists in manifesting an indiscriminate love for people of various sects—even as far as the wallet is concerned. He who has no love for the church has no love for God. He who is engaged in battling the church is battling God and will endure His judgment. . . . [T]hey make a great display of spirituality and thereby gain entrance with the upright. They thus lead them away from the church and from true religion. Therefore you must, first of all, keep in mind what their objective is, and from that perspective judge their fair speeches. However, do not permit yourself to be ensnared by these fair speeches, nor to be tempted to the commission of the dreadful sin of leaving the church and engaging in battle against her. "He that gathereth not with me scattereth

abroad" (Matt 12:30).

PROPOSITION 3: *The Holy Scriptures are the only rule for doctrine and life.* In the first proposition we have demonstrated how precious and lovely the truth is, and that he who loves the truth, hating all who deviate therefrom, will withdraw himself from all who depart from the truth—and thus also from the *Pietists*. In the second proposition we have discussed the esteem and love which all lovers of the church have for the people or congregation of God from which the [quietists] are separated. To this we shall now add the preciousness and loveliness of *the Word of God*, in which all saving truth is comprehended, upon which the church is built, and which God has given to the church for the purpose of preserving and spreading it. This the [quietists] either reject or minimize.

God has caused the way of salvation (there being but one, which is hidden from the natural man) to be recorded so that His people would have a steadfast rule of doctrine and life, and be protected against the deceits of Satan. . . . God has furthermore given such a record in order that the church be protected against the deceits of men who make use of craftiness, causing people to err in a subtle manner. He has also done so in order that everyone would be protected against his own heart which carries within it the seed of all heresy and error. This way of salvation, having thus been recorded, has been entrusted to the church in order that she would preserve it in its purity, transmit it from generation to generation and from nation to nation, proclaiming it everywhere unto the conversion of men, to lead the converted to the church, and to govern the faith and life of the members of the church.

The Word of God is the foundation upon which the church is built (Eph 2:19-20), the insignia of the true church, the nourishment of the church, the only rule of faith and life, and the sword against the enemies who err and battle against the truth—it is everything to the church. There is no church without the Word and there is no Word without the church. . . . The Spirit who has inspired the Word and causes believers to perceive, taste, and experience those matters contained in the Word, assures them of the divinity of that Word. He does this not only by means of its inherent evidences of divinity, but also by way of immediate operation in their hearts. . . . Even though a natural man reads and hears of the mysteries of the Word of God, he does not understand them unless God by His Spirit makes them known to his soul by immediate revelation. . . . [Quietists] lack this spiritual light. They have natural light concerning God's majesty and the insignificance of the creature. They perceive that man's felicity consists in the beholding of God; and by means of the Holy Scriptures their natural light becomes increasingly clear. Since these persons do not understand the spiritual mysteries, they

occupy themselves with a natural beholding of God, imagining that their natural perceptions are wondrously spiritual, and far exceed the Word and that of those who are truly illuminated. Yet such perceptions are nothing but fabrications and illusions which deprive them of salvation.

Not only do the Holy Scriptures contain mysteries, but they also contain all mysteries which God wills His children to know, and which are needful for their spiritual functioning here and the enjoyment of felicity hereafter. Therefore, to teach spiritual matters or spiritual exercises which have neither been revealed nor prescribed in God's Word is deceit. . . .There is nothing lacking in the Word—neither small nor great, low nor high. "The law of the Lord is perfect" (Ps 19:7). He who either adds to or subtracts from it shall have no part in all the promises recorded in the Word. Rather, all the curses which are declared in the Word will come upon them (Deut 4:2; Rev 22:18-19). . . .The Word of God is "able to make thee wise unto salvation ... and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim 3:15-17). One cannot desire anything beyond this; he who fabricates something else accuses God's Word of being deficient. God demands nothing beyond this; he who demands, seeks, and does something apart from Scripture cannot please God with his will-worship. . . .

The Holy Scriptures are the only rule for doctrine and life. He who wishes to live godly and desires to be saved must regulate his intellect, will, affections, words, deeds, and entire religion according to this Word. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa 8:20); "Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto all Thy commandments. Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? by taking heed thereto according to Thy Word" (Ps 119:6,9); "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God" (1 Pet 4:11). Therefore—whoever you may be—if you love godliness and salvation, if you have esteem and reverence for God, you ought also to have respect and esteem for the revealed will of God which, by the goodness of God, has been given to us unto salvation. Let this Word be your only rule . . . and you will walk surely. . . .

If the Word of God is so precious to you, if you love it so, and if you make it your rule for faith and life, you will be immune to the delusion of the [Quietists]. If you are taken in and shaken by their speech—having the appearance of spirituality—and you turn to the Word of God, you will immediately perceive that it is not according to the Word, that the Word of God does not speak in that fashion, and that God does not lead His children in such a manner; the Word of God will be a shield to you.

When you encounter them, you must investigate first of all what knowledge of,

esteem for, and study they make of the Word. You will then perceive that some reject it entirely, ignore it, and will not respond to your investigation. Others will perceive it as a primer, from which little ones and beginners derive benefit; they contend that one must ascend beyond the Word and engage in more elevated contemplations. However, they will either deny or be silent about the fact that the Word has been inspired by God and has been appointed to be the only and eternal rule—which you may interpret as a denial. Others, who do not perceive the spirituality of the Word with their natural eyes, will deem it to be of little value and will view it as a dead letter, having neither spirit nor life. They maintain that those who hold to the Word will never become spiritual. Others, in order not to give the appearance of casting aside the Word, and your being frightened by them, will make use of it in their conversation and will quote such Scripture passages which speak of light, beholding, and spirituality. Investigate them more carefully, however, as to whether they believe the Word of God to be inspired in its entirety, and whether they acknowledge it as the only rule for faith and life. You will then experience that things are not in order here. . . . You thus have sufficient reason to reject them, and to consider all their doings to be but natural (which they truly are), thinking of this passage: "Lo, they have rejected the word of the Lord; and what wisdom is in them?" (Jer 8:9). . . .

PROPOSITION 4: *Regeneration is the originating cause of spiritual life, and of all spiritual thoughts and deeds.* . . . However, the point in question is this: What is regeneration and what change does it bring about in man? . . . Many pagans have . . . excelled in conquering their corruptions and in practicing virtue . . . [h]e who reads Cicero, Seneca, Marcus Antonius, Epictus, and other pagan writers will stand amazed.

Regeneration does also not consist in losing sight of yourself; it does not consist in abstaining from aiming at or seeking prosperity and salvation, or your joy and delight for yourself, and instead lose yourself in nothing else but the beholding of God alone. It does not consist in the reflection upon and beholding of God, in sinking away in God, and in continually bringing yourself in the presence of God. All of that can also be the work of nature; pagans, idolatrous Papists, and other proponents of error do likewise.

It does not consist in the increase of natural light and virtuousness, as if man would be regenerated were light to exceed darkness or virtuousness sin. For,

(1) growth is of the same nature as the principle from which it originates. The principle of light and virtuousness is natural, and thus also the increase in both—regardless of how far it may go.

(2) The natural man, however illuminated, virtuous, humble, and exalted he may be in his beholding of God, is and remains a fool (Rom 1:22), without God and without hope (Eph 2:12), and blind (Eph 4:18; 1 Cor 2:14). Thus, regeneration does not consist in

the increase of the matters [here] mentioned.

(3) If this were so, man would not need to be regenerated; however, he does stand in need of this. Growth is the continuation of a principle which already exists, and not the receiving of a principle of life which did not exist previously. Regeneration is, however, the generation of a principle of a life which did not exist previously, and thus a translation from one state—death, into another state—life.

(4) Regeneration proceeds from the Holy Spirit by means of the gospel; it causes a person to behold God in the face of Jesus Christ, generates spiritual life by union with Christ, and culminates in felicity. None of these things are true for natural light and virtuousness, and they thus differ in their essential nature.

Regeneration is a complete change of man wrought by the Holy Spirit through the Word. This change is both internal and external. It is from death to life, from natural to spiritual, from an earthly disposition to a heavenly disposition, from self and all creatures to Christ, and through Him to God. Regeneration begins in the heart and in the innermost recesses of the soul. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh" (Ezek 36:26). The heart encompasses the intellect, will, and affections.

When someone comes under conviction and receives a desire toward God, he will then initially be in danger of striving for great things. Since natural religion is easier—having the cooperation of nature (true regeneration being contrary to man's nature)—he will very readily be drawn away to [Quietism], which is nothing else but a natural religion. He will thus be in danger of remaining in a natural state and of perishing. . . . When you are in the company of these people (however, I counsel you to avoid them and to stay with the church and the godly in the church), do not be taken back by highly elevated matters which have a great appearance of spirituality and thus are very attractive to beginning Christians. If, however, you ask them to speak about regeneration, you will find them to be ignorant in that respect or to be entirely in error. This will be sufficient for you to see that all their activity is but natural and thus draws away from true holiness and communion with God, and consequently from salvation itself. And if there is someone among them who was truly a partaker of the principle of regeneration prior to joining with them, and thus is able to speak soundly about this, do not allow yourself to be deceived along with him who is deceived. The principle of his life is indeed true and he will be saved, but the hay, straw, and stubble which he has built upon it will be burned. Regeneration is imperfect and we must therefore not follow them in all that they do; they also still sin. They, possessing a spiritual principle, can nevertheless yield somewhat to their nature which is yet in them, and thus can practice self-denial and

behold God in a natural sense. This will cause them to be a Christian of small stature where true growth is absent. Therefore, take heed.

PROPOSITION 5: *A Christian continually avails himself of faith*. . . . In order for someone to be a partaker of [the] Savior, he must respond to [the] offer [in Scripture], go to Christ, receive Him, and entrust himself entirely to Him. This act of faith is not the cause of a person becoming a partaker of Jesus, but only the means. Therefore, whether faith is weak or strong, whether it is exercised with clarity or be it in darkness, whether it is exercised with much ease or much strife, is not of the essence, but rather, whether it is done in truth with the heart. . . .

Faith is the beginning point of whatever believers undertake. Faith is the soul of their activity and permeates everything. By faith they take hold of His strength and thereby are active as though it were their strength. By faith they overcome the world, are united with the fullness of Christ, and become partakers of all His benefits. . . . If you are upon this way and exercise faith in the manner here delineated, see to it that you persevere in the same way. Do not ever depart from this way, for it will safely bring you to the end of your faith . . . [y]ou will be safeguarded against the errors of . . . all . . . who are in error as far as the practice of godliness is concerned. . . .

There are also those who at one time have received Jesus as their Savior. This task having been accomplished, they might as well proceed to perfection and pursue more lofty things. Poor people—as if it were possible to grow, apart from Christ; as if we could live, except by faith and the continual, actual beholding of Christ and being in union with Him; and as if we could bear fruit without continually drawing sap and nourishment from Christ! He who conducts himself in such (or even stranger) fashion, let him be convinced of his error and turn to Christ, in order to make use of Him continually unto . . . sanctification[.] . . . If someone is upright in the exercise of faith, but yet small in grace, let that which has been said be as a beacon. Let him flee from all who do not enter upon this way of faith and who with a great show of spirituality fail to encounter Jesus.

PROPOSITION 6: *All of man's felicity, here and hereafter, consists in communion with and the beholding of God*. . . . This is the most excellent promise: "I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him" (John 14:23); "We will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John 14:23). Their seeing of God agrees with the manner in which God reveals Himself from His side. "And hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true" (1 John 5:20); "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord" (2 Cor 3:18); "For God . . . hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor 4:6). Such is the activity and the exercise of the godly: "I have set the Lord always before me"

(Ps 16:8); " . . . they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of Thy countenance" (Ps 89:15); "My meditation of Him shall be sweet" (Ps 104:34); "How precious also are Thy thoughts unto me, O God! . . . when I awake, I am still with Thee" (Ps 139:17-18). This is sufficient to conclude that the beholding of God is reserved for God's children only. . . . God does not reveal Himself to the world; that is, to the unconverted, to natural men, to those who do not have the Spirit. This is evident in John 14:22, 17, "Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world . . . the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him." . . . Therefore, whatever the natural man writes or speaks concerning reflecting upon, beholding of, and being united to God in love, is nothing more than an illusion.

Although a natural man cannot ascend to the right knowledge and beholding of God, and since God does not reveal Himself to such, he nevertheless knows from nature that God is, and that his felicity consists in communion with God. This is further reinforced by the natural knowledge of the Word of God. As a result, many have engaged themselves in beholding God, so that the beholding of God and the discussion thereof is no evidence of spirituality.

I repeat, many unconverted do engage themselves in beholding God by means of their natural light, or by means of their knowledge of the Word of God.

(1) This is very evident among the heathen, who speak concerning this in their writings, doing so with such lofty expressions that a Christian must be amazed and astonished about it.

(2) This is also evident among the popish mystics and thinkers. They are obviously idolaters, for they worship a piece of bread as their God. They pray to angels and deceased persons and render religious honor to images. They destroy the atonement of the Lord Jesus by their abominable mass and in other ways. They wish to be justified by their own works, and thereby merit heaven. They acknowledge the antichrist to be their head and hate true believers. They are persecutors of the church of the Lord Jesus; and they, either by their contribution or by having pleasure in this, are guilty of the blood of the martyrs, and are thus much more abominable than the heathen and others who function only in the realm of the natural. They write and speak much about divine meditations, doing so with expressions which are as lofty as their imagination can devise—yes, their words even exceed imagination, and if they cannot understand them, others may understand them. If they cannot, they may be amazed about these incomprehensible expressions.

(3) This is also evident among many others (not of the popish religion) who also engage themselves in meditation and reflection about divine things. It is evident that they

neither have a knowledge of nor a love for the truth. They neither have a love for the Word of God nor do they establish it as their only rule for doctrine, thoughts, and life. There is no love for the church (from which they depart), and there is neither love for nor union with the truly godly. They can unite themselves with all manner of devoted people, but cannot tolerate the truly godly who rebuke them by means of their light. They are unacquainted with the nature of true conversion. This is also true for saving faith, they being total strangers of its exercise. . . . [T]hey speak about great things, about being drawn up, about ascending above themselves and above all creatures—yes, dreadful though it be, above God Himself. The language of Balaam is heard among them: "The man whose eyes are open . . . which heard the words of God, which saw the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance" (Num 24:3-4).

From that which has been said, it is very evident that unconverted persons also engage themselves in beholding God. You therefore ought not to be immediately inclined to think that those who speak thus—that is, who in a charming manner speak of extraordinary illumination—are true recipients of grace and are truly spiritual. The blind can also speak of light, the unspiritual of the spiritual, and those who are alienated from God about communion with God, and the loveless about love—doing so not feignedly, but from a heart that thinks to have and speak the truth. You must therefore investigate whether that which they say about beholding God is truly spiritual. Follow the advice of the apostle John: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John 4:1).

In order not to be hastily inclined by word or spirit, attentively take note of what has been said thus far: There is a twofold beholding of God—a *natural* and a *spiritual*.

(1) The *natural* beholding of God is practiced by the unconverted; the *spiritual* beholding of God by those who are true recipients of grace, have truly been regenerated, and truly believe.

(2) The *natural* beholding of God occurs by the light of nature and the external illumination of the Word, by one's own spirit, imagination, and mental powers, and by the drawing of rational conclusions; the *spiritual* beholding of God occurs by the illumination of the Holy Spirit who has drawn believers out of darkness into His marvelous light.

(3) The *natural* beholding of God *has God as its object as He reveals Himself in nature* as the eternal, exalted, and glorious One, etc. In the *spiritual* beholding of God a person *beholds Him in the face of Jesus Christ*; that is, in the manifestation of all the perfections of God in the work of redemption. In such spiritual beholding He reveals Himself at times in an immediate sense as their reconciled God and Father, doing so

occasionally with such light, glory, sweetness, and bliss that it cannot be expressed, and at other times with such expressions as: "I, God, am your God; I am your salvation; I have loved thee with an everlasting love; thou art Mine."

(4) The *natural* beholding of God leaves a man alienated from God; the separation remains. The illusion of being united with God is but a union according to their own imagination, for true union occurs only by way of faith—something they do not possess. The *spiritual* beholding of God brings the soul near to God—yes, unites her with God as belonging to Him. ". . . that they also may be one in *us*" (John 17:21). Oh, blessed unity! Oh, blessed appropriation!

(5) The *natural* beholding of God leaves man unchanged, that is, in the state of nature—even though through the knowledge of God they may flee from the excessive pollutions of the world. The *spiritual* beholding of God causes the soul to become increasingly a partaker of the divine nature, and to become holy as He is holy. By the Spirit of the Lord, the soul is transformed through such beholding—in harmony with the object being beheld—from glory to glory. See to it that you do not immediately deem all beholding of God to be spiritual in nature.

It is evident from the nature of their reflection, that the beholding by God of such persons—which in reality consists more in elevated words than in substance—is the result of natural illumination and imagination. Such beholding varies greatly according to everyone's physical constitution, inclinations, and power of imagination. What follows represents the common manner in which this transpires; if someone is not exercised in the manner as we shall now delineate, he should know that we do not have him in view.

(1) Some, as they undertake such reflection, meditate upon what they know about God in a natural sense, and have read or heard of God. They do not consider at that moment that they have read or heard this. While thus meditating, they ascend from one thing to the next, having conceptions about God in accordance with what their heart and imagination suggest. They then think about what they imagine, and all that is engendered by such thoughts. God must then be as such reflections project Him to be, and in this manner God has then revealed Himself to the soul. It is immaterial whether such thoughts of God are suitable and in harmony with the Holy Scriptures; this revelation is sufficient assurance for them that it is true and spiritual.

(2) Some will mentally withdraw from all creatures, themselves, and God. They are occupied with nothing except with expelling those mental objects which present themselves time and again. They thus endeavor to be without thoughts, as if nothing existed, and they thus enter and sink away into thick darkness. If a ray of light then falls upon their mind in this thick darkness, without the discovery of anything objective, they

consider this to be of the Spirit. They allow themselves to be illuminated and guided by this light, and as this light increases, God is unveiled to them as being such and such. This they observe passively—as being the recipient of it, allowing themselves to be illuminated thereby. The soul is thus ignited in love and receives such motions and stirrings, until they again come to themselves and desist for the time being.

(3) Some, having a desire to approach unto God and to behold Him, divest themselves of all reason, memory, affections, and even of those thoughts which initially ignited the inclination to contemplate upon God as having served their purpose. Having thus been emptied of everything, the soul turns to God, considering Him to be her God, and continually thinks: "Oh God, Thou art my God, and I am Thine." The soul then listens to what God will subsequently reveal of Himself, and thus, in an infatuated manner, focuses upon God as being present. Here she reposes, tastes more than she sees, worships, exults, is in subjection, and exercises love. The only things missing here are the Spirit, spiritual life, the exercises of faith, the going to God through Christ, and the beholding of God in the face of Christ. Since these things are absent, they are all the work and imaginations of a person's own doing. They are but natural exercises and thus of no value.

(4) Some remain quiet and in a disposition wherein which they are turned unto God, and do nothing but wait upon the Spirit. If nothing comes to mind, then they again proceed, being well satisfied. If something occurs to them, they deem this to be of the Spirit; then this is truth, and is more certain and infallible than the Word of God which they consider to be but a dead letter, a primer for beginners, and of no benefit whatsoever. If the thought which occurs to them gives direction to do or not to do something, it is considered to be the leading of the Spirit and they give heed to it. They do not pray, speak, or do anything unless they are motivated by such an idea coming to mind; they thus, quietly and with delight, live on. When they are stirred up by an idea which occurred to them, they depend on this, irrespective of whether it either agrees with or is contrary to God's Word. This they do not investigate; it is a matter of indifference to them. They are thus carried away by their own spirit to abominable practices from which even the natural man recoils. This is borne out by the witness of those whom God in His goodness has converted from the error of their ways, and is also taught by daily experience. Some go further than that and play prophet. When thoughts about future events occur to their empty minds, they are deemed to be revelations which will either occur or not occur. Poor, misguided people! They desire to seek God and to do His pleasure, but completely miss the way itself. With all their ideas and the adamant passion of their own spirit they perish.

It behooves all Christians to live in the presence of God, to examine themselves as to what is the good will of God in which He delights, to esteem the Word of God as the revealed will of God and as an infallible rule, and continually to give heed to the leading of the Spirit. It behooves them to give careful heed to their well-illuminated conscience and to be desirous not to act contrary to it. To follow one's own spirit and ideas, however, as if they were from the Holy Spirit, is to run to one's own destruction.

In order to be safeguarded against such fanaticism, we must keep the following in mind:

(1) Man has his own spirit; there are many seducing spirits, and the evil spirit can transform himself into an angel of light. He, with the intent to deceive, can give thoughts which are essentially good, but stir man up to use them in an erroneous manner. We must therefore give heed and know by which spirit we are being moved.

(2) The Holy Spirit convinces man of sin and causes him to grieve, be perplexed, and in many ways be troubled about his sin.

(3) The man who is conquered by the Holy Spirit will be regenerated and translated from darkness to light, from death to life, and from being earthly minded to being heavenly minded.

(4) The Holy Spirit is a Spirit of faith who brings God's children to Christ, causing them to receive Jesus by a true faith as their ransom and righteousness.

(5) The Holy Spirit unites His children and keeps them united to the church, for by one Spirit are they all baptized into one body (1 Cor 12:13).

(6) The Holy Spirit leads believers in all things according to the Word of God; He leads them into all truth. The Word of God is truth, however, and the only rule by which we shall not err. By that Word He regenerates, sanctifies, leads, and comforts them.

Know then with certainty that where these matters are not found, there God's Spirit is not present. Be assured that whatever is deemed to be spiritual but which does not harmonize with the above, is nothing but illusionary and are seductions of a man's own spirit. Regardless of how greatly one may boast of spirituality, be instructed and warned. Know that the Holy Spirit is given only to the children of God and that only those who are led by the Spirit do indeed have the Spirit of Christ. The natural man, however, does not have the Spirit (Jude 19); the world cannot receive the Spirit; it neither sees nor knows Him.

It is evident to the truly godly, when considering these ways of beholding God, that they are all but a natural work. This can especially be concluded from the fact that such persons consider the greatest mark of spirituality to be the measure by which a person is stripped of himself and loses sight of himself so completely as if he did not exist. This is not due to a shameful view of their sins, but the result of comparing

themselves to God, or it is without reason, or because of the opinion that thus it must be. This is foolish spirituality, which is nothing but the fruit of nature! Why do you delight yourself in such contemplation wherein you utterly lose sight of yourself and do not think about yourself? Is not self your focus in this and do you not deem this to be your salvation? Why then do you engage in this? You neither need to nor are able to do it by virtue of it being God's will, as it is certainly of no benefit to Him. You thus do it for your own sake, since this reflection upon your nothingness is your delight. Therefore, while thinking that you do not have yourself in view at all, and to be rid of self completely, you are nevertheless seeking yourself. Only if such exclusion and deprecation of self were spiritual in nature (while in reality it is natural and sinful), it would not be a sinful seeking of self, but rather a holy seeking of self.

There can be either a sinful or a holy seeking of self. A sinful seeking of self is when one seeks honor, esteem, love, respect, advantage, etc. in order that all men and everything would end in them. A *holy* seeking of self is to promote one's own physical welfare for the purpose of being fit to serve God in whatever capacity that may be. In our seeking after God, it is not sinful to have the welfare of your soul, and thus light, life, love, joy, delight, and salvation in view. Rather, it is evidence of being engaged spiritually in the right way. This is a holy seeking of self, for:

First, God has created this spiritual seeking of self within man. Did not Adam need to be careful to refrain from eating of the forbidden tree in view of the threat, "The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"? Did he not have to be in fear of losing his blessed state? Was he not obligated to seek his felicity in communion with God?

Secondly, God commands His children to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling (Phil 2:12). This they must therefore strive for.

Thirdly, God continually confronts man with threats in order to save him with fear (Jude 23). Observe this in Luke 13:3, "... except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

Fourthly, God uses many inducements to persuade man to seek his own salvation. "Come unto Me ... and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you. . . . For My yoke is easy" (Matt 11:28-30).

Fifthly, if man should not seek himself and his own well-being, it would be a matter of indifference to him how he fared according to body and soul; and being thus indifferent, all prayers would cease. Then there would be nothing for him to desire or request. God, however, wills that "in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God" (Phil 4:6). Then all thanksgiving for received benefits would also cease; God, however, wills that we give thanks in everything (1 Thess 5:18). "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us

meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col 1:12).

It is evident from all this that spirituality does not consist in disregarding our welfare, utterly deprecating ourself, utterly losing sight of ourself as far as salvation is concerned, and excluding ourself from everything. Rather, this is a fabricated religion which is contrary to God's commandment, serving no other purpose but the satisfaction of the flesh and our own imagination.

Objection #1: Ought not God be the focus of all things and ought not all things end in God? By seeking self, however, man makes himself the focus and ends in self.

Answer: When a godly person focuses upon himself in spiritual matters, he acts according to the command and will of God. It would be impossible for him to end in himself and to remain focused on his felicity only, for that is not the highest level of his felicity. Being a recipient of grace, however, and while enjoying the goodness of God, he will time and again turn to God as the cause of his salvation. He will thus end in Him, thank Him, give honor and glory to Him, and praise Him, because by reason of His essence, all praise must be unto Him, He being worthy thereof. The more pure the manner is in which a spiritual person ends in glorifying God, the more felicity he will enjoy; and the more felicity he enjoys, the more he will end in God. This is not to suggest that he contributes something to God, but rather, that the benefit is man's. Thus, having his felicity in view and ending in God must go together; the godly person cannot seek the one without exercising the other. As all the godly end in God upon receiving and enjoying the benefits of God, they (especially the fathers in Christ) likewise have the glory of God in view when they begin to undertake something.

Objection #2: A Christian must deny himself (Matt 16:24), not seek himself (1 Cor 10:24), is nothing (Gal 6:3), and must be lowly of heart (Matt 11:29). Therefore, man must remain outside of everything and neither seek nor have himself in mind in anything.

Answer: There is a threefold self. First, there is a *sinful self*; that is, pride, maliciousness, vengefulness, envy, miserliness, immorality, and all the sinful lusts of the heart, along with the deeds which issue forth therefrom, whereby he seeks to satisfy his lusts and to attain to the fulfillment of his desire. These a Christian must not seek, but he must abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul. He must mortify . . . them.

Secondly, there is also a *natural self*; that is, to desire and seek all that pertains to the welfare of the body, such as food, drink, sleep, clothing, housing, goods, peaceful association with people, and whatever else pertains to human existence. One may and must seek these things, for no one has ever hated his flesh, but rather, cherishes it. However, a Christian does not set his heart upon them, and it is his objective to serve God in the use of these things. He is resigned to the divine dispensation, and he must be

satisfied with either much or little, since these are not his portion. If, however, these matters run counter to the Lord Jesus, His cause, the truth, and godliness, and one is obligated to abstain from one or the other thing, then a Christian will readily deny himself, willingly let go of everything, view the disappearance of his goods with joy, and not even hold his life dear. This is the denial which Christ requires.

Thirdly, there is a *spiritual self*; that is, the desire for the salvation and welfare of our soul, consisting in reconciliation with God through the blood of Christ, union with God, and a life in the enjoyment of His fellowship, love, light, and holiness—and thus eternal glory. A Christian may not deny himself these spiritual things. He must always seek them with all his might. It is the life of the soul, the will of God, the command of God, and it pleases God. To neither seek nor pursue this is sin. Man, in having fellowship with and beholding God, may not utterly put self aside and keep himself entirely outside of this. Rather, he must strive for and seek to find pleasure in spiritual delight, joy, love, and holiness.

Matt 16:24 refers to the natural self; 1 Cor 10:24 refers to the sinful self; Gal 6:3 spreaks of such people who have great thoughts of themselves, despise others, and who in the meantime have no grace, or have but a very small measure.

Let us consider Matt 11:29. Humility does not exclude self; instead, it does relate to self, for it acknowledges what a person is and what graces and benefits are his. He does not boast of this, since he acknowledges that he does not have them of himself, but that they have been granted to him of God by reason of His goodness alone. He sees his sinfulness and that he is therefore not worthy of anything. He sees virtues and capabilities in other persons which he does not have, and thus exalts them above himself. Having the Lord Jesus as his example, he knows that this lowly and yet noble disposition as a Christian, is pleasing to God. He therefore seeks to walk humbly with his God as a weaned child and in a becoming disposition-one of submission and being obliged toward man. It is hereby very evident that the exclusion of self in beholding God is a sign of something that purely proceeds from nature, is of one's own choosing, and is a sinful act toward the majestic and holy God.

There are three things which cause the godly to be troubled more than anything else. It first of all troubles them that [certain mystics and quietists] speak of these lofty contemplations also speak of their union with God, of belonging to God, and that in such contemplation they view God as their God. Secondly, such persons, in an exceptional manner, are able to speak of love for God and of sinking away in the love of God, and, so to speak, being consumed by it. Thirdly, there are some who speak of the beauty and glory of the Lord Jesus in a most extraordinary manner. These three matters, they think,

are indeed spiritual and evidences of extraordinary grace. Who would not be enamored by these matters? Who would not desire always to hear this discussed? My response to this is that it cannot but be that truly gracious persons, when hearing others speak of beholding God, of belonging to God, of love to God, and of the beauty and glory of the Lord Jesus, will find love and desire stirring within to be in such a condition. This is due to their acquaintance with these matters in their spiritual nature, and they thus perceive them as such when they hear them being discussed. If those who speak thus would know and possess these matters in their true, spiritual nature, far be it from us to warn them in any way; rather, we would embrace them in love. Since we know, however, that these three matters can issue forth from natural illumination and can be expressed by persons who neither possess true grace nor derive these lofty views from a love for the truth, the Word, the church of the Lord Jesus, conversion, and the exercise of true saving faith, we must of necessity demonstrate how the unconverted can be occupied with these three matters.

As far as the first matter is concerned, it is common knowledge that temporal believers, those who are externally religious in the state of nature-yes, even heathens-view God as their God and call Him their God. Everyone knows this. Why is it that those who occupy themselves in contemplating God would also not be able to do so? However, just because they imagine this to be so, does not therefore imply that this is indeed the case. God is only the God of true believers who, through Christ, having received His ransom and righteousness, come to God for reconciliation. Those who are therefore strangers of this way, and do not come in truth unto God in this way, do not have God as their portion. God is not their God, and their imaginations are vain and without foundation. . . . In this illusion they proceed to be amazed, to be delighted in, and to rejoice in God as He is, in the fact that this God is their God, and in all that this God is for them. These are great matters indeed. Many who thus contemplate upon God, however, endeavor to rid themselves of all spiritual motions which pertain to themselves, be divorced from self, and neither think of self nor reflect upon themselves. They only wish to contemplate God, be illuminated by Him, and be drawn up on high, into glory, and into eternity. Yes, though it be dreadful to say, they even endeavor to ascend to God in their reflections. Who would then be offened by the claim of such persons that God is their portion and that He is their God?

Secondly, their love for God is consistent with the manner in which He is their portion. Man has a loving nature, and if he finds or imagines a desirable object, his love goes out toward it. The imagination can have a remarkable effect here, for vain man can imagine something or somebody which or whom he has never seen. He dwells upon this

with his thoughts; he delights himself in imaginary conversation, and rejoices in love, as if it were in truth. When a natural man focuses his thoughts upon God, he can also have natural inclinations of love toward God. When in addition he reflects upon the perfections of God—be it through the light of nature or external illumination of the Word—a love issues forth which is not of a spiritual, but of a natural sort. This love is commensurate with their knowledge. It is thus that the heathen delight in God. It is in this manner that idolaters and those who have strayed from saving truth speak of the love of God, the wondrous motions of love, and the kiss of love upon awakening. And thus, by all the motions of natural love which one man can have toward another, they ascend unto God, so that the nature of love does not change, but only the object. They thus dishonor God with their so-called love for Him.

Objection: Are not all natural men haters of God? "Let them also that hate Him flee before Him" (Ps 68:1); " . . . haters of God" (Rom 1:30); "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God" (Rom 8:7). Since many who meditate upon God delight in Him in doing so, is this not proof that they are spiritually illuminated and truly regenerate? "We love Him, because He first loved us" (1 John 4:19); "But if any man love God, the same is known of Him" (1 Cor 8:3).

Answer: Not all that bears the name of love is love. There is a love which is natural and a love which is holy. Natural men—such as the heathen and all the unconverted—have natural love, this being of the same nature as he from whom it proceeds; however, "they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom 8:8). From this natural love we can only conclude that such people are in the state of nature, and not at all that they are spiritual and regenerate. We completely agree that a natural man in beholding the perfections of God as He reveals Himself in nature in His majesty, glory, power, and goodness, etc., can with his natural heart love God in a natural manner. Pagans and other unconverted men have loved Him in this manner. Those who love God in such situations, can hate Him in other respects, demonstrating this by the rejection of His Word, by not receiving His Son, and in hating and persecuting His children. Those who thus meditate upon God in a natural sense are able to associate with all manner of men, but they detest God's children who truly manifest the image of God. They hate the light because it exposes them, and because they are rebuked by the light in true believers. They show that they hate God by being unwilling to live according to His laws, instead desiring to live according to their own imaginations. They hate His rebukes, and their entire life demonstrates that they do not delight in God.

If we compare this natural love with the purely spiritual love of God in Christ Jesus—which we shall briefly discuss further on—then we shall perceive that the

smallest spark and the tiniest ray of this love is incomparably superior and more pure than all the pretended love of such who meditate upon God, regardless of how they adorn it with beautiful words. The difference is not only one of degree, but of very essence. Oh, how far does this divine spark—that heavenly fire—excel all those dead coals!

The third matter pertains to the extraordinary manner in which they speak of the glory and beauty of the Lord Jesus. Should it come as a surprise that someone who has the Scriptures, who reads godly literature describing the Lord Jesus in His beauty and glory, and who furthermore has an eloquent tongue, can speak in a most excellent manner about Jesus? Does someone therefore know Jesus Himself? Is this proof that he himself experientially beholds and relishes the Lord Jesus? He who draws conclusions merely on the basis of such eloquent speech is naive, and too little skilled in the matters of Christianity. Take time to observe a person who speaks thus as far as his sentiments are concerned, the company he keeps, his love to the godly in the church, and in reference to the first five propositions of this chapter. You will readily perceive how you must judge such a person. Take particular note, however, of how he speaks concerning the manner in which the soul is led to Jesus as Surety, how the soul is exercised in receiving the Lord Jesus as his ransom and righteousness, as well as its engagement in spiritual wrestlings. You will then perceive that all this lofty speech only relates to the Lord Jesus as King, or as an example for imitation, but not as High Priest in order to find reconciliation and peace with God in His atonement, doing so by a continual and frequently repeated exercise of faith, which is the marrow and essence of true Christianity.

Some little children in Christ, who are easily driven about by every wind of doctrine, hearing someone speak eloquently about lofty reflections and not being conscious of the thorn hidden in it, become enamored with such a condition as a result of the spiritual life and light which is within them. They may also engage in meditation upon God as the [quietists] do; that is, in a natural manner—however, with different results.

(1) Some, when they begin, perceive inner strife and have an aversion for this way, although a heartfelt desire for the matter itself remains. They condemn themselves for such resistance and aversion, being of the opinion that this is engendered by their corrupt nature—thinking that it is but laziness and a lack of spirituality. They resume and strive all the more earnestly, but the resistance and aversion remain and increase. Having thus wrestled for some time, they begin to see that their objective—to behold God—is indeed good and spiritual, but that the method is but a natural one, so that this resistance and aversion were not sinful, but an activity of the regenerated nature. They perceive that there is a spiritual way to walk in the light of God's countenance. They thus escape this

snare and desist from pursuing this natural method.

(2) Others, having the principle of spiritual life, are careless as far as preserving and strengthening it. They are inclined to err in seeking to be someone special. They, when perceiving the appearance of spirituality in such lofty reflections, pursue this method recklessly. When God gives them over to themselves, they err by pursuing their fantasy and natural imaginations—and thus, upon that good foundation which is within them they build wood, hay, and stubble, which will be burned. They will nevertheless be saved since the gifts of God's grace are without repentance. In the meantime, they make themselves guilty of giving offense and are at times the cause of the damnation of other people who, not possessing grace, have followed them in this work of nature due to the esteem they have for them. It only occurs very rarely that such persons are exercised again in a unadulterated manner and come to the simplicity which is in Christ, since pride—which comes naturally to those who pretend to have such lofty reflections—has also overtaken their heart. Since those that are truly converted can fall and err greatly, we must therefore be careful in judging the deeds of the godly, as not all that they do is good. We may not imitate them just because they are godly, but only inasmuch as they are followers of Christ and walk according to the Word of God. "Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto all Thy commandments" (Ps 119:6). . . .

Truly spiritual persons do not make a distinction between meditation and beholding: they are both considered to be human activities. He does make a distinction, however, between the activity of the soul in meditating upon divine things, and the extraordinary revelations of God to the soul engaged in such meditation upon divine things, which the soul—upon receiving them—acknowledges, feels and tastes.

A believer, however much he may humble himself, will never arrive at beholding God as a result of the measure in which he waits, longs, exerts himself, and lifts up his heart. His duty is to meditate so that he may gain more and more insight into what he knows of God by means of the Word, faith, and experience—in order that he may delight himself in, rejoice in, and adore God, while bowing down before Him to worship Him reverently. He must endeavor to acquaint himself with God, become holier by virtue of having fellowship with Him, and serve God in a manner more pleasing to Him.

Objection: All of this is self-love and therefore must be rejected.

Answer: This sort of self-love is holy, commanded by God, pleasing to Him, and a proof of the spirituality of the meditation. Sinful self-love—which manifests itself in the seeking of esteem, honor, love, respect, to be served by others, and to cause all things to end in self—is hated, despised, and avoided by the person who meditates in a godly manner. In seeking his own spiritual welfare in spiritual meditation, he does not end in

self, but rather acknowledges all things to be from God and through God. In love and joy he returns all this again to God, giving Him the honor and glory.

Occasionally God, according to His promise (John 14:21,23), meets such who meditate spiritually with extraordinary and more immediate revelations of Himself, and causes them to behold God in more immediate proximity, and to taste who He is and what He is to them in Christ Jesus. . . . Since God does not reveal Himself to the world and the unconverted, and since they cannot attain to a seeing and beholding of God by their own activity, all their speaking of such beholding, and all their beholding of God is nothing but fantasy, is not in truth, and only a reflection of their thoughts upon the illusions of their own making. . . .

A believer, who engages himself in meditation upon divine things and seeking fellowship with God, withdraws himself from all things and considers there to be no one but God and himself. He acknowledges himself as a creature of God, as having an immortal soul, and as having been created with a human nature in Adam, excelling in holiness and glory. He also acknowledges that in all things he is miserably distorted, deformed, and abominable—being sinful within and without. He occasionally will focus upon his condition in order to gain a deeper insight about himself and thus acknowledge himself to be unworthy that God would look upon him, or would bestow any grace or benefits upon him. He acknowledges himself to be entirely unfit and unworthy to approach unto this majestic and holy God, although he cannot enjoy light, life, peace, rest, satisfaction, and felicity except in communion with God.

While thus maintaining this humble frame, he turns his eye to the Mediator, wholeheartedly approving of this holy way to come and to be permitted to approach unto God through Him. . . .

The soul may also be in a sinful condition. The corruption of the heart may manifest itself; she cannot resist vain thoughts; the lusts of the flesh are exceptionally strong and hold her captive; besetting sins are lively—be it due to disposition, physical condition, or incidents which she either desires, cannot avoid, or may not avoid—and she has little strength against them. She is then perplexed by this; sin is a heavy burden and she is bowed down by it. There is no peace; communion with God has been disturbed, God hides Himself, and faith is assaulted. What now? Any personal initiative does not result in progress; to stay away from God causes more regression. The soul dares not approach unto God due to being too sinful; and to remain in this condition is equivalent to dying continually, whereas there is life and faith in the soul. She makes the resolution to approach unto God, being convinced of her sincerity—not only to be delivered from guilt and punishment, but also from corruption and all the sin which proceeds from this.

Such a soul then presents herself to the Lord as sinful and as miserable as she is, together with her grief related to this and her desire to be delivered from it. She meditates upon the free grace of God, that God neither considers anyone's virtue (which is not naturally present anyway), nor sin, but is gracious because He wills to be gracious to her, and is merciful to whomever He wills. While meditating, she will focus upon the depth of this free grace, approve of it with her whole heart, be enamored with it, and adore it. From this she proceeds to eternal and sovereign election, to eternal love, and while reflecting upon herself and the grace which the soul perceives to be in herself, she is astonished and sinks away in adoration. "I, I sinful man have been known! I have been loved by Thee! I have been eternally appointed to be a recipient of salvation! To Thee, to Thee alone, oh Lord, be the glory for Thy free grace and for Thy unsearchable love for humanity." From this she proceeds to the Mediator Jesus Christ. In meditating upon Him she can find neither beginning nor end due to the manifestation of all the perfections of God, such as love, righteousness, wisdom, omnipotence, mercy, etc. She acknowledges this holy way as the way whereby the sinner is reconciled with God and which gives her liberty to approach unto God. This way she approves of. She becomes enamored with it and chooses it for herself. She observes in this way the fullness of the satisfaction and is absorbed by the unsearchableness of this way. She meditates upon the immutability of God, that God remains the same in His purpose and love toward the elect, even though they, time and again, spoil everything before Him. Christ's satisfaction cannot be abolished; the covenant of grace is unbreakable; God remains faithful, and always restores His own. When the soul in a negative frame occupies herself with such meditations, she will experience a wondrous change. The conscience perceives peace with God through the blood of Jesus, the estrangement is transformed into intimacy, and the soul—being washed and cleansed—goes her way rejoicing.

Occasionally the soul of a godly person has a desire for holiness which is more than ordinary. She is enamored with self-denial as far as honor, esteem, the love of men, comfort, earthly delight, and the riches or goods of this world are concerned. She does this neither for self nor for the rest and welfare of the soul, but for the Lord's sake, doing so to the degree and in those circumstances in which the Lord requires such from her. She is enamored with being continually in the presence of God, as well as with obeying, fearing, loving, and walking humbly with God. She greatly desires humility and meekness of heart, as well as wisdom, love, forbearance, and friendly dignity. She furthermore yearns for the image of her Jesus, and to give expression to His life in her life. She does not desire this in an earthly, lifeless, and natural manner as the unconverted do. Rather, she desires that this be so in a living and truly spiritual manner in union with

the Lord Jesus by faith—and through Him with God—and by the influence of the Lord's Spirit to the glory of her God, the honor of the church, and the salvation and stirring up of other people. With this desire she comes before the Lord and continues to focus upon His holiness. While continually cleaving to Christ, however, a view of God's holiness causes her to sink away in shame due to her insignificance and sinfulness, saying with Job, "Now mine eye seeth Thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes" (Job 42:5-6). With Isaiah she may cry out, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips" (Isa 6:5). She nevertheless, being in Christ, continues in her beholding of this pure holiness, and allows herself to be illuminated and enlivened by this holiness; in that respect she becomes holier and holier. This is according to the testimony of the apostle: "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord" (2 Cor 3:18). Thus, the soul who is enamored with holiness acquaints herself with the Lord, cleaves to Him as seeing the invisible, and continually focuses upon the exhortation: "Be ye holy, for I am holy." . . .

At times the soul beholds the Lord's perfections in the work of creation and meditates upon them in an orderly and attentive fashion. Sometimes she occupies herself by meditating upon the providence of the Lord, and learns from this to rightly know God's sovereignty, wisdom, righteousness, and goodness, so that all the power, evil, and goodness of the creature disappears. She views God as being the only one who is operative, executing all things irresistibly according to His purpose and good pleasure. Then again, the soul who attentively meditates selects other matter for reflection and thus acquaints herself with the Lord. The heart thus increases its steadfast confidence in the Lord, loves Him, fears Him, serves Him, and due to continual fellowship with God, the soul begins to shine forth as the countenance of Moses did when he had communed with God for forty days upon the mountain.

The Lord can also lead a longing soul to a more immediate beholding of Himself, at which time she neither brings before the Lord her conditions, nor is occupied with the works of God—be it in nature or in grace. Instead, she immediately approaches unto God, be it in a general sense or as far as each individual perfection is concerned. This is not done in a barren and lifeless manner by merely beholding and acknowledging them. Rather, the Lord occasionally permits her to taste the efficacy and salvation to be found, and at times gives her a foretaste of the beholding of God in heaven. The soul who beholds God in a lively and spiritual manner always cleaves to Christ, and in that frame she beholds God's all-sufficiency, goodness, love, holiness, sovereignty, majesty, glory, and omnipotence, doing all this while considering that this God is her God and that He is

her all. This brings forth adoration, joy, love, and praise. In thus beholding God, the soul maintains a humble, quiet, and approving frame that is void of earthly concerns—and also is believing, meditating, going out in love, characterized by intimate communion, dependent, desirous for counsel, and making use of His strength and benefits as her own. . . .

The conclusion of all that we have stated as a warning against the [Quietists] is as follows: There is *natural* and *spiritual* religion, a natural and spiritual *denial of self*, a natural *belonging to* God as Creator and Preserver and a spiritual and true belonging to God as a reconciled Father in Christ, a natural and spiritual *love to God and to man*, and a natural and spiritual *reflection upon and beholding of God*. This is the crux of the matter; everything depends upon this, and salvation or condemnation is contingent upon this. We have made as clear a distinction as possible between the natural and the spiritual, and wish that every one to whom salvation is dear would know this distinction, reject that which is natural, and practice what is spiritual, rather than embrace immediately whatever has the appearance of spirituality.

Objection: Religion, self-denial, belonging to God, love for God and man, the beholding of God, etc., are indeed good things, and if a person is engaged in that which is good, we ought to love such a person. Is it necessary to be so careful in investigating the difference between the natural and the spiritual, and to weigh it upon the scale of a goldsmith? We ought not to judge each other in these matters, but tolerate one another. The one may do it in this manner and the other in that manner, but we must overlook the manner itself, considering it to be insignificant.

Answer: However, must we not have a heartfelt love for our fellow man? Is it love if we, in order to maintain peace and unity, allow our neighbor to run to his destruction in hell? Is it not love if we wish to lead him by the hand unto salvation and warn him about the way which leads to hell? And even if he becomes difficult and views you as dealing lovelessly with him and as being desirous to lord over him, is it therefore not love if we nevertheless wish to pull him away from his destruction? What I did in this chapter I have done out of love, in order to deliver souls from destruction and to direct them in the holy way unto salvation. If you do not wish to hear me, it will grieve me that you are intent on running to your destruction.

You are saying that the actions of all parties are one and the same; the manner in which they are done is a matter of insignificance, and therefore, we must allow everyone to proceed according to his own opinion. If, however, everything depends on the manner in which one proceeds, and if this determines whether something is either natural or spiritual, and leads either to damnation or salvation, then this is not a matter of

insignificance. Love demands that we point this out to each other, and warn, protect, and correct each other. For example, in the realm of the natural, is it a matter of indifference to you whether you have a clear diamond in your ring or a piece of glass of the same size and appearance? It also glitters. Is it a matter of indifference to you if a coin has but the proper imprint, regardless of whether it is copper or gold—as long as it is red? You do search out the difference in the natural realm—either choosing or rejecting it—and will not allow yourself to be fooled by external appearance, and would you yet be careless in the spiritual realm upon which everything depends? If there are two rich persons, the one owning his goods righteously and the other unrighteously, will you consider them to be of equal status and say, "Rich is rich, and the matter of 'how' is not important; that should not be so strictly investigated or distinguished"? Should one not give consideration as to the "how" in spiritual matters, since everything depends on it? If there are two horses and the one is clean, vigorous, and fast, whereas the other is full of stinking abscesses, stiff, and halting miserably, would you then say, "A horse is a horse, life is life, and progress is progress"? Are there differences in the physical realm and must we yet approve of everything in the spiritual realm? Is it the same to you whether a dead horse teems with living worms, or whether it is alive? Is it the same to you whether you have your father, child, husband, or wife represented on a painting, or whether they are present in very person? Would you say, "It is all the same"? This is likewise true in the spiritual realm. Is it a matter of indifference as to whether a clock indicates the hour by her chime or whether this is indicated by a human voice? If some people wish to go to the same city and some travel upon the right way, whereas others enter upon a way which does not lead to the city, but to the land of the enemy, would you then say that they all have good intentions, and one must thus leave them alone in their choice of direction? Must we not warn those who have strayed?

I have presented an abundance of examples to convince everyone forcefully that everything does depend upon the "how" or the *manner*, and that primary attention must be given to this. Scripture says that we must take heed *how* we hear, and we must speak and act accordingly. Natural men who behold spiritual matters in a natural sense remain natural and unregenerate in the flesh, and the light they have only changes them as far as the degree of virtuousness is concerned—with which they cannot please God (Rom 8:8). They remain without Christ, without true saving faith, and therefore without spiritual life; all their reflections, self-denial, and love for God and men are but dead works. With all their illusions, spirituality (as they call it), and delightful daydreaming they will perish if they do not repent. Be warned, and may the Lord convict such persons and bring them to the right place. Take note of the following texts: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for

many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able" (Luke 13:24), since they are not upon the right way and do not seek to enter in the right manner. "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" (Prov 16:25). Since they are of the opinion that they are correct, believing that the hidden and spiritual way to heaven has been found by them, there is but little possibility that they can be convinced of their error. "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you ... but the publicans and the harlots believed Him" (Matt 21:31-32). Therefore, I warn you in love; do not stray any further, lest you perish. And you who are beginners in grace, and have been enticed by such natural beholding of God, self-denial, and love, I call out after you, "Return, return, O Shulamite; return, return, that we may look upon thee" (Song 6:13). May the Lord hear my prayer on your behalf.**bbb**

I have indeed anticipated that some of the godly in reading this warning would become concerned and doubt their state, thinking as follows: "If the unconverted also can come this far—that is, live in the beholding of God, in the denial of self, loving God and man, are determined to have God as their portion, and to commune with God as their God—do I even resemble them? How can I think to possess grace if I do not, so to speak, resemble them at all—neither in their activity, nor in their ecstatic speaking about those matters and about the Lord Jesus? I truly ask myself: "Do I have grace indeed?"

To this I answer that whatever they do in a natural manner, you do in a spiritual manner by the principle of spiritual knowledge and life which is within you. Even if they acted and spoke as you perceive they do (although they do not do so), you nevertheless have no reason to doubt your spiritual state, for a small, weak child is just as much a human being as the strongest man. In the church there are indeed men and fathers in Christ, and there are also weak children. Due to the faint resemblance to others, one may not draw the conclusion that one is neither gracious nor possessing grace. Rather, one must acknowledge that which he possesses and be desirous for growth.

Furthermore, your understanding of God and Christ, your prayers, your desires after God, your seeking after the Lord Jesus, your focusing upon God, and your deeds and exercises—all proceeding from this principle of life—exceed all their beholding of God, reflections, sinking away in God, losing themselves in God, and similar expressions. The difference is as great as the difference between a dead and a living person; it is incomparable. The difference is not one of degree but of very essence. The one is natural and the other spiritual; the one is but an illusion, a fabrication. They are but self-made images which you can observe as frequently as you wish, whereas the other is truth, Spirit, and a life emanating from the Holy Spirit. If you were familiar with their activity and the manner in which they behold God—however, they do not come to God,

but imagine a God who is according to their wishes—and the manner in which they deny themselves, love, and speak, you would not desire such spirituality, but would reject it. You are also able to create natural images of God and mentally ascend higher and higher. If you yield to such natural imagination, however, you will readily perceive that this cannot delight you; it makes you colder and you will reject it. However, the least ray of God in the face of Christ, the least fleeing to Jesus and leaning upon Him will be incomparably sweeter to you than all that lifeless meditation. Therefore, rejoice quietly in your portion—however small it may seem to you—since it consists in light, life, truth, union with Christ, and love, and allow all those who have such elevated natural notions to go their way. Out of love for communion with Jesus and for His children, continue to be exercised with that spiritual principle which is according to the Word of God, and thank the Lord for your portion, which incomparably exceeds all their natural motions. Your spiritual principle cannot coalesce with theirs, since they are the very opposite of each other. To be but acquainted with their activities is sufficient to reject their principle and to flee from it. Consider but this one example: You love the godly because they love the Lord Jesus and are loved by Him, whereas you love other people in an entirely different manner from the children of God. You cannot be in agreement with all manner of false doctrine. They love indiscriminately, regardless of which religion a person may belong to. It is only the truly godly who stand firm in the faith, who are established in the truth, and who have intimate fellowship with God in the Spirit, whom they do not love. Rather, they abhor them and flee from them since their works, which are not upright but only of a natural disposition, are made manifest by the light of such. By this you can discern the rest of their doings. Be on your guard against this, and let your dealings between God and your soul be in simplicity and in truth. Let your eye continually be focused upon the Word of God whereby you have received spiritual light and life, which is also your continual nourishment and the rule for your life. Then you will proceed safely.

We have thus presented to you the fundamentals to which you must adhere in order to be safeguarded against the temptation of the [Quietists], which simultaneously serve as marks whereby they are discovered. We have therefore considered the following from two perspectives: love to God and man, the denial of self, belonging and being united to God, and the beholding of God. We have done so both from the side of the [Quietists] and the side of the godly, having demonstrated from the Word of God that their activity is but the natural activity of the unconverted by which they will perish; and that the activity in which the godly engage is rooted in God, is by the Holy Spirit, is according to the Word of God, and leads them to salvation.

That which has been said is sufficient to convince those poor misguided people who, desiring to approach unto God and become partakers of salvation, instead depart from God and enter upon the broad way of destruction. Oh, that the Lord would open their eyes and change their hearts so that they would forsake their foolishness and walk in the way of understanding!

That which has been said ought also to suffice as a warning for those who are inclined toward the ways of the [Quietists]. That is an easy way which agrees with man's nature and in which Satan leaves them alone, being able to safely lead them to hell in this way—for the truly godly have both their nature and the devil against them. Therefore, withdraw your foot from them, depart from them, and remove yourself from their snares. If you desire pure light and true godliness, remain with the church, follow the Word, and walk in straight paths.

It also ought to suffice to stir up the truly godly to walk in the way of the Lord with new courage and lifting up of the heart, and to let their light shine—to let it shine in demonstration of what truth is, what the efficacy of truth is, and what is the way of uprightness and holiness, so that the [Quietists] and their illusions may be put to shame. "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet 3:18). May the Lord send out His light and truth; may they lead and bring you unto His holy hill, and to His tabernacles (Ps 43:3).

I. Excursus XI: Hannah Whitall Smith: Higher Life Writer, Speaker on Sanctification, Developer of the Keswick Theology, Quaker Quietist and Universalist Heretic

Mrs. Hannah Whitall Smith, author of *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* and other devotional books, was in her day, and remains at this time, a very influential—indeed, probably the most influential—Higher Life writer on sanctification. Her views undergird and powerfully influence and mold the entire subsequent history of the Higher Life theology. She published *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* in 1875, a capstone of her and her husband's preaching of the Higher Life as "lay evangelists of the National Assocation for the Promotion of Holiness"[902] at the Conventions at Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton that constituted the birth of the Keswick theology. The publication of her best-selling book coincided with the tremendous impact her preaching was having at that

[902] Pg. 61, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. Cf. pg. 66. The National Association was a prominent perfectionist and second-blessing advocacy organization.

time in Britain.[903] Robert and Hannah were spreading the Higher Life not only "in London, but [also] in other cities such as Manchester, Nottingham, Leicester and Dublin, as well as various Continental European centers. Additionally, strategic doors were opening to them, such as being invited to meet dons and other senior members of Cambridge University to share their message."[904] As thousands of ministers assembled from not the British Isles only, but also France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Italy, Spain, India, Russia, Persia, China, Australia, Israel, South Africa, and North America to learn the Higher Life from the Smiths at the Brighton Convention, Robert declared: "All Europe is at my feet!" There was much truth to his declaration,[905] although in leading venues such as the Oxford Convention[906] and "at Brighton . . . Hannah Smith['s] . . . daily Bible Readings were the main focus of interest and she was widely recognised as the leading spirit at the conference. Never shy about publicity, she observed that . . . she had a congregation larger than that of C. H. Spurgeon."[907] Her preaching brought many into the Higher Life.[908] Describing this period of time, Hannah wrote in her diary:

> In January 1874 I went over with our four children and joined my husband in England. . . . [T]he Lord gave us . . . wonderful openings . . . for preaching the Higher Christian Life to rich and poor. My inward experience continues, through it all, to be one of perfect rest and peace. My husband's health was mercifully restored, and the strain of my earthly sorrow was removed. The Lord saw that I had learned the lesson and He delivered me. And my earthly happiness has been unclouded since[.] . . . We returned last Sept. 1874 to America and this winter has been a time of busy work in Philadelphia for me. In March 1875, my husband went back to England, and in a week, I sail with the children to join him. A great work is opening before us there for this summer in large conventions calling for the promotion of Scriptural Holiness [the Keswick precursor Conventions], at which I have to take a prominent part, both in holding ladies meetings, and in

---

903 Pg. 23, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

904 Pg. 23, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; cf. pg. 179, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Other predecessor Higher Life and perfectionist meetings are listed on pg. 328, *ibid*.

905 Pgs. 60-65, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith; cf. "Die Heiligungsbewegung," Chapter 6 of *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, Warfield; pg. 28, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; pgs. 271, 358, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; pg. 225, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

906 At Oxford Mrs. Smith's Bible readings were technically for ladies, but "Gentlemen who chose to attend were not excluded, and many were present at this and the [other] hours devoted to her Scripture lessons" (pg. 65, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

907 Pg. 149, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

908 E. g., pg. 175, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

> giving "Bible readings," as they are called to save the feelings of the dear brethren who are afraid to call it preaching.[909]

Her preaching and her person were very well received at these conferences, and her book *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*, which was really "old Quaker doctrine,"[910] was likewise positively received by those who adopted the Keswick teaching, leading, throughout the rest of her life, to "numberless calls . . . for preaching or giving Bible readings" all over America[911] and abroad. Mrs. Smith was regularly "preach[ing] in Quaker and other churches in England" in high demand, while also publishing further influential books.[912] Indeed, "H. W. Smith['s] *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* . . . is regarded as the classic presentation of Keswick teaching and was instrumental in the spread of the 'victorious life' movement that began at the first annual Convention for the Deepening of the Spiritual Life held at Keswick, England, in 1875."[913] "[I]t may be confidently said that . . . *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* . . . has never been superseded . . . [in] its teaching . . . by anything which has appeared since. This book has had a remarkable influence in connection with the Holiness Movement."[914] Indeed, Hannah came to teach the Keswick doctrine of her *Christian's Secret* as the "Superintendent of the Evangelistic and Bible Reading work" of the "Women's Christian Temperance Union," so that she had "direct influence over 60,000 Christian women, and

---

909 Journal, May 6, 1875, reproduced in the entry for July 22 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

910 Letter to a Friend, August 17, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 21 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. In her autobiography, *The Unselfishness of God*, Hannah Smith devotes an entire chapter to proving that the Higher Life theology was Quakerism (pgs. 275-282, "The Life of Faith Quaker Doctrine.")

911 Journal, May 6, 1875, reproduced in the entry for July 23 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Even after her husband's downfall, she continued preaching widely; for example, she records that she held "some meetings in a Presbyterian Church . . . the Presbyterian synod object[s] so to women, but the minister says he will 'whistle' at the synod if only he can get me!" (Letter to Daughter Mary, January 8, 1878, reproduced in the entry for August 15 of *ibid*). On another occasion she preached at a Methodist Holiness Camp Meeting in Ocean Grove, New Jersey, where the Methodists "endorsed this meeting fully" and "called it a 'Methodist class meeting led by a Quaker'" (Letter to Robert, August 9, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

In light of Mrs. Smith's strong advocacy of women preachers, rejection of complementarian gender roles in the family, and deep-seated feminism in general, it is not surprising that in the Conference's early years the majority of Keswick missionaries were single women (pg. 114, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

912 December 26-27, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

913 Pg. 249, "B. B. Warfield and Lewis S. Chafer on Sanctification," Randall Gleason. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40:2 (June 1997) 241-256. "Hannah Whitall Smith's *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* is characterized as 'one of the most remarkable settings forth of the victorious life you can find anywhere.'" "Victory in Christ," p. 94, Trumbull, cited in "The Victorious Life," Chapter 5 of *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, Warfield.

914 Pg. 224, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

indirect influence over all their congregations." She testified: "[T]he Lord has given me my parish among them."[915] Indeed, she wrote: "ever so many of [these women were] saying that they had learned the secret from my book "The Christian's Secret." It is perfectly wonderful how that book has gone over this whole country. Wherever I go I am met with stories of its value and blessing. So many people even here have told me that it is 'next to their Bibles.'"[916] While it was reckoned by many as of great enough value to be always next to one's Bible, Hannah's book was most selective in its presentation of Biblical teaching, never citing verses such as Philippians 2:12,[917] for the Apostolic command to act with fear and trembling, and the mention of working, did not fit Mrs. Smith's emphasis upon personal happiness, ease, and sanctification by faith alone. In any case, her book is properly recognized as foundational and paradigmatic for the Keswick doctrine of sanctification, so much so that her "book . . . for many years, was the most-read devotional book in the world."[918] *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* "had not only a phenomenal sale all through [Mrs. Smith's] lifetime . . . [and] was reissued again and again, and translated not only into all the major languages of the world, but even into obscure dialects of half-civilized tribes . . . [in] every part of the globe."[919] Hannah W.

---

915 Letter to Anna, November 5, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. One Woman's Christian Temperance Union leader even wished for Hannah to lead a "W. C. T. U. School of the Prophetesses" (Letter to Pricilla, October 1884, reproduced in the entry for December 24 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

916 Hannah testified thus while writing from the Christian Temperance Union (CTU) meeting on October 25, 1882. She explained:

> Every day, from eleven to twelve, right in the midst of our business meeting we have an hour for a devotional meeting when we tell the story of the life of faith to the crowds who have come in to witness our proceedings. I spoke to them yesterday on "Knowing God" for ourselves and then showing Him to others. And I was followed by a great many short words of testimony as to the blessedness of it, ever so many of them saying that they had learned the secret from my book "The Christian's Secret."
>
> It is perfectly wonderful how that book has gone over this whole country. Wherever I go I am met with stories of its value and blessing. So many people even here have told me that it is "next to their Bibles." . . . The faces are shining with peace and they tell me that it has all come through that book.

Hannah further described that CTU setting in which her book molded the spirituality and had been so very influential:

> Our platform is as broad as humanity; we take in everybody, no matter what their 'views,' or church relationships. . . . It is such a testimony to the reality of the religion which embraces all humanity. (Letter to Mary, October 25, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter)

A universalist, non-doctrinal religion that embraces all people, regenerate and unregenerate, Catholic, Protestant, Muslim, and Hindu, despite the "C" of the CTU, in a simple desire to be happy, fit Hannah W. Smith and her Keswick classic very well.

917 "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."

918 December 31, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

919 Pg. 13, *Religious Fanaticism: Extracts from the Papers of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. Ray Strachey. New York, NY: AMS Press, 1976, repr. of 1928 London ed.

Smith's writings "have done [m]ore than any publications ever written to extend," in the eyes of advocates of the Higher Life, "the knowledge of the truth of sanctification."[920] Her preaching and writing have had an inestimably great impact on the ideas of many millions in worldwide Christendom.

Hannah wrote her book out of a conviction that Higher Life or Keswick doctrine was solid Quaker teaching. She was convinced that "the early leaders of her own society of Friends [Quakers] had been preaching the same" Higher Life theology "which she was hearing about from . . . Methodist writers such as John Wesley" and "the Holiness advocates of her day."[921] Certainly the classic Quaker doctrine of sanctification is either extremely similar or entirely identical to the doctrine taught by the Keswick convention.[922] Hannah was confident that her Higher Life teaching was simply classic, unreformed Quakerism.

How, then, did Mrs. Smith come to write her bestselling and extremely influential Quaker and Keswick classic? She explained:

> [M]y book, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* . . . was written simply and only to oblige my husband, who was editing a monthly religious paper at the time, and who begged me each month for an article. I had no feeling whatever of being "called" to write it, nor that I was being "guided" in any way. . . . I said . . . that I would only write one [article], and that he need not expect me to continue. For some reason, however, my article excited more interest than anything else in the paper, and he begged me so much to go on writing that I finally consented to give him an article every month. . . . [T]hese articles, collected in a book, made the *Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*[.] . . . But these articles were dragged from me, so to speak, at the point of the bayonet, for I never wrote them in any month until the printers were clamoring for their copy. I could not be said, therefore, to have had any great feeling or sense of being called to write them, beyond the fact that I did it to oblige my husband[.] . . . [T]he book was not written under any special feeling of being called to write it, nor with any idea that it was in the least an especially religious service. I did it simply and only to oblige my husband, and that was all there was to it. I didn't even pray much about it, nor had I any thought that I was doing a work for the Lord[.][923]

Indeed, Hannah was yet more candid in writing to her daughter:

> [M]y most successful book [*The Christian's Secret*] was written so to speak at the point of the bayonet, without one ray of enthusiasm, and *hating* to do it all the time. . . . I must repeat that I *did* write "The Christian's Secret" at the point of the bayonet, as it were. I did not want to write it at all, and only did it at father's earnest entreaties. . . . [H]e begged me so hard that at last I said I would write one article and no more, if he would give up drinking wine at dinner. Then when that article was published everyone clamoured for another, and father begged, and I was good-natured and went on, but under a continual protest. And the best chapter of all was written . . . when I was

---

920 "The 'Higher Life' Movement," Chapter 4 in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield.

921 See January 19-20, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

922 Cf. the article "Justification and Sanctification" in the Orthodox Quaker *Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887* (Elec. acc. http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml), where both a Higher Life theology is affirmed and the Quaker heresy that justification is by the impartation of righteousness rather than imputed righteousness is confessed.

923 Pgs. 251-253, *Religious Fanaticism: Extracts from the Papers of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. & intr. Ray Strachey.

> . . . as near cursing as a person who had experienced the "blessings of holiness" could dare to be! So . . . books can be successful even if they *are* ground out with groans and curses[.][924]

Thus, Hannah W. Smith did not pray much about her bestseller, nor think that she was doing a work for the Lord by writing it, but simply wanted her husband, at the pinnacle of his work as a Higher Life preacher, to stop drinking alcohol at dinner. She had not a ray of enthusiasm for the book, but emphatically hated writing it, and even ground out the best chapter with groans and curses. Nevertheless, with what appears to be assistance from the supernatural realm, her book, and its Higher Life theology, spread like wildfire and was received with overwhelming acclaim. So wonderful, she came to conclude, was the *Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* that she wrote concerning it: "Every line I write is a *pure favor* to the world[.]"[925] The book was her doing—it was marvelous in her eyes.

Nevertheless, even as she wrote her bestselling and paradigmatic Keswick book without much prayer and without thinking about doing any work for God by composing it, but filled with hatred, groans, and curses, Hannah recognized that the kind of religion she led others to adopt could be preached and promulgated by ungodly people who, without any blessing from God, simply were putting on a religious show. After the downfall of her husband Robert P. Smith on account of his promulgation of erotic bride mysticism during the Keswick precursor Conventions,[926] the Smiths returned to America. Upon their arrival, Dr. Charles Cullis, who "had stood by Robert more nobly and grandly than any other human being"[927] when Mr. Smith was exposed for his erotic mysticism, sought to restore Robert by having him and his wife preach some meetings. The "sole object [of the meetings] was to reinstate Robert in the eyes of the church and the world. . . . [I]t ought not to have been called a 'Convention for the promotion of holiness,' but a 'Convention for the promotion of Pearsall Smith.'"[928] Hannah Smith wrote to a friend about these meetings:

> I felt utterly indifferent to the meeting in every way . . . I f[ound] *no* pleasure in it whatever. So we made no preparations for the meeting, we neither studied, nor prayed, nor meditated, nor in fact thought about it at all. . . . We both of us hated it cordially, and felt we should be only too thankful when it was over.

---

924 Pgs. 172-174, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letters to her daughter, Mary Berenson, January 1, 1905 & February 25, 1905. Italics retained from the original.

925 Pg. 23, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing a Letter to her Husband, Robert Pearsall Smith, April 27, 1875. Italics in original.

926 The erotic Spirit baptism doctrine promulgated by the Pearsall Smiths will be explicated in further detail below.

927 Pg. 32, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing Letter to Mrs. Anna Shipley, August 8, 1876.

928 Pg. 32, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing Letter to Mrs. Anna Shipley, August 8, 1876.

> It was in no sense a religious or "pious" undertaking on our parts. We were neither fervent, nor prayerful, nor concerned, nor anything that we ought to have been. Thou sees[929] I am telling the *honest* truth. And I really cannot imagine a meeting begun in a worse frame of mind that [*sic*] ours was, according to all one's preconceived notions of what is the right and suitable thing. And in precisely the same frame of mind we went through the meeting. It was all a wearisome *performance* to us. We did it as if we had crossed over an impassable gulf. The flood had come since the last time [when Higher Life meetings were held], and changed everything for us. There was no interest, no enthusiasm. The meetings were a bore; the work was like a treadmill. We counted the hours until we could get away, and hailed the moment of emancipation with unspeakable joy. . . . [We knew we had] indifference and want of every sort of proper qualification for Christian work, which I have described before[.] . . . I was utterly unmoved; and both Robert and I came away more confirmed than ever in our feeling of entire relief from everything of the kind. *We are done!* Somebody else may do it now.

However, despite the fact that neither Robert nor Hannah Smith could stand being at the meetings, the power from the spirit world that was evident in their earlier ministry was more abundant than ever:

> I . . . am compelled to record that the meeting was a *perfect success*. There was just the same power and blessing as at Oxford or Brighton, only on a smaller scale because of the meeting being smaller. There was every sign of the continual presence of the Spirit. Souls were converted, backsliders restored, Christians sanctified, and all present seemed to receive definite blessings. Dr. Cullis and many others say that it was the best meeting ever held in this country. And it really *was* a good meeting, even I, uninterested as I was, could see that. There was just the same apparent *wave* of blessing that swept over our English meetings. And Robert and I never worked more effectually. He had all his old power in preaching and leading meetings, and the very self-same *atmosphere* of the Spirit was with him as used to be in England. As for me, thee knows I am not much given to tell of my own successes, but in this case, in order that thee may have all the *facts*, I have to tell thee that I was decidedly "favored" as Friends say. In fact I don't believe I ever was as good. All who had heard me before said so.
>
> The fuss that was made over me was a little more than even in England. The preachers fairly sat at my feet, figuratively speaking, and *constantly* there kept coming to me testimonies of definite blessings received while I spoke. The second time I spoke a Democratic Editor was converted and consecrated on the spot; and I could scarcely get a minute to myself for the enquirers who fairly overwhelmed me. . . . I had to write all this, and thee must tear it right up, but how could thee know it unless I told thee[.] . . . For who would have *dreamed* of such an outcome to the indifference and want of every sort of proper qualification for [Christian] work, which I have described beforehand? . . . They all talked to me most solemnly about how dreadful it was in me to *think* of giving up public work[.] . . . We had to refuse lots of urgent invitations to hold meetings in various places, but we did it without a longing thought, only *too* thankful to be released. . . .
>
> The one satisfaction of the meeting to *us* was this, and it *was* a satisfaction, that Robert was treated with all the old deference and respect, and that no one even seemed to think of or remember the English scandals, and Robert felt that it was a complete reinstatement of himself in the eyes of the church and the world. Our object in going to the meeting was accomplished . . . it will wipe out all the wretched English blot, and put him right once more. And then henceforth home and home life for us.

Personal holiness and genuine blessing from the Holy Spirit were not required for the type of religion spread by Hannah and Robert Smith. Their Higher Life doctrine could be

---

929 The use of the archaic English pronoun in this fashion was typical among the Quakers of Hannah Smith's day.

spread by both knowingly unconsecrated Christians who were just putting on a weary performance and by unconverted persons. Hannah continued:

> And now, WHAT does thee think of it all? *I* think one of two things, but which one I think, I don't know. Perhaps thee can tell me. Either I was awfully wicked in the whole matter, and God was not in it anywhere, and all the success was by force of natural gifts and talents. Or else I was awfully good, so good as to have lost sight of self to such a degree as to be only a straw wafted on the wind of the Spirit, and so consecrated as not to be able to form a desire even, except that the will of God might be fully done.
>
> I waver about myself continually. Sometimes I feel sure I have progressed wonderfully, and that my present sphinx-like calm and indifference to everything whether inward or outward except the will of God, is very grand. . . . I really don't much care what His will is. . . . And then again I think I am an utterly irreligious and lazy fatalist, with not a spark of the divine in me.[930] I do wish I could find out *which* I am. But at all events my *orthodoxy* has fled to the winds. I am Broad, Broader, Broadest! So broad that I believe everything is good, or has a germ of good in it, and "nothing to be refused," if it be received with thankfulness.
>
> I agree with everybody, and always think it likely everybody's "view" is better than my own. I hold all sorts of heresies, and feel myself to have got out into a limitless ocean of the love of God that overflows all things. My theology is complete, if you but grant me an omnipotent and just Creator. I need nothing more.[931] All the tempests in the various religious teapots around me do seem so far off, so young, so green, so petty! I know I *was* there once, it must have been ages ago, and it seems impossible. "God is love," comprises my whole system of ethics. And, as thou says, it seems to take in *all*. . . . I guess He means us to be good *human beings* in this world, and nothing more. . . . There is certainly a very grave defect in any doctrine that universally makes its holders narrow and uncharitable, and this is always the case with strict so-called orthodoxy. Whereas, as soon as Christian love comes in, the bounds widen infinitely. I find that everyone who has travelled this highway of holiness for any length of time, has invariably cut loose from its old moorings.[932] I bring out my heresies to such, expecting reproof, when lo! I find sympathy. We are "out on the ocean sailing," that is certain. And if it is the ocean of God's love, as I believe, it is grand.
>
> But, enough! Now, what will thee do with it all?[933]

Hannah saw that her Higher Life doctrine did not require the blessing of the Spirit of God and that it led people to reject Christian orthodoxy for ever greater heresy. While she was not willing to commit to the truth because of her unwillingless to evaluate everything by Scripture alone, she was correct when she opined: "I was awfully wicked in the whole

---

930 That is, without the Divine Seed of Quakerism.

931 That is, Jesus Christ was not necessary, Mrs. Smith thought. Note that this satisfaction with a bare creative deity, a satisfication with a god other and less than the Triune Jehovah who has brought redemption through His incarnate Son, was Hannah W. Smith's expressed doctrine immediately after the 1874-5 Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions. One cannot maintain that she was solidly orthodox at the time she founded the Keswick theology and merely became a heretic, say, some decades later.

932 That is, the adoption of the Higher Life leads to the disowning of Christian orthodoxy.

933 Pgs. 32-36, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Mrs. Anna Shipley, August 8, 1876. Italics and capitalization in original. See also Letter to a Friend, August 8, 1876, reproduced in the entries for August 2-4 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. A portion of the letter not reproduced by Logan is found in Dieter. Hannah elsewhere wrote: "The truth is my 'broadness' embraces every soul that is reaching out after God and every instrumentality that helps any to find Him, no matter how different it may be from my own views and ways"—that is, as long as one is "reaching after God," Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, animism, or any other system of belief was acceptable (Letter to a Friend, May 24, 1880, reproduced in the entry for October 10 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

matter, and God was not in it anywhere and all the success was because of our natural gifts and talents." Both Mrs. Smith and her husband possessed tremendous natural powers and salesmanship abilities which they used to great success.[934] Mrs. Smith was also correct that her sphinxlike indifference was pagan fatalism,[935] irreligious, and evidence that she had nothing of God in her. Describing the powers that brought her to be leading meetings and services continually, Hannah wrote: "There seems to be something occult about it."[936] Nonetheless, she continued on her path without care or concern, feeling happy. Mr. Smith recognized the overwhelming evidence provided by his last "successful" meeting that the Holy Spirit was not in his work at all, but that his success was simply natural; his apostasy from the profession of Christianity to agnosticism following in due course.[937] Mrs. Smith, on the other hand, was not willing to recongize that all her Higher Life agitation had been done without any real blessing by God, and so she retained her belief in the Higher Life and in a deity, while her orthodoxy, such as it was, went to the winds. She could be satisfied without the incarnate Christ,[938]

---

934 Logan Pearsall Smith described the natural powers of salesmanship possessed by his father Robert P. Smith as follows:

> My father was a man of fine presence, and of a sanguine, enthusiastic temperament[.] . . . He was, above all, a magnificent salesman; and traveling all over the United States, and offering the firm's wares [the glass manufacturing firm Robert worked with before he became a Higher Life preacher] to the chemists of the rapidly expanding Republic, he exercised upon those apothecaries the gifts of persuasion and blandishment, almost of hypnotization, which were destined later, in European and more exalted spheres, to produce some startling results [in his Higher Life work]. . . . My father . . . possessed the hypnotic power of swaying great audiences[.] (pgs. 32, 72 *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith)

935 The sphinxlike indifference of Hannah W. Smith was radically different from the attitude of the Lord Jesus Christ. Mrs. Smith declared: "I utterly refuse to let myself indulge in grief for my children who have left me [in death.] . . . It is really disobedience . . . to indulge in grief" (Letter to Priscilla, January 28, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 11 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). "She had lost her elder son . . . her heart was untroubled" (pg. 49, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Contrast Mrs. Smith's attitude with that of the Lord Jesus Christ: "When Jesus therefore saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled[.] . . . Jesus wept. Then said the Jews, Behold how he loved him!" (John 11:33-36).

936 Pg. 133, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her Daughter, Mary Costelloe, October 29, 1896.

937 Logan Pearsall Smith wrote: "After this 'scamp meeting' . . . as Dr. Cullis wittily called it . . . and the disillusion it brought, in spite of its success, my father became more sympathetic to my grandfather's want of faith; and this feeling was much increased [as time continued to pass]" (pgs. 66-69, *Unforgotten Years*).

938 One is not surprised that Hannah was also sympathetic to and ready to reject the orthodox doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon on the Person of Christ and His two natures for the heretical and idolatrous kenotic theory as expressed by Godet, that "the Church doctrine of the two natures does not perfectly set forth the sense of the Scriptures . . . the Scriptures do not teach the presence of the divine nature with its divine attributes in Jesus on earth. The expression in John 1:14 conveys the idea of a divine subject reduced to a human state, but not of two states, divine and human, co-existing" (pg. 399, *The Humiliation of Christ in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects*, A. B. Bruce. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900). Hannah Smith explained how the Higher Life led her against Biblical and Chalcedonian Christology:

considering dotrines such as His Deity, crucifixion, and resurrection as mere tempests in a religious teapot. She could be satisfied also without the church.[939] She could even be satisfied with the piety of mystical Hindu syncretism or Buddhism,[940] as long as she had a

---

> I must read Godet . . . [for] his views of Christ . . . I am not at all shocked at what you tell me about them; and it would be just like our God to take our place really and actually, and share our lot even in its limitations. I think I would have done it if I were in His place. . . . Anna, when once the soul has begun to know God, old prejudices must go! And before the two grand facts of His justice and His love, all the old creeds and notions vanish like clouds before sunshine. . . . I cannot express how thankful I am for the relentless pressure my dear Methodist friends put me under years ago on this matter of consecration. (Letter to Mrs. Shipley, 1878, reproduced in the entry for September 8 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

Hannah was sympathetic to the kenotic theory, for, even if it was not taught in the Bible, she would have followed it if she were God. In any case, at least she had a Divine seed in her, as Quakerism taught.

939 "Somehow my two summers out in the wilds of nature, with no meetings and no religious influences, only God and His works, have been more helpful in my interior life than any other thing I have ever known" (Letter to Anna, November 24, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 29 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Contrast the attitude of King David towards the instituted worship of the Lord: "How amiable *are* thy tabernacles, O LORD of hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the LORD: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God. . . . For a day in thy courts *is* better than a thousand" (Psalm 84:1-2, 10).

940 Her attitude toward a syncretistic blending of Hinduism and Christianity is evident in her view of Chunder Sen. "In 1857 the young Keshub Chunder Sen (1838–84) joined the society . . . Brahmo Samaj (Society of Brahma), which taught theism and rationality against the background of Indian mysticism[.] . . . Later he formed a new group, the Brahmo Samaj of India," which combined Hindu mysticism with "social Christianity" and "adopted some Christian teachings" while remaining fundamentally Hindu (pg. 549, *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol. 2, E. Fahlbusch & G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999-2003). Hannah Smith viewed this Hindu idolator and syncretist as a great spiritual teacher, and affirmed that, led by her Inner Light, she worshipped the same god, the god of mysticism, the god of this world (Ephesians 2:1-3), the god that spoke to the Quakers and gave them revelations that went beyond the Bible, as the Hindu mystic:

> I have read Chunder Sen, and do feel just like sailing for India to see him. What a grand revelation that man has had! It stirred me to the very depths. Oh, beloved, how it shames us who have such a blaze of light all our lives long! Where did we take the fatal turning that has led us so far astray? . . . I thank God however that the light has come at last; and like Chunder Sen I say that the "residue of my independence has been swallowed up by the all-conquering all-absorbing grace of God, and I am sold forever!" How wonderful that word, "No independence" is! [That is, both Chunder Sen's Hindu mysticism and Hannah Smith's Higher Life mysticism practice Quietism.] It cuts down to the root of everything; and yet is so full of life, Divine life, that it seems to bring the soul out into the grandest place of liberty.
>
> It seems just like one of God's coincidences that I had been learning the very lessons in regard to this which Chunder Sen's announces. I know the "I am" he knew [that is, the pagan Hindu "I am."]. And God has said to me: "I am your church and doctrine; I am your creed and your immortality, your earth, your Heaven, your food, your raiment, your treasure here and in Heaven. Believe in Me." To me it is a life, a free, independent, Divine life, back of all forms, an absolute, universal life, that can fit into any form, or can exist without form. [That is, any god, any worship, whether that of Jehovah or of the vilest idol, can fit into her mysticism.] It would be true then that circumcision availeth nothing, nor uncircumcision. That is, one might enter into the form or might remain without, just as led by the Spirit at the time. I cannot but think this is the deeper insight into the truth; and the more I look to the Lord about it, the clearer are my convictions. Well, I must follow the light, my light, that which is given to me, [that is, the Inner Light,] even though it separates me from all whom I love! And sometimes I think it may. . . . Am I to reckon on God and believe He has answered my prayer [for guidance apart from submission to *sola Scriptura*], or am I to think He has utterly disregarded it, and has left me a prey to delusions and errors? . . . [T]he Lord has had to put to death all my traditional views one after another . . . I am amazed sometimes to find out what a genuine "early Quaker" I am. (Letter to Anna, September 11, 1879, reproduced in the entries for September 22-24 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter)

Likewise, her spiritual "secret" was inquired about, she affirmed, by "Siddartha" (Letter to Anna, February 5, 1880, reproduced in the entry for October 2 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith,

simple Creator. When Mrs. Smith could dilute the whole counsel of God contained in the complete Bible to a simple and mushy "God is love"[941]—whoever and whatever God is—and when those who "travelled on this highway" of the Higher Life with her "for any length of time" ended up jettisoning orthodoxy also, it should have been glaringly and horribly obvious to her upon self-examination (2 Corinthians 13:5) that her religion was earthly, sensual, and devilish.

Hannah was able, in part, to continue to preach the Higher Life even after facing the evidence that all her work was unspiritual and devoid of the smiles of heaven because she flatly rejected self-examination. In direct contradiction to the command of 2 Corinthians 13:5[942] and other Biblical passages, Mrs. Smith proclaimed that "self-examination . . . seems to be spiritual" but in reality causes "injury and harm"—indeed, it is "about as disastrous as anything."[943] Consequently, as she learned from "Fenelon," she counselled others: "[G]ive up all future *self-reflective acts*," for this was a key to spiritual "liberty."[944] At the Brighton Convention, for example, she boldly preached against self-examination, distorting 2 Corithians 13:5 in a major way.[945]

---

ed. Dieter), that is, "Siddartha Gautama" or Buddha, founder of Buddhism, which "teaches that enlightenment may be reached by elimination of earthly desires and of the idea of the self" (*Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 11th ed., C. Soanes & A. Stevenson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). Buddha also taught the sort of Quietism affirmed by Mrs. Smith.

941 The affirmation "God is love" in 1 John 4:8 is not an affirmation about an empty attribute of the generic deity with which Mrs. Smith could be satisfied. The verse speaks about the loving nature of the Father of Jesus Christ. God the Father is love, and He concretely demonstrated His character as love by giving His Son as a substitute for sinners on the cross, graciously applying the salvation purchased there to His people by the Holy Spirit (1 John 4:9-14; cf. 5:7). 1 John 4:8 is about the concretely manifested love of this particular God, the only true God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

942 "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" (2 Corinthians 13:5; cf. Psalm 26:2; 119:59; 139:23-24; Lamentations 3:40; Ezekiel 18:28; Haggai 1:5-7; Matthew 7:5; 1 Corinthians 11:28-31; Galatians 6:4; Hebrews 12:15; 1 John 3:20-21).

943 Letter to a Friend, 1863; April 10, 1878; Letter to Daughter Mary, May 12, 1878; Letter to Daughter, Atlantic City, May 25, 1878; reproduced in the entries for January 30, August 17, 24, 28, of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

944 Pg. 65, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Miss Priscilla Mounsey, January 22, 1882 & Letter To Priscilla, January 22, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 9 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Hannah Smith often warned others, "Don't indulge in self-reflective acts" (Letter to Mary Beck, May 14, 1874, Letter, 1866, reproduced in the entry for July 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

945 Pg. 318, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

After all, she had "suffered so much from" self-examination that she wrote: "I have at last given it up forever. Do the same, dear friend[.]"[946] Rather than practicing self-examination, one is to "lear[n] the precious lesso[n] . . . of knowing the inward Voice, and following it without reserve. . . . For myself, I find that the sweetness of a life of obedience to this inward Voice is greater than I can express," as confirmed by her feelings of happiness and by the Quaker "Isaac Pennington."[947] Hannah sought to come to a "more complete surrender to . . . the inward voice . . . than ever" as she plunged ever deeper into the Higher Life; her "great hunger" was for this "voice."[948] Thus, by rejecting self-examination, she could remain deluded and happy despite in the devilish nature of her religion, as its terribly unsound character was only obvious to those who recognized human depravity, rejected the Inward Voice, cleaved to *sola Scriptura*, and carefully applied the Bible to their own spiritual experience, because of their own personal regeneration. Hannah W. Smith rejected such a careful and watchful attitude, since the conflict between the Bible and her experience hindered her feelings of happiness and made her feel like she was suffering; following the Inward Voice instead made her feel very happy, at least at the time—whether she was happy upon her death is another question.

As well as the paradigmatic Higher Life or Keswick writer, Mrs. Smith and her husband were Quakers, "birthright member[s] of the Society of Friends"[949] who sought to lead her children into the Quaker way.[950] The Smiths had Quaker ancestors reaching back to the days of William Penn.[951] Hannah's "father . . . was . . . a very strict Quaker . . . Robert's family were also of good Quaker stock."[952] Indeed, Hannah, her "parents, and [even her] grandparents" were "birthright Friend[s],"[953] and Hannah was raised in

---

946 Letter to a Friend, April 10, 1878, reproduced in the entry for August 17 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

947 Letter to Miss Beck, December 5, 1878, reproduced in the entry for September 9 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

948 Letter to Sisters, August 14, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 19 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

949 Pg. 11, *Religious Fanaticism: Extracts from the Papers of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. Ray Strachey. New York, NY: AMS Press, 1976, repr. of 1928 London ed; cf. also pg. 231 & *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey, pg. 19.

950 See, e. g., Letter to Daughter Mary, January 1, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 1 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter; pg. 79, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith, references Logan's education in Quaker schools all the way through, and inclusive of, college.

951 See pgs. 4-35, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

952 Pg. 20, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey.

953 Pg. 36, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*, Henrie.

"traditional Quaker mysticism."[954] While, Mr. Smith was for a portion of his life a member of the Presbyterian denomination,[955] even in his most theologically orthodox years he was close enough to Quakerism that, for example, around the time of his leadership of the Keswick precursor Conventions he could send his "children and their nurse . . . to stay for the whole summer with the Barclays, a wealthy Quaker family, at Monkhams, their home in Essex . . . [where] the girls shared the Barclay children's governess and tutors."[956] Furthermore, Mrs. Smith "could not follow . . . Robert . . . [in joining] the Presbyterians . . . as she found their views against the preaching of women unacceptable."[957] Indeed, Hannah was too heretical even for many Quakers: "In 1867 . . . Hannah . . . tried to start a little Quaker Meeting in Millville, which, not surprisingly, turned out too heretical to be approved, and she searched the Scriptures to support her strong feeling that she was called upon to preach."[958] Nevertheless, by "the 1870s Hannah had no church affiliation and . . . had begun to attend Friend's Meeting again,"[959] as she "had become more or less reconciled . . . [with] the Quakers."[960] During some periods of their married life when, in the words of Hannah, "Robert [was] enthusiastic over [men such as a local] Baptist clergyman . . . because he preaches such a pure gospel," Hannah nonetheless noted, "I *cannot* enjoy close contact with such people";[961] Quaker ministers, who did not preach a pure gospel, were better.[962] The teachings of the Pearsall Smiths cannot be understood properly without a consideration of the Quakerism that permeated their religious background.

Hannah believed that the "Friends . . . were especially raised up by the Lord to teach this truth" of the Higher Life, and she "long[ed] to see Quakerism the formost in the great battlefield" for it. She wrote: "More and more I am convinced that Quakerism

---

954 Introduction, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter; see also after January 7 for Robert P. Smith's heritage among "prominent Philadelphia Quakers.")

955 Pg. 17, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

956 Pg. 45, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey.

957 Pgs. 25-26, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey. A German Reformed minister did, however, administer infant baptism to Mrs. Smith (pg. 35, *The Secret Life of Hannah W. Smith*, Marie Henry). Such an event by no means changes the plain historical fact that she was firmly entrenched in Quakerism for the entirety of her time as a public speaker, teacher of men, Higher Life crusader, and formative writer in the Keswick movement, although she was not always specifically a member of a Quaker assembly.

958 Pg. 30, *Remarkable Relations,* Barbara Strachey; cf. pg. 55 for Hannah's continued public speaking.

959 Pg. 68, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*, Marie Henry.

960 Pg. 55, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey.

961 Pg. 29, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey; Italics in original. Compare 1 John 3:14.

962 Cf. Letter to Sarah, Marcy 12, 1885, reproduced in the entry for December 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

was in its first founding pure, unadulterated Christianity. Every advanced truth that the Lord teaches me, I find is only a return to pure Quakerism."[963] Before her rise as a preacher of the Higher Life, at the pinnacle of her preaching work with Robert that led to the founding of the Keswick Convention, and throughout the rest of her life, she remained a devoted Quaker.[964]

> Mrs. Smith . . . remained essentially a Quaker throughout life, or, as it would be more accurate to say, grew steadily more and more Quaker. There is scarcely a distinctively Quaker conception which does not find expression at some time or other in her writings. . . . [E]ven the fundamental mystical [Quaker heresy of] the "divine seed" is quite clearly enunciated and the characteristic Higher Life teaching developed out of it. . . . Mrs. Smith became perfectly well aware, then, that her teaching was in its essence genuinely Quaker teaching: and she delighted to present it in its organic relation with Quaker teaching.[965]

The Higher Life theology she founded was simply the theology of Quakerism.

Since she did not have to examine herself by the teaching of Scripture, Mrs. Smith could set Biblical doctrine and practice against each other, reject the former, exalt the latter, and feel happy in her deluded state. Hannah wrote:

> How true the old Friends were when they used to tell us that it was not what we believed but how we lived that was the real test of salvation, and how little we understood them! . . . And as thee says, my opinions about God may all be wrong, but if my loyalty to Him is real it will not matter. It seems as if it would be enough just to say, "God is," and, "Be good," and then all would be said. [That is, even Deism combined with mere morality would be acceptable.] It is the practical things that interest me now[.][966]

---

963 Letter to a Friend, August 22, 1880, reproduced in the entries for October 14-15 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

964 Thus, for example, a few days before the Brighton Convention, Robert having just concluded his continental preaching tour in 1875, when "it seem[ed] as if the whole German and Swiss Churches were moved to their very center by his message" of the Higher Life, Mr. and Mrs. Smith would still attend the Friends Meeting with Mr. Cowper-Temple, where Hannah would preach to people who had come to town to attend the Brighton Convention (pg. 26, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her parents, John and Mary Whitall, May 26, 1875; cf. also pg. 29). The idea that one would need to separate from and reject Quakerism as heresy to be part of the Higher Life or Keswick Conventions was absolutely unthinkable.

965 Pgs. 494-497, "The 'Higher Life' Movement," Chapter 4 in *Perfectionism, vol. 2*, Benjamin B. Warfield. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003 (reprint of 1932 Oxford ed.). Warfield downplays Robert P. Smith's Quaker background, but it is unreasonable to do so when, for instance, Mr. Smith did not renounce the Quakerism into which he was born as a false religion and he had his "steadily more and more Quaker" wife write Higher Life articles for him, such as those which became Mrs. Smith's bestselling *Secret of a Happy Life*.

966 Letter to Anna, August 4, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Since any deity was acceptable to Mrs. Smith, it is not surprising that the pioneering psychologist, pragmatist, and finite god proponent William James was friends with the Pearsall Smiths, nor that, in the words of Logan Smith, James "was an admirer of my mother's religious writings" (pg. 114, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith; Logan notes that James also "enlisted my father's assistance in the formation of an American Society for Psychical Research.").

She did not know whether what she taught people was sound, or whether it was true—but she knew that it made people feel comfortable, and this was enough.[967] Indeed, she wrote that her first duty in life was not to glorify God, but to be comfortable: "I consider it my *first* duty in life to make myself as comfortable as is possible[.]"[968] After all, as Hannah explained at the Brighton Convention, the Holy Spirit is not "one to make us unhappy"—thoughts that make one unhappy "always come from Satan."[969] She did not seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness (Matthew 6:33), but sought first the secret of a happy life. Feeling happy—eudemonism—was what was truly important. Her son Logan narrated:

> When in her later life [Mrs. Smith] came to be a sort of mother-confessor to the many people who used to come to her for advice in their perplexities, her advice was always, she told us, for them to do the thing they really and seriously wanted to do. . . . "But surely, Mother," [her children] sometimes protested, "this is dangerous advice to give to people!" "Well," she would answer, "our Heavenly Father knows the kind of advice I give, so if He sends people to me it must be because He wants them given this advice. Besides, children," she would add, "people always in the end do what they want to do, and they might as well do it with a good conscience."[970]

Based on this view that people should do whatever they wanted, Hannah taught: "[D]on't be too unselfish."[971] Logan Pearsall Smith explained what he learned from his parents about sanctification from the time he experienced his second blessing as an unregenerate seven year old:

> Sanctification . . . renders us immune from sin. . . . [I] renounced . . . Pelagian attempts to conquer Sin and Satan by [my] own carnal struggles, and realized that only by Grace, and unmerited Grace alone, and by no "deadly doing," could [I] attain the conquest that [I] sought. . . . [Those who receive the second blessing receive] [t]he glorious certainty that they are sanctified . . . they

---

967 "It is to be hoped I give . . . sound teaching! [For she did not know if she did or not.] At any rate it is *comfortable* teaching" (pg. 183, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, February 22, 1906. Italics in original.). Compare Jeremiah 6:14; 8:11.

968 Pg. 204, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing Letter to her Daughter, Mary Berenson, November 26, 1908. Italics in original.

969 pg. 376, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875. Contrast Zechariah 12:10-14; Matthew 5:4; 1 Corinthians 5:2; James 4:9-10.

970 Pgs. 155-156, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith. Mrs. Smith justified this utterly unbiblical advice by a wretched abuse of Philippians 2:13, which was said to prove that God leads people to do whatever they want.

971 Logan recounts the situation in which this advice was given:

> I remember once when [Hannah Smith] was full of years, and famous for her religious teachings, that a party of schoolgirls from some pious school in Philadelphia visited Oxford, and the teacher who conducted the party wrote to my mother . . . to say that it would be a privilege for the little flock of maidens to have a sight of this venerable Quaker saint, and to hear from her lips a few pious words. The permission was granted; the schoolgirls assembled on the spacious lawn outside our house . . . [W]hen she opened her lips I was considerably surprised to her her say, "Girls, don't be too unselfish."
>
> "Surely, Mother," I remonstrated with her afterwards, "when those girls go home their pious relations will be dreadfully shocked by what thee said."
>
> "Yes," she replied gayly, "yes, I dare say it will make them grind their teeth." (pgs. 156-157, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan P. Smith)

> rejoice—as all my life I have rejoiced—in the consciousness that they can commit no wrong. I may do, I have undoubtedly done, things that were foolish, tactless, and dishonest, and what the world would consider wrong, but since I attained the state of Sanctification at the age of seven I have never felt the slightest twinge of conscience, never experienced for one second the sense of sin.[972]

Logan achieved the goal of his mother's theology of sanctification—happiness in a perpetual freedom from a sense of sin and guilt—the secret of a happy life. To Hannah W. Smith, feeling happy, and having no pangs of conscience because of sin, were more important than the glory of God and obedience to the Bible.

In line with the Quaker background she shared with her husband, both Mrs. and Mr. Smith were believers in the continuation of miraculous gifts for the present day as opposed to being cessationists, advocates of the Biblical truth that the sign gifts ceased with the completion of the canon of the Scripture and the death of the Apostles in the first century. The Smiths were consequently involved in the Faith or Mind Cure movement which advocated miraculous and non-medical means for healing and laid the foundation for Keswick continuationism and Pentecostalism. Mrs. Smith knew Quakers who had received Faith Cures.[973] She was the instrument through which various people received such Cures herself,[974] healing several who were "close to hysteria," although she "tried

---

[972] Pgs. 38-40, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan P. Smith.

[973] Letter to Priscilla, August 14, 1882, reproduced in the entry for August 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[974] Mrs. Smith testified that she was the instrument of several healings, the character of which illustrate well many of the healings practiced in the Keswick and Pentecostal movements. Hannah recounts:

> On one occasion I had a dear friend who was very nervous. She used to cry on the smallest provocation and about things which had no personal element in them, except that they upset her nerves. . . . She and I attended a little prayer meeting . . . she announced to us at the beginning of the meeting that we were to devote that meeting to her[.] . . . I confess that I had not much expectation that praying would do her any good, as I thought it was a physical condition which probably could never be alleviated. But when the time came we all knelt down to pray, and of course I knelt with them. I supposed that there would be fervent prayers offered for our friend by the others, and I did not really intend to pray myself at all, but to my astonishment the whole little company prayed all round in turns and never mentioned her case. It seemed to me that this was very impolite, and, in fact, unkind, when she had thrown herself so upon our sympathy, and so mainly, with the idea that she might not be disappointed, and simply out of an impulse of politeness and kindness, when the rest had finished I prayed for her; but, I confess, I had not the slightest idea that anything would come of it, except that her feelings would be smoothed by the recognition of her need. Imagine my astonishment when we rose from our knees and she turned to me and said, "Hannah, thy prayer is answered; I am cured." And as a fact she was cured from that time.
>
> Another case was once when I was attending a meeting. After I had spoken, a woman rose from the middle of the meeting and said, "If that lady who has just spoken will come and lay hands on me and pray for my recovery I shall be healed of a throat trouble that has caused me great suffering for many years, and for which the doctors declare they can do nothing." I thought to myself, "How little that woman knows how unbelieving I am with regard to faith healing. I am certain my prayers would do her no good." And, in fact, I was rather amused at her ignorance, and had to cover my face to hide a smile. The meeting went on for a little longer, and by the time it closed I had entirely forgotten the incident, and began to talk to a friend beside me, when someone came hastily in and said, "Mrs. Smith, that woman is waiting for you to come and pray for her, and you must come at once, for she says her throat is very bad." Out of kindness I went, but I said to the woman as I entered the room, "You have sent for me to pray for you, but I haven't a particle of faith that it will do the least bit of good." "Yes it will," she replied; "it will cure me. Kneel right down here beside

her powers, in vain, on a victim of cancer,"[975] since cancer is clearly a physical disease that is not removed when someone is no longer hysterical. She stated: "With Faith Healing I have had a great deal of experience."[976] Hannah wrote concerning a sick friend: "I wish she could get hold of faith healing[.]"[977] She herself used a "Mind Cure for sea-sickness[.]"[978] She was acquainted with that prominent evangelist of the Faith Cure,[979] Dr. Charles Cullis, from at least 1871,[980] and ministered with Cullis on various

---

> me, and lay your hand on my throat and ask God to heal me, and I know I shall be healed." Out of kindness I did as she wished, although I confess it seemed to me something of a farce. However, when we rose from our knees, to my amazement her voice was changed, and she declared her throat was cured. I hear from her quite often afterwards, and the story was always the same, that the cure was complete.
>
> As I bade the woman farewell, she said, "Now, Mrs. Smith, you have the gift of healing, and you ought to exercise it." . . . Another instance . . . was in the case of a friend who had become . . . a victim of the opium habit. One day when we were talking together, she said, "I believe if you would pray for me, I could be cured of this habit." I myself had no idea that it could be done, but, of course, when a person wanted me to pray for them [*sic*], I should not think of refusing, so I keeled down beside her wheel-chair and prayed, and the result in her case also was a complete cure. (pgs. 253-256, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey)

Many other instances of the Faith Cure were, without a doubt, as supernatural as those Mrs. Smith experienced, and as a result of the employment of similar means.

Notwithstanding working several Faith Cures herself, elements of skepticism were engendered in Hannah concerning the Faith Cure as she saw that the Cure failed to cure disease. For example, having heard of Dr. Charles Cullis, whom she called "a most delightful Christian doctor," she assembled a few dozen sick people at her house so that he could come and heal them. He failed to heal anybody at all (pgs. 262-263, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey). The fact that the Faith Cure led to the death of her sister Mary Thomas must also have brought doubts into Hannah's mind. Nevertheless, she never renounced or opposed the Faith or Mind Cure but continued to believe and preach that there was truth in the practice, and she continued to recommend the Cure to others.

975 Pgs. xv-xvi, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith.

976 Pg. 262, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

977 Letter to Anna, May 15, 1878, reproduced in the entry for August 22 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

978 Pg. 89, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing *Letter to her daughter, Mary Costelloe*, September 2, 1886. Not surprisingly, the Mind Cure did not work, and Hannah W. Smith still suffered from a horrible sea-sickness.

979 Hannah describes the views of Cullis, and his working of a Faith Cure, in connection with a positive confession of healing, on her nephew Tom Whitall, who had suffered from overwork. The Cure did not completely cure him, and it did not work at all at first. In any case, the partially cured "overwork" of the Faith Cure is hardly the reattached limbs or raising of the dead performed by Christ and His Apostles. Mrs. Smith wrote:

> We really have been stirred up on this faith healing question lately. You may have heard me speak about Saidee's brother Tom as having broken down from overwork several years ago. For four years now he has been doing every thing possible to recover his health, but all in vain. His last venture was a voyage to the Cape of Good Hope, but he came back worse than he went.
>
> When Dr. Cullis was here a week or two ago, Tom felt drawn to try the faith cure, as every thing else had failed, and Dr. Cullis prayed with him twice and told him to say he was healed. He began to say it, and, poor fellow, he had a hard battle, for a whole week there was no sign of any improvement. His mother and I were immersed in the deepest sympathy with him, and we all had to fight for our faith together. . . After a week, however, Tom began to improve, and there has been a most wonderful change in him in every way, and he is full of praise to the Lord. It has, of course, made a great stir among all our circle here, for Tom was always a great favorite. He has gone on to Boston now to spend a little time with Dr. Cullis to have his faith strengthened, and perhaps to help the Dr. a little in his faith work.
>
> If he really does get entirely well I believe I will have to give up and adopt Dr. Cullis' view of the subject. He says Matt. 8:17 teaches clearly that Christ bore our sicknesses just as much as He bore our sins, and that we may be delivered from the one by faith precisely as we are delivered from the other! If this is

occasions,[981] since "Dr. Cullis of Boston [was] a friend and fellow evangelist" of the Smiths.[982] After all, Cullis surely had miraculous powers; he healed Mrs. Smith's

---

> true, it would revolutionize the church! I am not convinced yet that it is true, but I confess that passage looks wonderfully like it. I will mail thee some little books about it. Ask thy sister Charlotte and thy cousin Mary Agnes to compare Matt. 8:17 with James 5:14, 15 and see whether they get any light on the subject for themselves.
>
> It would be glorious, would it not, if Christians universally could dispense with all human doctors and be cured by the Great Physician alone, and could show the world a continual miracle of healing? Dr. Cullis thinks all disease is from the devil, and is a direct attack from him upon God's children, just like temptation to sin is, and must therefore be met in the same way. There is a good deal of Scripture that seems to support his view. (Letter to Priscilla, May 7, 1882, reproduced in the entry for August 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter)

Nonetheless, surely Tom's Faith Cure, while nothing like Apostolic healing, was very grand—at least until some days later, when it became apparent that he was not cured at all, causing Hannah doubts:

> I went up to that invalid friend's who has been trusting for faith healing for so long. We had a little Bible class in her sick room. She does not seem any better. And yet she sticks to the testimony that she is healed, since that is what Dr. Cullis told her she must do. It does not seem right to me somehow.
>
> The fact is this faith healing matter grows more and more perplexing all the time. You remembers [*sic*] that funny friend of mine Elisabeth Nicholson, who went with us to the prayer meeting about President Garfield? She is not particularly consecrated, except in quite an ordinary fashion; she does not believe in the "Higher Life" at all, and she is very much afraid of fanaticism. And yet the other day she wrote me as follows[:] "The 31st. of May, sitting waiting for the dinner bell to ring, I talked to the Lord like this, "Lord, you know the muscles of my back are weak, and cause me much pain. You know I have inherited this through two generations; that I have been very indifferent about healing, making it an excuse for not visiting or doing anything I did not want to. But now, if it will honor you and if it will give me more strength to work for you, Lord Jesus, then I ask thee to heal me instantaneously." It was done! From that moment I have not had a pain; nor even the soreness which often made me shift my position. It no longer seems like me, but somebody else! I have done my hardest work since then without pain. [Note: At least this is the testimony of this lady, unexamined medically, from the standpoint of two weeks later—a time frame in which Tom Whitall also thought he was cured.]
>
> Now what are we to think when such saints as some I know can't get healed with all their praying and all their trusting? There is a secret somewhere that we have not fathomed yet, I am convinced. Meanwhile, I would advise every sick person to try this way of prayer and faith anyhow. It cannot hurt, and it may be a grand success. My nephew Tom Whitall is not well yet. He thought he was for a few days, and was very jubilant over it, but his trouble all came back, and he has been having a hard conflict. Now he has gone to a water cure to fight it out. My heart just aches for him. I wish I understood! (Letter to Priscilla, June 16, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 14 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter)

Indeed, Mrs. Smith's "invalid friend" was still not better many months later, despite "declaring . . . she was healed that day" so long ago, despite still "trusting for faith healing" many months later, despite having "Dr. Cullis pray for her," and despite believing "teaching of all kinds on the subject of faith"—despite all this, her Faith Cure "fail[ed] . . . utterly" (Letter to Priscilla, August 14, 1882, reproduced in the entry for August 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). However, despite its failures, and despite the lack of exegetical evidence for it, Hannah W. Smith was so far from being willing to denounce the Cure of Cullis as a delusion that she still concluded that she "would advise every sick person to try this way" of the Faith Cure anyway.

980 See her Letter to Frank, May 16, 1871, reproduced in the entry for June 5 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

981 See, e. g., her narrative of her "Framingham, Massachusetts meeting sponsored by Dr. Charles Cullis," or her description of her ministry with "Dr. Cullis at his conference" in 1879 and her commending the "little book issued by Dr. Cullis" there, in her Letter to a Friend of August 8, 1876 & Letter to a Friend, August 17, 1879, reproduced in the entries for August 2-3 & September 20 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

982 Pg. 66, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith.

daughter of indigestion through the techniques of the Faith Cure,[983] although he was unable to heal himself—ever—of a serious heart condition he endured for decades.[984] Indeed, Cullis was such a firm supporter of Mr. and Mrs. Smith and their Higher Life preaching that he sought to restore Robert after Mr. Smith's fall due to his preaching of erotic Spirit baptism.[985] As a Quaker, Hannah W. Smith was naturally an advocate for the continuationism of the Faith or Mind Cure.

Mrs. Smith was likewise a "friend" of the "New Thought teacher . . . Mrs. Caldwell,"[986] illustrating the close relationship between the nineteenth century New Thought or Mind Cure movements from which arose the Christian Science of Mary B. Eddy, with its spiritualism and laws of healing, and the Faith Cure.[987] Hannah noted:

> I find that spiritualists have all the "baptisms" and "leadings" and "manifestations" that [non-spiritualistic but continuationist] Christians have, with precisely similar symptoms. The same "thrills," the same "waves" or currents of life, the same spiritual uplifts, the same interior illuminations; they even see similar visions of Christ, and hear similar interior voices . . . taken in themselves, it is utterly impossible to distinguish between them.[988]

Mrs. Smith's daughter also "visited . . . with the intention of studying her doctrine, the famous female prophet, Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy."[989] Indeed, Hannah Smith's description of the Faith Cure makes its identity with the Mind Cure of New Thought evident:

> [O]ur faith lays hold of spiritual forces which are superior to natural forces and which therefore can overpower them. . . . [W]e become able to avail ourselves of powers that He has put at our disposal in the spiritual realm. I expect His real will for us is health always, but if we disobey natural laws His will is thwarted, and it is only by bringing in spiritual laws that we can overcome the evil tendencies caused by sin[.] . . . [J]ust as a wire does not create the electric current but only draws it down in certain directions so our faith does not create health but only draws the vitality of the spiritual realm down into our vessel. It is wonderful what faith will do.[990]

Thus, the Faith or Mind Cure works based on "law," and prayer is not, as it is in the Bible, a means of healing through the petitioning of a personal, sovereign, and loving

---

983 Pg. 39, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing Letter ot Mrs. Henry Ford Barclay, April 13, 1877.

984 Pg. 131, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

985 Pg. 32, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing Letter to Mrs. Anna Shipley, August 8, 1876.

986 See Letter to Sarah, March 7, 1881 & Letter to Sister, July 28, 1881, reproduced in the entries for October 24 & 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

987 Interestingly, Hannah noted: "I find that spiritualists have all the 'baptisms' and 'leadings' and 'manifestations' that [continuationist] Christians have, with precisely similar symptoms. The same 'thrills,' the same 'waves' or currents of life, the same spiritual uplifts, the same interior illuminations; they even see similar visions of Christ, and hear similar interior voices . . . taken in themselves, it is utterly impossible to distinguish between them" (Letter to Carrie, July 31, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 17 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

988 Letter to Carrie, July 31, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 17 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

989 Pg. 128, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

990 Letter to Mary, November 1, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 27 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

God in Christ for His gracious physical mercies—rather, prayer is the instrument of healing insofar as by it people are "brought into harmony with those laws" of healing.[991] Anticipating the Word of Faith doctrine of positive confession creating positive realities and negative confessions creating negative realities, Mrs. Smith consequently counselled: "[L]et me advise thee not to talk of thyself as being *old*. There *is* something in Mind Cure, after all, and, if thee continually talks of thyself as being old, thee may perhaps bring on some of the infirmities of age."[992] She wrote: "[T]he mind cure . . . is only the science by which the faith cure works,"[993] a fact generally recognized by objective writers of her day.[994] No objective disjunction and sharp division between an allegedly Christian Faith Cure movement and a clearly pagan and evil Mind Cure movement can be established by objective historiography—Hannah W. Smith and other early continuationist Higher Life leaders certainly made no such division.

Indeed, the Mind or Faith Cure was simply the application to the body of the Higher Life or Keswick doctrine of sanctification by faith alone: "[T]he mind cure . . . [or] faith cure . . . is simply doing on the plane of physical health what we did on the plane of sin when we reckoned ourselves dead to it and alive only to God. If the atonement covers sickness as well as sin this [is] all . . . true."[995] Hannah's rejection of

---

991 Letter to Mary, November 1, 1882 & December 8, 1882, reproduced in the entries for November 27 & December 1-2 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

992 Pg. 187, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing *Letter to her Daughter, Mary Berreneson*, March 5, 1907. The date of the letter validates that Mrs. Smith continued to believe in the value of the Mind or Faith Cure for the course of her lifetime; her faith in the law of the Faith or Mind Cure was no passing fancy. Note also the connection between her affirmation of the Mind Cure and of the Word of Faith idea of positive and negative confession.

993 Letter to Anna, July 1, 1885, reproduced in the entry for December 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Hannah made these remarks concerning her sister Mary Thomas, who trusted in the Mind and Faith Cure, but saw "the mind cure . . . fai[l] . . . [a]nd . . . the faith cure . . . fai[l]" (Letter to Sister, March 15, 1885, reproduced in the entry for December 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter), so that she died of a breast cancer that the medical science the gracious God has allowed men to discover could have cured.

994 For example:

> Christian Scientists and Faith Healers are closely affiliated. . . . [T]hey have a common foe—the scientist and the Christian; and a more or less common practice—reaching, in a somewhat similar way, about the same sort of results. . . . [T]he adherents of the two systems often meet together in conventions, and the laity are to some extent interchangeable. . . . The two systems . . . converge in practice. (pg. 249, "Christian Science and Faith Healing," Clyde W. Votaw. *New Englander and Yale Review*. New Haven, CT: Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, 1891. However, Votaw recognizes that there are ways in which the Christian Scientist and Faith Cure advocate "diverge" markedly in their "theory," the manner in which they speak of their systems.)

995 Letter to Anna, July 1, 1885, reproduced in the entry for December 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. The "newer gospel" of the faith cure, Hannah's letter affirms, teaches that "suffering and sorrow" are not part of God's plan for the body, just as sorrow and suffering must be eliminated from the spiritual life for a perpetual state of happiness—the secret of a happy life. However, Hannah also notes that she entertains doubts about the validity of the Mind or Faith Cure, despite the fact that it is the necessary consequence of her Keswick or Higher Life theology of sanctification by

self-examination was helpful as a support for the Faith and Mind Cure, for not only should one refrain from spiritual self-examination, but from physical self-examination also, so symptoms that were "cured" by the Faith Cure but were still present could be ignored: "Self examination of one's physical symptoms or spiritual symptoms is about as disastrous as anything."[996] Unfortunately, the adoption of the Faith and Mind Cure in Hannah's family led to unnecessary and tragic early death. Hannah Whitall Smith's sister Mary Thomas died of breast cancer at the age of fifty-three in 1887, leaving behind her husband and eight children. Mary believed she was cured by the Faith Cure, consequently refused to go to a doctor to deal with her cancer, and consequently died. In the words of Hannah W. Smith:

> The one great grief to all of us is that six months [earlier] she *could* have been cured [by conventional medicine], when she first began to think she had the trouble, but then she trusted the Lord for healing and fully believed *it was done* and went on believing this all summer so fully that she never said anything to anyone about it.[997] And all the while [her cancer] was growing as rapidly as it was possible for it to do . . . my sister is simply the victim of the faith cure teaching.[998]

Hannah's preaching at a camp meeting exemplified the union of the Faith Cure and the Higher Life in her theology:

> In our hotel I found one of the housekeepers who was a devoted adherent of mine and who told me of a Holiness Camp Meeting in progress in the country outside of the city. . . . Just as I neared the ground . . . I saw a Philadelphia lady whom I used to see at meetings there long ago coming to the pump for water! I spoke to her and she recognized me at once, gave me a hearty welcome, and then introduced me to the leaders of the meeting and to all the dear saints right and left. I received a perfect ovation! They had all apparently read my book "The Christian's Secret," and were full of it, and of the blessing it had been to them "next to their Bibles" [as] the "constant companion of their devotions," the "greatest help of their lives" etc. etc. And they fairly overwhelmed me with their delight at seeing me, dear souls.
>
> They would hear nothing but that I should stay and preach for them in their evening meeting, which I did, under a large tent. It was altogether quite a refreshing experience. . . . They had a meeting for faith healing, and insisted on my going to it to teach them! . . . I told them . . . I would give them Dr. Cullis' teaching, and that seemed to satisfy them.[999]

---

faith alone, chiefly because the Faith Cure does not seem to work. It was not evident to her that her theology of sanctification by quietistic faith alone also was contrary to the truth of God.

[996] Letter to Mary, May 12, 1878, reproduced in the entry for August 24 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[997] Mary Thomas's action, a result of her confidence in the Faith Cure, was an instance of misplaced faith and of sinful disobedience to use proper means to preserve her life.

[998] Pgs. 97-98, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey. Italics in original. Hannah likewise queried while her sister was still alive: "Why should you have all this to suffer when you already had so much? And why the mind cure has failed with you . . . why the faith cure has failed too? And why, if you are going to get well, you do not get well faster?" (Letter to Sister, March 15, 1885, reproduced in the entry for December 26 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

[999] Letter to Priscilla, August 14, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 19 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. While she publicly preached the Faith Cure at the camp meeting, in her private letter to Priscilla she voiced reservations that she did not make public:

> I could not bear to upset their faith by telling them of the practical difficulties I see in the subject[.] . . . But I can tell you my heart ached to hear some poor invalids there declare they were healed, when it was perfectly plain to everyone else that they were not. I do not know what will be the outcome of all this agitation on the

Mrs. Smith was far from being alone in combining the Faith or Mind Cure and the Higher Life; rather, preparing the way for Pentecostalism, "belief in and the witness to miraculous divine healings attended the holiness movement at every turn."[1000] Her Quaker continuationism was by no means restricted to a belief in continued Apostolic healings; she noted that "speaking with tongues . . . is . . . apt to come to [Higher Life] Revivals, [and] I have known a great many instances."[1001] She likewise thought: "[It is] the privilege of Christians to receive the same Baptism now . . . [as was received] on the day of Pentecost. . . . There is nothing in the Bible which suggests that this gift [of Spirit baptism as experienced on Pentecost] should cease[.] . . . [T]he early Friends must have known and experienced it, and . . . this accounts for their wonderful success."[1002] After all, for Mrs. Smith, if not for Scripture, only elite believers—those only who have entered into the Higher Life—have the Holy Spirit,[1003] so a post-conversion second blessing comparable to Pentecost was obviously of tremendous importance. Mrs. Smith was a committed continuationst because of her Higher Life Quakerism, and was consequently very important Pentecostal precursor.

Hannah, as a natural concommitant of her continuationism and Quakerism, believed in the Inner Light heresy and was consequently an opponent of the sole authority

---

> subject of faith healing. In all parts of the church it is being made prominent, and enough wonderful results follow it to excite a continually increasing interest. And yet there are far more failures than successes, and I dread the reaction. For these failures are nearly always with the most devout Christians, and it is an awful strain on their faith.

She noted later: "It's no wonder that doctors are provoked at the way Christians ignore the very first laws of health, and because of it bring such misery and make so much trouble for others" (Letter to Priscilla, 1883, reproduced in the entry for December 16 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

[1000] Pg. 68, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

[1001] Pgs. 260-261, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey. Hannah recounts:

> [I]n one case it went so far that two apparently sensible people allowed their young daughter of thirteen years to go out to China . . . as a missionary, she not knowing a word of Chinese, but being led to speak gibberish in this way, and they all believed that when she got there the Chinese would understand. What really happened when she did get there, however, I have never heard, but I presume she had to come home again. (pgs. 260-261, *ibid*).

By the time Mrs. Smith composed those papers published posthumously by Ray Strachey, having increased in her skepticism with age, Mrs. Smith thought tongues were a "fanaticism."

[1002] Journal, October 29, 1866, reproduced in the entry for February 11, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1003] As Hannah preached at the Broadlands Conferences: "God wishes us [Christians] to have the Holy Spirit . . . [W]hy do we not? We do not accept [Him]." The Conferences taught: "The *permanence* of the presence of the Holy Spirit is a surer sign of a high degree of spiritual life than any other. . . . Let us pray for the Spirit of God Himself to come to us . . . [t]he highest life[,] [to be] one with God" (pgs. 190-195, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in original.). While the permanent presence of the Holy Spirit is the sign of spiritual life, a life possessed by all believers (cf. Romans 8:9), for Mrs. Smith and the Broadlands Conferences such a permanent presence is emphatically restricted to those in the Higher Life alone.

of Scripture. W. H. Griffith Thomas effectively summarizes the character of the Quaker Inner Light heresy:

> In the Mysticism of the Quakers we find the tendency to emphasise the doctrine of the "inner light" as something either independent of, or superior to the written Word. This position is set forth by Barclay, the leading theologian of the Society of Friends. "We may not call them (the Scriptures) the principal fountain of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the first adequate rule of faith and manners, because the principal fountain of truth must be the truth itself; i.e. that whose authority and certainty depends not upon another."[1004] Again, "God hath committed and given unto every man a measure of light of His own Son—a measure of grace, or a measure of the Spirit. This, as it is received, and not resisted, works the salvation of all, even of those who are ignorant of the death and sufferings of Christ."[1005] . . . [Contrary to Quakerism,] it is not true to say that every man, as such, has the Spirit of God, nor can we call the same thing "light," "reason," "grace," "the Spirit," "the Word of God," "Christ within," and "God in us." Such a procedure would create untold confusion and lead to almost endless trouble. . . . According to the early Quakers a man of their time might be as truly inspired of God as were the Prophets and Apostles of the Bible. Against the imposition of dogma by authority George Fox said that "though he read of Christ and God," he knew them only through a ["]like spirit in his own soul." And to refer to Barclay again, he taught that "God hath placed His Spirit in every man, to inform him of his duty and to enable him to do it."[1006]

The Inner Light was key to Quaker devotional writing and practice:

> The most obvious theological distinction [in] Quakerism which makes an impact on devotional pratice is the doctrine of the 'inner light.' . . . [E]very individual was born with the light of Christ within. Though the light (which is often identified with the Holy Spirit) is darkened by sin, it can be rekindled through quietness and spiritual listening. Christ, therefore, shines anew on the heart apart from the normal means of grace such as preaching and reading the Scriptures.[1007]

Rejection of the sole authority of Scripture was a necessary corollary to the Inner Light doctrine—consequently, Hannah W. Smith, along with Quakerism in general, opposed the truth of *sola Scriptura*. For the "Society of Friends . . . [the] ultimate and final authority for religious life and faith resides within each individual. Many . . . seek for this truth through the guidance of the inner light."[1008] Thus:

> [George] Fox and others stressed [that] the contemporary believer has the same or clearer experience of God as the biblical prophets. . . . [T]he scripture is . . . like a record of ancient men who had their own 'showings' of the divine light, experiences recorded in order to prompt us to do the same. The Bible is a guidebook only in this way[.] . . . "Quakerism is better off emphasizing pantheistic and universalist perspectives. Our [Quaker] mode of worship is especially well-suited to this theology. Other denominations probably better serve people who are looking for strict adherence to doctrine . . . or Christ crucified as a personal Savior[.]"[1009]

Hannah Smith, a universalist who came to rest satisfied in a mystical "bare God,"[1010] rather than the Triune Father, Son, and Holy Spirit revealed in Scripture,[1011] received

---

1004 Forsyth, *The Principle of Authority*, p. 181. See also p. 183.

1005 Barclay, *Apologia*. Note Barclay's universalism.

1006 Pgs. 237-239, *The Holy Spirit of God*, Griffith-Thomas. Note the universal Quaker equation of obligation to God and ability to obey.

1007 Pg. 46, *Trinitarian Spirituality*, Brian Kay.

1008 Pg. 431, "Friends, Society of," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell.

1009 Pg. 48, *Trinitarian Spirituality*, Brian Kay, quoting Ted Goertzel of Rutgers University.

1010 It is consequently not surprising that at the Broadlands Conference Christ crucified, or the economic redemptive-historical redemption and revelation of the ontological Trinity, or justification by the

shed blood of Christ, or other truly evangelical themes were not the "great topics round which our thoughts centered"—the "great topics" were ones that had nothing to do specifically with the Lord Jesus Christ and His redeeming work (pg. 122, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

1011 Indeed, Quakerism has never been strongly trinitarian. Already in the sixteenth century, John Owen wrote:

> God hath revealed or manifested himself as three in one, and, therefore, as such is to be worshipped and glorified by us; — that is, as three distinct persons, subsisting in the same infinitely holy, one, undivided essence. . . . I fear that the failing of some men's profession begins with their relinquishment of this foundation. It is now evident unto all that here hath been the fatal miscarriage of those poor deluded souls amongst us whom they call Quakers; and it is altogether in vain to deal with them about other particulars, whilst they are carried away with infidelity from this foundation. Convince any of them of the doctrine of the Trinity, and all the rest of their imaginations vanish into smoke. (*A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*, John Owen, I:3)

William Penn (1644-1718), the Quaker founder of Pennsylvania and co-laborer of George Fox, blasphemed the Triune God and sought to bring others to adopt anti-trinitarian idolatry:

> Before I shall conclude this head, it is requisite that I should inform thee, reader, concerning the origin of the Trinitarian doctrine: Thou mayest assure thyself, it is not from the Scriptures nor reason, since so expressly repugnant: although all broachers of their own inventions strongly endeavor to reconcile them with that holy record. Know then, my friend, it was born above three hundred years after the ancient Gospel was declared; it was conceived in ignorance, brought forth and maintained by cruelty. (pg. vi, *A History of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Early Church*, Hugh H. Stannus. London: Christian Life Publishing, 1882.)

Even for that minority of Quakerism that did not boldly adopt anti-Trinitarian heresy, the Triune character of the true God had very little influence on Quaker piety or devotion, for practical error on the Trinity was tied to the practices associated with of the Inner Light:

> The Quaker doctrine of the inner light was a misunderstanding of both the person and the work of the Holy Spirit. The constant emphasis on the Spirit within-the-soul was a subtle form of an exaltation of the Spirit by the Spirit, especially since the Spirit rarely was understood by Quakers to point the believer back to the objective work of Christ's sacrifice. For [orthodox Christianity, by way of contrast,] the Spirit was instead to glorify the Son, as per the words of John 16:14: "[The Spirit] shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine and shall show it to you." The message of the Quakers was thus an inversion of the order of the divine dispensations, for the Spirit's mission is to make the Son glorious, honourable, and of high esteem in the hearts of the believers and to shed abroad the love of God in our hearts. The Spirit's mission is therefore parallel to the Son's being sent by the Father to suffer at Jerusalem . . . for us and to bring glory to the Father who sent him. At its heart, the failure of Quaker worship was that it got the Trinity's work of redemption wrong. . . . [T]o the extent that . . . William Penn can be credited with articulating Quakerism's theological foundations, one would conclude that early on the movement had become decidely anti-trinitarian. John Punshon's history of the Quakers admits as much, saying that the movement never formally adopted the doctrine of the Trinity, but instead, the functioning theology proper is closer to pantheism [pgs. 158-167, *Portrait in Grey: A Short History of the Quakers*, John Punshon. London: Quaker Home Service, 1984]. . . . A nebulous doctrine of God leads naturally to a nebulous, unstructured form of worship. . . . Quakerism . . . tended to describe the spiritual life as if the Trinity did not exist or matter. . . . [Neither] an orthodox theology of God [nor] . . . the role of the Son as a historical mediator . . . filtered down into actual spiritual practice. The [Quaker] emphasis on the "Spirit of Christ" seems to therefore have no connection to the Jesus who lived in Palestine, and the "inner light" does not particularly illuminate the saving purposes of either Father or Son. . . . Quakerism, therefore, prayed, or listened [to the Inner Light], in a way that would be largely unaffected if the Trinity were proved untrue. (pgs. 46-50, *Trinitarian Spirituality*, Brian Kay. Quotation marks of sources cited by Kay have been removed.)

In contrast, for a born-again believer such as John Owen, the Trinity was at the heart of Christian piety, so that his devotional books and devotional "whole . . . discourse[s] doth presuppose and lean upon . . . the doctrine of the Trinity . . . [as their] foundation" (*A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*, John Owen, I:3). It is not surprising, then, that in contrast to orthodox Christianity, the piety of Hannah Whitall Smith, as a good Quaker, would be largely unaffected were the Trinity false, while the Triune God in Christ is at the heart of the piety of Christian orthodoxy. For a John Owen, Hannah W. Smith's "bare God" would never do in resisting temptation—only the God and Father of Jesus Christ, who displayed His love through the cross, would suffice for a holy life:

many great revelations as a Quaker—unfortunately, they were far, far too often not illumination that came from the study of the Scripture, but additional revelations or Quaker "openings" that arose from other sources. For example, she wrote: "One of my greatest 'openings' into the mystery of religion came from something I heard . . . Oscar Wilde . . . say in Philadelphia, dressed in shorts with a big sunflower in his buttonhole."[1012] Statements of the serial pedophile Oscar Wilde, with the assistance of the Inner Light, were, for Hannah, a fine substitute for the sole authority of the infallible Word of God, the Bible.[1013]

Naturally, Mrs. Smith opposed literal or grammatical-historical interpretation of Scripture, and the truly authoritative character of Scripture in general. She affirmed: "I am afraid of too much literalness"[1014] in interpreting the Bible, preferring rather "the spiritual meaning" that is "often so much deeper than appears on the surface, as even to seem almost in contrast"[1015] to the literal meaning. After all, literal interpretation was the death-knell of Quaker continuationism and the destruction of the foundation of the Higher Life theology—it was, therefore, better when at meetings like the Broadlands Conferences Mrs. Smith, her husband, and others could minister in a "wonderfully inspired way," testifying to notions validated not by literal exegesis of Scripture, but by

---

> [K]eep the heart full of a sense of the love of God in Christ. This is the greatest preservative against the power of temptation in the world. . . . "The love of Christ constraineth us," saith the apostle, "to live to him," 2 Corinthians 5:14; and so, consequently, to withstand temptation. A man may, nay, he ought to lay in provisions of the law also—fear of death . . . [and] punishment, with the terror of the Lord in them. But these are far more easily conquered than the other; nay, they will never stand alone against a vigorous assault. They are conquered in convinced persons every day; hearts stored with them will struggle for a while, but quickly give over. But store the heart with a sense of the love of God in Christ, and his love in the shedding of it; get a relish of the privileges we have thereby,—our adoption, justification, acceptation with God; fill the heart with thoughts of the beauty of his death;—and thou wilt, in an ordinary course of walking with God, have great peace and security as to the disturbance of temptations. When men can live and plod on in their profession, and not be able to say when they had any living sense of the love of God or of the privileges which we have in the blood of Christ, I know not what they can have to keep them from falling into snares. (Chapter 7, *Of Temptation*, Owen)

[1012] Pg. 170, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her Daughter, Mary Berenson, November 10, 1904).

[1013] As documented below, the Quaker rejection of *sola Scriptura*, by dominating the Higher Life theology through Quakers like Hannah W. Smith, Robert P. Smith, Robert Wilson, and Jessie Penn-Lewis, contributed to the continuationist or anti-cessationist trajectory of Keswick and wider Higher Life theology into Pentecostalism and the Word of Faith movements.

[1014] Letter to Anna, May 15, 1878, reproduced in the entry for August 23 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1015] Letter to Anna, September 27, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. At the time of her letter, her love for allegorical and "spiritual" meanings of the Bible and disregard of the literal meaning of the text led her to "not want to read anything but the Gospels."

"their personal experience," as they "tarried . . . not . . . in the *letter* of the Word, but . . . discerned everywhere beneath it the *living* Word."[1016]

Mrs. Smith could likewise rejoice when a modernist like "Newman Smyth" wrote "a *grand* book on Christian evolution,"[1017] or when the modernist "Canon Farrar . . . dealt forcibly with all timid holding on to old errors" and set forth the necessity for "revision of the Bible."[1018] Indeed, because of the preeminence of the Inner Light, the Bible was normally not used in the Friends meeting.[1019] Mrs. Smith certainly had no patience for a dispensational and literal view of Biblical prophecy; indeed, while Biblical holiness leads saints to long for Christ's second coming,[1020] Hannah Smith testified: "[S]ince Christ has come to me in my heart I cannot care so much for His outward coming."[1021] What need did she have for the Bible and its literal meaning when she had mysticism and a Quaker inward divinity, a "Christ within," to lead her and teach her?

Mrs. Smith, contrary to 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Corinthians 14:34-37, spoke frequently to mixed audiences and taught adult men. Although Paul, under inspiration,

---

[1016] Pg. 122, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Italics in the original.

[1017] Pg. 69, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Journal Letter to her Friends, August 8, 1883. Italics in original. Smyth made the Bible an authority subordinate to the "Christian consciousness" and made evolution his framework for interpreting Christian faith. (See pg. 233, *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol. 2, Fahlbusch & Bromiley & "*Review of The Christian Life: A Handbook of Christian Ethics*, by Joseph Stump," in *Reviews by Cornelius Van Til*, C. Van Til & E. H. Sigward. Labels Army Company: New York, NY 1997. Elec. ed. in *The Works of Cornelius Van Til*, Logos Bible Software.).

[1018] Letter to Family and Friends, July 4, 1885, reproduced in the entry for December 29 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Of course, Farrar approved of both the Higher and the Lower criticism.

[1019] Cf. Letter to Mary, September 4, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 24 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1020] E. g., 1 John 3:2; Psalm 17:15; Hebrews 9:28; 2 Corinthians 5:6-8; Revelation 22:20.

[1021] Letter to Anna, July 8, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 16 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Concerning a dispensational approach to the second coming, she wrote in the same letter:

> The Second Coming . . . all seems very spectacular and after the flesh to me. And it does not tend to spirituality say what they may. What with their seven judgments, and their two resurrections, and their rebuilding of Babylon, and their two Witnesses, and their time and times and half a time, there is such a complicated arrangement of affairs altogether, that one's best comprehension can hardly unravel it. And since Christ has come to me in my heart I cannot care so much for His outward coming.
>
> If this outward Coming were to usher in at once a reign of peace and joy I would long for it unspeakably; but according to the students it is to introduce first seven years of unparalleled tribulation and anguish, and I cannot long for that. Still He knows, and I shall be content; only somehow, I have the feeling that I will ask to be allowed to stay down on the earth during this tribulation to help the poor souls bear it. How can we enjoy ourselves up "in the air" when we know that our going has taken away the last restraint upon wickedness, and that we have left the poor world to an unbridled carnival of sin?

Thus, the literal interpretation of Biblical propehecy was "fleshly" to Mrs. Smith, as it did not lend itself to her sort of "spirituality," and she hoped that she could miss the Rapture, as she did not, in any case, care so much for Christ's return since she could experience the Higher Life now.

stated: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak. . . it is a shame for women to speak in the church. . . . If any man think himself to be . . . spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord," Mrs. Smith preached to men about how to be spiritual. At their meetings, both "Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith . . . took a leading part in the speaking."[1022] She "supported the right of women to preach as Quakers always had done,"[1023] defending "women's preaching" after "an experience of revolt from the traditional views"[1024] found in Scripture, a revolt in which she was followed by many, such as Mrs. Boardman, who was similarly "led" to address mixed audiences under Quaker influence,[1025] and Hannah's Quaker and Keswick successor Jessie Penn-Lewis. Mrs. Smith explained at the Brighton Convention, where vast crowds of men thronged to hear her preaching,[1026] that she had asked the Lord to show her whether women should preach or not, and "He . . . gave me such a strong feeling that it was His mind, that now, whatever is said against it, it makes no difference."[1027] Experience validated woman preachers in a way that Scripture could not. However, the unscriptural experiental validation of women preachers was most comparable to the validation of the Mind and Faith Cures by experience—the marvels performed by women validated both their leadership ministries and the value of their Cures. After all, students of the early decades of the Mind and Faith Cure movements noted: "[N]inety-five percent of [the] adherents [of] . . . 'Christian Science' . . . are women . . . [and] 'Faith Healing' . . . too . . . has a largely feminine constituency."[1028] Thus, experience on her side, arguments from Scripture could by no means move Mrs. Smith from her position, although she was willing to assent to the views of other Quaker women preachers who justified their disobedience by proclaiming at the pre-Keswick Conventions a misinterpretation of Joel

---

1022 Pgs. 21, 24, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1023 See January 29-30, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1024 Letter to a Friend, May 18, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 13 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1025 Pgs. 146-147, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

1026 Pg. 120, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

1027 Pgs. 375-376, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875. Mrs. Smith continued: "Don't ask the Lord and then try to find out by your own reasoning." In line with Quaker doctrine, she taught that impressions and strong feelings were to supercede the reasoning faculty of the mind in determining the will of God.

1028 Pg. 249, "Christian Science and Faith Healing," Clyde W. Votaw. *New Englander and Yale Review*. New Haven, CT: Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, 1891. 18:3:249-258. Votaw gives the 95% figure for 1891 and dates the origin of the Mind Cure to Mary Baker Eddy and the year 1866.

2:28's promise about the prophesying of daughters.[1029] While the committee backing their Higher Life conventions allowed both Hannah and Robert to preach, she made "the members of the committee . . . uneasy[.] . . . It was bad enough for a woman to preach; many, in particular the Germans, found it extremely shocking; but for her to preach Restitution, or the denial of Hell, was dangerously heretical."[1030] Nonetheless, Hannah wrote to Robert: "I quite enjoy the thought of your pow-wow over me . . . and of . . . condolences . . . on the possession of such a dangerous article as a heretical, preaching wife. . . . I do not in the least mind being a heretic. In fact I think it rather suits my cast of mind."[1031] Indeed, it was precisely her denial of hell for the universalist heresy that brought her and her husband to fame, for her universalist confession lead to her receipt, "at a time when the universal hope was deemed a heresy . . . an invitation to hold [the] series of [Higher Life] meetings at Broadlands."[1032] Consequently, on the authority of her feelings and subjective impressions and backed by her heretical opinions, Mrs. Smith began her career as a woman preacher in Quaker meetings and continued preaching regularly to mixed audiences of men and women for the rest of her life.[1033]

Mrs. Smith was also passionately opposed to the Biblical pattern of leadership by the huband in marriage (Ephesians 5:22-33), stating that it made women into slaves, and looking to woman's sufferage as the key to the destruction of all the Biblical patriarchy (Isaiah 3:12) that existed in the society of her day.[1034] Concerning the Biblical roles in marriage, she said: "'No' emphatically . . . a thousand times 'No.' . . . I know nothing more absolutely unjust in itself nor more productive of misery to the woman than the assumption of the place of authority on the part of men. It reduces women at once in principle to the position of slaves . . . [a]ny amount of anarchy and confusion would be

---

1029 E. g., pg. 371, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

1030 Pgs. 43-44, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey.

1031 Pg. 44, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey.

1032 Pgs. 41-42, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey.

1033 Pg. xv, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. For example, in a letter she wrote: "Sixty pulpits were filled by our women on Sunday, and I preached 3 times. Lady Henry's sermon was a great success. The crowds were something fearful" (pgs. 118-119, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her friends, November 10, 1891). Both before the fall of Robert and afterwards, she "often preached" (pgs. xvii, *ibid*). It was not unusual in those days for Quaker preachers to hold revival meetings, and Hannah and Robert Pearsall Smith were hardly the only Quakers to do so (cf. pg. 69, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Journal Letter to her friends, August 8, 1883).

1034 Letter to Mary, January 29, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 10 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

better."[1035] Nothing, Hannah W. Smith knew, could be more unjust than what the Holy and Just One, the good and loving God, commanded about the roles of men and women in the marriage relationship.

Judging by her unhappy and un-Christian marriage[1036] and the fact that none of her children who survived to adulthood were born again or honored the Lord,[1037] Mrs. Smith neither had the true "secret" of a happy Christian life nor the spiritual power to affect others for Christ. Her son Logan Pearsall Smith rejected Christ and Christianity. He wrote:

> The old doctrines of the corruption of man and his inevitable doom unless he finds salvation in the conviction of sin, the gift of grace, and a sudden catastrophic, miraculous conversion—this evangelical theology . . . has now become utterly alien and strange to me. . . . I rejoiced in . . . ridicule of the evangelical religion . . . I gave . . . serious attention to the literature of Theosophy, and was inclined to believe that the key to the problem of existence was to be found, if only I could grasp it, in a little book of Rosicrucian doctrine over which I used to pore for hours. . . . We are indeed leaves that perish . . . I do not find that a fate to be regretted . . . for any other form of being I feel no longing. All that I have read about what happens in a future existence makes the life beyond the grave seem an uncomfortable adventure. I have no desire for eternal bliss. . . . [I]f there is a struggle in the mind . . . between God and Mammon, I advise that the service of the god of money should be followed.[1038]

One of Hannah's two daughters abandoned her Roman Catholic husband and her children to pursue an adulterous relationship, while the other daughter married atheist Bertrand Russell; both daughters rejected Christianity.[1039] Indeed, Hannah's persistently adulterous daughter Mary wrote the following to her mother: "I have (I think) no orthodox standards of any kind. Thee, who is such a rebel against orthodoxy in religion,

---

1035 Letter to Frank Costelloe, 1883, reproduced in the entries for December 17-18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1036 Indeed, "for some years . . . [Robert] Pearsall and Mrs. Smith had no words—no relations—with each other," and had at least seventeen years of unhappy married life, according to their son Logan (pg. 73, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey). Mrs. Smith had such an antipathy towards husbands, and negative feelings about men in general, concommitants to her ardent feminism, that she wrote: "It is hard for me to believe that any husband and wife are really happy together" (pg. 218, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her daugher, Mary Berenson, September 28, 1910).

1037 Notwithstanding their truly unregenerate state, Robert P. Smith publicly proclaimed that all his children were saved (pg. 212, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; cf. Hannah's teaching on pg. 373). His doctrine that "consecration and conversion [are] two separate acts," so that he had "never known one instance in which they were not distinct" (pg. 256, *ibid*) was almost surely a contributing factor in his children—and he himself—never truly coming to that surrender to Christ as Lord without which salvation is impossible (Mark 8:34-36). Countless multitudes who have adopted his doctrine have also been eternally damned, and misleading their children into false professions, have brought them to hell also.

1038 Pgs. 35, 125-128, 275, 294, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

1039 Subsequent to Robert P. Smith's "spiritual apostasy and eventual agnosticism, after his fall from grace in England . . . the children . . . follow[ed] the same loss of faith. . . . Mary finally deserted her first husband and her two children to live in Italy with Bernard Berenson . . . Hannah had to rear the young children, Ray and Karin. Alys became the first wife of Bertrand Russell and was soon swept into his agnosticism" (December 31, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

cannot be surprised or shocked if I am a rebel against orthodoxy in conduct. . . . [O]ne heresy leads to another, in the next generation at least."[1040] As Hannah's children rejected Christianity, so her husband Robert evidenced his unregenerate state by his rejection of Christianity for agnosticism and Buddhism accompanied by his own persistent adultery. More importantly than her lack of the "secret" of happiness or spiritual power, Mrs. Smith did not have the "secret" of a God-honoring Christian life, or even, based on her heresies, a Christian life at all. Nonetheless, "[m]any today who know her only through her writings know very little about . . . Hannah's heresies . . . or, if they do, like those who knew her best, they still accept her spiritual insights as valid . . . loyal to . . . [the] doctrine . . . that life not doctrine was the true test of pure Christianity."[1041] However, one wonders if many of those advocates of a doctrineless false pietism who embrace Mrs. Smith are aware that, while not living an outwardly profligate life, she nonetheless disliked united prayer,[1042] went to casinos,[1043] and hated her household servants.[1044] She wrote a note to her daughter about her "belated birthday present—a telescope Cigarette holder. Thee need not advertise that it is a present from the author of the 'Christian's Secret of a Happy Life'!"[1045] She also wrote her daughter concerning her grandchildren: "The girls decided to play Demon in my sitting-room, and asked if I would let them say 'Da[-]n' now and then, and what could a poor foolish grandmother say but, 'Yes'! (But do not put this in my Memoirs, I beg of thee!)."[1046] Along with allowing her grandchildren to play Demon and employ curse words, Mrs. Smith also

---

[1040] Pg. 116, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey.

[1041] August 3-4, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Note that the idea that life, not doctrine, is the true test of Christianity is itself a doctrine.

[1042] Pg. 57, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to Sarah Nicholson, August 13, 1881.

[1043] Pg. 142-144, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her friends, August 26, 1899

[1044] "[M]y servants . . . I simply *hate* them, and if it would not inconvenience me too much, I would turn them out at once!" (pg. 220, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, December 5, 1910. Italics in original).

[1045] Pg. 181, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, February 15, 1906. See also pg. 182.

[1046] Pg. 198, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, February 14, 1908. The curse word is spelled out in Mrs. Smith's letter—the omitted letter was supplied instead here, instead of the "m," to avoid the use of the curse word in this book.

Note also that Mrs. Smith was perfectly willing to misrepresent or conveniently omit facts in documents concerning her and her life if such misrepresentation would place her in a better light. This willingness should be kept in mind as one evaluates her writings, where her minimalization of her role in accepting and propogating the erotic Spirit baptism heresy is of dubious historicity.

fellowshiped with spiritualists[1047] and received prophecies from occult palm readers.[1048] Her life was not a little different from that of a consistent pietist, even one who cared little for Biblically orthodox doctrine. Neither Mrs. Smith's beliefs nor her life indicated that she knew the alleged "secret" to a happy or holy Christian life.

Mrs. Smith was a committed universalist.[1049] She was passionately and zealously wedded to the heresy that everyone would go to heaven and nobody would suffer eternally in hell. After a period of time during which she blasphemously thought God was selfish for not saving everyone and that she was more loving than God, and consistent with her Quaker background, Mrs. Smith adopted universalism because of a grossly unscriptural "revelation" given to her while she was expressing her displeasure with God. While feeling justified in her "upbraiding" of the Holy One, she adopted universalism because of an "inward voice" that she "knew" gave her the truth because of the testimony of her "heart" before she even looked at the Bible.[1050] She was open to such "revelations" because she rejected the total depravity of man in favor of the Inner Light: "Just as we inherit natural life from the first Adam, so do we inherit spiritual life from the second Adam. There is . . . in every man a seed of the divine life, a Christ-germ as it were. The old Quakers called it 'the witness for God in the soul,' 'that which responds to the divine inspeaking. . . . There is a divine seed in every man[.]"[1051] After all, for Mrs. Smith, the law is not the externally objective testimony of Scripture, but the Inner Light, the Divine Seed—"Our law of life is within; we must love to follow it."[1052] She would have done well to consider God's testimony that "he that trusteth in his own heart is a fool" (Proverbs 28:26; cf. Jeremiah 17:9). Instead, Mrs. Smith taught that one

---

[1047] E. g., pgs. 155-156 of *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, record her letter to her daughter Alys Russell of January 24, 1903.

[1048] E. g., pg. 128 of *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith.

[1049] It is noteworthy that the universalism of Mrs. Smith's day was very open to the Higher Life and to continuationism; for example, the holiness preacher Mrs. Mary B. Woordworth-Etter, who became a leading Pentecostal after the events at Azuza Street, preached in Universalist churches, claimed she had the gift of healing, and claimed that the gift of tongues was evident in her meetings (pgs. 34-35, 249, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). A substantial portion of Pentecostalism, at least in part through Keswick influence under the flagship Keswick universalist Hannah W. Smith, adopted universalism. The doctrine was validated to them by supernatural revelations, just as Hannah Smith had her universalism validated by extra-Biblical revelation (cf. pg. 159, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). Rejection of the Biblical doctrine of an eternal hell also goes through Keswick men such as George Grubb to Pentecostal founder Charles Parham, whos annihilationism also spread to many others in the Pentecostal movement.

[1050] Pgs. 196-228, *The Unselfishness of God*, Hannah W. Smith. Hannah's description of her adoption of universalism is quoted extensively below.

[1051] pgs. 160-161, *Every-Day Religion*.

[1052] Pg. 181, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

should follow "God's four especial voices, i. e. the voice of the Bible, the voice of circumstances, the voice of one's highest reason, and the voice of one's inward impressions."[1053] She had learned from the Quakers that personal "revelations" were superior to the Scriptures:

> A Quaker "concern" [alleged revelation] was to my mind clothed with even more authority than the Bible, for the Bible was God's voice of long ago, while the "concern" was His voice at the present moment and, as such, was of far greater present importance . . . the preaching I hear[d] was certainly calculated to exalt the "inward voice" and its communications above all other voices . . . since God spoke to us directly[.][1054]

She received such revelations throughout her life, leading her to all kinds of conclusions that could not be found in the Bible.[1055] Mrs. Smith persisted in believing in and preaching[1056] the universalism she had learned from the spirit world through the Inner Voice until her death,[1057] for the Inner Voice was the necessary corollary of the Quaker and Gnostic[1058] rejection of human depravity for the doctrine of the Divine Seed in every man. Every man had a Divine Seed, so every man would be saved; thus Hannah had learned from the Inner Voice. Hannah came to teach religious pluralism as a corollary of her universalism, that "a *good* Creator can be got at through all sorts of religious beliefs and all sorts of religious ceremonies, and that it does not matter what they are." Indeed people who are "fundamentally good . . . can be so content without any real link with God," or even "without any certainty that there is a God to be linked to."[1059] Thus, not just the false gospel of High Church Anglicans[1060] and Roman Catholic priests,[1061] or the

---

[1053] Pg. 159, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1054] Pgs. 82-83, *The Unselfishness of God*, by Hannah W. Smith.

[1055] See pg. 148, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, October 26, 1901, for an example of such a revelation.

[1056] See, e. g., pg. 40, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her husband, Robert Pearsall Smith, April 19, 1878, for Mrs. Smith's description of a meeting where she preached universalism, so that others sympathetic to the heresy were "delighted at the plainness with which [she] declared Restitution."

[1057] She died and was cremated at the age of 79 on May 1, 1911. See pgs. 256-259, *Remarkable Relations*, by Barbara Strachey.

[1058] "[In] the Gnostic system . . . [t]he Divine element is hidden in man as a spark of the Father above, as a spark of the divine self consciousness" (pg. 82, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, Aloys Grillmeier, trans. John Bowden. Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1975). Whatever human connections may or may not be traceable between Quakerism and ancient Gnosticism, Satan is without a doubt the author of the Divine seed heresy for both religious systems.

[1059] Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, February 16, 1902, on pgs. 148-150 of *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S." (Mrs. Pearsall Smith)*, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. London: Nisbet & Co. 1949. Italics in original.

[1060] Pg. 88, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her friends, August 13, 1886. All such "High Churchmen . . . seem very holy men, and I expect our Father in Heaven does not mind *their* little notions any more than He minds *ours*[.]"

polytheism and blasphemy of Mormons[1062] within the realm of what might in the very loosest sense be termed Christiandom, but also the worship of various gods, whether Allah, Baal, or Satan, is fine; indeed, even atheists and agnostics can be fundamentally good, and everyone is going to heaven at the end, in any case. One may trust in Jehovah and hate the devil, and another may trust in the devil and hate the living God, but although "on exactly opposite pathways . . . we all meet God at last."[1063] People who do not care in the least about the "saving of the soul," and who are "unconsciou[s] . . . [of] the Christianity of Christ," are still "serving, though it may be unconsciously . . . the Divine Master,"[1064] regardless of whatever the Bible might say to the contrary (e. g., Ephesians 2:1-13). God receives the worship and brings to heaven those who worship in spirit and in truth and serve Him in a Bible-practicing church, and He also allegedly receives the worship and brings to heaven those who offer the gore of human sacrifices to Moloch. It thus becomes clear why it was necessary for Hannah to preach the Higher Life—all already have eternal life, but not all have the happiness and rest that comes from the Keswick theology.[1065]

Hannah W. Smith wrote *My Spiritual Autobiography: How I Discovered The Unselfishness of God*[1066] specifically because she loved being a heretic, and because she wanted to convince others to adopt heresies and become heretics:

> [M]y autobiography . . . "How I discovered God" . . . is the story of my soul life from my early Quaker days, on through all the progressive steps of my experience . . . I am putting all my heresies into my story, and am trying to show the steps that have led to them; and I flatter myself that it is going to be very convincing! So if you feel afraid of becoming heretics, I advise you not to read it. For my part, I always *did* love being a heretic as some of you know. What fun it

---

[1061] Pg. 126, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her friends, March 16, 1894. Mrs. Smith is here describing a priest, who even while specifically promulgating the damnable heresy of baptismal regeneration, is none the less "most saintly."

[1062] Pg. 52, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to Mrs. Ford Barclay, July 23, 1880.

[1063] See pg. 118, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her daughter, Mary Costelloe, November 7, 1891. In all religions "there is a knowledge of God that must be and that is more or less the same everywhere."

[1064] Pg. 125, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her friends, March 16, 1894.

[1065] Note that this view is extremely similar to that of F. B. Meyer, and explains Meyer's preaching of the Higher Life, rather than the gospel, to Hindus in India and the heathen in other lands; see the chapter below on F. B. Meyer.

[1066] *My Spiritual Autobiography: How I Discovered The Unselfishness of God,* Hannah W. Smith. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1903. She wrote this book at the age of 71. It was singularly fitting that the founder of the Keswick theology, which spread overwhelmingly through the influence of testimonial and not through the exegesis of Scripture, should also seek to spread her other heresies through testimonial, namely, through the story of her life and how her heresies made her happy.

was[!][1067]

The book documents Mrs. Smith's universalist and Quaker heresies, as well as the fact that her universalism, which she spread in her writings, antedated her and her husband's public proclamation of the "Higher Life" theology from which the Keswick movement originated. She explained her adoption of the universalist heresy as follows:

> Neither could I see how a Creator could be just . . . in consigning some of the creatures He Himself, and no other, had created, to the eternal torment of hell, let them be as great sinners as they might be. I felt that if this doctrine were true, I should be woefully disappointed in the God whom I had . . . discovered. . . . As an escape from the doctrine of eternal torment, I at first embraced the doctrine of annihilation for the wicked, and for a little while tried to comfort myself with the belief that this life ended all for them. But the more I thought of it, the more it seemed to me that it would be a confession of serious failure on the part of the Creator, if He could find no way out of the problem of His creation, but to annihilate the creatures whom He had created. . . . I could not believe He would torment them forever; and neither could I rest in the thought of annihilation as His best remedy for sin. . . . I set myself to discover my mistakes. . . . [O]ne day a revelation came to me that vindicated Him, and that settled the whole question forever. . . . I seemed to have a revelation . . . not of *His* [Christ's] sufferings because of sin, but of *ours*. . . . I had been used to hear a great deal about the awfulness of our sins against God, but now I asked myself, what about the awfulness of our fate in having been made sinners? Would I not infinitely rather that a sin should be committed against myself, than that I should commit a sin against any one else? Was it not a far more dreadful thing to be made a sinner than to be merely sinned against? . . . I saw that, when weighted in a balance of wrong done, we, who had been created sinners, had infinitely more to forgive than any one against whom we might have sinned.[1068]
>
> The vividness with which all this came to me can never be expressed. . . . I *saw* it. It was a revelation . . . it could not be gainsaid. . . . How long it lasted I cannot remember, but, while it lasted, it almost crushed me. And as it always came afresh at the sight of a strange face, I found myself obliged to wear a thick veil whenever I went into the streets[.] . . . One day I was riding on a tram-car along Market Street, Philadelphia, when I saw two men . . . dimly through my veil . . . [but when the] conductor came for his fare . . . I was obliged to raise my veil in order to count it out. As I raised it, I got a sight of the faces of those two men, and with an overwhelming flood of anguish, I seemed to catch a fresh and clearer revelation of the depths of the misery that had been caused to human beings by sin. It was more than I could bear. . . . I upbraided God. And I felt I was justified in doing so. Then suddenly . . . [a]n inward voice said . . . "He shall see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied." "Satisfied!" I cried in my heart . . . . ["]If I were Christ, nothing could satisfy me but that every human being should in the end be saved, and therefore I am sure that nothing less will satisfy Him." And with this a veil seemed to be withdrawn from before the plans of the universe . . . I saw therefore that the remedy must necessarily be equal to the disease, the salvation must be as universal as the fall.
>
> I *saw* all this that day on the tram-car . . . not only thought it, or hoped it, or even believed it—but knew it. It was a Divine fact. And from that moment I have never had one questioning thought as to the final destiny of the human race. . . . However great the ignorance therefore, or however grievous the sin, the promise of salvation is positive and without limitations . . . somewhere and somehow God was going to make everything right for all the creatures He had created. My heart was at rest about it forever.

[1067] Pg. 146, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her friends, February 18, 1901. Italics in original.

Indeed, if one loves Jesus Christ, and consequently hates heresy and does not wish to become a heretic, he would do well to avoid reading and seeking for any spiritual guidance whatsoever in Mrs. Smith's books, and he would do well to reject the Keswick theology that she originated.

[1068] Of course, Scripture teaches that God did not make man a sinner, but that the race freely rebelled against God and plunged itself into sin.

I hurried home to get hold of my Bible, to see if the magnificent fact I had discovered could possibly have been all this time in the Bible . . . my Bible fairly shone with a new meaning. . . . the true [universalist] meaning, hidden behind the outward form of words . . . rightly interpreted, not by the letter, but by the spirit . . . the denunciations of God's wrath, which had once seemed so cruel and so unjust, were transformed into declarations of His loving determination to make us good enough to live in Heaven with Himself forever.[1069] . . . [A]t this time my real discovery of the unselfishness of God began. Up to then . . . I had been secretly beset from time to time with a torturing feeling that, after all, it was rather a selfish salvation, both for Him and for me. . . . always there had been at the bottom of my mind this secret feeling that His love could not stand the test of comparison with the ideal of love in my own heart. . . . I still had often felt as if after all the God I worshipped was a selfish God, who cared more for His own comfort and His own glory that He did for the poor suffering beings He had made. . . . [M]ost of my ideas of the love and goodness of God have come from my own experience as a mother . . . since this discovery of the mother-heart of God I have always been able to answer every doubt that may have arisen in my mind . . . by simply looking at my own feelings as a mother. . . . I had in short such an overwhelming revelation . . . that nothing since has been able to shake it. . . . [W]hen I had that revelation on the tram-car in Philadelphia that day, a light on the character of God began to shine. . . . The amazing thing is that I, in company with so many other Christians, had failed, with the open Bible before me, to see this ["truth" of universalism.] . . .

[Opposition to my new belief in universal salvation] became at this time well-nigh intolerable. I could listen patiently, and even with interest, to any sort of strange or heretical ideas . . . but the one thing I could not endure, and could not sit still to listen to, was anything that contained, even under a show of great piety, the least hint of [opposition to universalism]. . . . [A] celebrated Preacher . . . was visiting us. . . . his object was to combat my views on Restitution [that is, universalism.] [A]lthough the speaker was my guest, I broke forth into a perfect passion of indignation, and declaring that I would not sit at the table with any one who held such libelous ideas of God, I burst into tears and left the room, and entirely declined to see my guest again. I do not say that this was right or courteous, or at all Christ-like, but it only illustrates how overwhelmingly I felt on the subject. . . . As was to be expected . . . my views on Restitution, which of course I had speedily announced, met with a great deal of disapproval from the Plymouth Brethren, and my other orthodox friends . . . I have always rather enjoyed being considered a heretic . . . the discovery I had made . . . was considered by many to be . . . a grave heresy . . . but the revelation I had had was too glorious for me to withhold it whenever I found an open door; and . . . I was never willing to sail under false colours, nor speak anywhere without it being perfectly well known beforehand what a heretic I was[.] . . . And, as a fact, these very views, and the frank confession of them . . . were the means of opening the way for some of our most important and successful work. . . . In 1873 my husband had come over to England to hold some meetings in the interests of the Higher Life, or, what I prefer to call it, the Life of Faith. I soon followed him, and upon my arrival in London I was invited to meet a company of leading Evangelical[1070] ladies, who were to decide as to whether it would be safe for them to endorse me, and lend their influence to the work. . . . I [declared my belief in] the universal hope . . . the moment I ceased speaking . . . [I was invited to] come and have some meetings . . . not a word of disapproval was uttered, and . . . [the way] was thrown open to us for our first conference, which was a time of wonderful blessing, and proved to be the entering door for all the future conferences, and for our whole after work in England and elsewhere. . . . I believe in Restitution more and more. . . . When in 1874 there was to

---

[1069] Hannah here displays her rejection of the true gospel, which is not that men are made good enough to live in heaven, but that they are justified by grace alone through faith alone based on the imputed righteousness of Christ alone. Rather than the true gospel, Hannah accepts the Quaker heresy of justification by imparted righteousness.

[1070] Mrs. Smith employs the word "evangelical" in an exceedingly loose fashion. This fact can be illustratated by the fact that although she was a Quaker who denied the gospel, accepted that Quaker revelations were on the same plane as Scripture, and believed in universalism, she considered herself to be an "evangelical" at this period of her life. The "evangelicals" she speaks of here include those spiritualists and Quakers she sought approval from, as described below.

> be one of these conferences . . . some of the committee who were helping to organize it, got frightened about my heresies . . . [but] as it was felt important to have me at the meetings, the committee . . . decided to take me as I was, with all my heresies. . . . I am a thousand times stronger in my view of restitution every day I live. . . . I . . . know that never for one single moment in all my work in England was I made to feel that my views on restitution in the slightest degree hindered the entrance of the message I had to give, or closed any door for my work. In fact I believe they made the way for me in many places that would otherwise not have been open. . . . [Concerning] my [universalist] . . . belief . . . without it I should have been shorn of half my power."[1071]

Mrs. Smith then proceeds to explain that she came to her position about "the life of faith"—although her view of faith was always extremely weak and unscriptural—only after she had adopted the universalist heresy. She called "the life of faith" the "fourth epoch in my religious life,"[1072] while the universalist heresy was "the third epoch in my religious life."[1073] Her universalism, she affirmed, opened up avenues for her spread of the "Higher Life" doctrine, and without universalism, she stated, "I should have been shorn of half my power." Universalism was essential for Mrs. Smith's development and promulgation of the Higher Life or Keswick doctrine of sanctification.

As already noted, Mrs. Smith declared that her universalist heresy and other heresies were key to her work as a Higher Life preacher and Keswick founder:

> [T]hese very views, and the frank confession of them . . . were the means of opening the way for some of our most important and successful work. . . . [the] meetings in the interests of the Higher Life, or, what I prefer to call it, the Life of Faith. . . . [A] company of leading Evangelical[1074] ladies . . . were to decide as to whether it would be safe for them to endorse me, and lend their influence to the work. . . . I [declared my belief in] the universal hope . . . the moment I ceased speaking . . . [I was invited to] come and have some meetings . . . not a word of disapproval was uttered, and . . . [the way] was thrown open to us for our first conference, which . . . proved to be the entering door for all the future conferences, and for our whole after work in England and elsewhere. . . . [M]y views on restitution . . . made the way for me in many places that would otherwise not have been open . . . without it I should have been shorn of half my power."[1075]

Hannah elsewhere explained her rise to Higher Life preacher in England in more detail, revealing that not universalism only, but spiritualism also—familiar intercourse with demons—was key to her exaltation as a famous Higher Life preacher and the founder of the Keswick theology. First, before beginning to preach the Higher Life, she sought Quaker approval for her teaching:

> Robert [Smith] . . . seems to expect nothing else but that I will plunge into the work [of Higher Life agitation] with equal zeal, but I have not felt any guidance as yet in reference to it, except in the direction of the Friends [Quakers]. . . . I really could not consent to do it unless the Friends had first heard me, and were fully alive to the purport of my message. [A Quaker leader] therefore

---

1071 Pgs. 196-228, *The Unselfishness of God*, Hannah W. Smith. Italics in original.

1072 pg. 228, *The Unselfishness of God*.

1073 pg. 199, *The Unselfishness of God*.

1074 Again, Mrs. Smith has a very broad definition of "evangelical."

1075 Pgs. 196-228, *The Unselfishness of God*. While much of this excerpt was reproduced earlier, the specific connection between Mrs. Smith's universalism and her rise as a Higher Life preacher is here more clearly brought out and noted.

> proposed, and we agreed, to invite a number of Friends to come to our house . . . to hear one of my lessons[.] . . . I burn to see this glorious life of faith becoming once more the realized experience of my dearly loved [Quaker] Society.[1076]

At this meeting, the critical incident was Hannah's declaration of her belief in universalism, which brought her the support of the famous noblewoman and spiritualist Mrs. Mount-Temple, also known as Mrs. Cowper-Temple,[1077] who attended both Quaker meetings and spiritualist séances with her husband. Mrs. Mount-Temple narrated:

> [T]he critical . . . incident at this meeting [took place while] Hannah was sitting in a little circle of excellent orthodox friends [Quakers], who had assembled to hear some of the good things that she had to impart, and she was there on examination.
>
> She happened to have seen a funeral in the street, and as she spoke of it, we all put on the conventional look of sadness. "Oh," she said, "when I meet a funeral I always give thanks for the brother or sister delivered from the trials and pains of this mortal state." "How wonderful," I thought, and I could not help exclaiming, "Is that possible? Do you feel this about everybody?" . . . She stopped and looked around. . . . [It was] a time when the universal hope was deemed a heresy, and she was on her trial. She owns that she went through a few moments of conflict. But truth prevailed, and looking up, with her bright glance, she said, "Yes, about everybody, for I trust in the love of God." I yielded my heart at once to this manifestation of trust and love and candour.[1078]

Logan Pearsall Smith described his mother's critical confession of universalism in more detail:

> [S]he could not, she avowed to the assembled company, believe that the God she worshipped as a God of love was capable of such awful cruelty [as not to take every single person to heaven]; sinners, of course, He punished, but that He had decreed that their torments should be unending was to her a horrible belief. . . . [T]he company was on the point of breaking up in confusion when from the depths of the great drawing-room there floated forward, swathed in rich Victorian draperies and laces, a tall and stately lady, [Mrs. Cowper-Temple,] who kissed my mother, and said, "My dear, I don't believe it either."
>
> This dramatic moment was . . . a turning point . . . since, if it had not occurred, our family would no doubt have soon returned to America[.] . . . For this lady who thus intervened and took my mother under her protection was, as it were, the queen of evangelical Christians;[1079] and her acceptance . . . [and] corroborat[ion] of [Mrs. Smith's] view of Hell . . . afterwards confirmed by that of her husband, William Cowper Temple, silenced all opposition and no further objections were suggested . . . [since the] Cowper Temples, owing to their great wealth and high position,

---

1076 Pgs. 21-22, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Sarah Beck, January 22, 1874.

1077 The "Mount Temples" were the "Cowper Temples" for the reasons, likely related to adultery and immorality, described on pgs. 45-46, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan P. Smith. William Cowper Temple inherited Broadlands in 1865, at which time he became Lord Mount Temple; he possessed the estate until his death in 1888. See pgs. 22-23, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. The designations "Cowper Temple" and "Mount Temple" are generally employed in this composition as synonyms rather than with reference to specific periods in the life of the husband and wife.

1078 Pgs. 27-28, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith; see pgs. 116-117, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

1079 That such an unconverted heretic and spiritualist as Mrs. Cowper-Temple could be viewed as "the queen of evangelical Christians" illustrates the utter absence of spiritual discernment in these "evangelical" circles where the Keswick theology was born.

were by far the most important people in the world in which [Mr. and Mrs. Smith] were, so to speak, on trial.[1080]

Mrs. Mount-Temple was delighted in Hannah W. Smith's confession of universalism—she declared that it was "what strongly drew me to her that day"[1081]—as was Mr. Mount-Temple, who "partly believe[d] in Mahomed, Vishna, Buddha, the Pope, the Patriarch . . . [and] love[d] high, low and Broad Church."[1082] The couple were of one mind in religious matters.[1083] Thus, because of Hannah W. Smith's frank confession of universalism, the Mount-Temples threw their powerful influence behind her and her husband. With such patronage, and the help of the demons conjured in the Cowper-Temples's séances, the Pearsall Smiths were exalted to their position as leading Higher Life preachers, and the founding of the Keswick theology became possible.

The Mount-Temples were the owners of the Broadlands estate where the foundational precursor Conference to the Keswick Conventions was held, and the fundamental innovations of the Keswick theology on the older orthodoxy were set forth.[1084] Broadlands was a receptacle for amalgamating many mystical heresies and spreading such newly minted concoctions onward; for instance, both the Catholic "Bernard of Clairvaux" and "profound saying[s] . . . of Druidic philosophy," uttered, perhaps, between Druidic acts of human sacrifice,[1085] were welcome at Broadlands.[1086]

[1080] Pgs. 44-46, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan P. Smith; cf. pgs. 27-28, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith.

[1081] Pg. 116, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1082] Pg. 6, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1083] Pg. 27, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1084] While the first Keswick Convention followed the first Broadland Conference as a continuation of Broadlands teaching, not the first Broadlands Conference only, but also the following yearly Broadlands Conferences profoundly impacted the Keswick Convention and its theology. The presence of many of the same Higher Life preachers at both events, and comparable themes and goals at the two meetings, contributed to a close symbiotic relationship.

[1085] For example:

> [T]he Gauls . . . [w]ithout the Druids . . . never sacrifice. . . . [A]s to their modes of sacrifice and divination . . . [t]hey would strike a man devoted as an offering in his back with a sword, and divine from his convulsive throes. . . . It is said they have other modes of sacrificing their human victims; that they pierce some of them with arrows, and crucify others in their temples; and that they prepare a colossus of hay and wood, into which they put cattle, beasts of all kinds, and men, and then set fire to it. (pg. 295, *The Geography of Strabo*, Strabo, 4:4:5)

> The nation of all the Gauls is extremely devoted to superstitious rites; and on that account they who are troubled with unusually severe diseases, and they who are engaged in battles and dangers, either sacrifice men as victims, or vow that they will sacrifice them, and employ the Druids as the performers of those sacrifices; because they think that unless the life of a man be offered for the life of a man, the mind of the immortal gods can not be rendered propitious, and they have sacrifices of that kind ordained for national purposes. Others have figures of vast size, the limbs of which formed of osiers they fill with living men, which being set on fire, the men perish enveloped in the flames. They consider that the oblation of such as

As Hannah W. Smith saw her doctrine of the Higher Life in the ideas of Buddhism[1087] and Hinduism,[1088] so the Higher Life proclaimed at Broadlands and affirmed by the Mount-Temples was not that only of Roman Catholic mysticism, and other unregenerate mystics within the Judaeo-Christian tradition, but even that of overtly pagan Eastern mysticism:

> From very early times, and especially in the countries of the East, there have been men and women who have sought . . . [to] ponder the nature and duties of true life, to be alone with God, and learn to know and worship Him.
>
> Buddha and his followers in India, the Essenes among the Jews, and the early Christians of the third and fourth centuries, who from Rome and many other cities fled to the deserts of Egpyt . . . [medieval] anchorite[s] . . . [dwellers in] monastic settlements . . . [h]ermits . . . perfect m[e]n . . . [possessed] spiritual power . . . [that] gave them force and initiative[.] . . . Men and women who lived thus were revered, trusted, and consulted during their lifetime, and honoured, and sometimes worshipped, after their death. . . . The Roman Catholics have their "Retreats" under a spiritual director, the . . . Anglicans of the English Church have their "quiet days," the Quakers their Conferences[.] . . . Surely these practices, during so many ages and amongst such diverse peoples . . . point to a true instinct rooted deeply in human nature, one which is referred to and sanctioned in the Holy Scriptures . . . the felt need . . . [to] reach after the highest possibilities of life. . . . The Conferences at Broadlands came about this way.[1089]

> have been taken in theft, or in robbery, or any other offense, is more acceptable to the immortal gods; but when a supply of that class is wanting, they have recourse to the oblation of even the innocent. (*Gallic War*, Julius Caesar, 6:16).

[1086] Pgs. 88-89, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. The particular profundity of the Druids discussed is both an affirmation of the Inner Light, that "God manifests Himself . . . [and] His word is uttered . . . [in the] human spirit," and a rejection of the Biblical fact that the church, the congregation of saints, is the temple of God (Ephesians 2:20-22; 1 Timothy 3:15). For the Druids, only nature and the human spirit are allegedly such temples.

Perhaps since the word "Druid" appears to be derived from the Old English word for "tree," and the Druidic philosophy had much alleged good in it at Broadlands that deserved to be accepted, apparently pantheistic affirmations (though not entirely clear because of their terseness) at Broadlands such as the following were less surprising: "Christ is everywhere. The *blessing* in everything reveals Him. *Trees*, one of the earliest symbols of God, worshipped" (pg. 213, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in original. There certainly is no hint of condemnation of tree-worship in the context, and pgs. 211-212 suggest that it is considered acceptable in at least certain situations.).

[1087] Mrs. Smith stated that her spiritual "secret" was inquired about by "Siddartha" (Letter to Anna, February 5, 1880, reproduced in the entry for October 2 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter), that is, "Siddartha Gautama" or Buddha, founder of Buddhism.

[1088] E. g., concerning the Hindu mystic Chunder Sen, Mrs. Smith stated: "I have read Chunder Sen, and do feel just like sailing for India to see him. What a grand revelation that man has had! It stirred me to the very depths. . . . I know the 'I am' he knew [the pagan Hindu 'I am.']" (Letter to Anna, September 11, 1879, reproduced in the entries for September 22-24 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

[1089] Pgs. 5-16, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. While Jackson's description of the parties above is overwhelmingly positive, unspecified "false ideals of life and religion" are mentioned (pg. 11).

Indeed, for Mr. Mount Temple, a poem praising the Muslim Allah, including the confession "*La Allah, illa Allah!*[1090] . . . expressed better than anything he knew his own thoughts and feelings."[1091] Universalism and religious syncretism were the foundation of the close friendship of Hannah Smith with Mrs. Mount-Temple and her husband.

The Mount-Temples also found enchanting and attractive the Quaker rejection of a judicial justification solely by the imputed righteousness of Christ and the associated Quaker Higher Life doctrine of sanctification by faith alone preached by the Smiths. Mrs. Cowper-Temple narrated:

> William [Cowper-Temple] was deeply interested in the experiences of which [Hannah W. Smith] and her husband had to tell us. We had been brought up to *try* to hold the forensic view of justification by faith; but of sanctification by faith we had never heard, and it seemed to us that, though the meaning of the two terms [justification and sanctification] might be identical, it enabled us to look at the doctrine in a new light . . . for who could really care about being merely *accounted* righteous? [W]hile to be *made* righteous . . . seemed something worth hearing about.[1092]

Mr. and Mrs. Cowper-Temple's support for Mrs. Smith and her husband, because of Hannah's universalism and the Smiths' Quaker repudiation of the gospel by confusing justification and sanctification, led to Hannah and Robert's exaltation to the central position as Higher Life preachers—their "fame spread from Broadlands."[1093] The 1874 Conference at Broadlands that came about because of Hannah's confession of universalism and repudation of justification and the gospel was the "initiatory [Higher Life] Conference . . . [and] the starting-point for those that followed . . . and which, but for this one at Broadlands, would never have been held."[1094] That is:

> [B]ut for this spectacular intervention, [the Smiths] might never have taken to preaching in England . . . [I]t was the worldly greatness of [Hannah's] new friend which saved H. W. S. . . . Lady Mount Temple . . . [was] a hospitable leader of the evangelicals[1095] (Broadlands became

---

1090 That is, the *shahada*, the most important article of faith for Muslims, the recitation of which is the means through which people convert to Islam. Modern transliteration of the *shahada* is usually slightly different than what was employed in Edwin Arnold's poem and referenced by Mr. Mount-Temple. The second half of the *shahadah* was not specifically quoted.

1091 Pg. 169, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. The poem Mr. Mount-Temple loved so well, as excerpted in his wife's *Memorials*, was Edwin Arnold's "After death in Arabia."

1092 Pgs. 116-117, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Italics in original.

1093 Pg. 57, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith; cf. pg. 120, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple, for Robert P. Smith's impulse in the initiation of the Broadlands meetings. Note also that the 1874 Broadlands Conference, the one that initated the Oxford, Brighton, and Keswick Conventions, was, as Mrs. Mount-Temple testified, the pinnacle of the spirituality of Broadlands (pg. 118, *ibid*).

1094 Pg. 135, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1095 Again, "evangelical" is very, very loosely defined, so that a heretic such as Mrs. Smith was considered one. Mrs. Smith was an "evangelical" in that she was not a High Church Anglo-Catholic.

> almost a second home to the Pearsall Smiths)[.] . . . The religious conferences at Broadlands, where H. W. S. often preached, became famous. . . . [T]he house . . . was filled to the attics and many of the guests overflowed into the inns . . . [f]amous people attended, in the company of others less famous.[1096]

Along with the weighty patronage of Mrs. Cowper-Temple, "the Friends . . . were unanimous in wishing [her] . . . to give them a series"[1097] of Higher Life lessons, and Mrs. Smith's fame as a Higher Life preacher had consequently begun, with the "Mount Temples [as] ardent supporters of the Smiths."[1098] As a result, "the good Cowper Temples . . . inaugurate[d] a series of such [Higher Life] meetings," the first and following, Broadlands Conferences, those key initial precursors and supports of the Keswick Conventions. "Lady Mount-Temple . . . initiated the Broadlands Conferences in 1874 where one might find, at the same gathering, a preaching Negress, a Quaker, a Shaker, an atheist, a spiritualist, an East End Socialist, and a prophet of any sort at all."[1099] At these Broadlands meetings Mr. Smith "was an acceptable preacher . . . but [Mrs. Smith], beautiful in her Quaker dress, with her candid gaze and golden hair, was given the name of 'the Angel of the Churches,' and her expositions . . . attracted the largest audiences, and made these gatherings famous in the religious world."[1100] Hannah W. Smith, who was present at the first, the last, and most of the Broadlands Conferences in-between,[1101] truly epitomized the Higher Life as presented at Broadlands and its successor Conventions at Oxford, Brighton, and Keswick.[1102] From the first Conference in 1874, the root of all the subsequent Higher Life and Keswick movement[1103] and a pinnacle of Higher Life teaching,[1104] participants generally recognized that they "received

---

1096 Pg. 28, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. At Broadlands Logan P. Smith notes that one of the speakers "taught that sin was a disease" (pg. 28, *ibid*), perhaps a reference to the Faith and Mind Cure.

1097 Pg. 22, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Sarah Beck, February 7, 1874.

1098 *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life,* ed. Dieter, entry for December 30.

1099 Pg. 7, *The Letters of John Ruskin to Lord and Lady Mount-Temple*, ed. John L. Bradley.

1100 Pgs. 48ff., *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

1101 Pgs. 48, 160, etc., *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1102 Pgs. 122ff., *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1103 Pg. 135, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1104 "'Each Conference,' said Lady Mount-Temple, 'had its distinctive character and charm, so that it was often said, 'Surely this is the best we have had.' I think, however, that none brought out such intimate revelations of spiritual experience as the first, or seemed more to make each one present to understand the meaning of the communion of saints,['"] (pg. 134, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910) including, of course, in Lady Mount-Temple's view, the dead saints that still communicated with the living through spiritualistic séances.

the clearest and most definite teaching" from Mrs. Smith's preaching there,[1105] just as she set forth the Broadlands and Keswick doctrines in her "books, which are well known."[1106] Many at Broadlands could testify: "She was to me the most inspiring . . . figure . . . amongst those who addressed us."[1107] She led countless multitudes of unregenerate individuals at Broadlands to feel happy, "sunny, and joyful" as she pointed them to the ease and rest of the Higher Life.[1108] The Cowper-Temples kept up the Broadlands Higher Life Conferences annually, spreading the Higher Life with Hannah W. Smith, as well as supporting the Oxford Convention[1109] and other subsequent Higher Life gatherings, until "Lord Mount Temple's death at Keswick."[1110] Truly, through the work of the Pearsall Smiths and Mount Temples in the birthing of the Higher Life theology proclaimed at Keswick and in other ways, "[t]he results that followed on the Broadlands Conferences were widespread and various"—indeed, "it is difficult to measure them," for they are truly incalculable.[1111]

Mrs. Mount-Temple was not only Mrs. Smith's patron in her Higher Life preaching, but the two became very close friends—so much so that Mrs. Mount-Temple mentions Mrs. Smith first in a list of "[f]riends whom we [the Mount-Temples] loved."[1112] During their time as Higher Life evangelists in Britain, the Smiths would often leave their children "at Broadlands in Hampshire, the home of [Mr. and Mrs. Smith's] friends, the Cowper Temples . . . Broadlands became . . . almost [the family]

[1105] E. g., pgs. 122-123, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Cf. pg. v.

[1106] Pg. 123, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1107] Pg. 48, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1108] Pg. 2, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910; cf. pgs. 134-135.

[1109] Thus, for example, Mr. Cowper-Temple's endorsement and support of the Oxford Convention was gladly accepted and publicly printed and proclaimed; see, e. g., pg. 32, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

[1110] Pg. 53, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck. The Broadlands Conferences ran yearly from 1874 to 1885 (cf. pg. 141, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890; pg. 1, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Lord Mount Temple died in the town of Keswick, not during a Keswick Convention meeting.

[1111] Pg. 245, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1112] Pg. 95, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

home in England,"[1113] where "innumerable guests . . . were gathered . . . to listen to the glad tidings" of the Higher Life.[1114] Hannah called her rich patron "our sweet Lady Mount Temple,"[1115] since their "friendship lasted till [Mrs. Mount Temple's] death in extreme old age,"[1116] when Mrs. Smith was one of a few very close friends granted entrance to Mrs. Mount Temple on her deathbed.[1117] They spoke together at various functions to large crowds.[1118]

Lord Mount-Temple was not merely the owner of the Broadlands property but the active leader and director of the Higher Life Conferences on his estate; they were the highlight of their year.[1119] He "was eminently fitted to preside over such an assembly . . . [and] occup[ied] the position of President at these Conferences,"[1120] while "Lady Mount-Temple . . . was the sun and soul of all that . . . company."[1121] Mr. Mount-Temple's spiritual guidance and leadership were crucial, unforgettable, and a model for Broadlands spirituality.[1122] He opened and closed the meetings, presided over them, introduced and specified the topics Conference participants were to address, set and maintained the tone and direction of the speeches, and regularly spoke himself.[1123] Broadlands spirituality and Higher Life theology are inextricably united to the spiritual system of the Mount-Temples—indeed, the spirituality of the Conferences and that of their hosts were indubitably one and the same.

[1113] Pgs. 42-43, 50, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

[1114] Pg. 50, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

[1115] Pg. 119, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her friends, November 22, 1891.

[1116] Pg. 47, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith. For Logan's connection with them also, see, e. g., pg. 166, *ibid*.

[1117] Pg. 147, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, October 26, 1901. See pgs. 27, 74, 111, 126-7, *ibid*, for other interactions of theirs.

[1118] E. g., to over 3000 at a "Women's Jubilee Meeting at a large hall in Lambeth" (pg. 90, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her friends, May 10, 1887).

[1119] Pg. 28, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1120] Pgs. 38-39, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1121] Pg. 44, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1122] E. g., note the description of his prayers on pgs. 135, 225, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910, as he "seemed to lift one into the very presence of God."

[1123] Cf. pgs. 156, 164, 168, 171, 184, 186, 195, 198, 208, 215, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Lord Mount-Temple would preach elsewhere also—his public proclamations were not limited to the Broadlands Conferences (e. g., pg. 41, *ibid*.).

Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple were unregenerate people who were drawn into spiritualism, the Higher Life theology, and many other grievous false teachings, and their devilish errors were blatent and obvious to any who had a modicrum of Biblical discernment. In Mr. Mount-Temple's "childhood[,] religion was at a very low ebb . . . religious instruction did not come within the scope of recognized maternal duties," and he received "no religious training," so his ideas were very "vague."[1124] He never came to a point of conscious conviction of sin and of his lost estate, followed by repentance and faith in Jesus Christ, and to the new birth. Instead, as he thought, he felt "the first strivings within him of an unexpressed God-consciousness . . . in his cradle," and from that time he was a "spotless youth" who was, apart from Biblical conversion, "growing spiritually"[1125] (contrast Luke 5:31-32). Similarly, Lady Mount-Temple "as a child . . . had learned to pray but had never undergone a 'conversion'" to Christ; instead, "search[ing] for . . . a higher life," she turned to spiritualism in 1861.[1126] She testified: "[C]onversion never came to me. Instead of it I was early beset by doubts of all kinds."[1127] However, at least each of the Mount-Temples could testify: "I am enrolled in [the] holy army [of] . . . the Lord Jesus. . . . I have been signed with the sign of the cross in Baptism."[1128] After all, the sacrament of "Christening . . . was the ingathering of [infant] lambs into [their] Master's Fold."[1129] Surely a baptismal regeneration could substitute for a Biblical conversion.

While unconverted, the couple nevertheless desired spirituality. Seeking the Higher Life, Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple "learned to take a much wider view of the Church as a single body of all baptized Christians, including Nonconformists and members of the Roman and Greek Churches."[1130] For example, a picture of Christ bestowing the stigmata on the hands and feet of Francis of Assisi was a wonderful

---

[1124] Pgs. 4-5, 101, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple, a biography by his wife, Georgina Cowper-Temple, Baroness Mount-Temple, followed by biographical notes by other authors]*, G. Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1125] Pg. 182, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1126] Pg. 8, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982; cf. pg. 11.

[1127] Pg. 101, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1128] Pgs. 24-25, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1129] Pg. 94, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1130] Pgs. 8-9, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

positive in the spirituality of Broadlands,[1131] for such a receipt of stigmata was certainly not a devilish deceit, but a glorious and positive event. Mr. Mount-Temple testified:

> I . . . always felt an interest in the opinions of different denominations . . . and have attended the worship of all which have been within my reach . . . I have been able to enjoy the privilege of prayer with them all.
>
> I have prayed fervently in the . . . Romish churches, and have lifted up my heart in their solemn litanies and pealing music[.] . . . I have learnt much in the Unitarian services in Liverpool; I have profited by the sermons and prayers of the Independents, Wesleyans, and Baptists; I have joined with Quakers and Plymouth Brethren . . . worshipping the same God . . . [by] Unitarian [writings] . . . I am drawn nearer to my heavenly Father[.] . . . I found myself edified by . . . Papists and Greeks [Eastern Orthodox], as well as with Calvinists and Lutherans[.] . . . In [a] . . . Unitarian Chapel . . . [i]t is delightful to . . . join in prayer and praise, and to carry away some good thoughts. . . . I have never become acquainted with any religious body in which there were not to be found persons full of love to our Lord.[1132]

Preachers of the Trinity and preachers of a non-Trinitarian deity,[1133] advocates of justification by faith alone and of justification by works, worshippers of Jehovah and worshippers of Mary, and all religious bodies whatever, contained people who were full of love to the Lord, Mr. Mount-Temple knew. "From the first he combined the opinions of the Broad Church with . . . fervour and warmth."[1134] Similarly, Mrs. Mount-Temple did not view Roman Catholics or other advocates of false gospels as people to "proselytize, believing they had all they needed to make them good Christians."[1135] Naturally, medieval Romanist mystics such as "Fénelon . . . were . . . men of exalted and angelic nature."[1136] "Catholic[s] of the mystic school" were present and preaching at the

---

[1131] Pgs. 67-68, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1132] Pgs. 17, 27-28, 34, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Compare also pgs. 53, 84-85, 102, for their delight in Catholic priests and Cardinals, building of a Roman Catholic church edifice, and further endorsements of Mystery Babylon, as well as ecumenicalism and acceptance of many other false religions. Mr. Mount-Temple stated: "I have to record my thanks for the omission in my childhood of all narrow doctrines," for that opened him up to the "teaching of Henry Drummond in intensely spiritual High Churchism . . . for [the universalist] Maurice's broad instruction in unconventional real Christian facts . . . for the knowledge that we are all two in one—two natures in one person . . . the Divine and the human" (pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

[1133] For example, it was acceptable to preach modalism at Broadlands: "Jesus Christ is. . . the Holy Spirit, Who will dwell in us" (pg. 170, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Other false teachings concerning the Triune God could be found at Broadlands (e. g., pg. 195, *ibid*), although at times because of the woeful ignorance of theology by its participants rather than because of a conscious and active hostility to Christian Trinitarianism.

[1134] Pg. 102, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1135] Pg. 79, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1136] Pg. 30, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

Broadlands Conferences from the first.[1137] The place of worship at the Mount-Temples's Broadlands residence contained a special crucifix, kept low to the ground so that not adults only, but children also could reach its feet to kiss the graven image of the Catholic "Christ," and poems about the crucifix and prayers to be like it were celebrated parts of Broadlands spirituality.[1138] Radically different and contradictory beliefs were to be united around Higher Life mysticism: "High Church, Broad Church, Low Church were . . . submerged in the Deep Church."[1139] Hannah W. Smith likewise rejoiced in the ecumenical unity and the "absolute oneness" she felt with those who believed and preached false gospels at the Broadlands Conferences, a oneness she recognized as greatly facilitated by and manifested in Mr. Mount-Temple.[1140] "All shades of religious opinion" were represented at Broadlands,[1141] and Mr. Mount-Temple's command was embraced: "[D]on't be too critical."[1142] "None of those who took part . . . at Broadlands . . . could be spared"[1143]—every single one of the false views and heresies represented there were necessary, and every single speaker and visitor was a positive influence and helped raise others to the Higher Life, no matter how abominable his false doctrines and practices were when compared to Scripture.

Having come to doubt the doctrine of the Fall,[1144] the Mount-Temples came to adopt a "broader view of Christian truth and of the universal hope," that is, the universalism that made Hannah Smith so appealing to them. Many universalists in addition to Mrs. Smith were among their religious teachers, facilitating both the ecumenicalism of both the Pearsall Smith and Cowper Temple families. "Dr. Baylee" was a dear "religious . . . . friend . . . for many years" who "helped indeed," and he "was rejoicing in the universal hope" when he "visited [the Mount Temples] in later years at

---

1137 Pgs. 79, 34-35, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1138 Pgs. 157-160, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

1139 Pg. 134, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

1140 Pg. 174, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

1141 Pg. 139, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Cf. pg. 174.

1142 Pg. 133, Pgs. 108-109, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

1143 Pg. 83, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1144 Pgs. 8-9, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

Broadlands."[1145] They testified: "[H]elp and enlargement through the great Christian prophet of our day, Frederick Maurice. We used to wander on Sunday afternoons to [his] . . . Chapel[,] [where we] heard the broader view of Christian truth and of the universal hope[.]"[1146] They testified that their "best friends" included Maurice's "disciple[s],"[1147] and proclaimed that "the blessed George MacDonald," that famous universalist, "has been one of our dearest friends and teachers,"[1148] indeed, a "special teacher or prophet" at Broadlands. Despite the plain words of Jesus Christ (John 8:44), Broadlands affirmed that "all [are] children of God," with the "actual, living, inspiring presence of the Holy Spirit in each heart."[1149] The rejection of Christ's teaching about hell in favor of the universalist heresy was important to the great Higher Life lived by the Cowper-Temples and proclaimed at Broadlands, and the promotion of universalists such as Hannah W. Smith was consequently near to their heart.

Broadlands ecumenicalism was held together, not by universalism only, but by the Quaker doctrine of the Divine Seed also:

> [Mr. Mount-Temple] discern[ed] far more quickly than most the Divine seed in every man. . . . He was in very truth, as George Fox was, the "friend" of all men. He believed, with George Fox, that every soul of man was a visited soul . . . therefore differences of creed . . . were no hinderances to his loving fellowship[.] . . . This deep sense of the solidarity of mankind [in the Divine seed] led Lord and Lady Mount Temple to seek to gather the leaders of wholly differing schools of thought together in their home at Broadlands, that they might all be drawn closer together[.] . . . All sects . . . were represented at these Conferences. High Church, Low Church, Broad Church, Dissenters, Quakers, Plymouth Brethren, Salvation Army officers, [and so on] . . . were all at [Broadlands] bound together into one common brotherhood[.] . . . Each [speaker] agreed immensely with the last speaker, and then proceeded to offer quite another Gospel.[1150]

Since the Divine Seed was in every man, Lord Mount Temple prayed for a mystical Deification: "My Lord Jesus, as Thou didst take my humanity, I pray Thee impart to me Thy Divinity."[1151] Employing the language of the truth affirmed at the Council of Chalcedon of Jesus Christ's character as one Person with two natures, a true Divine nature and a true human nature, Mr. Mount Temple affirmed the sickening idolatrous

---

[1145] Pg. 103, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1146] Pg. 182, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1147] Pg. 106, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1148] Pgs. 106, 130, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1149] Pgs. 131-132, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1150] Pgs. 120, 173-174, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1151] Pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

error that all men are, like Christ, likewise single Persons with a Divine and human nature: "I have to record my thanks . . . for deep Churchism at our Conferences . . . for the knowledge that we are all two in one—two natures in one person . . . the Divine and human."[1152] Likewise, as Christ had preexisted his incarnation, so all men had preexistent souls—"We were not created when we were born; that was not the beginning—'Trailing clouds of glory do we come/From God, Who is our home'; we were put here for a term, for our education, enwrapped in a fleshly nature, that the inner nature might grow by overcoming it."[1153] Consequently, as one enters the Higher Life of mystical union with God, one comes to "nothing short of interpenetration, oneness with God," patterned after Christ, for "[i]n Him the human is the Divine."[1154] Passing beyond a simple knowledge of Jesus leads to "the ideal life, the life of man as Son of God."[1155] The preexistent soul becomes the Divine Seed in man, so that he can enter into the Higher Life and be finally divinized. Speakers at Broadlands tied in deification and preexistent souls with universalism and the Divine Seed in every man, for the Biblical doctrine of total depravity was set aside: "Awake to the knowledge that every fellow-creature is a member of Christ. Gordon found it useful in dealing with men, whether heathen or others, to say to himself, 'Here is one in whom God is, I will speak to the God in him.' . . . We must be dead to the sin in others, alive to the God in them."[1156] Certainly if, in accordance with Satan's primordial lie (Genesis 3:5) and consistent with Quaker doctrine, all people are God and man, the possibility that some men are "heretick[s]" to be "reject[ed]" after admonition (Titus 3:10), or that the true Christian was to have "no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove *them*" (Ephesians 5:11), would the farthest thing from Mr. Mount Temple's supposedly Divine but actually depraved and idolatrous mind.

The ecumenicalism and universalism derived from the Divine Seed doctrine were at the heart of the Broadlands Conferences, as they were exceedingly dear to Hannah W.

[1152] Pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1153] Pg. 157, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Of course, the doctrine of pre-conception human existence fits very well with the spiritualism preached and practiced at Broadlands.

[1154] Pgs. 158-159, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1155] Pg. 192, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. "Son of God," not "son of God," is intentional by the Broadlands author.

[1156] Pg. 202, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

Smith and the Mount Temples, and passed into the Higher Life and Keswick movement through them. Unregenerate false teachers were treated as the objects, not of evangelism, but of hearty fellowship as the children of God,[1157] so that their ideas could be imbibed:

> Almost every shade of Christian thought was represented there; there were those who belonged to the High Church, Low Church, Broad Church, Dissenters, Salvationists, Quakers, Swedenborgians, all able . . . to meet as one brotherhood . . . in the real union apparent at these Conferences . . . learn[ing] from one another . . . [as] His children.[1158]

Indeed, ecumenicalism was one of the greatest and most marked results of the Broadlands Conferences:

> But perhaps the most marked of the results of the Conferences, the one which has had the widest influence, even amongst those who were never at Broadlands, but have caught something of its spirit, was the breaking down of barriers between brethren; . . . between those of whatever creed . . . the increased desire for union, that seems everywhere to be leavening the churches. . . . People met together at Broadlands who certainly would not have met elsewhere . . . [and] found their differences were of less importance than they had thought, and that they were one in the deepest aspiratons of their souls. . . . Evangelicals saw that Ritualists were not necessarily slaves of the husks and the letter; more important still, the eyes of orthodox religionists were opened to the mysterious workings of the spirit of truth in regions far beyond the precincts of recognized Christianity . . . a sign of what is coming upon Christendom.[1159] . . . Those hours were a prophecy and promise of . . . what is long[ed] for, "the corporate union[.]" . . . [T]he Broadlands Conferences were the starting-point of . . . [t]he great Conferences at Oxford in 1874, and at Brighton in 1875 . . . leading on to those held annually at Keswick[.] . . .
>
> Two men were heard talking together outside one of the great meetings at the first Oxford Conference. "What does it all mean?" said one. "Oh, don't you know," replied the other, "it's all the Christian people in the world are going to be one sect."[1160]

Ecumenicalism, both through the direct position of the leaven at Broadlands and through the leaven of the ecumenical Conferences it birthed at Oxford, Brighton, and Keswick, was a central result of the meetings started by Lord and Lady Mount-Temple. Furthermore, the alleged workings of God in saving and blessing people outside of Christianity and among all the groups in Christendom, which formed the foundation of Broadlands ecumenicalism, arose from the Broadlands emphasis upon universalism. At Conference after Conference Hannah W. Smith, Andrew Jukes, George MacDonald, and many others passionately set forth the universalist heresy;[1161] since all men have the Divine Seed within them, "the awakening touch will come, the life will be quickened and

---

[1157] E. g., pg. 78, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1158] Pgs. 32-33, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Compare also pgs. 2, 260.

[1159] Indeed, Broadlands was part of the preparation for the one-world religion centered in Rome, the whore of Babylon, that will unite unregenerate pseudo-Christianity and all other fales religions in the future Tribulation period (Revelation 17); in truth, Broadlands is a sign of what is coming upon Christendom.

[1160] Pgs. 249-252, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1161] E. g., pgs. 29, 50-52, 56ff., 165-166, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

manifest itself," so that all will come to salvation.[1162] Not regenerate man only, but each and every "man is the child of God,"[1163] without any qualification of any kind, so that "the ordinary work to be wrought by evangelical preaching . . . [s]udden and effectual conversion . . . is not in"[1164] MacDonald's writings or those of his fellow universalists. Evidence for universalism was culled, not from the Bible alone—for it was very difficult to find it there—but from many other sources, such as pagan religions and modern poets. After all, since "[a]ll the poets believe in a golden age," so should we:[1165]

> [T]he restitution of all things . . . [is something] which mankind in almost every age and in many countries seem to have had some kind of dim intimation[.] . . . I still have an impression of the reverent, serious attitude, the bowed head and almost breathless awe, in which the subject was approached, and the contributions, not only from our own Scriptures, but from the sacred writings of the East, from old philosophies, and from modern poets, which were brought forward to show how deep-seated was this great hope in the hearts of mankind generally. . . . "There is no evil," says the old Druidic philosophy, "that is not a greater good than it is an evil[."] . . . Dante surely had something of the same idea . . . [as did] Browning . . . [and] Tennyso[n] . . . [and] Trench[.] . . . Quotations were of course made from the Scriptures [also]. . . . Much was spoken that might be summed up in Walt Whitman's words[.] . . . [A] prayer from Lord Mount-Temple . . . would fitly close the meeting. . . . Referring to possibilities for individual souls after death, George MacDonald said one day: "The Roman Catholics believe in three stages after death. At the Reformation the Protestants gave up one, but they gave up the wrong one."[1166]

Consequently, the Broadlands Conferences stood for the position that "a desire to proselytize . . . has been the cause of all the religious tyranny and persecution that has been the disgrace of the Christian Church, and . . . is entirely opposed to the spirit and teaching of Jesus."[1167] Indeed:

[1162] Pg. 140, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Because of the Divine Seed in every man, Broadlands proclaimed: "The deepest cry of the human heart"—not of the regenerate heart only, but of all men's hearts, in flat contradiction to Romans 3:11—"is the cry for God" (pg. 230, *ibid*).

[1163] Pg. 263, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1164] Pg. 21, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Pierson.

[1165] Pg. 183, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. That is, our attitude should be that of George MacDonald: "All the poets believe in a golden age. I believe it."

[1166] Pgs. 140-143, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1167] Pg. 150, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Of course, the Broadlands position is entirely false. Boldly preaching all the truth to everyone, as Christ commanded in the Great Commission, and reproving error and sin (Ephesians 5:11-13; 2 Timothy 4:2), is actually conforming to the work of the Holy Spirit (John 16:8), loving one's neighbor as oneself (Leviticus 19:17-18), and the exact opposite of using the sword to torture or murder those with other religious convictions. When Romanists or other advocates of religious persecution killed their enemies, they put an end to the opportunity to convert them.

It is worth noting that the Broadlands attempt to convince the world that it is a great sin to prosyletize is itself an act of proselytism—it is an attempt to get those who believe John 14:6 to reject their view and adopt the religious sentiment of the Conference.

> [O]utside . . . the Christian temple . . . there are beautiful, preeminently beautiful souls adorned with all Christian graces. . . . These noble, beautiful souls . . . are the "other sheep, not of this fold," are guided by the "true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." . . . Proselytising is wrong. There was, perhaps, nothing our Lord condemned more strongly. . . . The desire to proselytize is generally from selfishness or pride. . . . We should never take from any man, not even from a heathen, that [spiritual truth] which he has, without giving him something better. . . . The world is helping the churches. There is an island in the South Sea, where, it is said, the people are never dishonest and never untruthful. A missionary is going out there. It makes one almost tremble to think of it.[1168]

Lord and Lady Mount-Temple were very successful in working at Broadlands with Hannah W. Smith and others in spreading their Higher Life ecumenicalism and universalism throughout Christendom.

The Inner Light, with its concomitant heresies of the Divine Seed and universalism, were exalted in the anti-cessationist Higher Life atmosphere of Broadlands. The "higher and deeper Christian life" was a development of "the inner light, which is variously manifested by human souls, each contributing in the measure it has received 'of the fullness of Him that filleth all in all,'" that is, of the Divine Seed in every man,[1169] the presence of which was intimately tied in with the affirmation of universalism and the rejection of an eternal hell.[1170] Experience and many world religions validated such ideas—had not the Druids believed in the Inner Light?[1171] A belief in the Biblical doctrine of human depravity, which denies that man has anything remotely close to a Divine Seed in him, was a tremendous roadblock to the Higher Life, for "only as . . . man . . . yields himself to this highest within him, can he know his true life, the spiritual life . . . self-surrender to the highest life within"[1172] is what is necessary. People can obey

---

[1168] Pgs. 209-211, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Of course, John 10:16 & 1:9 are radically misinterpreted in this quotation. Universalist sentiments such as these doubtless contributed to the early opposition of Keswick to adding a missionary meeting: "For the first few years of its existence, Keswick had no direct connection with missions. When Mr. Reginald Radcliffe pleaded [after the years of the earliest Conventions] for their admission to the programme, all he could obtain was the loan of the tent on the Saturday" (pg. 74, *The Key to the Missionary Problem*, Andrew Murray. London: J. Nisbet & Co, 1902). However, early Keswick reluctance to embrace missions was eventually overcome, and men such as Keswick's first world advocate, George Grubb, and Keswick's world embassador, F. B. Meyer, could circle the globe on missions, telling people that the lost do not burn in an eternal hell and that the heathen can be saved without personal faith in Christ.

[1169] Pgs. 120-121, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1170] E. g., pg. 140, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1171] Pgs. 88-89, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Compare pgs. 140-141.

[1172] Pg. 137, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

without grace, Biblically defined, since virtues are "latent in all men."[1173] Broadlands testified: "Whenever I meet a man, I know the germ of the Christ-life is there. . . . Christ is the life of men, the Divine seed in every one." Consequently, "[t]here is something to learn from every one," for "revelation" comes to all men through the Inner Light based on the Divine Seed.[1174] Monergistic regeneration of the spiritually dead sinner is the opposite of the Broadlands message; on the contrary, "[W]hat we call conversion [is] the potential spiritual life becoming the actual,"[1175] the Divine Seed beginning to flourish as those who already have Divinity within enter into the Higher Life.

The advance of "Christian Socialism"[1176] was also part of the Mount-Temples's spirituality. They "loved heartily" their "dear friends" and fellow leaders in "Christian Socialism," such as "Charles Kingsley" and "Tom Hughes,"[1177] who first met Mr. Mount-Temple at the first Broadlands Conference in 1874. However, Mr. Mount-Temple outshone them all in the battle for socialism: "[I]n the early days of Christian Socialism, . . . [the] movement [was] so vehemently and widely denounced, [but Mr. Mount-Temple] was from the first an advocate and liberal supporter, and, from his social and public position, risked more than all the rest of [its leaders] put together."[1178] Attacks on

---

[1173] Pg. 86, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1174] Pg. 178, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1175] Pg. 184, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1176] Pg. 9, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982. The Bible teaches an economic system that values private property (Exodus 20:15), free enterprise (Matthew 20:2), and economic freedom (Mt 20:15), rather than socialism or communism in any form. Scripture teaches that taxation on income should be below a flat 10% rate—any higher rate is a curse and a form of slavery (1 Samuel 8:6-8, 15, 17-18). "Redistributing" wealth—the government taking from one person by force through taxation to give to someone else it believes is more worthy—is ungodly (1 Samuel 8:14-15). Governments that redistribute wealth are stealing (Exodus 20:15), just like a robber who "redistributes" what a person owns. Such practices are considered in Scripture to be pagan (1 Samuel 8:19-20), tyrannical (1 Samuel 8:17-18), and oppressive (1 Samuel 12:3). Devaluing currency—as the government does by creating inflation—is also stealing (Isaiah 1:22, 25). National debt is a curse (Deuteronomy 28:12, 44). Bribery—including bribing certain classes of people to vote a certain way by promises of government handouts—is a sin and "perverted judgment" (1 Samuel 8:3), for the government is to be impartial and neither favor the rich or poor (Deuteronomy 16:19; Exodus 23:3; Proverbs 22:16). God commands individual believers and churches to generously and selflessly help the needy and poor (2 Thessalonians 3:10; Galatians 6:10; Luke 6:35), and not to do so is sinful, but for the government to employ force to extract money from people to give to either the rich or poor is the sin of stealing, not charity or generosity. Such Biblical teachings make the idea of a "Christian socialism" an oxymoron, similar to "Christian atheism" or "holy sinning."

[1177] Pg. 106, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1178] Pgs. 151, 171, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

freedom and the spread of socialism under the guise of Christianity were important parts of the Cowper-Temples's religion.

When the Cowper-Temples declared that they received alleged truths from "all sects" and "schools of thought,"[1179] their "all" was no exaggeration—as strong continuationists because of their belief in the Quaker doctrine of the Divine Seed, they happily received the allegedly inspired teachings of the most twisted cultists and vilest fanatics, as they exalted, listening to, and obeyed their heart's voice (cf. Jeremiah 17:9).[1180] They warmly held the "belief in the revival of the prophetic gifts which Christ had bestowed on his apostles for all men with a living faith."[1181] The couple consequently rejoiced in the demonically-manipulated perfectionist and cult leader Edward Irving and his Apostle, Henry Drummond. Irving founded of the Catholic Apostolic Church,[1182] predicted the end of the world in 1868, affirmed that Christ had adopted man's fallen nature, claimed that the gift of tongues and other first century miraculous gifts had been restored among his followers, and vigorously maintained other heresies, which Drummond faithfully supported and promulgated. Mrs. Mount-Temple narrated:

> Mr. Henry Drummond . . . [was] a very special influence which affected [Mr. Mount-Temple's] religious views[.] . . . At Albury, Mr. Drummond and Lady Harriet, the Duchess of Northumberland (then Lady Lovaine), and Lady Gage, the other daughter, were all very kind to us, and hoped perhaps that we should join the Apostolic Church, of which Mr. Drummond was an Apostle.
>
> It was all very interesting and hope-giving, and opened a new region to us. All we heard of the birth and development of this Church was thrilling. . . . Haldane Stewart had instituted . . . a system of prayer . . . for a special outpouring of the Spirit. He and other devout friends assembled at Albury, and there was, they believed, such a miraculous answer, that it was to them as a second Pentecost. Some began to speak under spiritual influences, and through these persons, endued, they believed, with the prophetic gift, a most beautiful Church system was organized, not, they said, by their own will or wisdom, but by the Spirit of God.
>
> They believed the Lord was soon to return [that is, in 1868], and that a new body of apostles and faithful disciples were called out to receive Him. They called this the Elias ministry. . . . They believed apostles were appointed supernaturally to rule the Church universal. Prophets were inspired to teach and evangelists sent forth with power [now that these offices had been restored in their religious organization; before that time] the prophetic gift was unknown, and the

---

[1179] Pgs. 173-174, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1180] Pg. 161, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1181] Pgs. 8-9, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1182] Compare the articles on Irving, Drummond, and the Catholic Apostolic Church in the *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, and the *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*. The Catholic Apostolic Henry Drummond (1786-1860) should not be confused with the later Henry Drummond (1851-1897) who worked with Moody.

> apostolic universal ministry had been lost. . . . [T]his [was a] really splendid ideal of a Church. . . . [It greatly influenced] my husband's religious development.
>
> The kindled hope of the Lord's speedy approach, the calling out of Apostles, and of an elect body to meet Him, greatly quickened our spiritual life. We attended their beautiful services, we listenened to [their] eloquent and fervent appeals[.] . . .
>
> We hung on Mr. Drummond's words for hours, while he described to us this wonderful ideal[.] . . . He was indeed one of the last men . . . whom one could suspect of any fanaticism or spiritual aberration.[1183] . . . Imagine such a man an Apostle . . . bringing in the Kingdom of God. . . . This was the new world in which we found ourselves, and very kindling and entrancing it was!
>
> I was carried away by it[.] . . . It deeply moved William, but he did not feel called to leave the place and the duties to which he was attached. . . . [W]hat remained to us of the teaching and blessing of this time [was,] [f]irst of all, the revival of spiritual life [that is, the Higher Life]; then, a much wider view of the Church . . . includ[ing] all who have been baptized . . . comprising therefore the members of the Roman and Greek Churches, and all Nonconformists [as well as] Quakers [as] the descendants of those within the covenant of baptism. . . . [S]pecial truth [was] confided to . . . the Unitarians . . . [while] the Friends [received the] . . . special truth . . . [of] the Inner Light . . . the Wesleyans [of] . . . perfection, etc. All one body . . . [Drummond] taught us also the meaning of Symbols, and of Ritual . . . [t]he members of the Apostolic Church hold that the Lord is truly present in Holy Communion[.] . . . So it was, that without joining the Apostolic Church, William always felt much indebted to the teaching we received [from them] at Albury[.][1184]

Thus, from Irving's Catholic Apostolic cult, the Cowper-Temples were encouraged in ecumenicalism, continuationism, post-conversion Spirit baptism with miraculous results, the Inner Light, the Real Presence, perfectionism, and the Higher Life, all of which flourished at their Broadlands Conferences and at the Keswick Conventions which developed from them.

Spiritualism was at the root of the Higher Life beliefs of Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple.[1185] Mrs. Cowper-Temple explained that, having first heard of spiritualism in 1857 and becoming fully initiated by 1861, she led her husband also to embrace the occult,[1186] so that Mr. Mount-Temple "gathered all the good he could from spiritualism, and was helped . . . leading us to a higher life."[1187] The couple attended a vast number of

---

1183 This affirmation of Mrs. Mount-Temple illustrates her utter inability to recognize fanaticism and spiritual aberration.

1184 Pgs. 103-105, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

1185 The Mount-Temples' interest in "somnambulism, believed to open a portal to the spiritual world" (pg. 752, *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol. 4, Fahlbusch & Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), is also noteworthy (cf. pgs. 39-40, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

1186 Pgs. 107-108, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Mrs. Mount-Temple recounts that Lord Palmerston "disapproved of my heretical views, and feared my influence over William" (pg. 48, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

1187 Pg. 108, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

séances,[1188] seeing there great marvels performed by, as they thought, the dead who had been conjured up. They learned, contrary to 1 Corinthians 15, that the true resurrection is not that of the body, but the rising into the realm of the spirits—the Higher Life.[1189] They not only were spiritualists themselves, but sought—successfully—to lead others into their fellowship with devils,[1190] as they were "always ready to introduce" their friends, such as Hannah W. Smith, "to influential people among the spiritualists."[1191] They greatly advanced the careers of self-professed "Christian spiritualist" ministers such as H. R. Haweis.[1192] They "studied the . . . writings of Swedenborg,"[1193] "the great spiritualist of the eighteenth century,"[1194] and Swedenborg's writings and friends were continued influences at Broadlands and its Conferences.[1195] Indeed, spiritualism was promoted at

---

[1188] For example, a book where Mr. Cowper-Temple records material concerning his séances indicates that he attended at least 31 between 1861 and February 23, 1864, sitting with numerous prominent mediums; see pgs. 9-10, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982. They continued for years to attend very many, and eventually gave up counting (pg. 18).

[1189] "The true resurrection day" is not the day with the Triune God raises the bodies of the dead, but "the day of that great promotion from the world of matter to the world of spirit and the unlocking of the senses of the soul" (pg. 188, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

[1190] See, e. g., Letter 9 10, 13, pgs. 30-32, 36-37, *The Letters of John Ruskin to Lord and Lady Mount-Temple*, ed. John L. Bradley, where one can find discussions of learning things from ghosts and casual and familiar references to seeing, asking questions of, and conversing with spirits of the dead that have been raised up. See also pgs. 7-8, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1191] Pg. 18, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982. Compare Mrs. Smith's description of her visit to a spiritualist medium on pgs. 155-156 of *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith.

[1192] Haweis believed and taught: "Spiritualism fitted very nicely on to Christianity; it seemed to be a legitimate development, not a contradiction, not an antagonist. . . . Spiritualism had rehabilitated the Bible. . . . They [spiritualistic phenomena] occur every day in London as well as in the Acts of the Apostles" (pgs. 176-177, "Modern Spiritualism Briefly Tested by Scripture," *The Fundamentals* 4:12, A. J. Pollock). When the Mount-Temples heard Haweis preach, were impressed with his "ability and largeness of view," and "thus Mr. Haweis became our friend," they stated, so that Mr. Mount-Temple "asked him to revive" the "Church in Westminster" where Haweis was, by "William's gift," able to preach spiritualism and other damnable heresies to "crowded services in the restored Church" (pgs. 106, 182, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890) and was elevated to a place of prominence in England.

[1193] Pg. 108, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1194] Pg. 161, *An Elusive Victorian: The Evolution of Alfred Russel Wallace*, Martin Fichman. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2004; cf. pg. 128, *Emanuel Swedenborg: His Life and Writings*, William White, 2nd. rev. ed. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co., 1868.

[1195] At Broadlands the Mount Temples and their Conference guests "me[t] as one brotherhood" with the "Swedenborgians" and other heretics (pg. 32, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910; cf. pgs. 78, 82). Of

the Broadlands Conferences, where it fit well with the doctrine of the erotic spiritual Baptism: "Each meeting included discussions on the uses of Spiritualism, the role of entrancement, the role of prayer, and the mission of God in the world."[1196] The Mount Temples's longing for restored miracles and a Higher Life was satisfied by the spirits with whom they became familiar through séances.[1197] For example, they conversed with the spirit of Frederick Lamb, a Viscount, who told Mr. Mount-Temple where he could find assorted letters and speeches and commanded that they be published.[1198] Lord Palmerston, who had been dead for 13 months, similarly told Mr. Mount-Temple where important memoranda could be found.[1199] They worked with mediums who "engaged in extensive automatic writing . . . and . . . often left [their] body to traverse the spheres," while also working wonderful cures [of sickness]."[1200] At various séances, and in the company of other spiritualists, including those they had proselyted into spiritualism, the Mount-Temples experienced the supernatural signs and wonders that they had been seeking:

> [Prophetic] message[s] . . . [were given through using] a ouija board[.] . . . [A] wonderous demonstration [took place] of a table dancing in tune with music played on a piano apparently by invisible hands [for a while until they] heard departing footsteps and the [spirit's] farewell, "Dear earthly friends, good night." . . . [T]able rapping and spiritual music . . . table tilting and levitation . . . psychical responses sent through clairvoyant visions or spirit writing moving [one's] fingers when . . . in a state of trance [were experienced]. . . . [G]uests pressing their fingers lightly to the tops of two tables, [Mr. Temple recorded,] "the large table danced in time to a country dance & the little table rose & being suspended in the air the feet be[in]g about 1 foot from the ground & it rapped against the edge of a sofa . . . it also heaved as if at the top of a wave & tilted to the side." . . . [Séances were discussed where] fresh eggs, fruit, and flowers would descend from the ceiling . . . [although some were] amazed with the triviality of the manifestations.[1201] . . . [S]pirits moving about the room [caused] ferns [to] shake[.] . . . [A medium] elongating his body by some six to eight inches in a trance [was also] summoning luminous forms visible to guests. . . . [O]bjects materiali[zed] without the aid of a medium[.] . . . [Many] messages from the dead [were delivered.][1202]

---

course, these facts do not mean that everything taught by Swedenborg was followed to the least letter at Broadlands by everyone (e. g., pg. 78, *ibid*).

[1196] Pg. 51, *Altered States: Sex, Nation, Drugs, and Self-Transformation in Victorian Spiritualism*, Marlene Tromp. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006.

[1197] Pg. 12, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1198] Pg. 10, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1199] Pg. 18, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1200] Pg. 23, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1201] The triviality of spiritualistic marvels was indeed a very notable contrast with Biblical miracles.

[1202] Pgs. 12-24, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

While the Mount-Temples led many to adopt spiritualism, some of their converts came to suspect the true source of the manifestations. For example, one who had been converted to spiritualism by the Mount-Temples and attended numerous séances with them wrote to Mrs. Mount-Temple in April 1868:

> Could anything more perfectly answer the description of a "familiar or household spirit" [Leviticus 19:31; 20:6, 27, etc.]—than that thing—if a true thing—that came . . . and answered the question—"Have you any News?["]—"I haven't got any"? Think of it! [If the Testament is true,] I have no doubt that it is your duty at once to abstain from all these things . . . [and] to receive what you *have* seen of them [the spirits] as an awful sign of the now active presence of the Fiend among us.[1203]

The manifestations, this more discerning convert recognized, were "beneath the dignity of an intelligent God"—therefore, "have done with 'Mediums.'"[1204] However, the Mount-Temples, despite being confronted with the plain warnings of Scripture, did not take heed to this advice. Mr. Mount-Temple continued to be so enchanted with spiritualism that he was even nursed by a medium in his last illness.[1205] He never decided to reject them as Satanic, for they were among "the great cloud of witnesses encircling the world."[1206] Besides, "the presence of unseen heavenly ones added to the deep gladness that was felt"[1207] at the Broadlands Conventions, so the spirits of the dead must have been good because they made people feel the happiness of the Higher Life. Likewise, Mrs. Mount-Temple, even to the end of her life, was never freed from the influence of mediums.[1208] After all, as she had learned from them, "Spiritualism [was] . . . the handmaid of Christianity."[1209] Mrs. Mount-Temple even exercised supernatural powers herself; for example, one day when a man was suffering from a sickness, she threw a lady into a trance so that the cure for the disease could be obtained by prophecy, and then brought the lady out of the trace—"another bit of witchery."[1210] In the 1870s,

---

[1203] Pgs. 19-20, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982. Italics in original.

[1204] Pg. 20, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1205] Pg. 24, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982. Mr. Mount-Temple was born in 1811 and died in 1888 (pg. 179, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

[1206] Pg. 21, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1207] Pg. 262, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1208] Pgs. 22, 27, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1209] Pg. 16, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1210] Pgs. 23-24, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

when the Higher Life meetings at Broadlands were founded and Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple were promoting Robert and Hannah Pearsall Smith, as well as cultists like Laurence Oliphant, the "Cowper-Temples . . . met the best-known mediums of this decade," bringing "the greatest of the English mediums, with whom they had been attending séances . . . to Broadlands . . . [b]y 1874,"[1211] the very year Mr. Mount-Temple asked the spirits during a séance for permission to become a medium himself to further his spiritual growth.[1212] Thus, in 1874 Mr. Mount-Temple, seeking the Higher Life, both asked for permission to become a medium and thrust the Pearsall Smiths into the limelight in that fateful Higher Life Conference on their property. Indeed, the Mount-Temples were "one of the earliest" to explore "spiritualism" in England.[1213] Broadlands truly was a very spiritual place—mediums validated that "all manners of ghosts [were] about the house,"[1214] since "[c]ontact with ghosts helped shape both Lady and Lord Mount Temple's futures and day-to-day living."[1215] The day after the 1874 Broadlands Conference that germinated the Keswick theology, Mrs. Cowper-Temple had reached such a spiritual height in her Higher Life that she attended a séance to see if more of the spirit of a dead man, John King, would materialize than in the last attempt to contact him—previously, only his head had materialized, and Mrs. Cowper-Temple was hoping for more in her post-Conference séance.[1216] Truly, Mr. and Mrs. Cowper-Temple lived a supernatural and spiritual life, and the spirits that gathered there contributed to the supernatural and spiritual Higher Life that so many led at Broadlands. Such was the place, and such were the promoters, of the Broadlands Conference for the promotion of the Higher Life that hatched the Keswick system.

Scriptural cessationism, consequently, was rejected at the Broadlands Conferences for continuationism. Pentecost, with its signs and wonders, was not a completed dispensational event, but "a sample of that dispensation of the Spirit, which was the gift of God to the Church in all generations."[1217] Indeed, because of the Divine

---

[1211] Pg. 22, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1212] Pg. 53, *Altered States: Sex, Nation, Drugs, and Self-Transformation in Victorian Spiritualism*, Marlene Tromp. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006.

[1213] Pg. 19, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

[1214] Pgs. 25-26, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1215] Pg. 53, *Altered States: Sex, Nation, Drugs, and Self-Transformation in Victorian Spiritualism*, Marlene Tromp. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006.

[1216] Pg. 113, *Christmas Story: John Ruskin's Venetian Letters of 1876-1877*, John Ruskin, ed. Van Alan Burd. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1990.

[1217] Pg. 125, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

Seed in every man, "[a]ny hour may be a miracle hour"—such miraculous visions as "the young Isaiah" had of Jehovah on His throne (Isaiah 6), as "Moses" had on "Mount Horeb," and as "Paul" had on the road to "Damascus," "such hours of visio[n] come to all . . . [h]ow many, in all ages . . . have known these sacred experiences[.] . . . Such special, memorable hours, came to us, not seldom, at Broadlands."[1218] Many "*hours of vision*" and "dreams . . . came to the worshippers at Broadlands."[1219] In fact, even the poet Wordsworth[1220] had received visions like those of Isaiah, Moses, Paul, and the participants at the Broadlands Conferences.[1221] While Scripture testifies that "God . . . spake . . . at sundry times and in divers manners . . . in time past" before the coming of Christ (Hebrews 1:1-4), Broadlands testifies that "At sundry times and in divers manners God [still] speaks and manifests Himself."[1222] *Sola Scriptura* and cessationism were out, while spiritualism and continuationism were in.

Those at Broadlands desired the presence of the sign gifts and healing powers, practiced the Faith and Mind Cure, and received inspiration from those demons that directed the Mount-Temples and promulgated through them the corruptions of the Higher Life theology. Supernatural beings from the angelic realm gave commands, so that voices, with music accompanying them, were heard at Broadlands Conferences.[1223] When Mr. Mount-Temple was, sick, through the Faith and Mind Cure he was restored

---

[1218] Pgs. 218-220, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. A record of an alleged vision "from the first Conference" is recounted immediately following the quotation reproduced above—however, unlike the Scriptural and truly miraculous visions with which the marvels at Broadlands were compared, the Broadlands marvels "do not sound much in the telling" (pg. 226), while the miraculous visions of Scripture sound like very much, in the telling, because they truly were.

[1219] Pg. 266, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in original.

[1220] In Wordsworthean fashion, Broadlands also testified: "Look up at these trees and sky . . . and God will speak to us through these . . . they . . . tell of much" (pgs. 223-224, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Personal messages, speech "to us" in particular, could come through nature, although, as pgs. 223-224 explain, there is more than just nature through which God speaks—the Inner Voice, for example.

[1221] Pg. 218-220, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. The fulsome exaltation of false visions, and the yet more fulsome downgrade of Biblical inspiration, is evident in the placing of what God gave the Apostles and prophets on a comparable level with what was allegedly given to those at Broadlands and to Wordsworth.

[1222] Pg. 233, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. That is, the past tense "spake" of Scripture is altered to the present tense "speaks" at Broadlands.

[1223] Pgs. 129-130, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

again; both he and his wife "tried the 'mind cure'" at times.[1224] They were conversant with homeopaths.[1225] Mr. Mount Temple's "witness to others in the matter of healing by the prayer of faith was unceasing . . . ['']I am anxious[,] [he said,] ['that] . . . this form of Divine Healing . . . should be tried . . . it seems to me to be unfaithful not to have recourse to it . . . showers of healing are so plentifully falling around us . . . this valuable life should be [within] reach.['']" During his sickness, in a manner consistent with his spiritualism, he was even able to join in prayer "with words of fervor and power as though his spirit were using his body whilst the mind remained dormant."[1226] Dormant minds allegedly disjoined from actions on the spirit were most helpful in affecting Faith Cures.

Contrary to the truth that inspiration was complete with the canon of Scripture, but in accordance with its embrace of the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light, Broadlands was a place where allegedly post-canonical inspiration was as plentiful as fog in London. At Broadlands, "[n]ot only . . . pastors and teachers" were present, but "prophets" also.[1227] Mrs. Mount-Temple stated that the "impulse" through which Mr. Mount-Temple offered his Broadlands estate to Hannah and Robert Smith for the foundational Conference "seemed . . . like . . . inspiration"; "thus our first Conference was initiated,"[1228] Mrs. Mount Temple declared, by a revelation and by inspiration. The Conference was then "led by Mr. Pearsall Smith" in a "wonderfully inspired way,"[1229] even as Mr. Mount Temple's speeches were "so inspired in utterance"[1230] both at that first Conference and at other times. Mrs. Pearsall Smith had reached such a height of spirituality that "inspiration" even "came from her shining face."[1231] Indeed, women

---

[1224] Pg. 85, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. In the particular case mentioned on pg. 85, the Mind Cure was self-confessedly a failure.

[1225] Cf. Pg. 8, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1226] Pgs. 108-109, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1227] Pgs. 136-137, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1228] Pgs. 117-118, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1229] Pg. 186, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1230] Pgs. 108-109, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1231] Pg. 123, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

preachers—"inspired wom[e]n"—gave "inspired addresses,"[1232] and continuationism in general, and in particular a rejection of *sola Scriptura* for the Quaker doctrine of authoritative continuing revelations and inspiration because of the Divine Seed in every man, were insisted upon as of primary importance and as the core of Broadlands teaching:

> It was insisted on first of all, that God does actually communicate with each one[1233] of the spirits He had made: not only did He speak to human beings in the past, but does still, here and now. This fact is referred to in the Bible . . . as *the light* . . . as *a voice* . . . as *a guide* . . . [in] individual guidance . . . [and] also as *inspiration*. . . . [T]his Divine communion is not only . . . the light (that which reveals), not only . . . a voice (which lets us know from Whom the word comes), or . . . a guide (which indicates our course), but is even as the breath or life of God within our life, to inspire us[.] . . . The power to discern this Divine guidance is given to all in some measure . . . it is a gift, a faculty common to all . . . God's voice is of the heart[.] . . . Surely this is . . . the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light, which is the corner-stone of their belief. . . . Intuitions come at such times . . . [w]e feel within us "the breath of God, that warrenteth the utmost, inmost things of faith"[1234] . . . The vision br[ings] supreme joy . . . visionary hours may be as the steps in a rocky path, by which we climb to the pure air of the mountain-top.
>
> Dream, vision, prophecy, spiritual imagination, call them what we will, are an essential element of human life. . . . [W]ithout the inspired spiritual element in life, man can never be truly man. . . . the highest powers of his being remain unused.[1235] . . . Every age[1236] has its seers, its dreamers of dreams, its men of [supernatural] insight . . . [such men] are needed. . . . The seer brings us new knowledge[1237] . . . as vision opens beyond vision into the depths of being and of love. . . . The seer rejoices . . . and the worker is glad of the inspiration . . . [t]hey are not disobedient to the heavenly vision.[1238]

After all, the Incarnation was not necessary so that Christ could satisfy the Law of God and shed His blood as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men,[1239] but He came to lead

---

[1232] Pgs. 71-73, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1233] That is, post-canonical inspiration is not limited to the regenerate, but all men receive it, because all have the Divine Seed; in truth, there is no need to pass from darkness to light through a truly evangelical conversion and new birth, but all will ultimately be saved without one.

[1234] Note that Scripture does not warrant the utmost, inmost things of faith for those at Broadlands—on the contrary, the Inner Voice provides the warrant. In the words of Hannah W. Smith and other Broadlands preachers: "Within us is an intense life which nothing can touch"—the Divine Seed in every man. Consequently: "Our law of life is within; we must love to follow it" (pgs. 180-181, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

[1235] That is, men who do not experience inspiration from the Divine Seed in them are missing out on what is most important in life.

[1236] That is, inspiration is not limited to the production of Scripture or to the Apostolic era, and, as the sentence explains, such additional revelations are not even simply available but optional—they are "needed."

[1237] That is, truths not found in Scripture are revealed by the Inner Light.

[1238] Pgs. 144-145, 226-228, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in the original.

[1239] For, indeed, in the orthodox sense of the word, Broadlands affirmed that there was no propitiation for sin; on the contrary, "'*Propitiation*' . . . mean[s] [only that] . . . He was altogether merciful to sin" (pg. 188, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

people to listen to the Inner Light: "He came in the flesh, that He might get at us from the outside, because we do not listen to the inward voice."[1240] Despite multitudes of texts like Isaiah 53:4-6 and 1 John 2:2, Hannah Smith and the Mount Temples knew that "Christ" was "not in any sense . . . appeasing the wrath of God"[1241] by His work on the cross, so having His redemptive blood personally applied through a new birth was, without a doubt, not necessary for salvation. Further revelations are necessary, because "Christianity has never yet been fully preached," not even by the Apostles and the first century churches—the "chuches have to learn that." Consequently, "what a power there is in *vision*"![1242] Thus, at that first Broadlands Conference, as at subsequent ones, the universalist Andrew Jukes proclaimed his heresies with "inspired wisdom."[1243] Antoinette Sterling, consistent with "her Quaker upbringing . . . seemed as much inspired in the choice of her songs as in the rendering of them,"[1244] for "she was one of the few to whom God . . . [w]hispers in the ear," so she could "guid[e] . . . the assembly . . . to a higher, nobler plane" with her "spontaneous outpourings which seemed inspired."[1245] After all, "the highest music is itself a revelation, a manifestation of something divine" as it "prophesies of . . . predestined good . . . [and] salvation universal," and "[t]here is no truer truth obtainable than comes of music,"[1246] including the propositions of Scripture, which flatly deny that salvation is universal. By entering into the Higher Life "the soul . . . receives more inspiration than it can hold."[1247] The supernatural spirits that worked so greatly in Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple's lives, as they did in the Quakers to give them Inner Light, and gave them and others present at Broadlands wonders and marvels, were the source of what Mrs. Mount-Temple called "the God-inspired . . . Conferences which

---

[1240] Pgs. 214-215, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1241] Letter to Anna, September 3, 1876, reproduced in the entry for August 8 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1242] Pg. 192, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in the original.

[1243] Pgs. 52, 129, 135-136, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Jukes adopted the universalist heresy in 1867.

[1244] Pgs 62, 113, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1245] Pgs. 113, 266, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1246] Pg. 115, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1247] Pg. 170, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[Mr. Mount-Temple] inaugurated and carried through for so many years . . . at Broadlands."[1248]

The broadness of the Mount-Temples's views embraced not only Irvingism, continuationism, and broader spiritualism, but even and especially the filthy religion of the occult perfectionists and free-love practicioners Thomas Harris and Laurence Oliphant,[1249] since spiritualism and sexual immorality were the natural handmaids of each other.[1250] As Hannah and Robert P. Smith adopted the doctrine that the baptism of the Spirit was associated with erotic thrills, so the only way to receive the true Spirit Baptism was through sexual immorality, taught Oliphant as Harris's disciple. "Laurence Oliphant, together with his disciples, actually carried out, to the utmost possible extent, the practices of which Robert Pearsall Smith was suspected."[1251] However, only those initiated into the Higher Life were brought into these depths of Satan; publicly Harris and Oliphant were more vague, as were the Smiths. Nevertheless, Oliphant held that "sexual passion was the only real spiritual life."[1252] Oliphant explained to Mrs. Smith, and to many others, at the invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Cowper-Temple, his unspeakable abominations. Hannah W. Smith explained:

> [T]he Baptism of the Holy Ghost, [which we were to] seek the experience [of] for ourselves. . . . was to be the aim of our desires. . . . Mr. Oliphant . . . told me that he believed my husband was called to enter into and propogate the views he held, and he urged me to beg him not to stop short of the full consummation. . . . "Come and get into bed with me." . . . I asked him if it were not

---

[1248] Pg. 184, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. As is frequently the case with those who accept extra-Biblical inspiration for post-canonical periods, the character of genuine inspiration is also downgraded in claims for the inspiration of persons, messages, and so on associated with the Broadlands Conferences. Thus, not all the claims that the Conferences, Mrs. Smith, and so on, were "inspired" were necessarily affirmations that the persons or things in question were vebally, plearily, and infallibly dictated by the Holy Ghost, as Scripture truly was.

[1249] Perhaps the fact that Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple "loved to prove that faults are but twisted virtues" (pg. 141, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple) contributed to the facility with which they adopted the ideas and practices of Harris and Oliphant.

[1250] The connection between sexual immorality and spiritualism is clearly evident historically, so that the Broadlands doctrines of an erotic Spirit Baptism and of familiar intercourse with demonic spirits are naturally connected. For example:

> Mr. T. L. Harris, once a Spiritualistic medium, testifies that the marriage vow imposes no obligation on the Spiritualistic husband. They have been known to abandon their own wives, and prefer the company of those of whom the spirits told them that they had a closer spiritual affinity to them. Mrs. Woodhull, elected three years in succession as president of the Spiritist Societies in America, often lectured in favor of free love; and advocated the abolition of marriage ("forbidding to marry"), stigmatizing virtue and responsibility as the two thieves on the cross. She said: "It was the sublime mission of Spiritism to deliver humanity from the thraldom of matrimony, and to establish sexual emancipation." (pg. 178, "Modern Spiritualism Briefly Tested by Scripture," *The Fundamentals*, Pollock, 4:12).

[1251] Pg. 86, *A Religious Rebel: the Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith.

[1252] Pg. 223, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

> possible to lead people into this glorious experience he spoke of without personal contact. He said no, it was not.[1253]

Such was the Higher Life Harris and Oliphant spread with the patronage of Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple.

It was Mr. Mount-Temple's seeking to "gathe[r] all the good he could from spiritualism" that led him to make the acquaintance, his wife explained, of Harris and Oliphant.[1254] Mrs. Cowper-Temple, who was especially attracted to Oliphant[1255] because of his turn from materialism to spiritualism after necromantic contact with his dead father,[1256] narrated concerning the dirty duo:

> [N]o one . . . ever attracted William [Mount-Temple] more . . . [than] Mr. Harris. . . . It was through him we became much allied with Laurence Oliphant, whom we first met at Broadlands . . . All there were interested in him. [Oliphant had] turned his back upon all and went off . . . to find God under the guidance of Mr. Harris. . . . [H]e always said he owed everything to Mr. Harris. . . . [Laurence] married [one from] our house [that is, one from the Cowper-Temple household], who was of one mind with himself . . . upheld by the hope of bringing others [by sexual contact] into the new and higher life . . . [They resided] with us at Broadlands [among other places].[1257]

The Mount-Temples "considered joining . . . Harris [and] his cult in New York State," but they decided instead to simply make their "home at Broadlands a haven for . . . Harris,"[1258] from whence they "might help in [the] unfolding"[1259] of the spiritual Kingdom of which Harris was the messenger. From Broadlands Harris and Oliphant could propogate their ideas and seduce others into the Higher Life of sexual immorality and the thrills of the erotic Spirit Baptism, for Mr. Mount-Temple was zealous to promote such spiritual growth in all those whom he could influence from Broadlands.[1260] The

---

[1253] Pgs. 225-226, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1254] Pgs. 107ff., *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1255] "Oliphant, Laurence (1829-1888). Author; born in Cape Town, Africa, in 1829. Lord Elgin made him his private secretary in 1853, and in 1865 he was elected to Parliament, but he resigned in 1868 in obedience to instructions from Thomas L. Harris, leader of the Brotherhood of the New Life, a spiritualistic society of which both Oliphant and his wife were members" (pg. 4316, *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History*, B. Lossing, Ed. Medford, MA: Perseus Digital Library, elec. acc. Logos Bible Software).

[1256] Pg. 108, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890; pg. 18, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982; cf. pg. 21.

[1257] Pgs. 108-109, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Compare pg. 87.

[1258] Pgs. 6-7, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1259] Pgs. 108, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1260] Cf. pg. 109, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. What the Cowper-Temples termed spiritual growth might, by those who hold to Christian orthodoxy, perhaps be better termed cancerous growth.

Mount-Temples founded the Broadlands Conferences, the root of the Keswick Conventions and the capstone of their personal spiritual quest,[1261] for the purpose of promoting such Higher Life theology as that of Harris and Oliphant, and the special spiritual Baptism that accompanied it:

> These [Broadlands] Conferences were established . . . to seek the outpouring of the Spirit[.] . . . A meeting . . . of universal character, all speaking as the Spirit moved them, not of doctrines or of systems, but of the wonderful things of God. . . . In 1874 a few persons were led together on this new basis . . . their participation in the same desire to lead a higher and deeper Christian life.[1262]

People sought "a tangible sign of the Spirit," and received "*ten times* more [than they] expected" in his "felt presence."[1263] Mr. and Mrs. Smith were consequently invited by the Cowper-Temples to lead that first fateful conference at Broadlands in 1874, that others also might enter into that same Higher Life and Spirit baptism that they four had experienced with all its physical thrills.[1264]

Hannah W. Smith was well aware of the spiritualism and the immoral abominations practiced and propounded by the Mount-Temples. She wrote: "Lady Mount Temple is about as sweet as a human being can be. But she is a spiritualist, and told me that nothing had saved her from absolute infidelity but the proofs she had seen in spiritualism of a life in another region . . . she . . . had so much Scripture on her side[.]"[1265] Hannah Smith believed "so much Scripture" was on the side of Mrs. Mount-Temple's spiritualism despite the clearest and direst warnings against this demonic practice in texts such as Deuteronomy 18:11 and Isaiah 8:19. Thus, Hannah Smith allowed Mrs. Mount-Temple to introduce her to numerous spiritualists and mediums, and they sat under their teaching together.[1266] Was it not good that Mrs. Mount-Temple had been kept from agnosticism[1267] and atheism through the close communion with Satan and

---

[1261] Pg. 115, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1262] Pgs. 115-116, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1263] Pgs. 127, 148, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Italics in original. Note the reference to bridal union with Christ a handful of lines after the quotation from pg. 127 on the top of pg. 128.

[1264] Pgs. 116ff., *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1265] Pg. 67, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Priscilla Mounsey, January 10, 1883.

[1266] E. g., pg. 27, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982; a goodly amount of the material in Mrs. Smith's *Religious Fanaticism* came from the fellowship with spiritualists and mediums she partook of with Mrs. Mount-Temple.

[1267] Likewise, in a letter to Mrs. Mount-Temple, Ruskin indicates that the conversations with the spirits of the dead that have been raised up through spiritualistic necromancy have also convinced him "that

his devils into which she was brought as she engaged in familiar intercourse with demons pretending to be dead people who had come back from the grave? However, notwithstanding her preservation from agnosticism and atheism at the time, at a later time "Lady Mount Temple" began to "rav[e] against God one minute, and d[id] not believe there is any God the next minute."[1268] Furthermore, "Lady Mount Temple could never grasp the difference between right and wrong; when no cruelty was involved she couldn't see why people should not do what they like"[1269]—why they could not, as Hannah advised, "always . . . do the thing they really and seriously wanted to do . . . and . . . with a good conscience."[1270] That such advice could lead to the most monstrous iniquities, and extreme lasciviousness, was apparent. Indeed, Mrs. Mount Temple's "family, the Tollemaches, were a wild family, much given to misbehavior" that led many of them into "disgrace," as a result of which they would be invited to stay with Mr. and Mrs. Mount Temple for a while.[1271] Mrs. Mount-Temple's "only answer" when confronted with the fact that a servant of hers named Sarah, "under the almost intolerable domination" of whom she had fallen, "was the mother of a large family of illegitimate children," was: "'I am so glad poor Sarah has had some fun.' . . . [A] charge of misconduct made no impression."[1272] Indeed, Lady Mount Temple even "wrote . . . a friendly letter . . . [to] Oscar Wilde [while he] was out on bail between his two trials . . . inviting him to pay her a visit,"[1273] although Wilde was a notorious and serial pedophile, and his two trials were connected to his despicable sodomizing of countless boys and men. Lady Mount Temple also thought—as her conection with Laurence Oliphant makes most unsurprising—that it was "incomprehensible and silly" that Mr. Smith was removed

---

there *is* a spiritual state" (Letter 13, pg. 36, *The Letters of John Ruskin to Lord and Lady Mount-Temple*, ed. John L. Bradley).

1268 Pg. 132, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her daughter, Mary Costelloe, October 3, 1896.

1269 Pg. 47, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

1270 Pgs. 155-156, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

1271 Pgs. 48-49, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith. Logan Smith illustrates the wild behavior of Mrs. Mount Temple's family with one relative who had left her husband for an adulterous relationship, and who consequently "had been placed under Lady Mount Temple's roof." There, along with exhortations to some kind of morality, Mrs. Mount Temple composed a letter to send to the man the lady was committing adultery with, so that he could come and join her, as the adulteress was "feeling so lonely without" the man for whom she had betrayed her holy vows to God and her husband (pg. 48, *ibid*).

1272 Pg. 49, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

1273 Pg. 47, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith. Compare Hannah W. Smith's receipt of revelation from seeing Oscar Wilde on pg. 170, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her Daughter, Mary Berenson, November 10, 1904.

from his leadership of the Keswick Convention[1274] after the Brighton meetings because of his espousal of erotic bridal mysticism: "If these good people wanted to kiss each other, what, she wondered, could be the harm in that?"[1275]

Despite, or perhaps because of, Mrs. Mount-Temple's spiritualism, damnable heresies, immorality, and rejection of the gospel of Jesus Christ, Mrs. Smith could write to her: "I think of you as . . . sitting in a bower of heavenly love . . . our true and only [l]and is the beloved and beautiful will of God, which environs us all everywhere and in everything."[1276] Indeed, Mrs. Smith was happy to have fellowship with a variety of other spiritualists also,[1277] as well as receiving prophecies from occult palm readers.[1278] It is unsurprising that Hannah felt that there was "something occult about"[1279] the powers that assisted her preaching ministry. She was certainly not an enemy of the Satanic spiritualism of her great Higher Life patrons.

With the Mount-Temples,[1280] Mrs. Smith fellowshipped with Laurence Oliphant, that spiritualist, perfectionist cult leader, and free-love practicioner.[1281] Oliphant taught

---

[1274] Robert Smith also thought that he would be able to continue to lead the Convention and expected "encouragement to continue his ministry" after his confession of teaching erotic bride mysticism (pg. 36, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck).

[1275] Pg. 65, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearasall Smith.

[1276] Pgs. 105-106, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Lady Mount Temple and Mrs. Russell Gurney, October 3, 1889. Logan Smith comments: "Mrs. Russell Gurney, Lady Mount Temple, and H. W. S. formed themselves as a holy band" (pg. 105, *ibid*). "Emilia Gurney was among Mrs. Cowper-Temple's best friends . . . [w]ith Hannah Smith these three ladies called themselves the "Trins," a holy band comparable to the five mystic birds of ancient Philadelphia. Mrs. Gurney was at least sympathetic with Mrs. Cowper-Temple's interests . . . [in] spiritualism . . . and acquainted with members of the spiritualist circle, including Mrs. Acworth" (pgs. 121-122, *Christmas Story: John Ruskin's Venetian Letters of 1876-1877*, John Ruskin, ed. Van Alan Burd. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1990.

[1277] E. g., pgs. 155-156 of *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, record her letter to her daughter Alys Russell of January 24, 1903, where Mrs. Smith discusses her time with a spiritualist named Podmore, who saw spirits materialize and talk with each other, and who believed that both Cardinal Newman and Napoleon appeared to him.

[1278] E. g., pg. 128 of *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, records her discussion of the prophecy of a "Palmist" in her letter to Mrs. Lawrence of May 12, 1895. She claimed that she was skeptical of his prophecy.

[1279] Pg. 133, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to her Daughter, Mary Costelloe, October 29, 1896.

[1280] Compare the references to the Mount Temples on pgs. 310 & 313 of *The Memoir of the Life of Laurence Oliphant and of Alice Oliphant, His Wife*, by Margaret Oliphant, William Blackwood & Sons: London, 1892.

[1281] For example, during Mr. Laurence and Mrs. Alice Oliphant's "missionary" work in the Middle East, "Mrs. Oliphant felt compelled into high-minded but unreticent intimacy with Arabs, 'no matter,' as H. W. S. writes, 'how degraded and dirty they were'" (pg. 86, *A Religious Rebel: the Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith). Mrs. Smith enjoyed reading "some of Mrs. Oliphant's books" (pg. 196, *A Religious Rebel: the Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her Daughter, Mary Berenson,

the doctrine which had already been adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Smith some years earlier, and was publicly proclaimed at the Keswick precursor Convention at Oxford, that Spirit baptism brought erotic sexual sensations,[1282] although Mr. Oliphant affirmed with greater clarity[1283] that the actual entertainment of lustful and vile passions in acts of shameful immorality was the key and the only way to receive Spirit baptism. It was essential, Hannah knew, to receive a post-conversion Spirit baptism,[1284] for only after the Baptism does one really become a temple of the Holy Spirit and have His indwelling.[1285] And, in truth, it certainly would not be surprising if a supernatural spirit made the body of someone who received the erotic bridal Baptism his dwellingplace.[1286] In any case, Mr. and Mrs. Smith were not alone in receiving patronage from the Mount-Temples;

February 14, 1908.), referring to the works of Laurence Oliphant's cousin, Mrs. Margarent Oliphant, who wrote the *Life of Irving*, a biography of that earlier continuationist fanatic and heretic, Edward Irving.

[1282] The author begs the pardon of the reader for reproducing such blasphemous trash as the following examination of Mrs. Smith's confusion of the baptizing work of the Holy Spirit of God with sexual sensations. Although it is so unbelievably ridiculous and appalling, it constitutes a key part of the historical development of the nineteenth century Higher Life and Keswick doctrine of sanctification. It consequently seemed necessary to this writer to reproduce at length the evidence that Hannah W. Smith, her husband, and others adopted it, that the reader might not dismiss the facts as impossible because of their evidently Satanic, fanatical, and delusional character.

[1283] At least Oliphant was clearer, and the doctrine adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Smith somewhat more moderate and less crude and vile, if Mrs. Smith's declarations are to be believed—that is, if she did not wish, in describing the erotic Spirit baptism espoused, experienced, and promulgated by both Robert and herself, to make her family and her own person look better than they actually were. Only if what she wrote about herself in this connection was nothing but unvarnished and brutal truth, to be conveyed without diminution to the public, was Oliphant's teaching worse than the Pearsall Smiths's views. However, the historical record provides clear evidence of Hannah "adjusting" and distorting the facts to cover up and mitigate her and her husband's adoption and promulgation of the erotic Baptism doctrine. Oliphant himself publicly proclaimed only a vaguer version of his doctrine, concealing the real depths of Satan in his teachings from the masses—he reserved them for those he privately initiated into immorality.

[1284] Compare her explaining her own receipt of a post-conversion Spirit baptism and her call to the Ladies Meeting at Brighton to do so also on pgs. 376-377, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1285] Hannah wrote that through "the baptism of the Holy Ghost" one received "the full indwelling of the Spirit, whereby we become, not judicially, but really and actually the temples of the Holy Ghost, filled with the Spirit!" (Journal, April 29, 1868, reproduced in the entry for April 15 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

[1286] It is noteworthy that leading Pentecostal historians connect their doctrine of gibberish-speech as the essential evidence of Spirit baptism with Hannah and Robert P. Smith's doctrine of erotic thrills in Spirit baptism (cf. pg. 51, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan; pg. 64, "Wesleyan-Holiness Aspects of Pentecostal Origins: As Mediated through the Nineteenth-Century Holiness Revival," Melvin E. Dieter, pgs. 55-80 in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan; cf. pgs. 84-85, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner, for the Pentecostal "passion . . . to know even physically" that they have received the Baptism). Supernatural spirits can indeed possess many unconverted people who receive such Baptisms.

Oliphant also was received in the like manner and given a stage upon which to proclaim his filthy abominations.[1287] Mrs. Smith wrote about their meeting:

> I went to Dorking to join Lord and Lady Mount Temple at a friend's house there to meet Laurence Oliphant. . . . He . . . has come over to England on a mission to propogate a sort of mystic spiritualism of a most peculiar kind. . . . After dinner Laurence Oliphant read us a long paper . . . [t]he next morning, however, he unfolded his ideas to me . . . similar teaching had [been adopted by] a great many good people[1288] in America.[1289]

Her letter dramatically understated matters; as other writings of hers, which she would not allow to be published until after her death, and the deaths of all those involved in the events, indicated: "Readers of her [Hannah Smith's] *Religious Fanaticism* will recognize the moderation of this letter, for, as she there frankly reveals, Laurence Oliphant, together with his disciples, actually carried out, to the utmost possible extent, the practices of which Robert Pearsall Smith was suspected,"[1290] speaking of the doctrine that Spirit baptism was associated with sexual thrills, and engaging in practices suitable to such a confession; for Oliphant held that "sexual passion was the only real spiritual life."[1291] In her more forthright and posthumous description of her visit with the Mount-Temples to sit at the feet of Oliphant, Mrs. Smith wrote:

> On one occasion I was invited to go with two friends of mine . . . to meet Mr. Oliphant. In the evening, after dinner, Mr. Oliphant read us a paper about some mysterious experience that he declared was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and was the birthright of everyone; urging us to seek the experience for ourselves. . . . I scented out what he meant;[1292] but one of my friends did not, and she was profoundly impressed with the mysterious reference to some wonderful "it" that was to be the aim of our desires. When he closed the paper, she said in her sweet, childlike way, "What would'st thou have me to do in order to gain this?" Immediately he coloured up to the roots of his hair, and said, "I could not tell you in this company." It flashed into my mind that if he had answered her what was really in his mind, he would have said, "Come and get into bed with me." However, nothing more was said then, and we separated for the night, but I was convinced from the behaviour of our hostess and her daughters that they had been more or less initiated into the mystic rites of this new religion. The next morning Mr. Oliphant asked for a private interview with me, in which he told me that he believed my husband was called to enter into and propogate the views he held, and he urged me to beg him not to stop short of the full consummation. I asked what the full consummation was. He said, "You noticed the question that was asked me last night? Do you know what I would have answered? I did not tell him what I

1287 See, e. g., Letters 59, 96, 118, 121, pgs. 117, 181, 223-224, 228-229, *The Letters of John Ruskin to Lord and Lady Mount-Temple*, ed. John L. Bradley. Note also the discussion of Thomas Harris and his writings in Letter 112, 121, pgs. 212-214, 228-229.

1288 Mrs. Smith does not specify who these "good people" are in her letter; they included her husband and herself, who both adopted the erotic Spirit baptism heresy from the "good" Dr. Foster in America, and also many others, some of whom are described in her book *Religious Fanaticism*, which she allowed to be published only after her death and the death of all parties mentioned in it. In her letter, on the contrary, she affirms that she told Oliphant: "I told Oliphant of the dangers which I saw in his teachings[.]"

1289 Pgs. 85-86, *A Religious Rebel: the Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her friends, Dorking, August 1, 1886.

1290 Pg. 86, *A Religious Rebel: the Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith.

1291 Pg. 223, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1292 Mrs. Smith knew of what Oliphant spoke for she had herself adopted, with her husband, the erotic Baptism doctrine years earlier.

> had thought, but asked him, "What would you have answered? His reply was, "If I dared to I would have said, 'Come and get into bed with me.'" . . . I asked him if it were not possible to lead people into this glorious experience he spoke of without personal contact. He said no, it was not.[1293]

In addition to contact with Oliphant through the Mount-Temples, Hannah Smith had contact with the sect of Oliphant's father in his filthy faith, Thomas Harris,[1294] although she professed, at least in public, that she did not adopt either of their views. However, it is clear that she sought out, learned, and "knew personally about" Oliphant's sect and Harris's sect,[1295] while reading some of Harris's writings and lending them to others.[1296] On Mrs. Mount-Temple's request, Hannah even visited Harris's colony in California.[1297] Since Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple made their "home at Broadlands a haven for all sorts of prophets of new religious and utopian experiements, including the American Thomas Lake Harris . . . [and] his cult in New York State" and they seem to have "considered joining [his] American group,"[1298] Mrs. Smith's exposure to and fellowship with Harris and Oliphant is not surprising in the least. Indeed, although he may be difficult for her to understand, "Harris" is definitely "in his senses," as Hannah knew, a fact validated to her by her friend, the New Thought teacher Mrs. Caldwell, who considered his writings "very advanced truth"—and Hannah knew that Mrs. Caldwell was also certainly "in her senses," with "plenty more people, too" who found Harris and his abominations attractive.[1299] Filthy fanatics like Oliphant were some of the people[1300] Mrs. Mount-Temple introduced to Mrs. Smith. Through Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple, Hannah W. Smith was both influenced by spiritualism and other forms of demonic activity, encouraged in the doctrine of erotic bride mysticism being promulgated by her husband

---

[1293] Pgs. 225-226, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1294] Pgs. 213-239, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1295] Pg. 219, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1296] Cf. Letter to Sister, July 28, 1881, reproduced in the entry for October 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1297] Pg. 112, *Christmas Story: John Ruskin's Venetian Letters of 1876-1877*, John Ruskin, ed. Van Alan Burd. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1990.

[1298] Pgs. 6-7, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

[1299] Letter to Sister, July 28, 1881, reproduced in the entry for October 28 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1300] Oliphant was by no means the only deluded fanatic Mrs. Mount-Temple introduced to Hannah W. Smith. For example, Mrs. Smith wrote:

> As usual Lady Mount Temple is full of interesting things, and today she introduced me to a mysterious creature, a *man* he looked like, who is the leader of a strange sect called the "Temple," and who declared to me that he had not slept a wink for 8 years, but had every night got out of his body and travelled around the world on errands of service for the Lord!! He declared that he sees angels as plainly as he sees men, and knows them all apart, and that Michael has light flaxen hair, and Gabriel dark eyes and hair, and they all live in the sun! (pg. 102, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her friends, June 10, 1888)

and adopted, for a time, by herself also, and exalted to be the most important leader of the Higher Life movement, so as to become the founder of the Keswick theology.

The Mount-Temples's Broadlands Conference was the launching point for the Keswick movement; all the key Keswick theological distinctives were there in place.[1301] The distinctive pattern of the later Keswick meetings of beginning with an explication of the evil of known sin, progressing through the provision made in the Higher Life for victory, and a call to the embrace of the Higher Life and its practical consequences, was pioneered at Broadlands.[1302] The positive Keswick emphases, retained from the older classical orthodox doctrine of sanctification, on the necessity of surrender to Christ, a rejection of self-dependence, and the importance of faith, were set forth. What was truly new, the deviations from classical orthodoxy among Keswick speakers and writers, was also taught. For example, Broadlands taught the Keswick idea that Christ Himself lives the Christian life for the believer.[1303] Broadlands rejected Christ's Lordship and Biblical repentance in conversion, teaching that one receives Christ with the attitude of "some of self, and some of Thee" and only later comes to a real surrender.[1304] Broadlands taught the standard Keswick Quietism and its associated continuationism.[1305] The standard pattern of progressive daily topics at the Keswick Convention was that of Broadlands.[1306]

[1301] Compare the references in "An Analysis and Critique of Keswick Theology as Set Forth Particularly in *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*, by Stephen Barabas," below.

[1302] Pgs. 21ff., *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. The Broadlands and Keswick emphasis upon the renunciation of "known sin" to receive the second blessing carried over directly into Pentecostal theology (cf. pg. 95, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner).

[1303] Pg. 23, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

[1304] Pgs. 25-26, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; pg. 126, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890; pgs. 191-193, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. The confused Higher Life gospel became a very famous Keswick hymn written by Monod at Broadlands (cf. pgs. 53-54, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

[1305] E. g., Lord Mount Temple taught that in seeking the Higher Life one is to "respond to the impulses and impressions" allegedly from Christ outside of the Bible and "overcome all allurements to . . . independent action," (pg. 184, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890) rejecting what is apparently a temptation to study the Bible think about it, and obey it instead of following passively received suggestions and impulses; for to the Mount Temples, the spirit can use the body while the mind remains dormant (pg. 186, *ibid*).

[1306] Pgs. 124-125, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

Broadlands taught the distinctive Keswick model of sanctification. Keswick theology was consequently molded by the corruption of the gospel, confusion of Biblical sanctification, spiritualism, continuationism, ecumenicalism, the Inner Light, New Thought, the Mind and Faith Cure, feminism, Quakerism, syncretism, quietism, antinomianism, universalism, erotic sensations as Spirit baptism, and the other heresies of the Smiths and their fellow teachers of the Higher Life as taught at Broadlands. It is difficult to underestimate the influence of the teaching of Hannah W. Smith and others at Broadlands on the subsequent history and development of the Keswick movement, as the Oxford and Brighton Conventions were simply Broadlands writ large,[1307] and Keswick theology is the permanent establishment of the promulgations of these Conventions.

Thus, Mr. Mount-Temple was by no means a passive host who simply lent his Broadlands property to others for their use—on the contrary, he was the mainspring and heart of the Broadlands Conference and consequently a prime initiator of Keswick. Those who knew Broadlands best testified:

> Lord Mount Temple . . . was th[e] mainspring, th[e] very heart . . . of the Broadlands Conferences[.] . . . He was the preparer and the almost hidden ruler of the feast. . . . [T]he aim of his life express[ed] itself and t[ook] visible form in these Conferences . . . it was in *these* that the sap of his inner ideal life . . . found issue[.] . . . I attribute . . . the felt presence of the Spirit [at the Conferences] . . . not a little, I may say mainly, to the tone and spirit of him who [was] the lord of those broad lands[.] . . . I believe the main channel of all this blessing at Broadlands was dear Lord Mount Temple himself. . . . [I]t was his heart which . . . first conceived the possibility of such meetings . . . it was his personal influence, also, . . . which kept . . . opposite elements in peace[.] . . . Broadlands . . . [was under] the . . . leadership of Lord Mount Temple.[1308]

Lord Mount Temple led the way in spiritual things, Hannah Smith testified, and called through the Broadlands message for others to follow him to his eternal dwelling place.[1309] He received rhapsodic and hagiographical praise from key Keswick men such as Charles Fox,[1310] the poet of Keswick and its closing preacher for two decades.[1311] He developed

---

[1307] Cf. e. g., the testimony that Oxford was but a larger scale of Broadlands on pgs. 27-28, 31, 146-147, 243, 321, 354, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; Brighton was just Oxford intensified (cf. pgs. 321, 344-346, *ibid*.).

[1308] Pgs. 132-134, 148-150, 172-174, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Italics in original.

[1309] Pg. 175, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1310] For example, consider an excerpt of Charles Fox's *in memoriam* poem addressed to and concerning Lord Mount Temple (pg. 135, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple):

> The world is colder since thy sun went down,
> Went down in splendor noiseless as thy life,
> Thou noble-hearted banisher of strife,
> Thou tender traveller betwixt Cross and crown.
>
> Heaven's own simplicity was thine,—a light,

the practice of "open[ing] every meeting"[1312] at the Broadlands Conferences, where he "urged upon his hearers the need of a higher spiritual life" and promoted Quietism.[1313] Furthermore, his influence was by no means limited to Broadlands, but "he often preached"[1314] in various venues. By leading the Broadlands Conference, he was the source of the Oxford, Brighton, and Keswick Conventions that patterned themselves after and developed from it. As Hannah Whitall Smith explained out of her personal experience as a fixture and leader among the Broadlands preachers:[1315]

The light of early dawn instinct with dew,
Healing all sundered souls, thou didst diffuse,
Like summer twilight linking day and night.

Thy name was fraught with human brotherhood,
Thy words down-lighting softly everywhere,
Like snowflakes fell, but straight unveiled there stood
Truth's dauntless snowpeaks, towering crystal-fair!
Thy life soul-luminous, transparent, just,
Seemed God's own signature in human dust!

This was the praise of Keswick for the unconverted man who was both the founding impulse for their movement and among the most prominent of the promoters of familiar intercourse with demons in spiritualism.

It is natural that Fox was an honored guest not at Keswick alone, but at the Broadlands Conferences also (pgs. 118-119, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

1311 Andrew Naselli notes:

> Charles Armstrong Fox (1836–1900)[,] Keswick's Poet[,] an Anglican minister, spoke at the Brighton Convention in 1875, and Harford-Battersby and Wilson were so impressed with him that they invited him to speak at the first Keswick Convention just three weeks away. He was constantly ill, which inhibited him from speaking at the Keswick Convention until 1879, but he was then able to speak there every year through 1899 (except for 1897 because of illness). . . . After Fox's first convention, he gave the closing address on the final evening of each convention he attended. . . . The Keswick Mission Council passed a resolution on 18 December 1900 noting the Keswick Convention's "irreparable loss" in Fox's death: "As its saintly poet, he lent distinction to the Convention from the first, and to him by general consent in the days of his prime was entrusted the address on the Friday evenings, in which the whole series of meetings culminated." (pgs. 128-129, *Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology*, Naselli)

1312 Pg. 184, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Mrs. Cowper-Temple specifically speaks of her husband's practice at the Conference of 1888—she does not specify how far back it goes, but pg. 124, *ibid*, provides evidence that Lord Mount-Temple's practice was by no means limited to the 1888 Conference.

1313 Pg. 124, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Lord Mount-Temple's promotion of Quietism is evident in, e. g., his address's declaration that, to experience the Higher Life, not only must "our carnal will . . . be subdued" but "our natural will must die," not only must "carnal wishes" be removed but "emptying ourselves of human desires" must take place. While both the Son of Man, Jesus Christ, and unfallen Adam had sinless human desires and a sinless natural will, for Higher Life Quietists such as Lord Mount Temple and Hannah W. Smith not sin alone, but human nature itself is the enemy—it is not surprising, therefore, that for Lord Mount Temple, as for the Gnostics of old, "the true resurrection" is not that of the body, but "promotion from the world of matter to the world of spirit" (pg. 188, *ibid*).

1314 Pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

1315 E. g., she was not only leading at the first Conference, but testified: "As a Quaker, I have attended many of these Conferences," and was present and preaching even at the last one (pgs. 132, 174, *Memorials*

> Mr. and Mrs. Cowper Temple . . . were among the first to open their hearts and their home to the teaching concerning the life of faith that was at that time beginning to attract attention among English Christians. The great Conferences at Oxford, later, in 1874, and at Brighton in 1875, and the long series of similar, though somewhat smaller Conferences since held for the "deepening of the spiritual life," were all the outcome of that first Conference gathered by Mr. and Mrs. Cowper Temple at Broadlands . . . in the summer of 1874; and probably without this brave initiatory Conference of theirs those which followed, filled as they have been and still are with [Higher Life] blessings to thousands, would never have been held. This fact is not generally known, but in the great day of accounts, when the secrets of all hears are revealed . . . thousands will [recognize] these . . . pioneers for having thus opened to Christians a wide door into . . . the life hid with Christ in God.[1316]

Broadlands led directly to Keswick:

> [O]n July 17, 1874, the first Broadlands Conference met. About 200 persons assembled[.] . . . After this a Conference was held at Broadlands nearly every summer till 1888, and soon after the last one, in August of that year, Lord Mount-Temple died.
>
> Many who attended the first Conference in 1874 felt it would be well if similar meetings, open to larger numbers, could be held elsewhere, and, at the suggestion of Stevenson Blackwood, Oxford was selected as a suitable spot[.] . . . Accordingly a Conference was held in September in the lovely old city, and about 1000 men and women of all ranks of society and of various religious denominations were present.
>
> A fortnight later a crowded meeting was held under the Dome of Brighton, to hear about the Oxford Conference, and as a result of the interest awakened, a Conference was held at Brighton in the following spring, which was largely attended. There were about 8000 strangers in Brighton, as many as 6000 attending services at the same time. . . .
>
> The same year as the Brighton Conference, 1875 . . . the Keswick Conventions . . . [were] inaugurated . . . which have drawn great numbers . . . year after year ever since[.][1317]

Both persons who attended and written works about Broadlands and its teaching were key in the formation of the Higher Life movement encapsulated at Keswick.[1318] Thus, "the Broadlands Conferences were the starting-point of many important movements. The great Conferences at Oxford in 1874, and at Brighton in 1875, for the deepening of the spiritual life, leading on to those held annually at Keswick and elsewhere . . . were the outcome of those at Broadlands[.]"[1319] The 1874 Broadlands Conference, at which the Smiths were key speakers, was "the germ from which Keswick was to grow, and out of which the memorable gatherings at Oxford and Brighton sprang more immediately."[1320]

[of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple], Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

[1316] Pgs. 171-172, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1317] Pgs. 16-18, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Cf. pg. 25, *Forward Movements*, Pierson.

[1318] Pg. 27, *Forward Movements*, Pierson.

[1319] Pg. 24, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1320] Pgs. 61-62, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie); cf. the account on pgs. 57-60, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith. At Brighton it was indisputable and assumed that the teaching was that of Broadlands (e. g., pgs. 8, 23, 176, 343, 419 *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875) and Oxford (e. g., pgs. 6, 89, 94, 111, 143, 145, 200, 242, 259, 292, etc., *ibid*), for at Mrs. Cowper-Temple's residence at "Broadlands the first such English gathering was held . . . Oxford and Brighton have been their

The Keswick Conventions are indubitably the product of Broadlands. What is more, "the fruits of these . . . Broadlands Conferences . . . even now are seen, [even] among those who never were at Broadlands, but who have caught something of its spirit."[1321] The deviations from orthodox spirituality in the Keswick movement developed from the foundation of the movement in the federation between the Mount Temples, the Pearsall Smiths, and other false teachers at Broadlands.

Hannah Smith's Higher Life theology, promulgated in the Keswick movement, that sanctification produces a sort of perfection of acts,[1322] follows the teaching of the leading Quaker theologian Robert Barclay.[1323] However, Mrs. Smith came to her view of "the life of faith" in association not only with the "Quaker examples and influences" that from her youth led her to seek for entire sanctification,[1324] but also the Catholic heretics and mystical quietists "Fénelon and Madame Guyon."[1325] Hannah described her love for

---

successors" (pg. 19, *ibid*.). Keswick indisputably developed from these meetings (cf. pg. 123, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford).

While Mrs. and Mr. Smith were the center of the Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions, men such as Asa Mahan and William Boardman were present and preached also; cf. pg. 73, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874, etc.

[1321] Pg. 147, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1322] That is, "the necessary consequence of consecration and faith . . . is a present and complete deliverance from sinning. If my soul is really entirely surrendered to the Lord Jesus and if I am really trusting Him to work all the good pleasure of His will in me, I must be delivered from sinning" (Journal, February 16, 1869, reproduced in the entry for May 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.).

[1323] Barclay wrote:

> This most certain doctrine then being received, that there is an evangelical and saving light and grace in all . . . as many as resist not this light, but receive the same, in them is produced an holy, pure, and spiritual birth, bringing forth holiness, righteousness, purity, and all these other blessed fruits which are acceptable to God; by which holy birth (to-wit, Jesus Christ formed within us, and working his works in us) as we are sanctified, so are we justified in the sight of God. [Barclay thus teaches that sanctification and justification are received exactly the same way, and that justification is not by Christ's imputed righteousness, but by becoming inwardly holy, a rejection of the gospel, in which Hannah W. Smith follows him; cf. pgs. 193-194, *Every-Day Religion, or The Common-Sense Teaching of the Bible*, Hannah W. Smith. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1893.] . . . In whom this holy and pure birth is fully brought forth, the body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed, and their hearts united and subjected unto the truth, so as not to obey any suggestion or temptation of the evil one, but to be free from actual sinning, and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; and there remaineth a possibility of sinning, where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord. (pgs. vii-viii, cf. pgs. 87ff., Proposition 7, "Concerning Justification," and Proposition 8, "Concerning Perfection," *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People called Quakers*, Robert Barclay)

Hannah Smith cites Barclay repeatedly and positively in her writings; see, e. g., her Journal from 1849, reproduced in the entry for January 3 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1324] See, e. g., her Journal from 1849 & 1861, reproduced in the entry for January 2 & 29 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1325] pg. 232, *The Unselfishness of God*. Methodist influences were also present, as explained below.

a collection of their writings and its influence upon her, and her father before her, in leading them towards the Higher Life, as follows:

> I knew I was not what I ought to be. My life was full of failure and sin. . . . I was continually sinning and repenting, making good resolutions and breaking them . . . longing for victory . . . but more often failing. . . . From the peaceful, restful lives of the Quakers, among whom I had been brought up . . . I had supposed of course that becoming a Christian meant necessarily becoming peaceful and good, and I had as much expected to have victory over sin and over worries as I had expected the sun to shine. But I was forced to confess in the secret depths of my soul that I had been disappointed. . . . Nothing could have described my condition better than the Apostle's account of his own condition in Romans 7:14-23.[1326] I had entered into the salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord, and yet I knew no such triumphant deliverance from the "body of death" within me[.] . . . This feeling became especially strong after my discovery of the unlimited love of God.[1327] . . . The Quaker examples and influences around me seemed to say there must be a deliverance somewhere, for they declared that they had experienced it[.] . . . There was also another influence in my life that seemed to tell the same story. I possessed a book which distinctly taught that God's children were not only commanded to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, but also that they could do so;[1328] and which seemed to reveal the mystical pathway towards it. It was called "Spiritual Progress," and was a collection of extracts from the writings of Fénelon and Madame Guyon. This book was very dear to me, for it had been a gift from my adored father, and always lay on my desk beside my Bible. . . . [Concerning it, my father also testified,] "This book proved to be of the greatest comfort to me. I carried it in my pocket, and at leisure moments read it to my everlasting profit, I trust. And I cannot but thank a kind Providence for giving me this blessed book." . . . He valued the book so highly that, as fast as his children grew old enough, he presented each one of us with a copy, and asked us to read it carefully. Our father was so dear to us that we always wanted to please him, and I for one had made the book my special companion . . . its teachings had made a profound impression upon me[.] . . . After . . . the discovery I had made of the wideness of God's love [universalism], I began to feel more and more uneasy. . . . And more and more I felt the inconsistency of having a salvation, which was in the end to be so magnificently complete [as every single person would be in heaven], but which failed now and here so conspiculously in giving that victory over sin and over worry . . . [until I discovered] the Methodist "blessing of holiness."[1329]

Thus, not only Quakerism, universalism, and a self-centered eudemonism that was focused upon being free from worry and having a life of ease and rest, but also Roman Catholic mysticism was key in Hannah's discovery of the Higher Life. In her youth Hannah had wished to "get perfectly good, just like Mme. Guyon,"[1330] and even to the

---

1326 Hannah adopts the Higher Life view of the passage that considers it as a description of Paul in self-dependent defeat. She goes on to give the standard Keswick argument that Paul must pass out of defeat in Romans 7 into victory in Romans 8 because of Romans 7:25a, ignoring Romans 7:25b, Paul's actual conclusion in Romans 7:14-25.

1327 That is, after she rejected eternal torment and became a universalist.

1328 That is, the Higher Life and Pelagian doctrine of the equation of obligation and ability, here taught to Hannah Smith by Guyon and Fénelon.

1329 Pgs. 172-176, 185, *The Unselfishness of God*, Princeton, NJ: Littlebrook Press, 1987.

1330 Pg. 2, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing Letter to her Cousin, Annie Whitall, 1850. Hannah was 18 at the time. Her writings contain other references to being "much helped" by Madame Guyon (cf. pg. 164, *The Unselfishness of God*, Hannah W. Smith, Princeton, NJ: Littlebrook Press, 1987).

limits of her old age she found various affirmations of Fénelon "everlastingly true."[1331] She further wrote: "Fenelon's whole teaching is to show us how to let the lower life die, and the higher life take its place[,] [that is,] . . . the 'Higher Life' . . . [taught in my] 'Christian's Secret[.]'"[1332] Likewise, Hannah Smith found "the true meaning of self abandonment" in Madame Guyon's *Commentary on the Song of Solomon*,[1333] found confirmation on "the subject of guidance" by the Inner "Voice" from "Madame Guyon,"[1334] discovered her quietistic doctrine of resting on God in "naked faith" from "Madame Guyon" and "Fenelon,"[1335] and developed her doctrine of being "one with God" from them also.[1336] Indeed, she made many discoveries from this pair of Catholic mystics, who were central to her doctrine of sanctification,[1337] although other Roman Catholics were also important.[1338] Indeed, she found that not only Romanist mystics, but "[a]ll the writers on the advancing life say that a renunciation of all the activities of the soul must come before God can be all in all."[1339] That is, quietism is the necessary

---

[1331] Pg. 213, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing Letter to her Daughter, Mary Berenson, March 25, 1910. Hannah was 78 at the time.

[1332] Letter to Daughter Mary, October 9, 1881, reproduced in the entry for October 30 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1333] Journal, Millville N. J., August 27, 1865; reproduced in the entry for February 3 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1334] Letter to Abby, Millville N. J., September 6, 1865; reproduced in the entry for February 4 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1335] Letter to Carrie, March 12, 1881; reproduced in the entry for October 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1336] Letter to Carrie, March 12, 1881; reproduced in the entry for October 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Guyon and Fénelon also assisted Hannah move all the further away from literal interpretation of Scripture to the "inner sense" of allegorical, mystical, and non-literal interpretation that supported the doctrines she was imbibing from the Romanists.

[1337] Compare Letter to Sarah, March 7, 1881; Letter to Priscilla, 1883; Letter to a Friend, January 17, 1883, Providence, R.I., reproduced in the entries for October 24, November 16, & December 7 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1338] For example, Hannah enjoyed the works of Frederick W. Faber, who journeyed with Cardinal Newman from the false gospel of Anglo-Catholicism into the arms of the Roman harlot itself (Revelation 17). She quoted him favorably in chapter 22 of her *Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*. Commending him to another, she likewise wrote: "I wish you had Faber's *Growth in Holiness* to read a little of it as a part of your devotions. I find him very helpful" (Letter to Carrie, February 2, 1881, reproduced in the entry for October 23 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). See further representative examples of her positive view of Faber in Letter to Robert, July 20, 1873, Letter to a Friend, September 2, 1873, Letter to Anna, September 29, 1876, Letter to a Friend, August 17, 1879, reproduced in the entries for July 2, 5, August 9, September 20, of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter, etc.

[1339] Letter, 1880, reproduced in the entry for October 19 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Fenelon and Guyon were the most prominent of these "writers on the advancing life" or "spiritual writers"; cf. Letter to Carrie, March 12, 1881, reproduced in the entry for October 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

prerequisite for mystical union and deification.[1340] The Higher Life "may make us lazy on the line of 'creaturely activity,' for all our restless strivings and agonizings will be over, and our souls will dwell in 'peaceable habitations' continually,"[1341] but quietism is the truth, at least in the view of the writers on the advanced life, if not in the view of the Bible.

Both the Roman Catholic Archbishop Fénelon and the mystical Quietist and panentheist Madame Guyon, who in "all that concerns the distinction between Protestantism [and the Baptists] and Romanism . . . is wholly Romanist,"[1342] were enemies of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Madame Guyon began her last will as follows: "I protest that I die in the faith of the Catholic, apostolical, Roman Church; having no other doctrines than hers; believing all that she believes, and condemning, without restriction, all that she condemns."[1343] She was "an outstanding proponent" of "quietism," that "manifestation of Roman Catholic mysticism in the seveneenth and eighteenth centuries," having adopted it from "Miguel de Molinos, a Spanish priest"[1344] who was "founder of the Quietists."[1345] Packer describes the error of Quietism:

> Quietism . . . holds that all initiatives on our part, of any sort, are the energy of the flesh; that God will move us, if at all, by inner promptings and constraints that are recognizably not thoughts and impulses of our own; and that we should always be seeking the annihilation of our selfhood so that divine life may flow freely through our physical frames. . . . by biblical standards this passiv[e] frame of reference is altogether wrong, for the Holy Spirit's ordinary way of working in us is through the working of our minds and wills. . . . Thus, our conscious, rational selfhood, so far from being annihilated, is strengthened . . . Philippians 2:13. This is holiness, and in the process of perfecting it there is, properly speaking, no passivity at all.[1346]

David Cloud explained:

> The school of mysticism that Guyon adhered to, sometimes called Quietism, was an extreme form of Roman Catholic mysticism that emphasized the cleansing of one's inner life and included the belief that one could see Christ visibly. Before Guyon's day, in the Middle Ages, this took strange forms in erotic "bride mysticism" with some visionaries believing they were married to Jesus. Guyon and the Quietists went further, into something called essence mysticism. They believed that

---

1340 Hannah W. Smith's doctrine would have been in accord with her fellow preacher and founder of the Broadlands Conferences, Lord Mount Temple: "My Lord Jesus, as Thou didst take my humanity, I pray Thee impart to me Thy Divinity" (pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

1341 Letter to Priscilla, September 20, 1882, reproduced in the entry for October 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1342 pg. 376, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, Benjamin B. Warfield. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003; reprint of 1932 Oxford ed.

1343 "Guyon, Jeanne-Marie Bouvier De La Mothe," pg. 402 in the *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, vol. 3, James Strong & John McClintock. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 2. Albany, OR: AGES Software, 2006.

1344 Pg. 901, "Quietism," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell.

1345 "Molinos, Miguel De," *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, John McClintock & James Strong, vol. 6, elec. acc. AGES Digital Software Library.

1346 Pg. 127, *Keep In Step With The Spirit,* Packer.

> their being was merged with God's being and the two became one. This unbiblical idea survives today in the New Age and other non-Christian religions. . . . She taught that we can know of God by "passing forward into God," going into a mindless, meditative state where we can get in touch with the Christ within the self, merge with that Christ and be lifted into ecstasy.[1347]

Guyon "won many converts," resulting in a "belief in a vague pantheism which is closer to the South Asian religions than to Christianity," but, nevertheless, she "felt herself so close to God that she received visions and revelations,"[1348] as did so many of her Higher Life successors who devoured her writings. Madame Guyon also, with other medieval Roman Catholic mystics, believed in the abominable heresy of deification, which was also transferred into the Higher Life and Keswick milieu.[1349] Fenélon, who "admired and defended [Guyon's] ideas,"[1350] had many converts also—he became the Catholic "Superior of a house for recent converts from Protestantism and then led a mission to the Huguenots,"[1351] seeking to bring those French Protestants back to the fold of that religious system, centered in Rome, that the Apostle John called the mother of harlots and

---

1347 "The Delusions of Madame Guyon," by David Cloud. Port Huron, MI: Fundamental Baptist Information Service, November 16, 2010. It is likely that the medieval Roman Catholic erotic bridal mysticism was ultimately at the root of the theological trajectory that led to Mr. and Mrs. Smith's reception of the doctrine, although Henry Foster was the more immediate instrument of their adoption of the heresy.

1348 Pg. 902, "Quietism," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell.

1349 Madame Guyon wrote: "The essential union is the spiritual marriage where there is a communication of substance, when God takes the soul for His spouse, unites it to Himself, not personally, nor by any act or means, but immediately reducing all to a unity. The soul ought not, nor can, any more make any distinction between God and itself. God is the soul, the soul is God" (cited pgs. 82-83, *The "Higher Life" Doctrine of Sanctification*, Henry A. Boardman). "Communication of substance" is classical Trinitarian language for the possession of the undivided Divine essence by the Son through His being eternally begotten by the Father, and of the Spirit's possession of the undivided Divine essence by eternal procession from the Father and the Son. To affirm that the Divine substance is communicated to a human being, so that the soul is God, is horrific blasphemy. Sundry Keswick advocates, such as Watchman Nee and Witness Lee, accepted the mystical heresy of deification, which was present in the Keswick movement from the time of its genesis in the Broadlands Conferences. Since the Higher Life and Keswick theology developed out of a historical trajectory involving Guyon, Fénelon, and mystical Quietism, this acceptance of deification is natural. However, more orthodox proponents of Keswick theology agree with Stephen Barabas and deny that sanctification involves "the merger of the personality with that of God . . . [or] the destruction of the personality" (pg. 121, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas); those Higher Life writers who agree with Barabas have allowed Scripture to remove this particular heresy from the historical stream of Keswick theology within which they swim.

The Word of Faith movement likewise calls believers "god men" and preaches deification, as did the nineteenth century New Thought movement, which developed "the Divinity of Man" through "obedience to the Indwelling Presence which is our source of Inspiration, Power, Health, [and] Prosperity" (pgs. 106-107, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell). The metaphysical and Word of Faith doctrine that through "deification" men "are transformed into gods," since "man was created with the divine nature, sinned, and was filled with satanic nature; but through the new birth, he is again infused with the divine nature," so that "to be born again" is to receive "the nature and life of God in one's spirit" (pg. 119-121, *ibid*.) is also very similar to the doctrine of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee, and the Word of Faith system arose from the Higher Life antecedents that produced Pentecostalism.

1350 Pg. 902, "Quietism," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell.

1351 Pg. 89, "Fénelon, Francois de Salignac de Mothe," *Who's Who in Christianity*, ed. Lavinia Cohn-Sherbok.

abominations of the earth (Revelation 17). Concerning these Quietists, Hannah W. Smith wrote: "By my Quaker education, I was exceedingly inclined towards mysticism, and the books I had read—such as Madame Guyon, Fénelon, Isaac Pennington[1352] and others, all of which lead to a life of introspection and self-abandonment—had greatly strengthened me in this, so that I honestly believed that wonderful spiritual light would come, and did come, to souls that gave themselves up to the control of their interior emotions and followed impressional guidance."[1353] She stated: "[B]ecause of my education in the Quaker Society . . . [m]y idea of guidance . . . was of having impressed upon my mind in some miraculous way the will of God; and the teaching I received was that instant, unquestioning obedience to these impressions was the only way[.]"[1354] Quaker and Roman Catholic mysticism were at the heart of Hannah W. Smith's Higher Life and Keswick theology.

Mrs. Smith also rejoiced in her "dear Quaker friend[s] and the Catholic Saints" who "exalted James with his justification by works."[1355] After the death of her daughter's Roman Catholic husband, she "covenanted that" her grandchildren from that marriage would "be educated as Roman Catholics, and she kept . . . strictly to her promise."[1356] She wrote: "My two little grandchildren are . . . devout little Catholics, and seem to enjoy their religion, and I am glad of it. I daresay they will be saved a good many of the perplexities and difficulties that so often beset Protestant children."[1357] She led them to celebrate Lent,[1358] to "la[y] up treasure in Heaven by giving candlesticks to a Roman Catholic High Altar" and by going to Mass[1359] and the Confessional.[1360] Hannah used the methods in "*The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*" to lead "a Roman Catholic lady, a convert who was vexed by doubts about some dogma of the Church" of Rome, to an unshaken confidence in the dogma of transubstantiation. "H. W. S. wrote out on a

---

1352 Pennington was a Quaker mystic and heretic. Hannah W. Smith repeatedly refers to him (e. g., April 23, May 6, September 9, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life: The Unpublished Personal Writings of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. Melvin Dieter).

1353 Pg. 206, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1354 Pg. 240, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1355 Pg. 234, *My Spiritual Autobiography*, Hannah W. Smith. James does not teach that one is justified in the sight of God by works, nor contradict in any way the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone (Romans 3:28).

1356 Pgs. 158, 144, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. She would not have even "the narrowest Catholicism" taken away from her granddaughters (pg. 194, *ibid*). See also pg. xx.

1357 Pg. 139, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letter to Miss Olive Seward, March 28, 1898.

1358 Pg. 158, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith.

1359 Pg. 158, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith.

1360 Pg. 174-175, 184, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith.

piece of paper, 'I undertake never to have any more doubts about the Real Presence' (or whatever it was), and brought it to her, and made her sign it. After that the troubled spirit was utterly at rest"[1361] in the bosom of the Whore of Babylon. After all, nothing was wrong with Romanism, since because of a Quaker "opening," one of the special revelations she received that supplemented or contradicted the Bible, Mrs. Smith came to realize that Roman Catholics were all one in God with other Christians.[1362] In any case, a Christian does not need to be justified by Christ's imputed righteousness, nor believe what the Bible says about Jesus Christ—rather, "to be a good human being is to be the best Christian that can be made."[1363] Mrs. Smith documents how she turned away from the doctrine she had learned from the Plymouth Brethren of judicial and forensic justification by faith alone (cf. Romans 3:28), "[a]fter . . . the discovery [she] had made of the wideness of God's love [universalism],"[1364] adopting instead the heresy and works-gospel that justification means that "the life of Christ in our souls is a righteous life."[1365] She thus denied the Biblical doctrine of justification, as well as holding to other corruptions of the gospel, both before and during the time when she began her influence as a Higher Life teacher and preacher, and she cleaved to a false gospel the rest of her life.

In addition to rejecting the core Biblical doctrine of justification, Mrs. Smith was very confused on the instrumental means for the receipt of the gospel. Denying that repentant faith alone was the instrumentality for the receipt of salvation, Hannah taught that "we cannot be saved until after we confess," so that it was necessary to "make an apology" after doing wrong.[1366] Her view of faith was dangerous and heretical. She wrote: "Faith, then, is not a grace . . . Neither are there different kinds of faith. Men talk about a . . . living faith, and a saving faith, and an intellectual faith, and an historical

---

1361 Pg. 153, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith.

1362 "I had one of my 'openings' in regard to all the Catholic ceremonies, that took away forever my prejudices, and made me feel that it was a *fact* that we are all one in God. Such openings are tremendously enlightening. I love to have them" (pg. 216, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith).

1363 Pg. 256, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1364 pg. 237, *My Spiritual Autobiography*, Hannah W. Smith.

1365 Pg. 193-194, *Every-Day Religion*, Hannah W. Smith.

1366 Hannah was writing, in 1870, to her son Frank, basing her false gospel upon a misinterpretation of Romans 10:9-10 (Letter to Frank, January 2, 1870, reproduced in the entry for May 22 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Romans 10:9-10 does not make confession of any kind a prerequisite to justification; rather it affirms that after one has believed in his heart and received Christ's righteousness, he will confess Christ before men as a mark of his regenerate life, and so enter heaven, that is, receive ultimate salvation. See "An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians," by Thomas Ross.

faith, and a dead faith; but God talks about believing what He says, and this is the only kind of faith the Bible mentions."[1367] Thus, to Mrs. Smith, saving faith was merely intellectual assent, believing facts. Furthermore, Mrs. Smith anticipated the Word-Faith heresy[1368] that positive confessions create positive realities:

> Put your will then over on to the believing side. Say, "Lord I will believe, I do believe," and continue to say it. . . . I began to say, over and over, "The Lord does love me. He is my present and my perfect Saviour; Jesus saves me, Jesus saves me now!" . . . Those three little words, repeated over and over, — "Jesus saves me, Jesus saves me," — will put to flight the greatest army of doubts that ever assaulted any soul. I have tried it times without number, and have never known it to fail. Do not stop to argue the matter out with your doubts, nor try to prove that they are wrong. Pay no attention to them whatever; treat them with the utmost contempt. Shut your door in their faces, and emphatically deny every word they say to you. . . . Cultivate the habit of expressing your faith in definite words . . . repeat often.[1369]

Further anticipating Word of Faith error, she wrote elsewhere: "Faith, we are told, 'calleth those things which be not as though they were.' Calling them brings them into being," so that exercising faith is "the law of creation[,]"[1370] misinterpreting Romans 4:17, which states that the personal, omnipotent God, not faith, calls those things which are not as though they were. Thus, Hannah believed she could do what Romans 4:17 affirms God, not the Christian, does: "[I]t is like the pangs of creation to have 'the faith of God' and 'call those things which be not as though they were.' Is not that a grand definition of faith? It is in Romans 4:17."[1371] Nevertheless, Hannah admitted: "I see the

---

[1367] Pg. 42, *The "Higher Life" Doctrine of Sanctification Tried by the Word of God,* Henry A. Boardman. Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle, 1996, citing Mrs. Smith's tract "Faith," published by the Willard Tract Repository. Pgs. 38-58 of Boardman's book documents Smith's unbiblical, Pelagian, and rationalistic view of faith.

[1368] Mr. Robert P. Smith also makes affirmations that sound like the Word-Faith positive confession heresy (cf. pgs. 100-101, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875).

[1369] *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, Chapters 3, 6, 14, elec. acc. *Accordance Bible Software*; cf. Letter to Anna, September 6, 1871, reproduced in the entry for June 16 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

It is noteworthy that Hannah Smith's "Jesus saves me now" was also Robert P. Smith's great refrain of immediate sanctification, the "watch word" of the Conventions that developed the Keswick theology (Letter to Father and Mother, June 9, 1875, reproduced in the entry for July 26 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter), and the way of entrance into a state of a perfection of acts, instantaneously obtained as a result of an act of faith directed to that end. Furthermore, "'Jesus saves me now,' is the refrain of more than one peculiarly 'Keswick' hymn," which teach that by that immediate act of faith one obtains this second blessing (pg. 216, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford); "Jesus saves me now" was enshrined in Keswick hymnody from at least the time of the Oxford Convention (pgs. 88-89, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Compare pgs. 140, 319, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1370] Pg. 235, *The God of All Comfort*, Smith.

[1371] Letter to Daughter, February 14, 1883, reproduced in the entry for December 11 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

difficulty you speak of, and I confess it does seem an odd sort of thing to do, to become satisfied by saying one is satisfied, when one is not. But is it not just what faith is described to be 'calling those things which be not as though they were.' And what else can we do?"[1372] She recognized that it was, indeed, very odd to simply say that things were a certain way when they were not so, but such was her view of faith, and she did not know what else to do. Her view, applied to feelings, might have had some effect as a psychological gimmick, but when applied to physical healing in the nineteenth century Faith and Mind Cure movements, and the modern Word of Faith movement, it has caused vast numbers of early deaths, while when applied to conversion and assurance of salvation, it has led to vast numbers of eternal, spiritual deaths.

As Mrs. Smith's view of faith was heretical, so her view of conversion was terribly deficient and dangerous. Her counsel to the unconverted was:

> If you are *unconverted,* take His message to sinners in 2 Corinthians 5:19, for instance, and make up your mind to believe it, irrespective of your feelings, or of your reasonings or of any other thing whatever. Say to yourself, "God says that He 'was reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.' I do not see how this can be. I do not feel as if it were so. But God says it, and I know He cannot lie; and I choose to believe Him. He *is* reconciled to me in Christ, and He does not impute my trespasses unto me; I *was* saved through the death of Christ." Repeat it over and over, putting all the power of will you possess into it. "I will believe; I choose to believe; I do believe; I am saved." "How do you know it?" says Satan; "do you feel it?" "No I do not feel it at all; but I know it, because God says so; and I would far rather trust His word than my own feelings, let them be ever so delightful."[1373]

Henry Boardman[1374] rightly comments on this false view of faith by Mrs. Smith: "Can this grossly unscriptural advice be followed without deadly peril of self deception?"[1375] Saving faith is a Spirit-worked trust in the Person and cross of the Lord Jesus Christ. It possesses intellectual, volitional, and emotional elements. Repeating to oneself over and over that since Christ died for the sins of the world, one has received spiritual life, is a fearful error and a false gospel. Describing, on another occasion, how she would bring someone to "conversion," although conversion to "a different sort of God altogether" than that of Christian orthodoxy, that is, the god of universalism, Hannah explained that the sinner does not need to recognize that he is a child of the devil (John 8:44) who is dead in sin (Ephesians 2:1-3) and then come to repentance (Luke 13:3); rather, he should simply mentally assent to the fact that he is, allegedly, already a child of God and already

---

1372 Letter to Priscilla, January 8, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 3 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1373 *Faith,* Hannah Whitall Smith, cited pg. 55, *The "Higher Life" Doctrine of Sanctification Tried by the Word of God*, Henry Boardman. Italics in original.

1374 Henry Boardman must not be confused with the Higher Life leader William Boardman.

1375 Pgs. 55-56, *The "Higher Life" Doctrine of Sanctification Tried by the Word of God*, Henry Boardman.

forgiven, just like all other sinners in the world, and then enter into the Higher Life and feel happy and free from trouble. Hannah and Robert Smith were happy to give assurance and the peace and comfort that comes with it to those without any testimony of real conversion or the life associated with it; for example, they publicly proclaimed that all their children were saved, although none of them were.[1376] She wrote:

> [C]onversion comes . . . at the moment of belief, only it is belief in a different sort of God altogether. I go to a sinner now and say, "Poor soul, God loves you; God is your Father; He is on your side. He came down to this world in a human body, just to take your lot upon Him and to bear your sins and sorrows. He met your enemy and conquered him, so that you need not fear him any more. He is not angry with you. He took your sins upon Him and made your cause His own. He is reconciled to you. He declared that He forgave you when He was on earth, and He declares it still in the Record He left behind Him. He says if you will only trust Him He will get you out of all your troubles. He will beget His own spiritual life in you, and make you a partaker of the Divine nature. You shall be born of the spirit, and be filled with the spirit[.][1377]

In light of Mrs. Smith's confusion on the nature of saving conversion—errors in which she was followed by her husband[1378] and in which she stood with other Higher Life leaders[1379]—it is not surprising that Mrs. Smith's son Logan could remember little about

---

[1376] Pg. 212, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; cf. Hannah's teaching on pg. 373.

[1377] Letter to Anna, January 21, 1881, reproduced in the entry for October 20 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1378] A brief testimony by Robert about his professed conversion appears on pgs. 168-169, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; he came to see what Christ's blood "had" already done for him, and recognising that fact, he testified: "I never for an hour doubted my pardon and adoption"; mention of repentance, or of actually trusting in what Christ did, is omitted; only assent to facts about Christ's blood is stated. Furthermore, Robert believed that "consecration and conversion [were] two separate acts" and he had "never known one instance in which they were not distinct" (pg. 256, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875); that is, if his testimony is to be credited, he never knew a single instance in which a sinner repented and surrendered to Christ as Lord at the time of his professed conversion, and Mr. Smith did not surrender to Christ at the time of his own professed conversion; consequently, his salvation was spurious, as were all those of whom he testified truly.

Mr. Smith's exceedingly weak view of conversion is also evident in that he testified: "I had asked the Lord not to send me out [in ministry] till the Divine seal had been set on my work at home—[but] when all my children, my servants, and many of my work-people had been converted, and brought to live the faith-life, it was easy to go 'to the parts beyond'" (pg. 221, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Although his children, at least those who lived to adulthood, were all unconverted, he publicly proclaimed exactly the opposite—but it is not surprising that one who is unconverted himself should have great difficulty leading others to true conversion.

[1379] For example, Jacob Abbott, commenting on William Boardman's definition of faith in his *The Higher Christian Life*, notes:

> We had read with astonishment, in the early part of the work, what he quoted, with an apparent endorsement, from a monk, who was directing Luther how to be saved. Said the monk: "The commandment of God is, that we believe *our own sins* are forgiven" (p. 25). Where do we find a warrant for so believing, and calling it saving faith? What kind of faith would that be for impenitent men . . . [to] believ[e] that their own sins are forgiven, [that they have] an assured hope of heaven, [and] an assured knowledge of the saving presence of Jesus[?] . . . Would it not be, what a great many are doing, believing a lie, that they might be damned? . . .

his own alleged conversion at the age of four. He had to find out what happened at the time of his professed conversion by reading a tract his father Robert P. Smith had written about it. His alleged conversion did not change his life—for such a change needed to await the second blessing, sanctification, Logan related—and he was never truly born again and so was able to apostatize from, renounce, and come to hate evangelical Christianity and the Christ set forth by it,[1380] just as his father and mother came to do, and all the other Smith children that lived to adulthood.

Mrs. Smith was able to adopt all her heresies because she was never truly born again. At the time of her alleged evangelical conversion Mrs. Smith noted that she thought that she simply "had found out something delightful about God" and the idea "that I personally was different in any way from what I had been before, never entered my head."[1381] A member of the Plymouth Brethren, however, hearing her change in doctrinal views, told her: "Thank God, Mrs. Smith, that you have at last become a Christian," to which she "promptly replied, 'Oh no, I am not a Christian at all.'"[1382] However, Mrs. Smith allowed this member of the Plymouth Brethren to convice her that her doctrinal assent was equivalent to becoming a Christian, so that she came to conclude: "'I must be born of God. Well, I *am* glad.' From that moment the matter was settled, and not a doubt as to my being a child of God and the possessor of eternal life, has ever had the slightest power over me since."[1383] Unfortunately, since she had never through repentant faith come into saving union with the crucified Christ, but had simply assented to certain Biblical truths, she never was regenerated, and thus was able to apostatize from even the evangelical doctrinal beliefs that had, for a time, captivated her interest. She refers, in her later life, to her "very evangelical days" as a time in the past that had come to an end,[1384] and she "had afterwards to discard" even the trappings of

---

The amount of it is, that we are to believe something *about ourselves* . . . [n]ow we ask, is that *evangelical* faith at all? . . .

What *is* the object of Christian faith? Is it not the salvation of Christ, the "good tidings" revealed in his word? Can anything be a proper object of justifying or sanctifying faith, what what God as recorded in his word? . . . [Assurance] springs up amind the fruits of a renewed heart [and] must not be mistaken for the *faith* itself, that works by love, and purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. (pgs. 515-516, Review of William E. Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, Jacob J. Abbott. *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July 1860) 508-535. Note that Boardman's account of the monk and Luther is almost certainly mythological in any case. As Abbott notes later: "[S]o far as we have the means of verifying them, there is not one of [Boardman's testimonials from history] that stands upon the ground of historical truth" (pg. 520).)

1380 Pgs. 35-38, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith.

1381 Pg. 179, *My Spiritual Autobiography*, Hannah W. Smith.

1382 Pgs. 179-180, *My Spiritual Autobiography*, Hannah W. Smith.

1383 Pg. 180, *My Spiritual Autobiography*, Hannah W. Smith.

1384 Pg. 278, *The Unselfishness of God*.

Christian orthodoxy that she held in her "extreme evangelical days."[1385] At the time of her evangelical influence, she stated that she had not embraced the Person of the crucified and risen Christ through a repentant faith, but "what I got at was the *fact* of God's forgiveness," and since all she "got" was a "fact," not a Person, she stated that the evangelical gospel was "a hook [about God's forgiveness] that I had afterwards to discard. . . . The various hooks upon which I hung this fact at the different stages of my progress were entirely immaterial after all."[1386] She could apostatize from even the evangelical truths she temporaily held to because they were simply facts assented to mentally—she had never embraced Jesus Christ as her own Lord and Savior on gospel terms. Consequently, as years passed, "[s]he found that, after all her searching and all her experimenting, she had come back very close to the position of the old Quakers from which she had started, and in her later days she was more mystical, more quietist, and at the same time less positive," that is, more relativistic, than ever,[1387] since the "time has not yet arrived in the history of the human race when in this world we can have any absolute standard of right and wrong."[1388] Mrs. Smith's universalism led her to reject the necessity of the new birth and of conversion, truths to which she had intellectually assented for a short period:

> [As Quakers,] [w]e were never told we had to be "converted" or "born again," and my own impression was that these were things . . . [which] were entirely unnecessary for us, who were birthright members of the Society of Friends, and were already born into the kingdom of God, and only needed to be exhorted to live up to our high calling. I believe this was because of one of the fundamental principles of Quakerism, which was a belief in the universal fatherhood of God, and a recognition of the fact that Christ had linked Himself on to humanity, and had embraced the whole world in His divine brotherhood, so that every soul that was born belonged to Him, and could claim sonship with the same Father. . . . [T]he early Friends accepted this as true, and would have thought it misleading to urge us to become [converted or born again, since] we . . . already belonged . . . [to] the Good Shepherd. For a little time, in my Plymouth Brethren days, I looked upon this [Quaker doctrine] as a dreadful heresy; but later on I learned the blessed fact . . . that we are all, the heathen . . . heathen idolators . . . even included, "God's offspring;" and I realized that, since He is our creator, He is of course our Father, and we equally of course are his children. And I learned to thank and bless the grand old Quakers who had made this discovery, since their teaching made it easy for me to throw aside the limiting, narrowing ideas I had first adopted [of the necessity of the new birth and conversion], and helped me to comprehend . . . that no one can shut another out [universalism].[1389]

Mrs. Smith was an unregenerate woman who professed and preached a false gospel.

[1385] Pg. 149, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, October 26, 1901. The theological looseness and indulgence of various heresies that are consistent, in Mrs. Smith's mind, with being an allegedly "extreme evangelical" should be recalled.

[1386] Pg. 149, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith, Letter to her daughter, Mary Berenson, October 26, 1901. Italics in original.

[1387] Pg. 15, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1388] Pg. 159, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1389] Pgs. 83-85, *The Unselfishness of God*.

Having rejected justification by faith and the new birth and having become a universalist, in association with what she learned "among the Methodists . . . [of] the 'Doctrine of Holiness' . . . [Hannah Smith learned about] an experience called 'sanctification' or the 'second blessing' which brought you into a place of victory."[1390]

She explains what she learned by means of Methodist meetings on the second blessing:

> [I] found . . . what Paul meant when he said, "Not I, but Christ," and that the victory I sought, was to come by ceasing to live my own life[.] . . . I find there are some Christians who say that [we] receiv[e] Christ by faith for our sanctification, just as we received Him by faith for our justification . . . a Methodist doctrine . . . but it seems to be the only thing that can supply *my* needs . . . this is the Methodist "blessing of holiness."[1391]

She wrote:

> This new life I had entered upon has been called by several different names. The Methodists called it "The Second Blessing," or "The Blessing of Sanctification;" the Presbyterians[1392] called it "The Higher Life," or "The Life of Faith;" the Friends [Quakers] called it "The Life hid with Christ in God." . . . I have most fully set it forth . . . [in my book] the "Secret of a Happy Life" . . . [where the teaching is expounded that] practical sanctification was to be obtained, like justification, by simple faith; and that, like justification, it was to be realized in any moment in which our faith should be able to grasp it.[1393]

The Higher Life "is what the Quakers have always taught. Their preaching is almost altogether about it."[1394] Quaker men and women "receiv[ed] the blessing of full salvation or death to sin" in Quaker meetings and went on to become "very successful in holding Holiness meetings."[1395] Indeed, Mrs. Smith thus noted that the Quakers, Methodists, and Catholics all taught the Higher Life doctrine she also embraced:

> [T]his discovery, which I have tried to set forth, was the beginning of a great revival in the spiritual life of the Church everywhere . . . the life of faith [was found] not only among the Methodists, but among the Quakers and among the Catholics as well, and in fact it is I believe at

---

1390 pg. 240, *The Unselfishness of God*. The Methodist doctrine of the second blessing or perfectionism affirms:

> [In] the entirely sanctified . . . "concupiscence" has lost its evil, and [has] reverted back to . . . mere desire incident to the flesh, without any complicity or affinity with sin . . . victory is perfectly gained through the overwhelming might of the Spirit in the inner man, so that [those who have been perfected] have only to keep themselves from the external enemy who seeks to "touch" them, and to preserve or maintain the victory over self which God has given them. . . . The natural will being dead, the agony of a divided life and purpose is gone; for now our glorious motive power, God's own will, works in us, freed from internal opposition . . . released from the inward proneness to sin. . . . God is pleased to reckon as a fulfilment of the law . . . perfect love[,] [which is] possible to the faith of the Christian. . . . "Christian perfection" was indeed a favourite expression . . . [of] Mr. Wesley[.] . . . [T]his perfection is always wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith; consequently, in an instant. But [there is] a gradual work, both preceding and following that instant. (pgs. 118-124, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875; comparison is made to the second blessing doctrine of Robert P. Smith, which is evidenced to be very similar to that of Wesleyan perfectionism.)

1391 pgs. 242-243, 245, *The Unselfishness of God*. Italics in original.

1392 That is, Presbyterians such as William Boardman; Presbyterian orthodoxy rejected the Higher Life movement.

1393 pgs. 261, 264-265, *The Unselfishness of God*.

1394 pgs. 269-270, *The Unselfishness of God*.

1395 Letter to Priscie, reproduced in the entry for September 4 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Hannah Smith speaks of the Quaker woman preacher Helen Balkwell.

> the bottom of the creeds of every Church . . . The Life of Faith [is] . . . what the Quakers had always taught. . . . They were in short "Higher Life" people[.][1396]

Hannah W. Smith refined the Higher Life perfectionism that was her Quaker birthright, not only from Roman Catholic influences, but from Methodist perfectionism also.

Mrs. Smith further developed her doctrine of sanctification by faith and the Higher Life through a discovery she stated was "more fundamental"[1397] than any other. She received this Higher Life truth through the influence of a Methodist minister who experienced demonic revelations and was a sexual predator. She explained why she was open to his twisted ideas:

> [I]n my search after the deep things of God . . . I think all the fanatics in the United States must have found their way to my presence to try and draw me into their especial net, and . . . I was always ready to listen sympathetically, hoping that among them all I might at last find the truth[.] . . . I [could] be completely taken in by anyone who professed to be "guided by the Lord." This was owing, I expect, to my early Quaker teaching about Divine Guidance. People had only to say to me that the Lord had led them into such or such a course, for me to bow down before them in profound reverence. . . . I was made to believe that . . . I should be able to understand the Divine reasons for what seemed to me violations of good sense and even of simple morality.[1398]

In contrast, concerning a local "Baptist clergyman . . . [who] preaches such a pure gospel," Hannah affirmed, "I *cannot* enjoy close contact with such people,"[1399] finding preachers of a pure gospel repulsive,[1400] but fanatics of all sorts much more attractive, in keeping with her background, associations, and unrenewed nature. She stated: "My first introduction to fanaticism, if I leave out all that I got from the Quakers to start with, which was a good deal, came through the Methodist doctrine of entire sanctification. That doctrine has been one of the greatest blessings of my life[.]"[1401] This blessing came in association with Dr. Henry Foster and his Clifton Springs sanitarium; the Pearsall

---

1396 pgs. 272-274, 280, *The Unselfishness of God*.

1397 Pg. 267, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey. Italics in original.

1398 Pgs. 194-195, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1399 Pg. 29, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey. Italics in original.

1400 Hannah preached and testified: "When I entered this [Higher] life . . . [t]he Lord delivered me from [judging]. . . . I feel it is not my place to judge anybody" (pg. 368, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875). Mrs. Smith was relatively consistent in her failure to judge and condemn heretics, universalists, and fanatics, despite Christ's command to "judge righteous judgment" (John 7:24) and the Apostolic pattern of judging people for false doctrine and practice (1 Corinthians 5:3; Galatians 2:4-5). However, she seems to have made an exception for Baptists who preached a pure gospel—these, she judged, were repulsive and intolerable—a feeling reflective of her view of their Master (Matthew 10:40; John 13:20).

1401 Pg. 203, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey. Hannah Smith went on to warn that the Methodist doctrine had "introduced [her] into an emotional region where common sense has no chance, and where everything goes by feelings and voices and impressions," which she did not think was good, as, at the time she was writing, she did not think that very extreme fanaticism was commendable. However, she did not go on to reject the Quaker Inner Light heresy, or the Methodist errors of entire sanctification and extra-Scriptural revelations, for a consistent *sola Scriptura* stand and a truly Biblical doctrine of sanctification, such truths being aborrant to her because of her unregenerate state (cf. 1 Corinthians 2:14). Thus, she remained a fanatic herself.

Smith family had known Dr. Foster since at least 1871 when Robert had stayed at the sanitarium and learned from the spiritual doctor the doctrine of erotic Sprit baptism. Hannah described her association with this Methodist minister and his family, the insight into the Higher Life she received, and evidenced her incredible spiritual blindness,[1402] as follows:

> In the year 1879[1403] we took a furnished house in Coulter Street, Germantown,[1404] for the summer. A lady who lived next door to us had lent her house to some friends who had the reputation of being wonderful Christians, and of having great revelations and marvelous experiences. As I was at that time in search of remarkable experiences, I was exceedingly interested in these people, and very soon made their acquaintance. The head of the household was a Methodist minister named J. L., and I found him to be a most impressive and interesting man. He had a way of suddenly turning to you when conversation was going on and saying that he had a message for you from the Lord[.] . . . There were also in the house two sisters named W., whose father, Dr. W., was a man of position and authority in the Methodist Church, with a great reputation for piety. . . .
>
> From the first I was profoundly impressed by the apparent holiness and devotedness of this household, and felt that they must have been brought there on purpose to help me onward in my earnest search for a realised oneness with Christ, a oneness which they seemed to have attained in a very marvellous degree.
>
> The thing which interested me at first was the remarkable way in which they seemed to understand the guidance of the Holy Spirit in all the little daily affairs of life. . . . I must say here that their way of looking continually, moment by moment, to the Lord for His Guidance, and their perfect certainty that He did indeed, according to His promise, direct their every step, seemed to invest them with an atmosphere of holiness and to surround them with the conscious presence of the Lord. . . . They seemed literally to live and move and have their being in God . . . hungering . . . to know the utmost possibilities of the life hid with Christ in God, [so that] it seemed [to me] that it ought to be almost like entering the very gates of Heaven to be in their presence, and I threw myself with intense eagerness into their teaching and their influence.
>
> No one could associate with them and not believe that they thought themselves special Divine favourites. They professed to be so minutely guided in life that I was very anxious to attain the same experience, so finally I got Miss W. to give me a sample of the way in which she was guided. She said it was like this: that when she was awakened in the morning her first conscious thought was to consecrate the day to the Lord, and to ask Him to guide her every step of the way throughout the whole day. She would then ask Him whether she was to get up or not; and very

---

1402 Compare the chapter "An Excerpt from 'A Warning Exhortation Against Pietsts, Quietists, and all Who in a Similar Manner have Deviated to a Natural and Spiritless Religion under the Guise of Spirituality,' by Wilhelmus á Brakel." Wilhelmus á Brakel describes and penetratingly warns against the pseudo-spirituality of the sort espoused by this Methodist minister which Hannah W. Smith esteemed so highly and adopted.

1403 Note that 1879 was by no means the first introduction of the Smiths to Clifton Springs or to the erotic Baptism doctrine; both Mr. and Mrs. Smith had learned and adopted the doctrine from Dr. Henry Foster years earlier. The fact that they still fellowshipped with him in 1879 shows that association with their mentor in spiritual eroticism was still acceptable to the family even after Mr. Smith's downfall in England for preaching the erotic Baptism.

1404 Germantown was in such close proximity to Clifton Springs that Hannah could state in a letter that she was staying in Clifton Springs in the summer of 1879 (see Letter to Anna, written from Clifton Springs on July 8, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 16 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). It is not possible from the historical record to determine if Mrs. Smith wrote "Germantown" in her published book and "Clifton Springs" in her unpublished letter to make it more difficult for readers to associate the Methodist sexual predator whom she does not name with Dr. Henry Foster's Clifton Springs Sanitarium. It is also very possible that she simply frequented both the adjacent locations.

often, although it was apparently very important that she should get up, the Lord told her to stay in bed. Then, perhaps, in a few minutes the voice would order her to get up. Then she would proceed to get up. As she put on each article she asked the Lord whether she was to put it on, and very often the Lord would tell her to put on the right shoe and leave off the other; sometimes she was to put on one stocking and leave off the other; sometimes she was to put on both stockings and no shoes; and sometimes both shoes and no stockings; it was the same with all articles of dress. She also said that often during the day, when she was seated at work, the Lord would tell her to get up and go out of the room, and when she got out would tell her to come back. And often she would be told to move from one chair to another, or to go and stand on the front doorstep, or to do all sorts of erratic things. She said that the object of this was to make her pliable so that she would be ready to follow the guidance of the Lord on the instant. I immediately thought that I would like to live this way, so the next morning after this conversation I began the process, and it was with the greatest difficulty that I got dressed or downstairs to my duties, as the voice kept telling me all sorts of things. Then when I did get downstairs I could hardly get through my breakfast, for the voice would suggest, just as I would get a mouthful nearly into my mouth, that I must not take it. I spent the morning running about from one chair to another, going out to the steps and coming back again, and running from one room to the other, and even going so far as to take off my shoes and stockings, and then to put them on again without any apparent cause.

I kept this up until about twelve o'clock, and then . . . I said to myself . . . ["]I have just got the ideas from what Miss W. told me, and I am making it up all out of my own head," and I was forced sorrowfully to conclude that I had not fathomed the secret of Divine guidance yet.[1405] This did not, however, weaken my desire to know the inner depths of the experience of which I heard[.] . . .

In spite of all their evident holiness, I had been conscious all the while of something mysterious about the whole household, an intangible atmosphere of something wrong which seemed to fill the house, and to look out of the eyes of its inmates, and to be heard in the tones of their voices. There was nothing I could lay my hands upon, or could even formulate in my thoughts, and whenever the feeling forced itself upon me I blamed myself as being as yet too unspiritual fully to enter into their heights of spirituality and set myself more determinedly than ever to attain to their divine level. Believing, as they taught, that human reason must be laid aside in spiritual matters, and only the interior voice of the Spirit obeyed,[1406] I . . . tried to convice myself that I was in this way being uplifted more and more into the secret things of God's immediate presence.

I must confess it was all very fascinating. . . . in many respects their teaching was exceedingly valuable. And I did receive during the course of the summer a real revelation of God that has made my life to me a different thing ever since [that is, the Higher Life doctrine of sanctification in greater fulness]. . . . It was the continual habit of this strange household to refer everything to God. . . . Their one universal reply to everything was simple, the words, "Yes; but then there is God"; and no arguments or questionings could turn them from this by so much as a hair's-breadth.

As may be imagined, during my intercourse with them, because of all the unexplainable mystery accompanied by the apparent wonderful holiness that seemed to surround them, I often found myself in a good deal of spiritual perplexity, and, as I looked upon them as religious teachers deserving the highest confidence, I continually went to one or other of them with my difficulties, chiefly, however, to the oldest of the W. sisters, Miss Caroline W., who was a woman of great culture and intelligence and unusual spiritual power.[1407] I would pour out to her all my

---

1405 Neither, of course, had Miss W. discovered such a "secret," and close attention to the real Divine guidance in the Word of God would have kept both women from such unhesitating submission to the suggestions of their own sinful hearts and the openness to Satanic influence that went along with it.

1406 The truth is that neither fallen and corrupt human thinking nor the "interior voice" was the proper authority—the sole authority in spiritual matters, and all other matters it addresses, is the Bible (2 Timothy 3:16).

1407 Note that this is Mrs. Smith's description of this women even after she knew about the fleshly abominations in which she participated.

interior perplexities and difficulties and temptations, to which I must say she always listened very patiently, but when I would pause for some comforting or helpful reply, there would always ensue a moment or two of silence, and then she would always say in a tone that seemed utterly to conclude the matter, "Yes, that may all be true, but then, *there is God*." . . . [M]y most impassioned or despairing stories of my spiritual woes could never elicit anything more than this. "Yes, yes," she would say; "I know it all. But then, there is God." . . .

Towards the end of their stay, one night, a friend who had come to sit at their feet and I had gone to be in great perplexity, full of questioning as to how it could be that God would permit people who wanted to follow Him, and were trying to walk in His paths, to wander into error. We went to sleep in this perplexity, unable to see any light; but somehow, in the morning when we met, we turned to each other and said, in the sense that we had never said it before, the single word, "God!" and with that word came to us a recognition of the all sufficiency of God in a way that has never left us. . . . It would be impossible to put into words just what seemed to come to us that morning, but it certainly was a satisfying revelation of the all-sufficiency of God, just the bare God[1408] . . . for all our needs. . . . I shall never cease to feel real gratitude to this strange household for having brought me to this, although I very soon found out some dreadful things about them. . . .

One day . . . I received a telegram from Mrs. C. in Boston, begging me to come and see her at once on a matter of vital importance. The message was so urgent that I took a night train, and arrived there the next morning. Immediately Mrs. C. told me that she thought I ought to know the state of things in this household, and she had sent for me to tell me about it. She brought in a highly respectable woman doctor, who told me the following facts.

The doctor said that she had two very intimate friends in Boston, who were ladies of very good standing, and, in fact, one of them was at the head of a large school or college, and was considered an authority on education . . . and were, in fact, devoted Christians. They had become acquainted with Mr. L., the Methodist minister, who was the head of the mysterious household next door to me . . . and had seemed to find great spiritual uplifiting from his teachings. This doctor was at that time in charge of a hospital, and these ladies would often come to see her. She noticed that one of them seemed to be losing her spirits, and to be greatly depressed, with so far as she knew no apparent reason. She seemed to be on the verge all the time of saying something to the doctor which she appeared afraid to continue, and the doctor felt that her friend had a confidence to make to her which for some reason she was reluctant to make.

One night this friend came to stay all night at the hospital and slept in the room with the doctor. As she was standing by the looking-glass arranging her hair, the doctor noticed something peculiar in her appearance, and it flashed across her mind that her friend was in the family way. She explained, "Oh, darling, what is the matter?" and her friend burst into tears. Nothing more was said; the doctor was too shocked to speak; she would as soon have expected to find the Angel Gabriel in such a plight as her friend; and they spent the night both weeping, but saying nothing till towards the morning. Then her friend opened her heart and confided in the doctor. She told her that she and her companion had been greatly impressed by the teaching of this Mr. L., to whom they had been introduced by Miss ——, a religious teacher of a great deal of spirituality, living in Boston.[1409] They had both become greatly influenced by Mr. L's teaching, and gradually he had unfolded to them that it had been revealed to him that he was to be the father of a race of children that were to be born into the world as Christ was, and that the Lord had shown him that they themselves were to be the favoured mothers of these children. . . . Mr. L. . . . not only believed that he was Christ, but thought that he was destined to be the father of "Christ's children," who were to found a race that was to revolutionize the world. These children,

---

[1408] That is, the generic god of natural and pagan religion, associated for Mrs. Smith with a merely natural and unregenerate intellectual assent to various facts about Jesus Christ, not the true God of the regenerate, the Father, who has reconciled His people to Himself through the substitutionary sacrifice of His eternal Son Jesus Christ, and regenerated and justified them through the sole instrumentality of Spirit-produced faith.

[1409] For, truly, Boston was a hotbed of fanaticism, Faith Cure, Mind Cure, New Thought, and other wretched abominations at the time.

according to him, were to be begotten in a spiritual way, without bodily contact, but his practice did not bear out his assumption. . . . [H]e succeeded in completely deluding these ladies, and in carrying out his purposes, and this poor thing was now expecting to be the mother of one of those children. The agonies of mind that she had gone through could not be described. She dared not admit the idea that it was a delusion, for her whole spiritual life seemed to depend upon believing that she had been rightly guided; for if she could think that in the most solemn moments of consecration the Lord could allow her to be so deceived, she would feel that she could never trust Him again.[1410] She clung with a deathlike grip to the belief that it was Divine guidance, and that she was greatly favoured to be allowed to be the mother of one of these wonderful children. How to get through the earthly part of it, however, was the great difficulty. But her doctor friend stepped in to the rescue; she took a house out of the city, brought her friend there, took care of her until the time came, carried her safely through her confinement and kept the facts hidden from everybody. The lady told her mother, who had been anxious about her health, that she was broken down by so much teaching, and was going to the country for a complete rest, and there was no exposure.

Mr. L. was a constant visitor at the house, as the doctor had not the heart to plunge her friend into the abyss of despair which would have been her portion if she had lost faith in him. The doctor did not like his ways at all, and herself believed that it was pure human lust. However, the thing was carried through; the doctor adopted the baby, and her friend went back to her usual avocations. She never lost her [faith in Mr. L.] during my knowledge of her. Mr. L. married the other lady, the companion who had shared in her delusion, and, soon after the birth of the baby the mother went to live with him and his wife, and for many years they formed one household.

The dear sister who had lent Mr. L. the house . . . a wealthy widow . . . came so much under his influence . . . [that] she was tempted to go away with him. . . . [He] had almost succeeded in persuading her to put all her private property into his hands, and go and live with him. We at once, in his presence, told her the whole story as we had heard it, and while he acknowledged the facts, he stuck to his position that he was commissioned of the Lord to bring forth these children, and that they were not begotten according to any natural process. We succeeded, however, in frightening him so much as to our revelations that might be made, that he himself told our friend he did not believe she was called to go with him[.] . . . How many poor souls were beguiled during that strange summer I do not know.

Of course, from that time my intercourse with these dear misguided Christians[1411] ceased, but about a year after I received a very impressive and solemn note from one of them saying that the way was still open for me to return to the Lord if I would give up my self-will and consent to be guided as the Lord led. . . . Since then, I have never seen nor heard about them. . . .

[Nonetheless, from Mr. L and his household] I did discover one truth, more important to Christians than any warnings about dangers in this world . . . and that truth was God. . . . [In] the summer . . . [of] 1879 . . . when the L. household lived next door to me[,] The Lord . . . t[aught] me very blessed lessons about the interior life[.] . . . He [had] sent some of His children to spend the summer in a house [next door].[1412] One of them especially [was] helpful to me. She is what I call a "mystic"—one of those who know the Spirit's voice, and who walk alone with God. . . . At last I begin to understand what this means, and I believe I am beginning to live it. . . . Definitely and forever I consent now to die as to any recognized self-life. It shall be henceforth no more I, but Christ. . . . [I]n spite of . . . [their] frightful fanaticism . . . [which made me question if I ought to be] content to know but little of the inward voice . . . [since] they have tried so faithfully to find it, and have been deluded . . . [yet] I know the truth about it must exist[,] . . . [and] I *had* gained

---

1410 Note that Robert Pearsall Smith came to exactly this conclusion—when he rejected the erotic Spirit baptism at the heart of his Higher Life ministry, he also rejected Christianity for agnosticism and Buddhism.

1411 For, Hannah W. Smith believed, they were indeed Christians, despite such abominable heresies and evil works—since they were the human instruments through which she came into her most fundamental knowledge of spirituality and of the Higher Life, how could they be otherwise?

1412 That is, Mrs. Smith believed that these deluded fanatics and filthy fornicators were sent by God to teach her spiritual truth.

> from the summer's experience a knowledge of God . . that . . . brought me into a peaceful resting in Him that has never been seriously disturbed since. . . . It may seem strange that such an acquaintance with God could have come to me out of such a hotbed of fanaticism, but there is the fact, and there is no getting around it. Whatever else these dear deluded fanatics may have been or have done they did live in the presence of God in a most unusual sense[.][1413] . . . "Pure religion," says Fénelon, "resides in the will alone."[1414] And again, "the will to love God is the whole of religion." I . . . am thankful beyond words that . . . I was brought at last to see that a quiet stedfast holding of the human will to the will of God and a peaceful resting in His love and care is of . . . great[est] value[1415] in the religious life.[1416]

Thus, Hannah Whitall Smith learned what she considered her greatest spiritual discovery, not from the study of the Scriptures, which would have prevented her from adopting such a sort of pagan spirituality, but from the demonic revelations of a Methodist minister who was a sexual predator, to whose ideas she was open because of her background in Quaker and Romanist mysticism, Methodist fanaticism, and her expectation of Quaker revelations from the Inner Voice.

The Methodist predator from whom Mrs. Smith made her most fundamental discovery of the spiritual life also believed in the doctrine, developed out of medieval and counter-Reformation Roman Catholic mysticism, that Spirit baptism brought physical sexual thrills. Visiting "the lady who had been largely instrumental in starting people . . . on the career which led them to L. [the Methodist sexual predator mentioned above]," Hannah W. Smith narrated the following:

> I found her to be a quiet refined lady rather past middle age, evidently very intelligent and a Christian worker who was highly esteemed by all who knew her. I told her what I knew about the L. household [the Methodist minister and sexual predator]. . . . She said . . . that the Lord's dealings were often very mysterious and such as the natural man could not understand, but that what God had pronouced clean no one might dare to call unclean, and that these dear saints had

---

1413 Mrs. Smith affirmed that they lived in the presence of God in an unusual sense. However, the true God describes people like them in words such as: "They profess that they know God; but in works they deny *him*, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate" (Titus 1:16). Passages such as the following provide Jehovah's view of such persons:

> For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Likewise also these *filthy* dreamers defile the flesh . . . [and] speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core. These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear: clouds *they are* without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever. (Jude 4, 8-13)

Thus, the only god that these fanatics could be unusually in the presence of was the god of this world, Satan, the source of their deluded Higher Life spirituality.

1414 Robert P. Smith also cited this maxim of Fénelon at the Brighton Convention (pg. 140, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

1415 That is, Mrs. Smith learned, in the most fundamental way, the tremendous value of the natural and pagan "spirituality" of the Roman Catholic mysticism and quietism of Fénelon from these Methodist fornicators and fanatics; such was the spirituality of Mrs. Smith's Higher Life.

1416 Pgs. 182-193, 259, 267-270, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

been most manifestly led by Him. . . . [S]he had been led into these courses and . . . she could do nothing but obey[.] . . . During the course of my conversation with this lady she said: "You may think it strange, Mrs. Smith, but I speak from experience; there have been times when, in order to help my friends to receive the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, I have been distinctly led of the Lord to have them get into bed with me and lie back to back without any nightgown between. And," she added, "it has always brought them to the conscious Baptism." . . . [S]he has been the means of leading a great many young women into the same line of things.

Another friend of mine . . . whom I had told about Dr. R., received while I was talking to her, what she believed was the Baptism, and began to experience right there thrills of rapture from head to foot, which completely carried her away. . . . [S]he [came] to spend most of her time lying on the sofa trying to induce [the thrills] to come. She also . . . felt it her duty to kiss several men, with the idea that through that means God would bestow either great blessings upon them or greater blessings upon herself. She had felt led to kiss Mr. L. [the Methodist sexual predator]. . . . [Indeed,] a great many saintly women . . . one after another . . . would in some mysterious way begin to "feel led" to give him a kiss . . . the called for kiss bestowed . . . floods of joy and peace would fill their souls.[1417] . . . She was impressed with the idea that through this performance God would bestow the Baptism of the Spirit upon the receipient of her kisses. . . . [She] was so good and pure minded that we all called her "Saint Sarah[.]" . . . At one of our meetings at Brighton [when Mr. and Mrs. Smith were preaching the Higher Life] . . . there was a great deal of talk about the Baptism of the Spirit, and many souls were hungering for it[.] . . . My friend, "Saint Sarah"[1418] . . . confided to me that she felt led to kiss . . . a refined and cultured gentleman . . . herself as a means of imparting to him the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. . . . She was in the greatest trouble about it . . . and she felt sure that she would be making herself ridiculous. . . . Days went on and she became really ill with the conflict; and at last, seeing that there was no way out of it[1419] but for her to do it, I said, "It won't hurt; I'll explain it to him. So just go and kiss him and be done with it!" My taking of it in this way greatly relieved her mind. I told our host what she wanted to do, and he said he wouldn't object in the least . . . she was able to perform what she thought was her religious duty. This kiss was given[.] . . . In two or three other instances the same process was repeated [with other men]. . . .

This dear Saint was so enmoured of what she called "The Touch of God," that she spent a large part of her time seeking for it and enjoying it, until it finally became a sort of possession . . . a very good Christian lady . . . said . . . [she] was possessed of the devil. . . . I made up my mind that she must be freed from this somehow, so I . . . went to the woman who had plunged her into the trouble [by stating "Saint Sarah" was demon possessed] and told her the dreadful effects of her

---

1417 Hannah herself recounts:

> One day when I was alone reading my Bible and praying for guidance . . . suddenly, in the moment of a most solemn act of consecration to God, a voice, that seemed to be entirely distinct from my own personality, said plainly, "If you want to be *entirely* consecrated to God, you must kiss Mr. L." . . . There seemed nothing for me to do but to surrender my will in the matter and to say, "Yes, Lord, if it is Thy will, repulsive as it is, I will do even this!" Perfect peace at once filled my heart[.] (pgs. 247-248, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey. Italics in original).

However, she never ended up kissing him, because when "the voice spoke again, 'Now you must do it,'" Mr. L. told her not to (pg. 248, *ibid*.). However, she narrates:

> I went to my dressmaker . . . an inward Voice told me I . . . must kiss the dressmaker. . . . I dared not refuse, and said to the dressmaker, "The Lord tells me to kiss you," and proceeded to bestow a kiss upon her cheek. I must say the whole thing fell very flat. The poor woman coloured crimson with embarrassment, and I shared her embarrassment. . . . She hurried to finish her fitting and I hurried to leave the house, thankful to get alone where I could endure my mortification in silence. (pgs. 249-250, *ibid*.)

1418 Compare the commentary by this Quaker woman preacher on the book of Joshua, from which the typical Higher Life conclusions are drawn: *The Fulness of Blessing; or, The Gospel of Christ, as Illustrated from the Book of Joshua*, Sarah F. Smiley. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876. In discussing the post-conversion Baptism of the Spirit, she condemned the "tendency to ignore the importance of the body, [which] proceeds from a general lack of insight into the Scriptural philosophy of nature and of spirit" (pg. 89).

1419 Mrs. Smith at first tried to get her to not kiss the man.

former words, and said to her, "And now you must give me in writing the assurance that the devil has gone out of her," and I bullied her into doing it. I then went back to my friend armed with this assurance, and said to her: "Now the devil has gone out of thee, and here is the proof." She believed it, and from that moment began to recover, and has since lived a peaceful and normal Christian life.[1420]

Mrs. Smith narrates other similar and awful instances of people who were seeking Spirit baptism and the Higher Life of entire sanctification:

[Another] young woman . . . had been seeking the Baptism of the Spirit as a result of the fervent preaching of a Methodist minister in the town where she lived, and had found great spiritual help from her conversations with him. They found, she said, that when they were together they seemed to feel an especial nearness to the Lord, and the closer they sat together the more they felt it. They constantly, when in one another's company, had wonderful waves of divine thrills going through them, especially when there was any personal contact, which thrills the preacher told her were the conscious Baptism of the Holy Spirit for which she was seeking. Of course, if this was the case, the more of these waves of delicious thrills they had the more truly filled with the Spirit they were, and they had consequently sought every opportunity of being together, and had encouraged a closer and closer personal contact, never dreaming of evil, until at last she found herself in the midst of a criminal connection with the preacher who was already a married man. . . .

[A] dear beloved saint . . . who had given up everything in life to follow the Lord, and who was considered by everybody who knew her to be one of the saints of the earth . . . had all the Quaker scruples with regard to dress, and looked as she walked about like the embodiement of ascetic piety. I greatly revered her and sat at her feet to be taught. . . . [A] friend [and I] . . . asked her to tell us her last experience. She said that . . . she had told the Lord that she wanted to make Him some New Year's gift, and that as she had given Him everything that she possessed and everything she was, she could not think of anything new to give. Then, she said, the Lord told her that there was one thing, and that was her virginity, and that He would send a man whom she must be willing to receive in His name and surrender herself to Him. She told us that she had said, "Thy will be done," and was now awaiting the ringing of the bell and the advent of the promised man . . . whether the man came or not, I do not know. I have heard, however, that at one of the camp meeting grounds, where she . . . held meetings, the authorities had been obliged to close her meetings on account of the dangerous tendency of her teaching.[1421]

The heresy that Spirit baptism was associated with physical sexual thrills was thus widespread in the religious background of Hannah and Robert Smith, and it is thus not surprising that they both adopted it.[1422]

1420 Pgs. 194-202, 246-248, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1421 Pgs. 196-197, 203-205, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1422 Higher Life perfectionism, antinomianism, continuationism, and the rejection of *sola Scriptura*, are all related concepts which easily relate the one to the other. Lyman Atwater explains:

[M]en who esteem themselves perfect are apt to make themselves, their own subjective exercises, experiences, judgments, desires, and appetites, the measure and standard of perfection; to make these the rule and measure of rectitude, rather than God's word; or rather to construe them as God's voice and word, speaking in and through them. They have often maintained that as Christ was living within them, their desires, and words and deeds were Christ's. This, of course, is the extreme of fanatical and blasphemous Antinomian pride and licentiousness. . . . [T]here are [grave dangers in] making our subjective feelings the standard of truth and holiness . . . [as] often develops in simple mysticism, in which the feeling of the subject, devout and elevated though it be, still becomes a law unto itself, and sets its own impulses and bewilderments above the law and the testimony. Against all this we cannot too sedulously guard. . . . [T]he Antinomian feature of [the Higher Life perfectionism] has strong logical and practical affinities for licentiousness[.] . . . Nor do we think it wrong or uncharitable in this connection to refer to the career of Mr. Pearsall Smith, who has been so conspicuous in Higher Life leadership. (pgs. 418-419, "The Higher Life and Christian Perfection," Lyman H. Atwater. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* (July 1877) 389-419)

Robert maintained and propogated the erotic Baptism heresy throughout his time as a preacher of the Higher Life—his promulgation of his beloved mystical abomination ended only with his fall because of scandal associated with it—while he influenced many others to adopt and practice it as a key aspect of the Higher Life theology.[1423] For example, "Miss Bonnicastle sp[oke] on this subject . . . [of] conscious union of the believer and Christ as the Heavenly Bridegroom . . . at the Oxford Ladies meetings . . . [which] quite shocked a good many."[1424] In "the Christ-life," another minister proclaimed, one is to "let the thrill . . . surge and thrill through all your being."[1425] Thus, the doctrine of the sexual Baptism as a key portion of the Higher Life experience was proclaimed publicly at the Oxford Convention, that key precursor to the Keswick Conventions. Indeed, many of Robert and Hannah W. Smith's Higher Life "evangelical and especially their Quaker friends . . . condoned . . . [Robert's] adventures with his feminine disciples."[1426] Nonetheless, after convincing many to adopt the heresy, Robert eventually rejected erotic bride mysticism, and "in rejecting what he himself had experienced, he could not help turning his back on all religion,"[1427] so that he turned away from his profession of Christianity to agnosticism,[1428] and then moved from

---

[1423] Leading Pentecostal historians connect the theory of erotic Spirit baptism with the rise of their doctrine of speaking in tongues as the physical mark of Spirit baptism. For example, Donald W. Dayton, in his essay "From 'Christian Perfection' to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost,' which was recognized as the prizewinning submission in its category from the Society for Pentecostal Studies in 1973, references the description of Hannah and Robert P. Smith's doctrine of physical sexual thrills in Spirit baptism in *Religious Fanaticism: Extracts from the Papers of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. Ray Strachey, and writes: "It is easy to see how the gift of tongues would fulfill this longing" (pg. 51, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan; Dayton's essay covers pgs. 39-54). Melvin E. Dieter also notes the background to Pentecostal tongues in the erotic Spirit baptism of Robert and Hannah W. Smith, along with "the inherited . . . tendencies of a perfectionist movement and the influence of the spiritual raptures in the experiences of the Quietists and other Catholic mystics who had been widely accepted as part of the true holiness movement" (pg. 64, "Wesleyan-Holiness Aspects of Pentecostal Origins: As Mediated through the Nineteenth-Century Holiness Revival," Melvin E. Dieter, pgs. 55-80 in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan). The doctrine of thrills in Spirit baptism could easily be passed down by the Higher Life and Faith or Mind Cure movement into Pentecostalism through innumerable continuationists such as Dr. Henry Foster and Robert P. Smith.

[1424] Letter to a Friend, February 12, 1876, reproduced in the entry for July 30 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1425] Pg. 158, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

[1426] Pg. 132, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith. Logan speaks of the time when his sister was married in Oxford: "[T]o these festivities my parents invited their [Higher Life] evangelical and especially their Quaker friends, who most of them had condoned, if they had not forgotten, the scandal of my father's adventures with his feminine disciples."

[1427] Letter to Carrie, February 13, 1877, reproduced in the entry for August 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1428] Hannah wrote to her daughter Mary: "I have watched the growth and development of agnosticism in your father[.] . . . Your father gave in to the doubt, and has lost at last all sense of any perception of God"

agnosticism to Buddhism. Robert could not retain his profession of Christianity without his erotic bride mysticism. Robert testified at the Oxford Convention: "There has been no period since . . . [my] baptism of the Spirit . . . when God has not been more or less in my consciousness as the living Being unto Whom I looked."[1429] At the time of his Baptism a Power came to be present with him that always accompanied him afterwards, a Power that directed all his actions as a minister of the Higher Life and was at the heart of his spiritual experience. If his erotic Baptism was a delusion, so was all of his Christianity, and agnosticism appeared to him to be a necessary consequence. The possibility that he was possessed by demons through his erotic Baptism, demons that then directed him in his subsequent Higher Life ministry, does not seem to have been given serious consideration. Hannah also eventually came to reject erotic bride mysticism later in her life[1430] after some time propogating it near the years of the zenith of her and her husband's work as Higher Life agitators.

Describing the incident that led to Robert P. Smith's withdrawal from public work shortly before the first Keswick convention, a headline in the *Brighton Weekly* stated: "Famous Evangelist Found in Bedroom of Adoring Female Follower."[1431] In the bedroom of his disciple, Miss Hattie Hamilton, Mr. Smith had explained to her the abhorrant doctrine he had learned in 1871 while institutionalized, on account of a total nervous breakdown he had suffered,[1432] in a hydropathic and homeopathic sanatorium from the head of the facility, Dr. Henry Foster, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was

---

(Letter to Mary, January 27, 1883, reproduced in the entries for December 8-9 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter), and noted: "His unbelief is most contagious. . . . He has been pouring floods of agnosticism upon me" (Letter to Daughter, February 7, 1883, reproduced in the entry for December 10 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

[1429] Pg. 253, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

[1430] Hannah eventually concluded that "it seems impossible that anything can be the truth of God which is not fit to be publicly proclaimed" (Letter to a Friend, February 12, 1876, reproduced in the entry for July 30 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Note, however, that promulgation of the physical thrills doctrine and association with its other advocates continued for the Pearsall Smiths far after the time of the composition of this letter, which was more a piece of revisionist history and apologetic defense of Robert P. Smith than actual fact. Hannah not only affirmed in this letter that "it seems impossible that anything can be the truth of God which is not fit to be publicly proclaimed," but also that "I don't have to tell you I am sure that my dear husband is entirely innocent of the vile charges against him," a statement which was simply false, and which casts doubt upon her repudiation of the erotic Baptism doctrine.

[1431] pg. 82, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*, by Marie Henry. The woman, Miss Hattie Hamilton, stated that Robert P. Smith tried to commit adultery with her in her bedroom, but he denied that he had sought to do so.

[1432] Robert, recounting his and his family's "fearful curse of our inheritance of NERVES" in a letter to his daughter Mary, concluded: "be very distrustful of our own intellectual and moral conclusions" (pgs. 159-160, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey). His conclusion that his own intellect and morals were untrustworthy appears to be most sound.

accompanied by physical sexual thrills because of the esoteric union of Christ with His people as Bridegroom and Bride, as described in the Song of Solomon.[1433] Robert Smith's explanation of the erotic Baptism doctrine in one bedroom too many brought about the rapid fall of his previously rising star in the Higher Life movement.

Dr. Foster, while "a lifelong Methodist," was "interdenominational" in his religious spirit.[1434] Thus:

> Dr. Foster insisted upon . . . [the] chapel [at his sanitarium] . . . be[ing] purely interdenominational spirit and life. . . . He established the custom that the Holy Sacrament should be administered every month, the form for one month being that used by Episcopalians and Methodists, and alternating the next time with the form observed by Presbyterians and others. [People] counted one Sabbath morning when . . . the kneeling form [was administered, and] twenty-six religious bodies [were] represented by those partaking. Following the public service the Chaplain always administered the rite privately in their rooms to those requesting it.[1435]

Indeed, Foster's sanatarium "ha[d] always been noted for its prevailing fairness and charity towards different types of religious belief, [so that] all grades from the highest ritualism to the simplicity of the society of Friends, have felt perfectly at home. . . . [F]requently . . . Roman Catholic Priests and Bishops . . . seemed to appreciate the place and enjoy it."[1436] Nobody was warned about his false religion, whether the Catholic sacramental and ritualistic false gospel or the rejection of justification by faith alone based on the imputed righteousness of Christ alone taught by the Quakers. Foster "was never happier than when sharing or promoting interdenominational fellowship."[1437] Indeed:

> All the churches of the village received from [Mr. Foster] substantial help at various times. . . . When the Roman Catholics erected their new Church edifice in 1895, the Doctor made a substantial contribution, and rented a pew in it each year thereafter, which custom is continued to the present. Annual offerings were made by him to all the Protestant churches and that custom is continued to the present.[1438]

Mr. Foster loved ecumenical fellowship with false teachers of all sorts.

Dr. Foster's religious ecumenicalism extended to an ecumenicalism of healing praxis:

1433 Cf. pgs. 506-508, Warfield, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2. **Meneghel, "Becoming a 'Heretic,'" 227-30.**

1434 Pg. 26, *Life of Henry Foster, M. D., Founder Clifton Springs Sanitarium*, Samuel Adams Hawley. Clifton Springs, NY: Sanatarium Board of Trustees, 1921.

1435 Pg. 98, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley. Administering the elements of the Lord's Supper kneeling supports the Roman Catholic idea that the bread changes into God and is an error, as is giving it to people in private. The Biblical mandate for unity is that "all speak the same thing, and *that* there be no divisions among you; but *that* ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Corinthians 1:10). Such unity is an essential aspect of the Scriptural celebration of the Supper (1 Corinthians 11:18-21; 10:17), but it is impossible among twenty-six denominations with different doctrines and practices—indeed, it is impossible outside the context of an individual true church.

1436 Pgs. 146-147, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1437 Pg. 157, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1438 Pg. 75, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

> "Allopathy," "Water Cure," "Homeopathy," "Mind Cure," "Faith Cure," were to him members of a group in the therapeutic family. He . . . look[ed] for the higher unity, treating each as a segment in the full circle . . . allopathy, homeopathy, hydrotherapy, mental therapy, and the prayer of faith . . . belong[ed] to one great healing family.[1439]

Thus, Foster believed in homeopathy, although it was obviously demonic in its origin and practice,[1440] in hydropathy, although it was intimately associated with spiritualism and demonism,[1441] and in Mind Cure—which was, indeed, associated with Faith Cure—although it was likewise essentially a form of pagan and demonic medicine based upon untestable mystical energies.[1442] The nineteenth century Mind and Faith Cure movements, which were part of the warp and woof of the Keswick theology and at the root of the Pentecostal and charismatic movement, developed out of a common background in mesmerism, vitalism, homeopathy, and other pagan and demonic ideas, and cannot be separated into distinct and unrelated phenomena.[1443] Thus, despite its

---

[1439] Pgs. 26, 157, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

[1440] See pgs. 263-314, *Can You Trust Your Doctor? The Complete Guide to New Age Medicine and Its Threat to Your Family,* John Ankerberg & John Weldon. Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1991; "The New Age in Health Care," David Cloud (Fundamental Baptist Information Service, November 3, 2008); elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*.

[1441] Historians generally recognize the association between hydropathy or Water Cure and spiritualism:

> In water cure, Spiritualists found a medical system in sympathy with their reform orientation. Also called hydropathy, water cure was a therapeutic approach imported from Europe in 1843 that relied on the internal consumption and external application of cold water for the prevention and cure of all diseases. Spiritualists . . . embraced water cure because of its appeal to the laws of nature embodied in each human being as the source of healing and because of the reform principles of its leaders. Hydropathy relied on the natural curative tendencies of the individual rather than on intervention by an authoritative medical expert. . . . Water cure establishments provided a fertile environment for the development of many of the ideas advocated by Spiritualist health reformers. (pg. 154, *Radical Spirits: Spiritualism and Women's Rights in Nineteenth-Century America*, Ann Braude. 2nd ed.)

Thus, "[a]long with homeopathy and animal magnetism, hydropathy was a favorite cure among the Spiritualists" (pg. 116, *Plato's Ghost: Spiritualism in the American Renaissance*, Cathy Gutierrez).

Of course, water itself is something God made, and some people who went to Water Cures just liked to get wet, while others were were simply ignorant or dupes of quacks; not all were intentional devotees of Satan.

[1442] Dr. Foster noted: "Spiritualism had its birth just north of us" (pg. 33, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley).

[1443] As the Mind Cure and homeopathy, which developed from mesmerism and vitalism, undergirds the Faith Cure in men like the homeopathic doctors Dr. Foster and Dr. Cullis, who were themselves roots of the Higher Life and Faith Cure doctrines of people like William Boardman and Hannah and Robert Pearsall Smith, so Mary Baker Eddy's Christian Science developed from the "mind-cure . . . homeopathy . . . mesmerism . . . and the magnetic doctor, Mr. P. P. Quimby," from whom "she had learned her system." "Quimby was . . . the founder of the whole school of Mental-Healers which . . . flourished in America through the . . . half-century [of the late 1900s]" (pgs. 272-274, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield). The Mind Cure involved one convincing himself he was not really sick, but perfectly healthy, and believing it was so, because of a healing Power; the Faith Cure likewise involved one convincing himself that he was not really sick, but pefectly healthy, and believing it was so, because of a healing Power. The Faith and Mind Cures were by no means two separated and unrelated phenomena, but were the same fundamental error and two names or emphases of one and the same movement.

demonic origin, at Foster's sanitarium "[t]he prevailing method of administering medicines was homeopathic."[1444] Dr. Foster "became a hydropathic practitioner, then he saw in homeopathy special adaptation to chronic cases, then he awoke to the large realm of mental therapy." He "was profoundly impressed with the effect of mind over matter. The relation of the mind or the spirit to disease, he concluded, was a subject of prime importance. . . . [T]his led to his seeking for a new place where he could establish his practice and work out his ideas unmolested," that is, his sanitarium, where "he came with a protest and also with a purpose. . . . his highest thought was in relation to the effect of the mind over the body in disease.[1445] Discovery of the power of Mind Cure was "the greatest event in his life."[1446] Thus, Dr. Foster taught the doctrine of Mary Baker Eddy's cult of "Christian Science," which "aligns itself with . . . pantheistic idea[s] . . . [and teaches that] [s]in is like sickness and death, and these are errors of the mind and can therefore be completely overcome by 'mind cure,'" so that "thoughts are things, thoughts are forces, and therefore as a man thinks, so is he."[1447] Dr. Foster, as an important part of the basis for the later Keswick healing theology, combined Mind and Faith Cure, saying:

> Take this law and power of faith, and take the law of the influence of mind over the body, and put them together and see what you get. You get something that will work . . . It was the acceptance of this truth that decided me to try and establish a house where these truths . . . the power of the mind over the body, and the salutary effects of a constant religious faith upon the sick . . . should be enforced.[1448]

Foster "was a firm believer in the effect of mind over matter—over disease. . . . [This belief] pervaded the whole institution. . . . Whatever good there is in Christian Science [the cult of Mary B. Eddy], in the Emmanuel Movement, and in modern faith healing he brought to bear in his therapeutics[.]"[1449] Thus, "prayer to God was a force in nature, as real as the law of gravitation,"[1450] rather than simply a petitioning of that God who was above nature and does, in accordance with His will, intervene in nature. In this way,

---

For more information see, e. g., James Monroe Buckley, *Faith-Healing, Christian Science and Kindred Phenomena* (New York: The Century Co., 1898); Paul G. Chappell, "The Divine Healing Movement in America" (Ph. D. diss., Drew University, 1983); Heather D. Curtis, "'The Lord for the Body': Pain, Suffering and the Practice of Divine Healing in Late-Nineteenth-Century American Protestantism." (Th. D. diss., Harvard University, 2005).

1444 Pg. 57, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley. Foster's brother "Dr. Hubbard became an avowed and pronounced homeopathist," and, naturally, Foster had "intimate association with his brother, Dr. Hubbard" (pgs. 17-18, *ibid*.).

1445 Pgs. 169-170, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1446 Pg. 169, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1447 Pg. 161, *Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 4: Holy Spirit, Church, and New Creation*, Herman Bavinck.

1448 Pgs. 23-25, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1449 Pgs. 174-175, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1450 Pg. 90, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

practicing "[m]ental hygiene and mental therapy . . . as well as the great therapeutic value of religious faith . . . the 'Emmanuel Movement' at Boston, of which so much has been said with its slogan 'Religion and Medicine,' was anticipated by Henry Foster."[1451] Although the Bible taught that much of Dr. Foster's practice was demonic in origin, his practices were confirmed to him by a vision. He stated:

> I presented my whole life again to God; the entire interests of the Sanitarium, and my relations with it. While thus contemplating the work, the Holy Spirit came upon me, filling me with His presence, and I saw what seemed to be a rainbow. The base of it was there on [a] mountain inclosing me; it went up to the mercy seat; the other base came down and rested here in Clifton Springs, over the house [sanitarium]. . . . I looked at it, and I saw there were streams going up, and then there were streams going down, and resting upon me. I was re-energized, and so much so that I became astonished . . . that settled me, strengthened me, proved to me that the teaching was from God, and from God alone[.][1452]

Surely such a vision was sufficient proof that his pagan and demonic philosophies and practices were acceptable to God.

As a result of Foster's vision, received at the time of his "pentecostal baptism of the Holy Spirit"—physical sexual thrills because of erotic bride mysticism—he founded his Water Cure:

> [He] saw that his pentecost was not for its own sake, but was given to prepare him for such a work. He prayed, and light came. He had a vision of the institution God would give him,—just as definite a vision as Moses had of the Tabernacle in the Mount; and as Moses was to make all things according to the pattern showed him in the Mount, so God had in vision outlined the work he was to do, and he must follow the pattern.[1453]

When Mr. Foster experienced his "real baptism of the Holy Spirit and of power" he also gained "a vision like Paul's when he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, a call and a commission like that of the prophet Jeremiah, or of Isaiah in the temple—an imperative call when his whole soul was filled and thrilled," and in this manner the spirit world led him to "the beginnings of the Sanitarium and of this pentecostal baptism" that was both its its erotic origination and an element of its religious proclamation.[1454] At his hydropathic and homeopathic healing house, he sought to bring especially "Christian workers, such as clergymen, teachers, and missionaries who are peculiarly liable to physical and nervous breakdown . . . [that they might] come to his institution and remain long enough for a cure."[1455] Consequently, "at least seventy or eighty thousand" patients came to the sanitarium, including "presidents of colleges, professors, lawyers, judges, ministers, bishops, all classes of men, literary men and

---

1451 Pgs. 22-26, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1452 Pgs. 54-56, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley. Foster stated that his vision "was a mental thing, of course, but it was a reality to me" (pg. 55, *ibid*.)

1453 Pg. 27, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley; see pg. 33.

1454 Pgs. 18-21, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1455 Pg. 27, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

literary women, some of the most renowned in the land. There have been [there] thousands of the foremost cultivated men and women of America, and some from other lands," so that a vast "spiritual influence," more, in the mind of some, than from "any institution" else, went out to influence the "intellectual and moral" climate of America,[1456] and, indeed, the world, as the sanitarium "bec[a]me a center of missionary interest and activity. Dr. Foster's invitation to foreign Missionaries of all Mission Boards to come to the Sanitarium for needed rest and treatment, and his concessions as to cost . . . brought hundreds of them."[1457] Note the Pearsall Smiths alone, but other Keswick leaders, such as A. T. Pierson, could praise "Dr. Henry Foster, of Clifton Springs, N. Y.[,]" for "all who came in contact with him bear testimony to the elevating effect of his spirituality of life" and his "benevolence . . . [to] the cause of missions." After all, "for some years the International Missionary Union . . . held . . . [at] Clifton Springs . . . its annual sessions."[1458] Many came, and, like Robert and Hannah Smith, also left with both Dr. Foster's love for Faith and Mind Cure and his vile doctrine of physical bridal-union in mystical Spirit baptism.

Hannah W. Smith chronicled Dr. Foster's communication of his views to herself and another lady as follows:

> Never shall I forget that interview. He began by telling us that "The Baptism of the Holy Spirit" was a physical thing, felt by deligthful thrills going through you from head to foot . . . and that this had been revealed to him in the following manner. He had been praying to the Lord to give him the Baptism . . . and he found that whenever he prayed especially earnestly he had physical thrills which he had thought belonged to earthly passions. He blamed himself exceedingly for this, and thought what a sensual man he must be, that in his most sacred moments such feelings should come. . . . One day . . . an inward voice seemed to say "These sensations you so much condemn are really the divine touch of the Holy Spirit in your body." . . . Immediately, he said, he began to receive them with thankfulness and the result was that they had become so continuous that there was scarcely a moment in his life without them. . . . My friend and I had not dared to say a word while this revelation was being made to us, and when Dr. Foster left us we sat for a long while in dumbfounded silence.[1459]

Hannah Whitall Smith described how their family adopted Mr. Foster's abominable doctrine and communicated it to others:

> I was seeking to know all that could be known of the "life hid with Christ in God," and was hungering and thirsting after an expression of entire consecration and perfect trust. . . . I had also a very mystical side to my nature which longed for direct revelations from God . . . and for many years I sought in every direction to find a satisfaction for this craving. . . . The beginning of it was was in the year 1871 or '72, when my husband needed a course of treatment for a nervous

---

1456 Pgs. 140-141, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1457 Pg. 81, *Life of Henry Foster,* Hawley.

1458 Pgs. 230-231, *The Modern Mission Century Viewed as a Cycle of Divine Working*, Arthur T. Pierson. New York, NY: Baker & Taylor Co., 1901. The closer the contact, the higher the elevation, no doubt.

1459 Pgs. 34-35, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey. Strachey's book supplies ample difficult to obtain original source material.

breakdown. We took our family to a Hydropathic Sanatorium in New York State, and we stayed there for three or four months. . . . A very dear friend of mine was staying in the Sanatorium at the same time; and as we were both hungering and thirsting to know the deep things of God, we very often had long conversations about it. One day she said to me, "Hannah, I believe that Dr. [Henry Foster] knows some secrets of the divine life that thee and I ought to know: he has hinted as much to me when he has been seeing me about my health. Wouldn't thee like to have him tell us?" Of course I agreed to this with all my heart, and she decided to ask him. When I next saw her she said she had asked him, and he had told her that he would ask the Lord whether he was to reveal the secret to us or not. A few days later he told my friend that he had received permission from the Lord to tell us the secret, and he fixed a time when were were to meet to hear it. . . . Never shall I forget that interview. He began by telling us that the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was a physical thing, felt by delightful thrills going through you from head to foot, and that no one could really know what the Baptism of the Spirit was who did not experience these thrills. He said that this had been revealed to him in the following manner. He had been praying the Lord to give him the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and he found that whenever he prayed especially earnestly he had physical thrills which he thought belonged to earthly passions. He blamed himself exceedingly for this, and thought what a sensual man he must be that in his most sacred moments such feelings should come. By fasting and prayer he would get deliverance, as he thought, and would then begin to pray again for the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, but invariably, after a short time of prayer, the sensations would return, and the same process of fasting and prayer would have to be gone through. As this happened over and over he was at last almost in despair. One day, however, when, during an earnest season of prayer, these sensations were particularly strong, an inward voice seemed to say, "These sensations which you so much condemn are really the divine touch of the Holy Spirit in your body." He said it was very hard for him to believe this, but it seemed to come with such divine authority that he dared not reject it. He asked specially for a sign that if it really were that Baptism of the Spirit for which he had been praying it might be made so plain to him that there could be no mistake. And this prayer, he said, had been unmistakably answered, and he had been convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that these very sensations, which he had condemned as being of the flesh, were actually the very Baptism of Spirit that he had longed for. Immediately, he said, he began to receive them with thankfulness, and the result was that they had become so continuous that there was hardly a moment in his life without them, and that he had found the greatest spiritual enlightenment and uplifting from the moment that he allowed himself to receive these sensations as being the touch of the Lord. This he told us was the divine secret which had been revealed to him, and which he was permitted to tell chosen souls. He urged us to take the subject before the Lord in prayer, and ask Him to enlighten us, and he warned us not to let carnal thoughts concerning this blessed experience come in to blind our eyes to the divine realities it embodied. My friend and I had not dared to say a word while this revelation was being made to us, and when Dr. [Foster] left we sat for a long while in dumbfounded silence. . . . [W]e had such absolute confidence in the holiness of this saint of God, as he seemed to us, that we were afraid our horror at what he had told us must be because we were too carnally minded, as he had said, to be able to see the deep spiritual purity of it all, and we felt that we dared not reject it without further prayer and consideration. We had several further talks with Dr. [Foster] about it, and he told us these "baptisms" were really the fulfilment of the union between Christ and His people as the Bridegroom and the bride, described in Ephesians v, 25-32, and typified in the Song of Solomon, and declared in many parts of Scripture, and that to reject it was to reject union with the Lord Himself. And he described this spiritual union as being so enrapturing and uplifting, and so full of the Lord's actual presence, that at last we began to believe there must be something in it, and to long to know for ourselves the reality of this wonderful consecration. We could not accept *all* the details of the experience that Dr. [Foster] gave us,[1460] but we did begin to believe that there

---

[1460] Hannah Smith publicly claimed that, at least at this time, she did not accept Dr. Foster's teaching in every detail; she admits only that others did. For example, Hannah wrote about what had happened when she had explained their experiences at Dr. Foster's sanatorium to a friend, Quaker minister Sarah F. Smiley:

> When I told her of my experiences at the water cure [Dr. Foster's hydropathic sanatorium] . . . she seized upon it . . . putting herself under the teaching of the doctor there, hoping that she might learn his strange

was a physical "touch" of God, that manifested itself in a bewildering delicious sensation of a sort of magnetic thrill of divine life pouring through both soul and body, which lifted one up into an enrapturing realization of oneness with Christ and that this was the true 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost.' We came to the conclusion that it must be what all the old mystics had known, and that it was the true inner meaning of that Union with Christ for which saints of all ages had longed, and into the realization of which so many of them seemed to have entered. And we both began earnestly to seek to know it for ourselves. . . . I [thought] that now at last I had found the key that would open to me the door of this mystic region of divine union. As usual, when I was interested in anything, my friends had to become interested too, and to all with whom I dared to touch on such a sacred, yet delicate, subject, I tried to tell what Dr. [Foster] had told us. And in several instances, both in England and America, those I told of it receved the baptism I described, and in each case this very baptism was the opening up for them of a life of union and communion with God far beyond anything they had ever known before. . . . In many instances the receiving of it by preachers was the beginning of great revivals in their churches, and was, in fact, the initiation of a great deal of the "Holiness" movement of thirty years ago [that is, the time when the Keswick and Higher Life theology was originated and promulgated]. This movement took hold of the upper classes, and the meetings were largely composed of the aristocracy and the rich and influential people in English Society. There was nothing sectarian in the whole [Keswick] movement; no

---

secrets. The result was that she went into the wildest extravagences. . . . Among other things she felt it her duty to ask him to stand naked before her, and also to do the same thing herself before him. To what other lengths she went I have never known. . . . She really believed that Christ had often come to her at night when in bed, as the real Bridegroom, and had actually had a bridegroom's connection with her. She taught this doctrine to a choice circle of friends and even tried by personal contact to produce in them those physical thrills which she believed were the actual contact of the Holy Ghost. (pg. 39, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey)

However, in her narrative above, in order to make herself look better, Hannah distances herself and understates her influence in leading Sarah Smiley into the erotic Baptism heresy. Elsewhere, in a writing which was only to be circulated posthumously and in which she attempted to conceal the identify of Dr. Foster, Hannah admitted that she was the immediate instrument of Sarah's entering into the erotic experience:

> Another friend of mine . . . whom I had told about Dr. R., received while I was talking to her, what she believed was the Baptism, and began to experience right there thrills of rapture from head to foot, which completely carried her away. . . . [S]he [came] to spend most of her time lying on the sofa trying to induce [the thrills] to come. She also . . . felt it her duty to kiss several men, with the idea that through that means God would bestow either great blessings upon them or greater blessings upon herself. She had felt led to kiss Mr. L. [the Methodist sexual predator discussed above]. . . . [Indeed,] a great many saintly women . . . one after another . . . would in some mysterious way begin to "feel led" to give him a kiss . . . the called for kiss bestowed . . . floods of joy and peace would fill their souls. . . . She was impressed with the idea that through this performance God would bestow the Baptism of the Spirit upon the receipient of her kisses. . . . [She] was so good and pure minded that we all called her "Saint Sarah[.]" . . . This dear Saint was so enmoured of what she called "The Touch of God," that she spent a large part of her time seeking for it and enjoying it, until it finally became a sort of possession . . . a very good Christian lady . . . said . . . [she] was possessed of the devil. (pgs. 194-202, 246-248, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey)

Smiley became part of what was known as the "Boston Party," following the "outgrowth of Dr. Foster's idea." Smiley testified that the Boston Party was "far ahead of all other Holiness meetings she has ever attended in spirituality, direct guidance, etc." (Letter to Robert, December 4, 1873, reproduced in the entry for July 8 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Smiley also set forth the typical Higher Life and Keswick allegorization of the book of Joshua, including a doctrine of post-conversion Spirit baptism, in her *The Fulness of Blessing; or, The Gospel of Christ, as Illustrated from the Book of Joshua* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1876). It is noteworthy, in light of Hannah's revelations of Smiley's activities with Dr. Foster, that Smiley's discussion of post-conversion Spirit baptism allegorically eisegeted into Joshua includes an extensive note decrying the "tendency to ignore the importance of the body, [which] proceeds from a general lack of insight into the Scriptural philosophy of nature and of spirit" (pg. 89).

Of course, Boston was the place from which the Faith and Mind Cures of Dr. Cullis and Mary Baker Eddy spread in the background of Higher Life teaching, rejection of *sola Scriptura*, fanaticism, and demonism.

> one was asked, or in any way influenced, to leave the Church to which they belonged . . . one of the marvellous features of it was the union of people of all forms of belief, and of all denominational relationships[.] . . . Dogmas and doctrines were of no account, and were never referred to, for they were not needed in the region in which this movement was carried on. It was the region of personal experience[.] . . . But while great spiritual blesings have seemed often to be the result of this experience of union with God, very disastrous outward falls from purity and righteousness have sometimes followed[.][1461]

Hannah Smith, thus, both adopted and promulgated the erotic Baptism doctrine and explained that it was at the root of the Holiness, Higher Life, or Keswick movement.

Hannah Whitall Smith further explained, through a representative example, how she spread Dr. Foster's filthy doctrine to others, and its effects upon them:

> One day, not long after our [Mr. & Mrs. Smith's] stay at the New York sanatarium, I [met] . . . a very strict Friend [Quaker] . . . a most successful Christian worker, but rather self-absorbed. She . . . dressed in the strictest fashion of sugar-scoop bonnets, crossed handkerchiefs, with a dainty three-cornered shawl over her shoulders. We became very intimate[.] . . . She was very religious, and we soon discovered that we were both seekers after the mystic life, and especially after the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and we embraced every opportunity we could find of seeking for it together.
>
> At that time some Methodists who believed in sanctification by faith were in the habit of holding in the summer what were called Holiness Camp Meetings . . . led by prominent religious preachers and teachers who believed in the doctrine of Holiness, or, in other words, of "sanctification by faith." . . . [T]he friend of whom I speak and I myself, with a large company of congenial friends, attended one of these Camp Meetings, all of us hungering and thirsting . . . to know experimentally the conscious baptism of the Holy Spirit. The whole camp ground was exercised on this subject, and in almost every meeting wonderful testimonies would be given by those who had, as they believed, consciously received it.
>
> Our expectations and our longings were wrought up to the highest ptich of enthusiasim, and one evening, after the public meeting under the trees was over, a few of us gathered in one tent for a special prayer meeting on the subject, determined to wrestle and agonize until the answer came. We knelt in the dark, and poured out our prayers and supplications . . . for two or three hours. . . . As the company passed out of the tent, I noticed my friend did not pass out with them, and I wondered whether she had slipped out silently before the meeting closed and gone back to her own tent. I lighted a candle to go to bed, when, to my astonishment, I found her lying across the foot of my bed in what appeared to be a swoon. I spoke to her, and immediately she began to praise God in the most rapturous way: "Oh, how wonderful! Oh, how glorious! Oh, this is the Baptism! Oh, what a blessing; 'tis more than I can bear! Oh, Lord, stay Thy hand! Flesh and blood cannot bear this glory!"[1462] And similar exclamations burst from her lips in tones of ecstasy. As may be imagined, I was overwhelmed with awe and delight, and I immediately rushed out to call in my friends to see the wonderful answer to our prayers, for I could not doubt that my friend had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit for which we were all longing. Why she had been picked out, I could not imagine, for she was not, as far as I knew, a bit better or a bit more earnest than any of the rest of us. However, there it was . . . [a] little awestruck company gathered round the bed, and eagerly drank in all her rapturous exclamations, afraid almost to breathe for fear that we should disturb the heavenly visitation. After a while she seemed to recover from her swoon sufficiently to go to her own tent, and, although very tottering and scarcely able to walk, we managed to take her there and get her undressed and into bed. . . . [E]arly in the morning I sent word to the early Prayer Meeting of the great blessing that had come to the camp ground. Immediately a deputation of the leaders of the meeting came to the tent to ask my friend whether

---

1461 Pgs. 165-172, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1462 Compare Hannah Smith's description of her related experience near Clifton Springs through her surrender to the Inward Voice in her Letter to Sisters of August 14, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 19 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, ed. Dieter.

> she would not come to their large meeting and bear testimony to the blessing that had been bestowed upon her. . . . It was one of the foundation principles among believers in the definite baptism of the Holy Spirit that if you did not confess it when you had received it, it might be lost[.][1463] . . . [The baptism] seemed to have been what the Swedenborgians[1464] call "her opening into the spiritual world," for from that time she began to have very strange and wonderous experiences . . . [which made] ordinary religious life very humdrum and uninteresting[.] . . . I told her of my experience at the water-cure [Henry Foster's hydropathic sanitarium], and of the secret that had there been revealed to me[.] [S]he immediatley seized upon it . . . and went to this same water-cure, and put herself under the teaching of the doctor there[.] . . . She embraced all his views, and felt led, as she fully believed by the Holy Spirit, to great lengths in the lines he taught. Among other things, she felt her duty to ask him to stand naked before her, and also to do the same thing herself before him. To what other lengths she went I have never known, but she was fully imbued with the idea that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was physical as well as spiritual, and that the great aim of religious teachers should be to excite in themselves and in others those physical thrills which accompany passion, and which she had come to believe were the manifest token of union with Christ. She took the Song of Solomon to be the exposition of the relation between the soul and Christ as the Bride and Bridegroom, and she confessed to me with great awe that she really believed that Christ had often come to her at night when in bed as the real Bridegroom, and had actually had a bridegroom's connextion with her. She taught this doctrine to a choice circle of friends, and even tried by personal contact to produce in them those physical thrills which she believed were the actual contact of the Holy Ghost. She overawed these friends by the tremendous force of her own convictions, and in many cases obtained . . . control over them, so that they were not surprised or shocked at anything she did or said, but accepted it all as from God, and as being the avenue through which the Holy Ghost was to be poured out upon them . . . [although] the person who was acknowledged by all to be the most full of self was my friend [herself], who had apparently received the Baptism. [1465]

Hannah had written to her husband: "There does seem to be a truth in it [Dr. Foster's doctrine], and I feel as if it would be a great means of restoration to health to thee if thee could get fully into it. Do try."[1466] With the leading of Dr. Foster and the encouragement of Hannah his wife, then, Robert P. Smith received such an erotic baptism, and having "received the baptism of the Spirit . . . he began to teach, preach, and propogate"[1467] the

---

[1463] This principle that blessings not confessed immediately were lost carried over to the foundational pre-Keswick Conventions, into the Keswick movement, and into the Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements; thus, e. g., the Oxford Convention proclaimed: "None retain the blessing of full faith [the Higher Life], and its consequent victory, who refuse to acknowledge, on suitable occasions, what God has done for them. The saintly John Fletcher four times fell back into the old level by fearing to witness for this grace of God" (pgs. 284-285, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Fletcher was the central theologian of Wesleyan Perfectionism (see, e. g, "How John Fletcher Became the Theologian of Wesleyan Perfectionism, 1770–1776," T. L. Smith. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 15:1 (Spring 1980): 68–87).

[1464] Swedenborgianism is another demonic and spiritualist cult that Hannah W. Smith viewed in a positive light, as did, among others, Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple.

[1465] Pgs. 173-181, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1466] pg. 38, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey, citing a letter from October 21, 1873. Hannah later became less enthusiastic about Dr. Foster's doctrine and then rejected it, but her husband continued to believe and promulgate it secretly until it caused his public downfall.

[1467] Pg. 317, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, D. M. Lloyd-Jones. Robert had earlier received entire sanctification and a less erotic spiritual Baptism at a Methodist Holiness meeting, where he learned that "one can be sanctified by faith just as one was saved by faith" (February 5-6, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

Higher Life theology publicly and the mystic baptism privately, leading many[1468] into a post-conversion Spirit baptism and the thrills of the marriage-bed that allegedly accompanied it. For example, one of Robert's first English disciples, a woman called Lizzie Lumb, wrote Robert a series of letters between 1873 and 1875 describing the physical sensations of her "Betrothal with [a false] Christ":

> The thrill commences in the love nerves, with a great throbbing, as though a heart beat there, and rises to the regions of the chest, with a thrill and sweet confusion of union[.] . . . Most earnestly do I thank you for revealing such treasures to me, as you have in this mystery of the heavenly marriage.[1469]

Hannah Smith recognized that adoption of the Bridal Baptism doctrine led to the free acceptance and practice of sexual debauchery, or at least something very close to it.[1470] For instance, as a consequence of Robert's preaching at one meeting, Hannah W. Smith narrated: "Boole got a great Baptism during the meeting, the unmentionable kind, and was so completely carried away by it . . . that he came near to making love to me, and actually did get into a deep and spiritual flirtation with a lady there who had left her husband because of his ill usage."[1471] Likewise, Hannah W. Smith recounts:

> I knew one dear lady who began in the purest and simplest way to give herself up to these emotions, and gradually came to spending most of her time allowing these waves of thrills to flow through her from head to foot, believing that she was in this way realizing more and more the presence of the Lord, and coming more and more into actual union with Him. And the result was most disastrous in destroying her moral nature, and launching her into a course of impurity from which in the beginning she would have shrunk with horror.[1472]

One must not be surprised that the infinitely holy and pure Holy Ghost would give over to their lusts (Romans 1:26) those who would defile His Holy Name by associating such things with His baptism. Certainly such supernatural manifestations as the erotic Baptism were manifestations of the god of this world, the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that works in and energizes the children of disobedience, the infernal Power

---

[1468] The doctrine was a regular theme of Robert P. Smith, and many adopted it as a result of his propogation of it; cf. pgs. 233-234, 238, 251, 255-260, 466-467, 470, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1469] Pg. 39, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey.

[1470] Pg. 48, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachy; cf. pg. 104.

[1471] Pg. 50, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey. This meeting took place in 1876 under Robert Smith's preaching at a camp meeting in the United States after his downfall in England. Note that Robert was still, obviously, promulgating the doctrine of the erotic Baptism even after being forced to leave England after the Brighton Convention because of it.

Other manifestations of fanaticism ascribed to the Holy Spirit at another camp meeting the Smiths graced were similar to those experienced by early Quakerism: "The ladies . . . at our house this spring have that *quaking* under the power of the Spirit that gave the early Friends the name of Quakers. Mrs. Ashmead and Mrs. Bond both *quake* wonderfully at times. And yet neither of them are at all remarkable for any depth of natural character" (pgs. 51-52, *ibid*.).

[1472] Pg. 162, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

behind Robert and Hannah W. Smith's theology of sanctification and "Christian" living. Robert believed in his erotic Baptism "as late as 1878,"[1473] that is, until he gave up Christianity entirely, for he "thought that it was a very precious truth."[1474]

While Mr. Smith most clearly spread Foster's filthy doctrine in private to a variety of his followers, usually women, he did publicly proclaim with clarity the necessity of a post-conversion Spirit baptism as the climax of the Higher Life, while pointing publicly to its sexual nature only in a guarded way. Unsurprisingly, he also warned that those who entered the Higher Life should "expect revelations of the world of darkness"[1475] far greater than those experienced by those who were merely normal, uninitiated Christians. While many women, and some men, knew what Robert Smith meant when he spoke of the "phenomena of the coming of the Spirit upon individuals,"[1476] not all understood the significance of his public proclamation at the Oxford Convention:

> [H]as the Baptism of the Spirit been duly pressed upon the believer? . . . Beloved Christian, let me ask you, have you had this baptism[?] . . . [M]any Christians seem to forget that this happened again and again. It was not the characteristic of the beginning only, but of the continuance of the dispensation in which we live. . . . [There are] phenomena [accompanying] the coming of the Spirit upon individuals[1477] . . . [We ought to] expect this baptism[,] [which has] been so long lost to the Church. . . . [It brings] a thrill, an intense emotion . . . [although] [y]ou may have special temptations of Satan after this time of baptism . . . [and] the highest elevations of experience involve the most fearful dangers.[1478]

Those who already had experienced the physical thrills of Baptism by the spiritual Bridegroom understood what was involved in the Higher Life doctrine of the Smiths—others were only pointed towards it by their public proclamation:[1479]

1473 Pg. 36, *The Keswick Story*, Polluck.

1474 Letter to a Friend, February 12, 1876, reproduced in the entry for July 30 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1475 Pg. 43, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Compare Jessie Penn-Lewis's affirmations that Spirit baptism brings one to revelations of the world of darkness, discussed below in the chapter concerning her and Evan Roberts.

1476 Pg. 251, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Mr. Smith affirms that he does not wish, at that time, "to point so much to the phenomena . . . as to the reality . . . of the coming of the Spirit" (pg. 251), for an open and explicit declaration of the erotic phenomena he thought accompanied the Baptism were not fit to be proclaimed publicly.

1477 Robert explained that in his public discourse he did "not wish to point so much to the phenomena," for he was not willing to explain plainly the eroticism of his doctrine to everyone present at the Oxford Convention.

1478 Pgs. 244-259, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

1479 While this writer feels it is necessary to print the following quotation, it is exceedingly grievous to His soul to have the infinitely holy God, and the perfect purity of Jesus Christ, blasphemed in the manner that it is by those who understood and accepted the Bridal Baptism doctrine. The glorious, blessed, and

[T]here is a point in our spiritual life, in which all self-imposed barriers break down . . . [j]ust so . . . there is a certain point at which a true woman breaks through all the reserve of her nature, and lets her heart go . . . the time of the soul's espousals, when it realises its union to the heavenly Lover. . . . [T]here will spring up a sweet soul-intercourse between your soul and Him such as you have never conceived the thought of. Often has my whole being thrilled . . . I could not understand this when I was contentious about doctrine[.] . . . Will you yield yourself to Him in this the day of your espousals? . . . [I]f earthly love be so sweet, shall not Divine love satisfy our whole being[?] . . . Earthly relationships are created but to reveal heavenly realities of union with our Lord. . . . Faith contradicts even our moral sense[.] . . . [B]reak down every barrier in your nature . . . and let your heart go[.] . . .[E]very need of a woman's heart could be met and satisfied with the love of Christ . . . [when] the Lord reveal[s] Himself . . . as the heavenly Bridegroom, who would henceforth carry [her] in the arms of love[.] . . . [C]laim the Lord as [your] heavenly Bridegroom . . . a thrilling message [that] stirred the meeting so deeply that it seemed a necessity to give some expression to our feelings[.] . . . [Women] followed, testifiying to the same blessed experience [of the] . . . wonderous secrets of His love[.] . . . [A]s we had learned deeply the lessons of entire consecration and simple trust, we needed now to go on to consider more fully the blessed secret . . . only the soul that had entered into rest could understand . . . passages [such as] Eph v. 22-32; Isaiah lxii. 4, 5, liv. 5; Hosea ii. 16, 19, 20; Song of Sol. iv. 7-12[.] . . . The Song of Songs [contains a] blessed secret . . . that the soul is slow to understand . . . the actings of the love of espousals. . . . The believer does not fully know what Christ is until he comes to this . . . [and surrenders] throughout the whole range of our being [including the physical organism.] . . . For the consecration we have been pressing in these meetings, and the full and childlike trust, are only stepping-stones to this glorious consummation of soul-union with the Beloved[.] . . . [O]ur souls have not reached their highest destiny until it is known and rejoiced in . . . absolute abandonment . . . overmastering love. . . . Several [more] ladies followed, testifying to the joy and rest their souls had found in thus knowing Christ as the Heavenly Bridegroom . . . far more than earthly friend or husband[.] . . . Many hearts were melted . . . in view of such glorious privileges as were opened up before us. The feeling was so great, that at the close of the meeting several met more privately[1480] . . . that to each one of them this wonderous soul-union . . . might become an experimental reality. . . . [As] Boaz . . . called the claim . . . that Ruth . . . had made "showing kindness,"[1481] . . . [the] Lord delights in every claim we make upon Him for union with Himself, and calls it kindness—"the kindness of thine espousals." . . . [Let us] make our claim for this realized union . . . [with Christ] more than any earthly friend or lover ever could be. . . . This is the consummation of all Christian experience . . . the wonderous secret . . . [to be] learned by each one experimentally for herself . . . thrilled with the sweetness of His love.[1482]

---

truly spiritual union of the Redeemer with His espoused church is a wonderful and awesome truth which it is the depths of vileness to drag into the gutter as the Bridal Baptism heresy does. This writer perfectly understands, and has great sympathy with, those who would prefer to simply pass by without reading such quotations, with their double entendres for the initiated and the uninitiated, so that his mind does not need to think upon the despicable evil intended in such public proclamations for the initiated. Singing or reading Psalm 109 might be an appropriate response by those who truly love that One before whom the seraphim sing "Holy, Holy, Holy"—or even a good preparation for the reading of the following quotation, and the rest of the quotes exposing the filthy doctrine of the Smiths and other Higher Life promulgators elsewhere in this composition.

[1480] For, in private, the Bridal Baptism doctrine could be more openly set forth; more private explication was the practice of its advocates, whether Robert and Hannah W. Smith, Laurence Oliphant, or sexual predators who claimed that they were fathering an exalted new human race.

[1481] Compare Logan P. Smith's description of the erotic Baptism doctrine as "the doctrine of 'Loving-kindness'" (Pgs. 60-65, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith).

[1482] Pgs. 236-239, 270-271, 300-302, 306-314, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. The Oxford Ladies' Meetings were led by Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Boardman (pg. 289).

Once again, this writer begs the pardon of his reader for reproducing and calling to mind the trashy filth meant by the initiated into the Bridal Baptism secret. Reader, know that this writer sympathizes with

While the Smiths were somewhat reserved in public, others were more open in their proclaimation of the Bridal Baptism teaching. For example, "Miss Bonnicastle sp[oke] on this subject . . . [of] conscious union of the believer and Christ as the Heavenly Bridegroom . . . at the Oxford Ladies meetings . . . [which] quite shocked a good many,"[1483] but led many also into the knowledge of that Bridal Baptism. It was common knowledge that "the "object of the . . . Meeting at Oxford . . . was to lead Christians to . . . [be] baptised with the Holy Ghost,"[1484] and as a result of that Convention "there was so much" of "the Baptism of the Holy Ghost"[1485] that vast multitudes received physical thrills. Nevertheless, the full depths of Satan hidden in Robert Smith's doctrine were not clearly revealed to all, but only to those fully initiated into the Higher Life. Thus, experience of erotic thrills in the Baptism was the culminating and highest point to which the Higher Life led, and many, through coming to "lie passive in His hands," came to know "the baptism of the Spirit" as allegedly set forth in the Song of Solomon and as taught by Smith.[1486]

While Mr. Smith successfully proclaimed and led others to the erotic Baptism at Oxford and Brighton, divulgence of this Higher Life secret to Miss Hamilton in her bedroom shortly before the first Higher Life Convention at Keswick proved his public downfall[1487]—although even through this, the Smiths did not cut off contact with Mr. Foster or Clifton Springs.[1488] "Hannah found [Robert] huddled in despair in a Paris hotel

---

you if you desire to vomit. Were such quotations introduced for an insignificant purpose, they would certainly be unjustifiable—they are reproduced only because they represent the thinking of those who have profoundly influenced the doctrine of sanctification of huge portions of Christiandom—a fact that would be almost absolutely unbelievable, apart from clear evidence such as that provided in this composition, and one which illustrates how deeply Satan has laid his deceptions.

1483 Letter to a Friend, February 12, 1876, reproduced in the entry for July 30 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1484 Pg. 19, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

1485 Pg. 215, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

1486 Pgs. 371-372, 384-385, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. It should not be a surprise that those who pointedly affirmed, "I cannot remember . . . my conversion" were prominent among the people who "heard Mr. Smith's address on the baptism of the Holy Spirit" and received the "conscious . . . blessing" he proclaimed (pgs. 384-385).

1487 Hannah called Dr. Foster's heresy "the subtle doctrine concerning the physical manifestation of the Holy Spirit which led my dear husband astray" (pg. 48, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachy; cf. pg. 104). Mrs. Smith, as usual, downplays her own adoption of the erotic Baptism teaching.

1488 Thus, for example, Hannah Smith was staying at Clifton Springs in July 1879 (see Letter to Anna, written from Clifton Springs on July 8, 1879, reproduced in the entry for September 16 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

room where he had fled in his collapse."[1489] Concerning his father's exposure, and the attempt—which was quite successful during Mr. and Mrs. Smith's lifetime[1490]—to cover up the true reason for Mr. Smith's downfall in his promulgation of erotic bride mysticism, Logan Pearsall Smith wrote:

> "All Europe is at my feet," . . . my poor father . . . exclaim[ed] when he stood on the platform [at the Brighton Convention]. But almost immediately an announcement appeared in the papers that he had been compelled to cancel all his engagements and to return almost at once to America. It was suggested that a fall from a horse some years before had led to the return of certain distressing symptoms which rendered absolute rest necessary. I must say that in the family we didn't believe in that horse; at least I am certain that my mother didn't. I don't think she ever referred to it at all, which made people suspicious, and so universal became the gossip that my father's friends felt it necessary to issue a further explanation. It had come to their ears, they stated, that my father had inculcated doctrines that were most dangerous and unscriptural, and that there had been conduct on his part which, though it was free, they were convinced, from all evil intention,[1491] had rendered it necessary to abstain from public work, and take the complete rest rendered necessary by the fall from his horse. That the doctrine of Sanctification and Deadness to Sin might lead to dangerous forms of Antinomianism was well known from the history of the past . . . [b]ut this was not the doctrinal quadreped from which my father slipped at Brighton. It was a much more mysterious beast which he had also brought from America, so mysterious that even the learned and profound Professor Warfield seems never to have guessed at its existence.[1492] But my mother

---

1489 July 27-28, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

1490 Victorian sensibilities and the fact that Hannah Smith's writings on fanaticism and various other writings were intentionally left unpublished during her lifetime account, in part, for the fact that early critics of the Keswick theology did not strongly identify the connection between Mr. and Mrs. Smith's Higher Life doctrine and mystical, erotic bridal union. However, the central factor is a deliberate decision to supress this portion of her and her husband's history, both by the Higher Life men in England who forced Robert out when he was found in Miss Hattie Hamilton's bedroom initially, and by the Smith family themselves. Concealement was sought, rather than open repentance of and renunciation of such filthiness. Hannah certainly sought to deliberately cover up her husband's practices and spiritual shipwreck, both at the time and during his later decline into agnosticism: "I think the thing to say about Robert when anyone asks about him is just this, that he never recovered from the nervous shock of that time in England, and that he is suffering an eclipse of faith from actual nervous collapse" (Letter to Priscilla, November 22, 1883, reproduced in the entry for August 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). She similarly sought to cover up her own adoption and propogation of the erotic doctrine.

1491 Of course, both those who engaged in immoral debauchery, believing that such was the method through which Spirit baptism and the Higher Life were obtained, and those who taught and led others to adopt such perversions, were free from "all evil intention." They were sincere in their indulgence of lustful passions, and their intentions were good, or so they claimed, while their actions were utterly shameful.

1492 That is, the mysterious declaration of Robert Pearsall Smith's friends about unnamed "doctrines" that were "dangerous" was as far as B. B. Warfield was able to penetrate in his day when he wrote the articles that came to constitute *Studies in Perfectionism;* it was as much as Stephen Barabas chose to divulge in the hagiographical and revisionist history in *So Great Salvation*, although in Barabas' day the truth was much more easily accessible than it was in the days of Warfield (see pgs. 26-27, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas & Warfield, *Perfectionism,* vol. 2, pgs. 505ff.). Unfortunately, the coverup of Robert P. Smith by Keswick advocates such as Barabas, despite the now clearly accessible facts, continues in the work of many other modern advocates of Keswick theology. For example, one notes the fantastic understatement on pg. 30 of *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, by Price & Randall, that Robert P. Smith's downfall was caused by nothing more than that he put his arm around Miss Hamilton; Price & Randall breathe not a whisper about erotic bridal mysticism. J. C. Polluck (pgs. 34-36, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*) says that he is revealing the truth, since the "facts have lain hidden for nearly ninety years inviting sensational speculation," and then goes on to relate that "the truth is pathetic rather than shocking," for Smith simply

knew it well[.] . . . What exactly was the nature of this doctrine? I cannot find that it has a name, so for convenience I shall call it the doctrine of "Loving-kindness." It is . . . based . . . on the fact . . . that nature, in one of her grossest economies, has placed the seats of spiritual and amorous rapture so close to each other that one of them is very likely to arouse the other . . . so exactly do these two forms of ecstasy feel alike [that] . . . sometimes . . . it [is] extremely difficult to distinguish between them.[1493] From this fact it was only too easy to form the heretical belief that this heightening of religious experience, due to the mingling of the sexes, was God's own way (and His ways were mysterious and not to be questioned by carnal reason) of bestowing His blessing upon them. When a holy preacher sat near a sanctified sister, or a female penitent close to her confessor, they became more conscious of the Baptism of the Spirit; and, as my mother sardonically expressed it, the nearer to each other they sat, the deeper and richer the consciousness became. . . . [I]t has taken . . . centuries to eliminate . . . this holy kiss—if indeed [Christianity] has succeeded in doing so completely. Certainly in my father's time this exquisite, secret doctrine was extremely prevalent in America; and my father, in spite of my mother's . . . warnings,[1494] would expound it to select gatherings mostly composed of spinsters of a certain age.[1495] Unluckily one of these grew jealous of another,[1496] and let the great beautiful cat out of the bag, to the scandal of the righteous, and the extreme joy of the unholy, whose jokes about the "Higher Life," as it was called, made my father feel that it would be wise for him to cease his ministrations. . . . As people grow old, it becomes very hard for them to keep clear in their minds the important distinction beteen Right and Wrong—outlines become dim and one thing fades into another. . . . At the time, however, my father found it wise, as I have said, to cease his ministrations; though to the Cowper Temples, I think—certainly to Mrs. Cowper Temple—all this fuss seemed

---

told a woman a false doctrine—the character of which Polluck leaves unnamed—"with his arm around her in his hotel room." It is difficult to think that Polluck's claim that he is finally making the truth clear, and there is nothing "shocking" about it, and then stating that Robert Smith put his arm around Miss Hamilton, while Polluck refuses to breathe a syllable about erotic bridal mysticism, is anything other than a deliberate coverup to make Mr. Smith look better. It is similar to Polluck's refusal to mention that Smith turned agnostic and then Buddhist. Nevertheless, the preface to Polluck's book by A. T. Houghton, Chairman of the Keswick Council, declares that Polluck "does not cover up the failings of those whom God has used in the leadership of the Convention, nor would the Council desire to hide anything" (pg. 10). Mr. Smith's unconfirmed self-testimony that he had good intentions (Oliphant and the whole host of fanatics advocating erotic bridal mysticism and practicing immorality as a consequence had good intentions also) when he had his arm around Miss Hattie Hamilton alone in a hotel room is mentioned; the fact that he told her of erotic bridal mysticism is unmentioned, the fact that at the Brighton Convention Miss Hamilton threw her arms around Mr. Smith and kissed him in Mrs. Smith's presence is unmentioned, and the fact that Miss Hamilton said Robert sought to commit adultery with her is not mentioned (cf. pgs. 78-82, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*, Marie Henry; pg. 111, *Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology*, Naselli). Keswick advocates who cover up the abominations of the founders and propogators of the Keswick theology are in plain violation of 1 Timothy 5:20: "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." However, while they violate the Apostle Paul's command in 1 Timothy 5:20, they practice Robert P. Smith's view that one is to do exactly the opposite of 1 Timothy 5:20—according to Mr. Smith, a Divine "curse" falls "on those who expose the sin of their brethren or their fathers in Christ" (pg. 42, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

1493 This difficulty is felt if the people involved are unconverted heretics not indwelt by the Spirit of truth, so that all their religion is not spiritual, but natural or devilish. The confusion of fornication and spirituality consequently had much in it to attract Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith, although it is utterly abominable to those truly born of God.

1494 Mrs. Smith contributed to her husband's adoption of erotic bridal mysticism, but she also turned away from it before he did.

1495 That is, Mr. Smith would especially seek to share this teaching with unmarried women of an age relatively near to his own.

1496 Did one of these ladies grow jealous of knowledge of this "truth," or jealous when it was acted upon with another person with whom she wished to act upon it herself?

> incomprehensible and silly. If these good people wanted to kiss each other, what, she wondered, could be the harm in that?[1497]

After the scandal in England, and the outward success of the Higher Life meetings conducted in America under the impulse of Dr. Cullis by Mr. and Mrs. Smith, despite utter lack of concern and consecration,[1498] "Robert gave up preaching, [although] his wife continued."[1499] "Robert Pearsall Smith lost more than his occupation; he lost his faith as well. . . . [T]his disbelieving and disillusioned preacher [would have] believing disciples . . . still come for guidance . . . leav[ing] him to the awkward task of giving advice and encouragement of which he himself hardly believed a word."[1500] Robert "went back to America and to selling glass. His spiritual life degenerated. He never again had a heart for ministry or for God. He retreated to a world of Buddhist meditation and died in 1899 a broken man."[1501] He "began to lose his faith [more completely in] 1875-1876 . . . [by] . . . 1877 he was . . . in the process of losing his faith altogether,"[1502] so that he become an

---

[1497] Pgs. 60-65, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan Pearsall Smith; cf. pgs. 61-62, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Indeed, in light of the association of the Cowper Temples with Laurence Oliphant and other practicioners and promulgators of the doctrine that one must engage in immorality to receive Spirit baptism, the noble family's inability to see anything wrong with the doctrine of the preachers at whose feet they sat, and whom they promoted, is understandable.

[1498] See pgs. 65-69, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan P. Smith, and Hannah W. Smith's mystified amazement with the Higher Life power both she and her husband still possessed although without all consecration (pgs. 251-253, *Religious Fanaticism: Extracts from the Papers of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. & intr. Ray Strachey; pgs. 172-174, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Smith. Letters to her daughter, Mary Berenson, January 1, 1905 & February 25, 1905; pgs. 32-36, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Mrs. Anna Shipley, August 8, 1876; Letter to a Friend, August 8, 1876, reproduced in the entries for August 2-4 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Mrs. Smith's ruminations over her ability to generate Higher Life results in a state of utter unconsecration has been examined above.).

[1499] Pg. 14, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1500] Pgs. 61-62, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Logan explains further:

> My father . . . had begun to lose his faith in the whole scheme of Salvation which he had so fervently advocated[.] . . . His situation was thus an awkward one; he had still a reputation in the religious world, he still possessed the hypnotic power of swaying great audiences, and many calls were made upon him to address meetings and administer religious instruction to souls in trouble. Invitations to preach he could avoid on the grounds of health, but the religious inquirers who called at the house, coming sometimes from as far as from Russia, were the source of greater embarrassment; and I remember how desperately he would try to keep one or the other of his children in the room to avoid the necessity of a spiritual dialogue, and how quite heartlessly we would escape from it, leaving him to grapple alone with these spiritual inquirers. This we thought great fun. (pgs. 72-73, *Unforgotten Years*, Logan P. Smith)

[1501] July 27-28, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1502] Pgs. 175, 85, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*, Marie Henry. As Logan P. Smith notes, Robert began to turn towards agnosticism when it became apparent that all the "blessing" that he had felt and experienced from the time of his consecration to preaching the Higher Life in conjunction with his erotic Baptism to his final Higher Life meeting under Dr. Cullis's encouragement in America after his downfall following the Brighton Convention was a delusion—the presence of the identical spiritual "power" and "blessing" that characterized his best earlier Higher Life ministrations in his final meeting when in an evident state of unconsecration and ungodliness was the beginning of his final fall. Rather than recognizing that he was in need of true conversion by receiving the true gospel and coming into a true

agnostic by 1883[1503] as his "religious beliefs [were] gradually dwinding into an interest in Psychical Research."[1504] Thus, "he gradually gave up all his Christian commitments and died alienated, but not separated, from his family. Plagued by a manic depressive nature for most of his life, he [came to be] happiest when engaged in his Buddhist meditations in his spacious tree house at the family's home at Friday's Hill, south of London."[1505] As with vast numbers of Higher Life advocates, Robert Smith's ultimate recognition that his merely fleshly and natural emotion-driven religion had nothing in it that was truly from God led him to apostatize from Christianity.[1506] A significant part of his familial alienation derived from his years of unrepentant adultery,[1507] evidencing, like his doctrinal apostasy, his unregenerate state, until he finally died in 1898 and went to his own place, where his wife joined him some years later.

Mrs. Hannah Whitall Smith was a false teacher who was deluded by Satan and her own unrenewed heart. Robert P. Smith was an unconverted false teacher also. Their writings are filled to the brim with dangerous theological errors and heresies. Alongside of the Higher Life of Keswick theology, one finds within the compositions and proclamations of Mr. and Mrs. Smith a false gospel, the Inner Light, New Thought, the Mind and Faith Cure, feminism, Quakerism, syncretism, quietism, fatalism, eudemonism, allegorical hermeneutics, passivity in sanctification, continuationism, antinomianism, universalism, works salvation, erotic sensations as Spirit baptism, and extra-biblical revelations. Hannah rejected *sola Scriptura*, total depravity, substitutionary atonement, justification by imputed righteousness, saving faith, the new birth, supernatural

---

living union with the resurrected Christ so that he could have real spiritual power, Robert concluded that the marvelous effects wrought by his own natural abilities, while under the delusion that his Higher Life agitation was genuinely spiritual, were a demonstration that there could well be nothing to religion other than the psychical powers analyzable by a Psychical Research Society, and perhaps no God at all.

[1503] Pgs. 70-71, 320, 51, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey, pg. 117, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*, Marie Henry.

[1504] Pg. 74, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey.

[1505] "Smith, Hannah Whitall & Smith, Robert Pearsall," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Tim Larson, pg. 617. Cf. pg. 107, Strachey, *Remarkable Relations*, pg. 127, *The Secret Life of Hanah Whitall Smith*, Henry.

[1506] Consider the testimony in 1912 of onetime Holiness leader Harry Ironside on the evil fruits of the Higher Life and "second blessing" theology: "[T]housands are yearly being disheartened and discouraged by their teaching . . . hundreds yearly are ensnared into infidelity through the collapse of the vain effort to attain the unattainable . . . scores have actually lost their minds and are now inmates of asylums because of the mental resultant upon their bitter disappointment in the search for holiness" (pg. 6, *Holiness: The False and the True*).

[1507] In his earlier years, Robert P. Smith preached erotic baptism to unmarried women. "In his later years, Robert was unfaithful to his wife" (pg. 173, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*, Marie Henry; cf. pgs. 99-105 & *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey, pgs. 184-187). Robert fell under the doom pronounced in 1 Corinthians 6:9-11; Galatians 5:19-21 & Revelation 21:8.

conversion, and self-examination. Mrs. Smith plainly testified that she rejected the evangelical gospel, detested Christian orthodoxy, and delighted in both being a heretic and in making others into heretics. She thought that man's chief end was not to glorify God, but to feel happy, doing whatever one wants without any pangs from the conscience. Her exaltation as the leading teacher of the Higher Life took place in connection with spiritists and the working of demons. She testified that she gained her chief spritual insight into the "Christian" life from a sexual predator who taught, practiced, and led others into unspeakable debauchery. She was an enemy of Christ, His Word, and of true holiness of life.

As an unregenerate false teacher, Hannah Whitall Smith is someone to mark, reject, and avoid (Romans 16:17; Titus 3:10). Her heresies and writings, and those of her husband Robert, should be abhorred and detested by the godly. She is by no means someone to embrace as a font of truth on Christian living, and adoption of her ideas by others evidences a tremendous lack of spiritual discernment and the certain presence of doctrinal error.

Applications from the Life and Writings of Hannah Whitall Smith and her Husband

As believers can learn much from the life and teachings of the wicked recorded in Scripture, whether Ahab, Judas, or Diotrephes, so the negative example of the life and writings of Hannah W. Smith can teach the Lord's people a number of important lessons.

Mrs. Smith's false teachings—all of them—must be discerned, rejected, guarded against, exposed, and warned about. Believers should not read her writings. Christian leaders should plainly preach and teach against her heresies and warn of her by name. Churches should separate from those who have been influenced to adopt her heresies and are unwilling to repent. Her confusion on the gospel has led precious souls into the fires of hell. Her confusion on sanctification has hindered countless Christians in their spiritual walk. There is no reason to try to pick out a little spiritual good from the veritable mass of errors in her works, but a clear Biblical basis for rejecting her, root and branch.

Many lessons can be learned from the deluded career and miserable end of Robert Pearsall Smith. His life exemplifies the extreme spiritual danger of rejecting *sola Scriptura* in practice, even if one accepts it in theory. His abandonment of literal, grammatical-historical interpretation for experience-driven hermeneutics is also seen to be extremely dangerous. Had Mr. Smith studied Scripture more carefully and recognized it alone as the authority by which he needed to judge all experience, he could have been

freed from the delusions of the devil and of his own sinful heart and come to a true saving conversion to Jesus Christ, instead of being an unconverted preacher who was both "deceiving, and being deceived" (2 Timothy 3:13). Furthermore, he illustrates the danger when religious experience is derived from a false fanaticism rather than genuine Christian and Trinitarian spirituality. When he finally saw through his fanaticism, instead of turning to the true Christ in true faith arising from Scripture alone, he rejected Christianity altogether. What dangers and proclivities to all evil are wrapped within the depraved human heart! No one will escape from that "desperately wicked" seat of corruption or escape delusion from that fountain of lies that is "deceitful above all things" (Jeremiah 17:9), without cleaving to the Scriptures and receiving the protection of the Holy Spirit as a consequence of the union with Christ brought about through true conversion. Reader, do you view your heart as God does? Do you meditate on its horrible and desperate depravity and, as a result, flee to the Christ revealed in the Scriptures as your only refuge? Learn your need so to do from the deluded life and everlasting damnation of the Higher Life preacher-turned-Buddhist, Robert Pearsall Smith.

Learn also from the lives of Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith life that unconverted false teachers can put on a great show of godliness and exert a tremendous influence on the spiritually unwary among the true people of God. The ideas Hanhah and Robert Smith propogated influence many millions today—millions who, in large part, have no idea that their confusion on and false doctrine of sanctification are derived from an unregenerate Quaker couple. Be sure that your beliefs and practices are truly "the faith which was once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3) and the product of Scripture alone. It does not matter whether or not men who are exalted by Christendom have taught them, for such are not your authority for faith and practice. Robert P. Smith was extremely popular in the Christendom of his day—all Europe was at his feet. There are many extremely popular false teachers in Christendom today. The Antichrist will be even more popular in the post-Rapture Christendom of the future than any of his anti-christian predecessors. Place no confidence in men because of their popularity, but, within the protection of a strong independent Baptist church, let all you believe and do arise only from the Spirit-illuminated teaching of the literally interpreted Word of God.

Furthermore, since Hannah W. Smith founded the Keswick theology with her husband, and Keswick has never dreamed of repudiating and repenting of their false teachings and pernicious influence, Keswick theology should be rejected. Keswick is saturated with the ideas of Hannah W. Smith. This is not a good, but a great and fearful evil.

The tremendous influence Mrs. Smith has exerted on Christendom, so that very large numbers of true churches and Christians have been unintentionally infected with her errors, illustrates the dangers of failing to issue plain warnings, avoid ecumenicalism, and exercise a watchful and strict separatist position. Mrs. Smith has influenced millions. She created a new, and very influential, doctrine of sanctification—the Keswick theology. Through both her direct influence and her stamp upon the Keswick movement, she has precipitated the rise of the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith heresies. How greatly the leaven of error has spread because so many preachers have refused to give plain warnings! How essential it is for pastors to be well informed about and very careful concerning what writings they recommend to the flocks over which the Holy Ghost has made them overseers! Reader, do not follow the bad example of those who blew an uncertain sound on their gospel trumpets—determine that you will, by God's grace, for His glory, and out of love for Him, contend against all error, and for all the faith once delivered to the saints (Jude 3). Do not fear man—you will be called "uncharitable," "too negative," "narrowminded," and all sorts of other names (Luke 6:22, 26). Instead, consider that the Apostle Paul commanded the marking and avoidance of false teachers in the context of his love for large numbers of God's dear people.[1508] Think on the love for the Father, for His people, and for the truth that filled the soul of the Lord Jesus, and led Him to boldly and pointedly denounce error (Matthew 23). Be Christlike—go, and do likewise.

Consider also what dangers there are that yet lie buried within your fallen heart. How Mrs. Smith was led astray by trusting in her own heart, in the Inner Light delusion, and in her continuationist Quakerism! While she was totally blind because of her unregenerate state, you, oh Christian, still have the serpent of indwelling sin lying within your own bosom. How essential it is that you reject all extra-Biblical revelation, and carefully study the Bible, cleave to its every precept, and prize it as your sole authority! The Sword of the Spirit is the only offensive weapon in your spiritual armor, and the only means through which you can stand against the wiles of the devil (Ephesians 6:10-17). How important it is for you to carefully and accurately exegete Scripture, put in practice all it says with holy fear and trembling, and walk humbly with your God, trusting in Jesus only!

Consider how essential it is for you to be a functioning member of a strong, separated, independent Baptist church. Only in the Lord's church is His special presence manifested, and the special protection Christ gives to His holy temple and beloved bride

---

[1508] Compare Romans 16:17-18 with 16:1-16.

is lost to those who are not members of Biblical Baptist churches. Mrs. Smith, being without the protection afforded by a true church, and without a true pastor for spiritual protection (Hebrews 13:7, 17), was influenced by hordes of false teachers and fanatics in her spiritual journey on the broad road to destruction. Spiritual guides may be very popular in the eyes of the broad and undiscerning world of Christiandom, and may possess a great appearance of piety, and yet be vipers and wolves—but Christ's true congregations have the spiritual equipment to discern and reject such. Had Mrs. Smith been aware of and adopted the historic Baptist doctrine of Spirit baptism, she would never have believed in the filthy perversion that led to her husband's public disgrace and contributed to his continuing adultery and the unhappiness of her marriage. Had she accepted the clear Biblical teachings of *sola Scriptura* and the cessation of the sign gifts, she would not have accepted the "miraculous" validation that led her into false teaching and led her sister Mary Thomas to an early grave through the false wonders of the Faith Cure. Had she rejected feminism for the loving and God-ordained patriarchy of family and church practiced in Biblical assemblies, she would have recognized that she could, as a lady, be more easily deceived (1 Timothy 2:14), and that she needed godly, Bible-believing men at home and church to protect her from error. Had she treasured Baptist ministers who preached a pure gospel, instead of finding them repulsive because they would not allow her to feel happy in her delusion, so that she preferred as a consequence the company of heretics and fanatics, she could have been saved herself, and her family with her, from both the earthly vanity of their false religion and the inconceivably horrible eternal consequences of the unpropitiated wrath of God.

Learn from Mrs. Smith's failures the necessity for a genuine vital piety, one which arises out of a true conversion and issues in a close walk with God. Mrs. Smith's false piety did not convince her family—her husband and all her surviving children rejected Christianity. People read her books and looked up to her, but those who knew Mrs. Smith best rejected godliness for rebellion against Jehovah, and received eternal retribution for their sins. Have you been led by Mrs. Smith's confusing views of faith, conversion, and salvation to settle for anything less than the supernatural new birth without which no one will enter the kingdom of God? Do you only have assurance of salvation if you compare yourself to the standard set by Hannah W. Smith, but not if you compare yourself to the standard set forth by the Apostle John in his first inspired epistle? Do not follow into hell the demons who misled Hannah W. Smith. Be satisfied with nothing less than the Biblical gospel and true conversion.

Do you want a godly seed—do you want your family, for whatever generations may be left until the return of Christ, to know and serve your Redeemer in spirit and in

truth? The sham spirituality of Hannah W. Smith will never suffice. But if you reject such pseudo-Christianity and sincerely and uprightly walk with God your Father, through Christ your Redeemer, as empowered by the Holy Spirit, you can claim the promise of Proverbs 22:6: "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it."

Do not turn aside to the idol of Hannah W. Smith's "bare God." An unconverted person who does so will be eternally damned, and to whatever extent a regenerate person turns from the God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit to Mrs. Smith's deity he will find his spiritual life much darkened and his holy Father much displeased. Genuine Christian spirituality arises out of the love of the Father, the purchase of the Son, and the applicatory work of the Holy Spirit. How sweet and precious to the saint is his dear adopted Father! How glorious is the redemptive work of Christ! How heart-melting it is to behold Him in the glory of His essential Deity, to marvel at the preciousness of His sinless humanity, and to be moved by the infinite condescension and love shown in the cross! How ineffably wonderful it is to know experientially the communion of the Holy Ghost! Do not, oh saint of God, turn aside from your own Redeemer, your own personal God who has come to you in Jesus Christ, who has supernaturally revealed Himself to you through His Word by His Spirit. What are the dregs of Mrs. Smith's idolatry to the overflowing cup of infinite blessing found in Jehovah, the living God?

Furthermore, you should examine yourself to see if you find Mrs. Smith's errors unbearable, horrible, and exceedingly grievous, or if you find her abominations titillating and exciting, as many ungodly people find gossip. Is it necessary to expose Hannah W. Smith's lies and unmask her pernicious character? Yes—certainly. Should such an expose be examined as a mere intellectual exercise, a curiosity comparable to some strange gene-spliced monster that might be on display at a circus or a fair for people to gawk at? By no means.

Indeed, how sweet—how precious, glorious, and soul-refreshing it is to turn with disgust from Hannah W. Smith to behold the Lord Jesus! Here is One who is spotless in purity. Here is one who mixes, not secret corruptions with false teachings, but perfect holiness with infallibly sure guidance. Here is a perfect Prophet, a spotless Priest, a matchless King, an all-sufficient Redeemer, one who is fairer than the children of men, whose lips are full of grace. How blessed it is to see Him in His holy Word, and find in Him a true Shepherd who properly and perfectly cares for, protects, and gives His life for His beloved sheep. Let the works of Hannah W. Smith, and all her fellow false-shepherds, be put in the trash where they belong, and listen instead to the voice of this true and unerring Pastor. Hearken to His voice as you read every line of His Word in

your personal Bible study—hearken to His voice as He is preached by a true man of God in the church of the living God—meditate upon His law day and night. So shall you have a truly blessed life during your earthly pilgrimage, and a rich reward in the coming life of sight for all eternity.

J. Excursus XI: An Analysis and Critique of Keswick Theology as Set Forth Particularly In *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention,* by Steven Barabas[1509]

1.) The Background and History of the Keswick Convention and Keswick Theology

Stephen Barabas's *So Great Salvation* is widely considered the standard interpretation of Keswick theology. In a preface to the book by Fred Mitchell, "Chairman of the Keswick Convention Council, 1948-1951," Mitchell states that Barabas's book is "faithful and accurate; it is well annotated with sources of his information; it is saturated with an appreciative spirit, for he himself has been so much helped by Keswick. The book will form a text-book and a reference book on this unique movement."[1510] Thus, its contents accurately represent the theology of the original Keswick movement. Indeed, "Steven Barabas['s] . . . book *So Great Salvation* is perhaps the single best interpretation of the message of Keswick."[1511] "The most objective account and appraisement of the . . . Keswick . . . movement is *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of The Keswick Convention*—an extraordinarily exact account . . . [written] after exhaustive research."[1512] Keswick's "standard

---

1509 *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*, Steven Barabas. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005. Orig. pub. 1952.

While Hebrews 2:3 is the most likely source, it is possible that Barabas took his title from a book by Keswick leader George MacGregor wrote of the same name in 1892 (pgs. 105-107, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck). While the Author of Hebrews would disagree, MacGregor believed that a man such as Robertson Smith was "a reverent and believing critic . . . of the Bible" (pg. 106-107, *ibid*), although Smith brought Wellhausen's Documentary Hypothesis to the English-speaking world and was expelled from the Free Church College at Aberdeen for heresy. "W. Robertson Smith, a cleric in Scotland, was subject to a heresy trial by the Scottish Presbyterian Church. He was accused of denying the deity of Christ. He responded, 'How can they say that? I have never denied the divinity of any man, let alone that of Jesus Christ'" (pg. 59, *The Speaker's Quote Book*, Roy B. Zuck. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregek Publications, 1997; cf. pg. 758, *Christian Theology*, Millard J. Erickson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998).

1510 Pgs. ix-x, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1511 "Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm.

1512 Pg. 20, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson.

interpretation is Steven Barabas, *So Great Salvation*."[1513] Consequently, the analysis of the Keswick system below will engage Barabas's book in detail while also evaluating other Keswick classics.

Barabas notes that in "the early 1870s . . . the Keswick movement had its rise in England."[1514] The "friends [Quakers] introduced the subject"[1515] of the Higher Life, although there were also very significant background influences of Roman Catholic mystics and heretics such as the monks "Thomas á Kempis[1516] [and] Brother

---

[1513] Pg. 112, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

[1514] Pg. 15, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas follows W. H. Griffith Thomas in claiming that Walter Marshall's *The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification*, written in 1692, is a Keswick antecedent. However, "the Keswick view is incompatible with Marshall's because the Keswick view is influenced by a Wesleyan second work of the Spirit that is conditioned on the believer's consecration. . . . Despite their claims to the contrary . . . Keswick theology is both historically and theologically novel" (pg. 72, 211 *Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology*, Andrew D. Naselli). A more accurate and less historically revisionistic view of Marshall's work is that the book is a "Puritan classic on sanctification" (pg. 692, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*, J. R. Beeke & M. Jones). Compare also "Sanctification by Faith: Walter Marshall's Doctrine of Sanctification in Comparison with the Keswick View of Sanctification," Cheul Hee Lee. Ph. D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2005.

Barabas also claims that William Romaine's books *The Life of Faith, The Walk of Faith*, and *The Triumph of Faith* were Keswick antecedents. However, J. C. Ryle's assessment that the books taught the older evangelical doctrine of sanctification, not the Keswick doctrine, is more accurate (cf. pg. xxix, *Holiness: Its Nature, Hindrances, Difficulties and Roots*, J. C. Ryle. London: William Hunt and Company, 1889).

Barabas may perhaps be cleared somewhat from historical revisionism in that he only implies that Walter Marshall and William Romaine taught Keswick theology, without actually stating it. In the midst of his discussion of the actual origination of Keswick theology by the Pearsall Smiths, he cites Romaine and also Griffith-Thomas's claim that the essentials of Keswick are found in Marshall. The only specific claim Barabas himself makes for Marshall and Romaine is that the men taught "the possibility of fellowship with Christ closer than than enjoyed by the generality of Christians" (pg. 16, *So Great Salvation*). Of course, an affirmation that Christians can walk more closely with God could be made for just about every devotional book ever written in Christendom. The reader will naturally assume that Barabas is not just making an empty affirmation that Marshall and Romaine wrote books that explained how one could draw closer to God but that the two men actually taught Keswick theology. It is uncertain whether Barabas qualified his specific affirmations simply because he wrote carelessly or because he knew that neither Marshall nor Romaine actually taught Keswick doctrine.

Contrast Barabas's inaccurate and hagiographical explanation of the development of the Keswick movement with B. B. Warfield's accurate one, where the widespread influence of both Mr. and Mrs. Smith, and their connection to earlier and later errors in sanctification, is carefully documented ("The 'Higher Life' Movement," Chapter 4 in *Perfectionism, vol. 2*, Benjamin B. Warfield, pgs. 463-558. Note also Chapter 5, "The Victorious Life," pgs. 559-611; and Chapter 1, pgs. 3-218, "Oberlin Perfectionism," which examines the perfectionist errors of Mahan, Finney, and others.).

[1515] Pg. 224, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Its Method, and Its Men*, ed. Charles Harford.

[1516] Thomas á Kempis, out of his "monastic formation," zealously practiced the anti-Christian piety that springs from the Roman Catholic false gospel. Thomas loved:

> Marian devotion . . . [believed in] the sacrificial character of the Eucharist . . . "meritorious" works . . . [and] den[ied] the crucial importance of Christ's mediatorship and sacrifice. . . . [In his writings, such as] *The Imitation of Christ* . . . the atoning significance of Christ's work is overshadowed by the exemplary perspective . . . the Holy Spirit . . . remains unmentioned . . . throughout . . . [Thomas has] little to say . . . about the Lord Jesus as a ransom and as our righteousness . . . [he] cannot be considered a fore-runner of the Reformation . . . [but] brokers . . . ideas that are characteristically Roman Catholic" (pgs. 97-102, *Sweet*

Lawrence,"[1517] and especially the Catholic mystical quietist "Madame Guyon."[1518] Catholics and Quakers were essential theological background for the rise for the rise of the Keswick movement.

The "Higher Life teaching . . . [in] the books of the American religious leaders, T. C. Upham and Asa Mahan . . . [and] W. E. Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*"[1519] are also undisputed theological background for the development of the Keswick theology; Barabas thus recognizes Thomas C. Upham as a Keswick antecedent.[1520] He notes without a hint of criticism that Upham wrote *Life and Religious Experience of Madame Guyon*, a book which Barabas affirms contributed to "the interest of the Church in the subject of sanctification and the Spirit-filled life," as did other works of Upham.[1521] What, then, was Upham's theology? Upham "experienced [entire] sanctification under Phoebe Palmer's influence and gave popular expression to the doctrine in a series of books drawing . . . explicitly on Catholic mysticism and Quietism."[1522] Upham taught, in addition to his Quietistic and Romanist Higher Life doctrine of sanctification associated with Wesleyan perfectionism and Pelagianism, that God was a duality of Father and Mother instead of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. However, this Duality became a Trinity through the appearance of a Son, who is identified with the created order itself. Upham saught to prove this gross idolatry from sources ranging from ancient Gnostics such as Valentinus and Heracleon, to the Jewish Cabala, to assorted other later heretics and perfectionists. He blasphemously wrote:

> God is both Fatherhood and Motherhood . . . from the eternal Fatherhood and Motherhood . . . all things proceed. [A] Maternal Principle . . . Sophia . . . [exists] in the Divine nature[.] . . . [T]he Jewish Cabala . . . [speaks of] a feminine deity . . . called Sophia. . . . John's Gospel . . . identif[ies] the Logos and the Sophia. . . . Sophia . . . was God; not only *with* God, but *was* God. . .

Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation, Arie de Reuver).

It is, therefore, not surprising that "Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuit order[,] . . . was accustomed to reading a chapter in the book [*The Imitation of Christ*] daily" (pgs. 74-75, *ibid*).

1517 Pg. 223, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford; cf. pg. 482, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875, for testimony to discovery of the Higher Life through "Brother Lawrence" at Brighton.

1518 Pg. 223, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford.

1519 Pg. 16, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. The wider background to the Keswick Convention included the "work of such figures as Charles Finney; Asa Mahan; W. E. Boardman; Hannah Whitall Smith and her husband, Robert Pearsall Smith; Charles Cullis; and others" from the Wesleyan, Oberlin, and Higher Life perfectionisms and continuationisms (pg. 104, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton); thus, for example, as noted in more detail below, both the persons and books of Mahan and Boardman were promoted at the Oxford Convention (e. g., pg. 90, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

1520 Pg. 16, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1521 Pg. 16, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1522 Pg. 81, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

> . [T]he somewhat mystic words of the Apostle John . . . [are] the announcement of the infinite Paternity and the infinite Motherhood. . . . Valentinus . . . speaks of the Aeon Sophia . . . [T]he mystics and Quietists . . . recognized . . . the divine Sophia[.] . . . [T]he Sophia . . . or Maternal Essentia or Personality of the Godhead . . . incarnated itself in Christ . . . caused him, in a mother's Spirit though in a male form, to endure his great sufferings[.] . . . [T]he Familists . . . recognize the Maternal Principle as a true and distinct Personality in the Godhead. . . . [The] Shakers . . . [and] Bible Communists . . . [recognize] that the Divine Nature is dual in its personalities . . . and includes the fact of a divine maternity[.] . . . [T]he Catholic Church is often regarded . . . as embodying the idea of the Motherhood element which exists in the Infinite, in its recognition of the holy or deific nature of Mary . . . and in the high honors, and even worship, which it is understood to render to her. . . . [U]nder the influence of inward suggestions, which I will not stop to explain and define . . . [and to] the thoughtful mind . . . the duality of the Divine Existence, written everywhere in the book of nature, necessitates a Trinity. . . . we must supplement the eternal Fatherhood and Motherhood by the eternal Son . . . the great and unceasing out-birth of the Divine Duality. . . . Generically, or considered in the whole of its extent, the trinal out-birth, otherwise called the Son of God, without which the eternal Fatherhood and Motherhood could have neither name nor power nor meaning, is the whole of creation from its lowest to its highest form. . . . [N]ot an insect that floats in the air, nor a fish that swims in the sea, nor a bird that sings in the forests, nor a wild beast that roams on the mountains; not one is or by any possibility can be shut out and excluded from the meaning and the fact of the divine Sonship[.] . . . All living nature then . . . constitutes the Son of God.[1523]

Upham continues to develop his stomach-turning idolatry in the subsequent pages of his book, but the quotation above is enough, if not far more than enough, of a sampling of his vile and devilish nonsense to give the sense of his doctrine. Despite being an unconverted idolator, he was very influential:

> Upham . . . became a Methodist holiness leader after contact with Phoebe Palmer. He studied Fenelon and Guyon, writing a biography of the latter entitled *Life, Religious Opinions, and Experience of Madame Guyon*. His [works] . . . influenced much of nineteenth and early twentieth century thinking on faith, including A. B. Simpson . . . leade[r] of [the] CMA [Christian & Missionary Alliance].[1524]

Like many other Higher Life writers, Upham also emphasized ecumenicalism and sought to prepare for the one-world religious system of Revelation 17. "On the basis of his experience of the baptism of the Spirit, T. C. Upham proposed the foundation of a League of Nations."[1525] Such a man was Keswick antecedent Thomas Upham.

Barabas also recognizes Asa Mahan, leader of the Oberlin perfectionism, as a Keswick antecedent.[1526] The Oberlin perfectionism of Asa Mahan and his mentor

---

1523 Pgs. 49-78, *Absolute Religion*, Thomas C. Upham. New York, NY: Putnam, 1873, pgs. 45-67; cf. also pgs. 337-459, Warfield, *Perfectionism* vol. 2. Italics in original. The "inward suggestions" Upham speaks of came from the devil, who worked through the Higher Life preacher's corrupt and unregenerate nature.

1524 Pg. 43, *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary Word of Faith Theologies*, Paul L. King. See also "The Mystical Perfectionism of Thomas Cogwell Upham," Chapter 3 in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield.

1525 Pg. 21, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

1526 Pg. 16, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

Charles Finney were indeed important to the rise of the Keswick system,[1527] and were recognized by Keswick as essential historical background for the genesis of their doctrine. "In 1872, [Mahan] moved to England and directly influenced the Keswick movement by his leadership in the Oxford and Brighton Conferences that immediately preceded the first Keswick Convention."[1528] Mahan's books were widely propogated in Higher Life circles, so that "Keswick writers . . . often mention or quote Asa Mahan . . . and Charles G. Finney."[1529] Indeed, "none . . . of . . . the 'conversational meetings' at Oxford . . . . was of more interest than that . . . under the guidance of Asa Mahan," who strongly taught orally the necessity of Christians receiving Spirit baptism, as he had already proclaimed in his book *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*.[1530] As a consequence of Mahan's "pressing upon" people, "[d]ay after day," the necessity of Christians receiving Spirit baptism, "a[n] . . . experience we should not and must not be without," "many . . . realised in his conversational meetings the baptism" and entered into Mahan's experience.[1531] Likewise, at "the Brighton Convention (of which he was one of the conveners) Mahan directed a series of sectional meetings . . . crowded to overflowing . . . [e]ach afternoon,"[1532] proclaiming post-conversion Spirit baptism. "Mahan carried the message" of the necessity of a post-conversion "Baptism of the Holy Ghost . . . to the Oxford (1874) and Brighton (1875) meetings from which the Keswick movements emerged . . . he spoke and led very popular seminars on the subject,"[1533] leading many into his second blessing Baptism experience,[1534] as Robert P. Smith and others led many to adopt the doctrine of the "physical thrills" of a post-conversion erotic Spirit baptism

---

[1527] Compare A. T. Pierson's recognition of Finney as a Higher Life antecedent and promulgator of the libertarian "liberty of the Human Will, in salvation and sanctification," so that all effectual influences of the Holy Spirit on the human will, and compatiblist views of freedom, were rejected (pg. 10, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Pierson).

[1528] Pgs. 98-99, *Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology*, Andrew Naselli; pgs. 18-24, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1529] Pg. 251, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

[1530] Compare pgs. 49, 81-83, 141-143, 192, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

[1531] Pg. 143, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; cf. pgs. 176, 192, 215, 241, 278, 333, 341, 356, 360, 369, 371-372, 376, 381.

[1532] Dayton, Donald W., "Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology," Donald Dayton. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1974): 60-69; cf. pg. 141, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874 & pgs. 383-385, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1533] Pgs. 46-47, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan.

[1534] Pgs. 384-385, 457, 466-469, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton*.

through the propogation of this doctrine at Oxford and elsewhere. Indeed, as Mahan and Robert P. Smith explained, the "object of the . . . Meeting at Oxford . . . was to lead Christians to . . . [be] baptised with the Holy Ghost."[1535] William "Boardman . . . link[ed] up with Mahan to conduct revivals in both America and Britain, and both were to have a direct influence on the spiritual and theological direction of the Keswick Conferences."[1536]

Mahan, as "the major architect . . . of the controversial 'Oberlin Perfectionism,'"[1537] in addition to teaching "the immediate attainment of entire sanctification by a special act of faith directed to this end,"[1538] denied the doctrine of original sin[1539] and promulgated other heresies along with the perfectionism of his mentor and colleague Charles Finney at Oberlin College.[1540] Mahan's development of the post-conversion crisis of sanctification and Spirit baptism contributed greatly to the "rise of modern Pentecostalism . . . [i]t is not surprising that modern Pentecostalism should sprout in th[e] well prepared ground" of the heterodox Oberlin holiness and pneumatological doctrines powerfully promulgated by Mahan, and, through his influence, "there seem to be several instances of this experience [of tongues] in holiness circles between 1870 and the outbreak of Pentecostalism in 1900."[1541]

Finney, whose theology helped to destroy the Second Great Awakening and hinder subsequent revival,[1542] likewise taught at Oberlin a Pelagian view of sin while denying substitutionary atonement in favor of the governmental atonement heresy,[1543] among other damnable heresies. For Finney, the "atonement . . . was not a commercial transaction . . . [not] the payment of a debt . . . [but] was intended as a satisfaction of public justice."[1544] He also wrote:

1535 Pg. 19, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

1536 "Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. http://www.pneumafoundation.org.

1537 "Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology," Donald W. Dayton. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1974): 60-69.

1538 Pg. 67, *Perfectionism* vol. 2, Warfield.

1539 Pg. 126, *Perfectionism* vol. 2, Warfield.

1540 Compare pgs. 1-218, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, Warfield.

1541 "Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology," Donald W. Dayton.

1542 See "Considerations on Revival in American History," by Thomas Ross. Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

1543 Compare pg. 102, the *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology,* Walter Elwell, ed., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1984, and pgs. 312-330, *Lectures in Systematic Theology,* Henry C. Thiessen, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949, for a statement and a refutation of the governmental theory.

1544 Pgs. 219-222, *Finney's Systematic Theology*, Charles Finney.

> Moral depravity . . . cannot consist . . . in a sinful constitution . . . [or] an attribute of human nature . . . [m]oral depravity is not then to be accounted for by ascribing it to a nature or constitution sinful in itself. To talk of a sinful nature, or sinful constitution, in the sense of physical sinfulness, is to ascribe sinfulness to the Creator, who is the author of nature. . . . What ground is there for the assertion that Adam's nature became in itself sinful by the fall? This is a groundless, not to say ridiculous, assumption, and an absurdity. . . . This doctrine is . . . an abomination alike to God and the human intellect.[1545]

Furthermore, Finney's denial of substitutionary atonement led him to reject justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ to teach salvation by personal obedience: "If [Christ] obeyed the law as our substitute, then why should our own return to personal obedience be insisted upon as a *sine qua non* of our salvation?"[1546] Finney plainly stated that the truth of justification by faith alone based on the imputed righteousness of Christ (Romans 3:19-28) was a different gospel from the one he believed and taught. By rejecting the true gospel, Finney indicated that he was an accursed false teacher who suffered eternal damnation (Galatians 1:8-9). In his *Systematic Theology*, Finney accurately summarized the true gospel and then plainly rejected it:

> Those who hold that justification by imputed righteousness is a forensic proceeding, take a view of final or ultimate justification, according with their view of the transaction. With them, faith receives an imputed righteousness, and a judicial justification. The first act of faith, according to them, introduces the sinner into this relation, and obtains for him a perpetual justification. They maintain that after this first act of faith it is impossible for the sinner to come into condemnation; that, being once justified, he is always thereafter justified, whatever he may do; indeed that he is never justified by grace, as to sins that are past, upon condition that he ceases to sin; that Christ's righteousness is the ground, and that his own present obedience is not even a condition of his justification, so that, in fact, his own present or future obedience to the law of God is, in no case, and in no sense, a *sine qua non*[1547] of his justification, present or ultimate. Now this is certainly another gospel from the one I am inculcating. It is not a difference merely upon some speculative or theoretic point. It is a point fundamental to the gospel and to salvation, if any one can be. Let us therefore see which of these is the true gospel. I object to this view of justification[.] . . . The doctrine of a literal imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity . . . [and] of the literal imputation of Christ's righteousness or obedience to the elect, and the consequent perpetual justification of all that are converted from the first exercise of faith, whatever their subsequent life may be—I say I regard these dogmas as fabulous, and better befitting a romance than a system of theology.[1548]

Finney called men to surrender to Christ because, as befit his doctrine of salvation by personal obedience and rejection of the eternal security of the believer, perfect consecration of life and his version of sinless perfection were an essential condition for entrance into heaven:

> We shall see that perseverance in obedience to the end of life is also a condition of justification . . . present, full, and entire consecration of heart and life to God and His service, is an unalterable condition of present pardon of past sin, and of present acceptance with God. . . . [T]he penitent soul remains justified no longer than this full-hearted consecration continues.[1549]

1545 Pgs. 249-250, 261-263, *Finney's Systematic Theology*, Charles Finney.

1546 Pg. 218, *Finney's Systematic Theology*, Charles Finney.

1547 Latin for "an essential condition."

1548 Pgs. 369-371, *Finney's Systematic Theology*, Charles Finney.

1549 Pgs. 367, 369, *Finney's Systematic Theology*, Charles Finney.

Mahan and Finney's false gospel were intimately bound up with their perfectionism. The perfectionist doctrine of sanctification promulgated by Finney and Mahan was very influential in the development of the Keswick theology, both through Mahan's personal preaching and through the books of both men:

> The links between Keswick and New School revivalism [Oberlin perfectionism] were many. Both Mahan and Boardman's involvement in the Oxford and Brighton conferences helped unify the higher life aspirations arising from the "Oberlizing of England." Furthermore, the Reverend John Moore was close friends with Charles Finney, a relationship which no doubt had influence on his son, C. G. Moore, one of the early Keswick speakers.[1550]

The rationale of Old School opposition to Finney and Mahan is noteworthy:

> Old School advocates . . . opposed the "second blessing" heresy [of Finney and Mahan] because [they] believed it not only violated the . . . doctrine of depravity, but that it adopted the modernist reliance of human ability. The concern of Old School advocates was that New School proponents were being unduly influenced by German liberal theology, particularly in the elevation of humanist philosophy. . . . New School theology was not only influenced by the rational pragmatism of the nineteenth century, particularly in the new measure procedures, but . . . the emphasis upon human responsibility in [the] New School . . .was the direct result of modernist thought.[1551]

Indeed, "[f]rom . . . the person and work of Charles Finney . . . the line is a straight one that leads through the holiness movement directly into Pentecostalism."[1552] Such were Asa Mahan and Charles Finney, architects of the Oberlin perfectionism and antecedents to the Keswick theology. Sadly, Stephen Barabas, with criminal neglect, suppresses, fails to warn of, and breaths not a whisper about the heresies of Keswick antecedents such as Thomas Upham and Asa Mahan, just as he entirely ignores the heresies, false gospel, and demonism associated with Hannah and Robert P. Smith.

While earlier perfectionist heretics were important, Barabas recognizes that "the Keswick movement had its [actual] genesis . . . [through] Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pearsall Smith [and the influence of three of their books, including Mrs. Smith's] *The Record of a Happy Life*,"[1553] after "Conferences . . . at Broadlands . . . Oxford . . . [and] Brighton.

1550 "Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. http://www.pneumafoundation.org. Quotation marks from Althouse's quote of Bundy have been removed.

1551 "Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation.

1552 Pg. 42, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit*, Bruner.

1553 Pgs. 15-16, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas; cf. pg. 193, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

One must not confuse Mrs. Smith's memoir of her son Frank, who died at eighteen years of age (cf. pgs. 33-37, *Remarkable Relations*, by Barbara Strachey), entitled *The Record of a Happy Life* (New York, 1873), with Mrs. Smith's classic statement of Higher Life doctrine, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* (Boston, 1875; often reprinted); one hopes that Barabas has not done so, but has simply cited Mrs. Smith's far less influential biography of her son for some reason instead of her far more influential Keswick classic. Both works do contain Higher Life theology.

Robert and Hannah [Smith] were at the very center of it all."[1554] Barabas provides not a whisper of warning about Mrs. Smith's universalism and other poisonous false doctrines, despite repeatedly citing her book *My Spiritual Autobiography: How I Discovered The Unselfishness of God*, which she wrote specifically to turn people from Christian orthodoxy to heresy, and where her universalist heresy is blatently and grossly set forth.[1555] In any case, it is clear that "the first steps . . . [towards] [t]he Keswick Convention . . . owe . . . everything to a Quaker glass manufacturer from Philadelphia, Robert Pearsall Smith[.]"[1556] Mr. Smith "was instrumental, not only in establishing Keswick as a perennial convention, but also in introducing the Keswick emphases back into the United States."[1557] Barabas indicates that "[b]oth [the Smiths] were born and bred Quakers,"[1558] having "always held the Quaker teaching concerning the Inner Light and passivity."[1559] They brought their Quaker theology and other distinctive heresies into the Keswick movement which they founded.

The "new revelation [of the Keswick theology of sanctification] came to Mrs. Pearsall Smith about 1867. . . . At first her husband . . . was somewhat frightened . . . thinking she had gone off into heresy . . . [but then he] came into her experience when she called his attention to Romans vi. 6."[1560] Unfortunately, Mrs. Smith did not interpret Romans 6:6 correctly, and she led her husband into an erroneous view of the verse as well. The erroneous interpretation of Romans six adopted by Hannah and Robert P. Smith continued to dominate the Keswick convention for many decades:

> In the history of the Keswick Convention, if one passage of Scripture is to be identified as playing a larger role than any other, it would have to be Romans chapter 6. Evan Hopkins said at the thirty-first Convention that no passage of Scripture was more frequently to the fore at Keswick than this one. Steven Barabas finds himself not only agreeing with this statement but adding: "it is doubtful whether a Keswick Convention has ever been held in which one or more speakers did not deal with Romans 6. . . . There is no understanding of Keswick without an appreciation of the place accorded by it to this chapter in its whole scheme of sanctification." The key to this chapter, in the early Keswick teaching . . . [of] Robert Pearsall Smith and his wife Hannah . . . is verse 6.[1561]

1554 Pg. 13, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

1555 Pgs. 17-18, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Compare the discussion of Hannah W. Smith and her writings above.

1556 Pg. 920, "A Hundred Years of Keswick," John Pollock. *Christianity Today* 19:18 (20 June 1975): 6-8.

1557 Pg. 86, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

1558 Pg. 17, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1559 Pg. 316, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, D. M. Lloyd-Jones.

1560 Pg. 18, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1561 pgs. 228-229, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall, citing pg. 94, *The Keswick Week*, 1906, & *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

The misinterpretation of Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith "was largely unchallenged from the Keswick platform until 1965 when John Stott gave Bible Readings on Romans 5-8."[1562] It was very easy for the Smiths to misinterpret Scripture because "[n]either of [the Smiths] had any training in theology,"[1563] in keeping with their Quaker backgrounds; for example, Hannah Smith testified: "[A]s a Quaker, I had no doctrinal teaching . . . I knew literally nothing of theology, and had never heard any theological terms" since in her youth "no doctrines or dogmas were ever taught us . . . a creature more utterly ignorant of all so-called religious truth . . . could hardly be conceived of in these modern times [that is, in 1902]. The whole religious question for me was simply whether I was good enough to go to heaven, or so naughty as to deserve hell."[1564] Despite woeful ignorance of theology and an inability to accurately exegete Scripture, following Hannah's lead, both Mr. and Mrs. Smith embraced and began to zealously propogate the doctrines of the Higher Life that were enshrined in the Keswick movement.

From its "beginning . . . some of the foremost leaders of the Church attacked [the Keswick doctrine] as being dangerously heretical."[1565] Indeed, "the opposition the work was subjected to at the beginning, even from Evangelical clergy,"[1566] was extreme, so that, indeed, the Keswick theology was "looked upon with the gravest suspicion by those who were considered as the leaders of the Evangelical section of the Church."[1567] Consequently, "very few Evangelical leaders ever attended . . . the Keswick Convention . . . which was quite an independent movement," since "the leading Evangelicals held aloof and viewed it with undisguised suspicion," and evangelicals "openly denounced it as dangerous heresy."[1568] Evangelical opposition to Keswick was intense because the founders of Keswick seriously compromised and corrupted or even outright denied the

---

[1562] pg. 234, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. "Increasingly, the teaching at Keswick in the later decades of the twentieth century would owe more to traditional Reformed thinking about sanctification as a process than to Keswick's nineteenth-century and earlier twentieth-century views . . . [t]he change in emphasis can be traced by looking at the way in which expositions of the letter to the Romans were given" (pg. 80, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

[1563] Pg. 18, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1564] Pgs. 163, 45, *The Unselfishness of God*, Hannah W. Smith. Princeton, NJ: Littlebrook, 1987. Note Hannah's false gospel of salvation by works.

[1565] Pg. 5, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1566] pg. 168, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1567] Pg. 162, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford. The specific reference in the quotation is to the leaders of evangelical Anglicanism, but what was true of them was so much the more true of English nonconformity.

[1568] Pgs. 193, 127, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*, John B. Harford & Frederick C. Macdonald.

evangel,[1569] the gospel. For example, Hannah believed, among other damnable heresies, that every single person would be saved, denied justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ, the sole authority of Scripture, and the new birth. Robert, while formally adopting a weak and wobbly concept of justification by faith for a time, instead of simply rejecting that core gospel doctrine as he had before, continued to reject eternal security and tied his Higher Life theology into his opposition to the preservation of the saints. Warfield describes Robert Smith's argument against progressive sanctification being incomplete until death, and its connection to Arminianism, as propounded by Smith at the Oxford Union Meeting of 1874, as follows:

> Smith, in the very same spirit, exhorted his hearers not to put an arbitrary limitation on the power of God by postponing the completion of their salvation to the end of their "pilgrimage," and so virtually attributing to death the sanctifying work which they ought to find rather in Christ. "Shall not Christ do more for you than death?" he demands, and then he develops a *reductio ad absurdum*. We expect a dying grace by which we shall be really made perfect. How long before death is the reception of such a grace possible? "An hour? A day? Peradventure a week? Possibly two or three weeks, if you are very ill? One good man granted this position until the period of six weeks was reached, but then said that more than six weeks of such living" — that is, of course, living in entire consecration and full trust, with its accompanying "victory"—"was utterly impossible!" "Are your views as to the limitations of dying grace," he inquires, "only less absurd because less definite?" The absurdity lies, however, only in the assumption of this "dying grace" . . . Smith describes it as "a state of complete trust to be arrived at, but not until death." The Scriptures know of no such thing; they demand complete trust from all alike, as the very first step of the conscious Christian life. It finds its real source in the Arminian notion that our salvation depends on our momentary state of mind and will at that particular moment. Whether we are ultimately saved or not will depend, then, on whether death catches us in a state of grace or fallen from grace. Our eternal future, thus, hangs quite absolutely on the state of mind we happen (happen is the right word here) to be in at the moment of death: nothing behind this momentary state of mind can come into direct consideration. This absurd over-estimate of the importance of the moment of dying is the direct consequence of the rejection of the Bible doctrine of Perseverance and the substitution for it of a doctrine of Perfection as the meaning of Christ being our Saviour to the uttermost. The real meaning of this great declaration is just that to trust in Jesus is to trust in One who is able and willing and sure to save to the uttermost — to the uttermost limit of the progress of salvation. Death in this conception of the saving Christ loses the factitious significance which has been given to it. Our momentary state of mind at the moment of death is of no more importance than our momentary state of mind at any other instant. We do not rest on our state of mind, but on Christ, and all that is important is that we are "in Christ Jesus." He is able to save to the uttermost, and faithful is He that calls us, who also will do it. He does it in His own way, of course; and that way is by process—whom He calls He justifies, and whom He justifies He glorifies. *He* does it; and therefore we know that our glorification is as safe in His hands as is any other step of our salvation. To be progressively saved is, of course, to postpone the completion of our salvation to the end of the process. Expecting the end of the process only at the time appointed for it is no limitation upon the power of the Saviour; and looking upon death as the close of the process is a very different thing from looking upon death as a Saviour.[1570]

1569 εὐαγγέλιον.

1570 Chapter 4, "The Higher Life Movement," in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield; see pgs. 55-57, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

Hannah W. Smith also believed, at least for a while, that Christ was the "redeemer . . . from past sins" who will only "redeem . . . from all future sins . . . if [one] will . . . submit . . . wholly to Him,"[1571] a clear anti-eternal security position; however, since she had become a universalist before becoming a Keswick preacher, denying eternal security had became largely a moot point for her. Since Robert and Hannah Smith held extremely compromised views of the gospel, and Hannah even avowed, "I *cannot* enjoy close contact with [those who] . . . preac[h] . . . a pure gospel,"[1572] it was not surprising that those who loved the true and pure gospel violently opposed the Keswick movement.

Furthermore, "Robert . . . did not try to convert unbelievers; his call was to [preach] a state of Holiness in those who already believed, whatever their creed."[1573] What is more, both Robert and Hannah Smith "belie[ved] in the inner light [doctrine of Quakerism,] to which they [were] . . . united in sentiment. . . . Mr. P. Smith [and his wife's writings] embod[y] the mysticism of Madame Guyon and the medieval mystics, as well as the semi-Pelagianism of Professor Upham."[1574] Consequently, both Mr. and Mrs. Smith rejected *sola Scriptura*—Robert, for example, proclaimed: "I get one half of my theology from the Bible, and the other half by watching my children," citing "Coleridge" as support for this astonishing affirmation.[1575] Both the Smiths also anticipated Word of Faith heresies.[1576] The demonism and spiritualism of the Mount-Temples and their influence on the Smiths and Keswick through the Broadlands Conferences also constituted a matter of grave concern. Evangelical rejection of Keswick theology was entirely natural. Nevertheless, despite vociferous and continuing evangelical opposition, both Mr. and Mrs. Smith began to preach to large audiences a "doctrine of sanctification

---

[1571] Journal, April 7, 1852, reproduced in the entry for January 12 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[1572] Pg. 29, *Remarkable Relations*, Strachey; Italics in original.

[1573] Pg. 42, *Remarkable Relations*, Barbara Strachey. Robert Smith's call was "communicating" the Higher Life "to Christians of all names and connections alike" ("Die Heiligungsbewegung," Chapter 6, *Perfectionism*, B. B. Warfield, vol. 1).

[1574] Pg. 102, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875.

[1575] Pg. 118, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Likewise, Hannah W. Smith preached at the Broadlands Conference: "I have learnt to know God in my nursery with my children on my lap" (pg. 222, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.).

[1576] For example, Robert preached at the Oxford Convention: "*[B]e sure to say [Christian language] aloud*—there is marvelous power reflected by thoughts put into spoken words. Keep on saying [such language], even when the heart rebels" (pg. 221, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; cf. pg. 42). Hannah similarly advised: "[I]f thee continually talks of thyself as being old, thee may perhaps bring on some of the infirmities of age" (pg. 187, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reproducing *Letter to her Daughter, Mary Berreneson*, March 5, 1907).

by faith [alone that had been] allowed to lie dormant for centuries, unknown and unappreciated . . . it remained for Keswick to call the attention of the Church to it."[1577]

Specifically, the Keswick form of the Higher Life theology was formulated through the central influence of Hannah W. and Robert P. Smith at the Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions that immediately preceded the first Keswick Convention. The first and following Broadlands Conferences was held at the invitation of the dedicated spiritualists Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple, and all sorts of infernal spirits, doctrinal differences, and heresies were always present. Speakers included the universalist George MacDonald, who received his prominent speaking position at the direction of his good spiritualist[1578] friends[1579] the Mount-Temples.[1580] He became good friends with fellow universalist Hannah W. Smith.[1581] Nonetheless, while Christian

---

[1577] Pg. 107, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas qualifies his admission that the Keswick doctrine of sanctification was unknown for centuries with the statement "except by a few isolated Christians," since to admit that the Keswick doctrine was unknown to the church of God for over 1800 years would lead to severe doubts about its character. None of these alleged "few isolated Christians" who believed in the Keswick doctrine before the latter portion of the nineteenth century are named, nor do they appear to have provided any written evidence that they ever existed, unless Barabas views idolators like Upham as Christians speaks of them.

It should also be noted that it is more appropriate to denominate the distinctively Keswick position "sanctification by faith alone" rather than simply "sanctification by faith," because the fact that without faith it is impossible to please God or be progressively sanctified is obvious and non-controversial on just about any position on sanctification that is adopted by those who recognize the authority of the Bible.

[1578] "Lord and Lady Mount Temple" determined that MacDonald should "have an hour all to himself" to address the Holiness Conference participants. (Circular letter, Broadlands, & December 30-31, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter); cf. pg. 33, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. MacDonald was perfectly aware of the spirititualism of the Mount-Temples; he wrote, e. g., to his wife about how he witnessed a medium at Broadlands winning a convert to spiritualism by employing her supernatural powers (pg. 26, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982).

[1579] Cf. pg. 27, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1580] E. g., Mrs. Smith recorded the events of another conference at Broadlands in 1887 where George MacDonald taught (pg. 98, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, reprinting a Letter to Her Friends of August 1887).

[1581] The friendship between Mrs. Smith and Mr. MacDonald continued for many years; for example, in 1893 he was her guest at her home, and she wrote of him: "George MacDonald . . . is the dearest old man, so gentle and yet so strong, and with such a marvellous insight into spiritual things. . . . [H]e has done a beautiful work in the world" (pg. 120, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith; from Letter to Her Friends, September 11, 1893). Hannah recommended George MacDonald's book *Diary of an Old Soul* to her daughter Mary, affirming that it "will help you" (Letter to Mary, January 27, 1883, reproduced in the entry for December 9 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Hannah wrote of her great "unity" with "George MacDonald," that they "got very close," and affirmed: "It has been a sort of dream of my life to . . . sit at the feet of [him]," as she was able to do at the Holiness Conferences at Broadlands. MacDonald was a welcome presence and speaker at English Holiness Conferences, for if Hannah W. Smith's universalism was no barrier to her, neither was his universalism a barrier to him—indeed, to Mrs. Mount-Temple, universalism was a reason to receive

orthodoxy was by no means held in common by the Broadlands speakers, "[t]he 'Seed,' of which George Fox spoke, was rooted in them all,"[1582] and those in "the Society of Friends"[1583] rejoiced at the messages brought, as did the spiritualist Mount-Temples, who continued their very influential patronage of Mr. and Mrs. Smith. At the first and flagship 1874 Broadlands Convention Robert "Pearsall Smith was chairman and principal speaker, though, before the week was done, it became evident that his wife, Hannah Whitall Smith, was a herald of the evangel they carried yet more effective than himself."[1584] She was the chief of the Broadlands preachers.[1585] Further Conventions, along the same lines and led by Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith, were held at Oxford and Brighton[1586] with ever-larger attendance.[1587] Mrs. Smith was an overwhelmingly captivating preacher, for at those "Conferences at Oxford and Brighton . . . no hall was large enough to accommodate the crowds that flocked to hear her."[1588] The meetings reminded Hannah W. Smith and others "of the days when George Fox," the founder of the Quakers, saw countless numbers "convinced . . . during . . . his meetings," or of the "wonderful Yearly Meetings" that took place in the days of the prominent Quakers "Elisabeth Fry and Joseph John Gurney."[1589] Following these Conventions, meetings specifically in the English town of Keswick, from which the new doctrine preached by

---

promotion and influence (Circular letter, Broadlands, & December 30-31, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

[1582] Pg. 62, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie.

[1583] Pg. 64, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie.

[1584] Pg. 64, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie.

[1585] Note, e. g., that a list of Broadlands Conference speakers and attendees places the Smiths first, following only the hosts, Lord and Lady Mount-Temple (pg. 34-35, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Cf. pgs. 186-187, where in the list of participants in the last Conference of 1888, she is prominent again, the first woman in the list after the Mount-Temples.). "Amongst the speakers [the Broadlands historian] think[s] first of Mrs. Pearsall Smith[.] . . . 'The angel of the churches,' Lady Mount-Temple used to call her" (pgs. 48-49, *ibid*).

[1586] "The most popular sessions of the Brighton Convention were those in which Hannah [W. Smith] preached her practical secrets of the happy Christian life to audiences of 5,000 or more, mostly clergymen who were theologically opposed [correctly, 1 Timothy 2:9-15; 1 Corinthians 14:34-37] to the preaching ministry of women" ("Smith, Hannah W. & Smith, Robert Pearsall," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals,* ed. Timothy Larsen).

[1587] Approximately eight thousand attended the Brighton Convention from around twenty-three countries (pg. 23, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas).

[1588] Pg. 124, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1589] Letter to Father and Mother, June 9, 1875, reproduced in the entry for July 26 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter. Compare the articles on Elisabeth Fry and Joseph John Gurney in *The Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

the Smiths came to obtain its name, were proposed in 1875. An Anglican minister,[1590] "Canon T. D. Harford Battersby . . . [who] . . . was part of an old and well-to-do west-

[1590] Barabas, who fails to mention that the Anglican minister in question, T. D. Harford-Battersby, had a Quaker background, does record that Harford-Battersby had made the theological rounds from apostate Anglo-Catholicism, to modernistic and evolutionary Anglican broad-churchism, to more evangelical Anglican low-churchism that was "strongly influenced by English Methodism" (pgs. 15, 24-25, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas). One hopes that Mr. Harford-Battersby did not just adopt better theology than the Anglo-Catholic and modernistic heresies that he had formerly followed but was himself personally born again after turning to Anglican low-churchism, although Barabas makes no mention of such an event. Indeed, Harford-Battersby's two hundred and thirty page biography only states that he "he drew by degrees, but steadily, towards a calm and firm settlement in what are known as evangelical beliefs" (pg. x, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford), "[b]eginning as a Tractarian, [but] little by little be[ing] led to Evangelical views" (pg. 75, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). Not a single sentence of the biography of Battersby mentions a new birth experience associated with his rejection of high-Anglican or Tractarian heresies.

It is not at all a good sign that the only record of anything like a conversion to Christ in Harford-Battersby's biography is his own testimony that he first began to repent and believe when he received confirmation. He wrote:

> I had little of Christian principle. I was altogether a thoughtless, vile creature. I . . . was plunged . . . into idleness and dissipation . . . justly might I have been cut off in the midst of this course, but the Lord most graciously kept me[.] . . . [In] the care and goodness of God to me[,] He so ordained it that confirmation should come very soon[.] . . . Then I first learned to turn my thoughts really towards heaven, to repent, and believe in Jesus. (pg. 6, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford)

Harford-Battersby thus indicates that he was a vile person, full of idleness and dissipation, but the Lord graciously kept him alive until he received the rite of confirmation, through which he came to repent and believe in Jesus. Belief in such a ritualistic false gospel in his allegedly more evangelical and non-Tractarian childhood would provide an easy explanation for his ability to adopt the Roman Catholic heresies taught by (the later Roman Catholic Cardinal) Newman and the other high-Anglican Tractarians at Oxford during Harford-Battersby's college days, such as a "visible church with sacraments and rites, which are the channels of invisible grace, an episcopal dynasty descended from the apostles, [and] an obligatory body of doctrine, to be found in Scripture, but only recognised there by the aid of Church tradition" (pgs. 24-25, *Memoir*). "Mr. Battersby came under the spell. He missed no opportunity of hearing, not only Newman himself, but Manning and Pusey, and other leaders of the [Anglo-Catholic] movement. He discussed the sermons with his friends. He wrote about them in his letters home, and thus drew down upon himself grave warnings from his father as to the dangers of Romanising views" (pgs. 28-29, *ibid*). Thus, one can hope against hope that Harford-Battersby was indeed born again at some point, but there is certainly no mention of such an event at any point in his biography. Neither in his childhood before he adopted—which a true Christian will not do—an accursed sacramental false gospel (Galatians 1:8-9), nor after his entry into Anglican holy orders, when he "elected to begin ministerial work in a High Church parish" where baptismal regeneration and other sacramental heresies were taught because of his "admiration for Newman and the other leaders of the Oxford movement," (pg. 52, cf. 43ff, *ibid*), is there any evidence at all of a genuine conversion. All that is recorded is that he gradually abandoned ritualism for rationalism and the broad-church Anglicanism of Frederick Myers, the curate of the town of Keswick under whom Harford-Battersby served after leaving his first ministry, and whom he regarded as "a guide and as a prophet" (pg. 288, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*) although Myers was a spiritualist (pgs. 23-24, *The Keswick Story*, Polluck). Under him Harford-Battersby learned not to be concerned about "trying to find out the right theory of inspiration" (pg. 67, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford). He finally replaced Myers as curate after his predecessor's death and then gradually moved towards evangelical ideas—which meant assent to the "truth of Protestant principles" rather than "Anglo-Catholicism" (pg. 60, *ibid*), not personal conversion and the new birth. Finally, after being convinced by the doctrine of Hannah W. and Robert P. Smith, Harford-Battersby was "persuaded that the current teaching of the Evangelical school itself was defective and one-sided, and . . . of the general truth of the teaching upon which the holiness movement was based" (pgs. 175-176, *ibid*). He then abandoned mainstream Anglican evangelicalism for the Higher Life doctrine characteristic of the Keswick theology,

country Quaker family that had moved into evangelical Anglicanism in the early 19th century,"[1591] and "a friend of his, Mr. Robert Wilson, a Quaker who also was specially blessed [at the earlier Higher Life meetings led by the Smiths] . . . decided to hold a Convention at Keswick, where similar teaching should be given." The "chief Brighton speakers," of whom the most important were certainly "Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith, [were] to take part in it."[1592]

Thus, Quakers were so far from being convicted of sin and of their need to turn from their false religion and false gospel to Christ for the new birth, and instead so happy with the Higher Life theology of Keswick, that one of them could become co-founder[1593] of the meetings at Keswick, be the "the heart and soul" of the Keswick mission fund,[1594] be lauded by many Keswick writers and speakers,[1595] and even be termed "the father of the Convention."[1596] Since the Quakers Hannah and Robert Smith formulated and spread the Keswick theology at the preparatory Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions,[1597] such acceptance of Quakerism was entirely expected. As one Quaker periodical noted, extolling the teaching of the Brington Convention:

> [T]his wonderful gathering . . . [taught the] truth [of the Higher Life and] the renewed [post-conversion] baptism of the Holy Spirit . . . [which had been] revived in a time of darkness by the

---

destitute of a clear testimony to a new birth, but possessed of a clear testimony to the second blessing of the Higher Life. Such was the spiritual life of the Anglican Canon without whose entry into the Higher Life at the "Oxford Convention . . . the . . . Keswick Convention would never have had a beginning" (pg. 29, *Forward Movements*, Pierson).

1591 pg. 340, Review by Ian S. Rennie of *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements*. by D. D. Bundy. Wilmore, Kentucky: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975, in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 19:4 (Fall 1976) 340-343.

1592 Pg. 170, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford.

1593 Pgs. 25, 168, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Canon Harford-Battersby, despite Wilson's Quaker theology, considered him a "dear brother" (pg. 195, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford), and at the Canon's deathbed, Wilson was by his side (pg. 219, *ibid*).

1594 Pg. 145, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

1595 For example, the Keswick classic *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Method, and its Men*, ed. Charles Harford, is dedicated "to the memory of Thomas Dundas Harford-Battersby and Robert Wilson, Founders of the Keswick Convention." In a chapter on Keswick men, J. Elder Cumming breathes not the slightest warning about Quaker heresies but concludes his very laudatory description of Robert Wilson with the following affirmation, after recounting Mr. Wilson's death: "Truly, the end of that man was peace! Who would not wish for such an end, if prepared for it, as he was?" (pg. 64, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford). Thus, although Quakers deny justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ and other essential aspects of the Biblical gospel, Keswick leaders wished to be in the same place as Quakers like Mr. Wilson at death. While one can hope that, somehow, Mr. Wilson did not actually believe in Quakerism and its false gospel but was truly converted, wishing to be associated in death with Quakers is not a little unwise.

1596 Pg. 110, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie.

1597 Pg. 118, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890; pgs. 335, 371, 407, 416-420, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

> early Friends[.] . . . It has been often said that the Friends have always upheld this cardinal truth[.] . . . This is undoubtedly true, and many of the early Friends walked in the light of it, as testified by the writings of Fox, Penn, Barclay, Penington, and others[.] . . . Hannah W. Smith . . . felt that she had an especial message to the Friends in this country, and from [her] lucid setting forth of this truth many of us have derived deep and lasting benefit. . . . Perfection lies in this [Higher Life system]. . . . [T]housands . . . every day flocked to hear the Bible readings of Hannah W. Smith, eagerly accepting her clear and winning settings forth of the life of faith . . . [at] the Friends' Meeting House . . . to a crowded assembly, those of our own body were proclaiming in triumphant strains the glory and richness of this full salvation[.][1598]

Quakers were unequivocally welcomed at Keswick as true Christians.[1599] Thus, "[a]t the outset the management of the Convention was entirely in the hands of the two conveners, Canon Harford-Battersby and Mr. Robert Wilson."[1600] The Quaker "Robert Wilson [was] one of the two founders of the Convention and its chairman from 1891 to 1900."[1601] Speakers were for some years only selected at "the personal invitation of the conveners," Wilson and Battersby, although in later times the "the Trustees of the Convention" began to make the selections.[1602] William Wilson, Robert Wilson's son, continued his father's work when Robert became Keswick chairman,[1603] Robert being the "successor" of Harford-Battersby after the latter man's retirement.[1604] The succession was the more natural because Wilson was Harford-Battersby's "principal parish worker," regularly attending the Canon's Anglican assembly Sunday evenings after attending the Friends' Meeting in the morning.[1605] Indeed, Robert Wilson was not only co-founder of Keswick and chairman of the Convention for nearly a decade but was also the author of the Keswick motto "All One in Christ Jesus."[1606] Truly, "without Mr. [Robert] Wilson's support and brave backing, there would have been no . . . Keswick story . . . at all."[1607]

Consequently, the Anglican with a Quaker background, Harford-Battersby, and his chief parish worker, the unrepentant Quaker Robert Wilson, together founded the Keswick convention and "invited . . . leading speakers [such as] Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall

---

1598 Pgs. 453-464, "Reflections on the Brighton Convention," *The Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, 9:23-26. London: Barrett, Sons & Co, 1875. Note that pages 416-420 of the *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875 consists of excerpts from this article in the *Friends' Quarterly Examiner* extolling the teaching at Brighton.

1599 Pg. 111, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

1600 Pg. 13, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Method, and its Men*, ed. Charles Harford.

1601 Pg. 60, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford; cf. pg. 119, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

1602 Pg. 20, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford.

1603 Pg. 14, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford.

1604 Pg. 51, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford.

1605 Pg. 30, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

1606 Pg. 60, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford.

1607 Pg. 61, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford.

Smith. Mr. Pearsall Smith promised to preside."[1608] "Robert . . . [was] invited . . . to preside and . . . Hannah Pearsall Smith . . . to give daily Bible Readings," that is, to preach,[1609] as well as to run the ladies' meetings;[1610] Keswick was to be "arranged around the Pearsall Smiths."[1611] However, the Keswick movement almost collapsed as a result of Mr. Smith's hasty withdrawal because of a doctrine and practice that the Brighton Convention Committee[1612] was hesitant to explain, namely, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was accompanied by physical sexual thrills because of the esoteric union of Christ with His people as Bridegroom and Bride, as described in the Song of Solomon. Publicly admitting what Robert Smith had been teaching would certainly have cast a dark shadow over Keswick, as it was an indisputable fact that even without Mr. and Mrs. Smith's presence "a continuity of teaching [was] maintained . . . the same as that given at the Oxford Conference,"[1613] where the great spiritual secret of erotic Baptism was publicly proclaimed. Besides, in that day of Victorian propriety very few would want to propogate and preach a theology of sanctification invented by such persons. The Keswick leaders consequently deemed it best to conceal the reasons for the withdrawal of Mr. and Mrs. Smith and get along as best they could.

Nonetheless, despite the withdrawal of Robert and Hannah Smith and "other expected speakers,"[1614] the first Keswick Convention took place, "acknowledging the debt [the speakers] owed to Mr. Pearsall Smith,"[1615] and propogating the Higher Life theology of sanctification Mr. Smith had learned from his wife. Despite "violent criticism and opposition . . . [such that to] identify oneself with the . . . Keswick

---

1608 Pg. 25, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1609 Pgs. 29, 149, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

1610 Pg. 197, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

1611 Pg. 11, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

1612 The Committee included Evan Hopkins, Stevenson Blackwood, the chairman of the Mildmay Conference, and Lord Radstock. All these were solid Broadlands men, and Blackwood's suggestion led to the expansion of the 1874 Broadlands Conference at the Oxford Convention (pg. 17, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

1613 Pg. 20, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford. Harford-Battersby testified to the profound influence of Robert P. Smith upon him and countless others: "Not that I would shrink from confessing the great debt which I, and thousands more with me, owe to that remarkable man whose name has become a by-word and a reproach in the estimation of many whom I greatly honour" (pg. 173, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford). Thus, "Mr. Smith . . . was at this time an honoured instrument in the hands of God for reviving the spiritual life in the hearts of hundreds, and even thousands, of devoted servants of Christ, both in this country [England] and on the Continent" (pgs. 174-175, *ibid*). That the teaching of Keswick was that of the Smiths is historically indisputable.

1614 Pg. 26, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1615 Pg. 26, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

Convention . . . [and] Higher Life teaching meant to be willing to be separated from the leaders of the Evangelical Church,"[1616] including opposition by men such as "Mr. Spurgeon," "Dr. Horatius Bonar,"[1617] and "Canon Ryle,"[1618] Mr. Battersby "and Mr. Wilson decided to hold another convention. After that there was never any doubt that it should be held yearly."[1619] The fact that "the greatest Leaders and Teachers of Evangelical Truth thought it their duty to oppose to the utmost what they considered 'very dangerous Heresy'" taught at Keswick and its antecedent Holiness Conventions, so that "the Evangelical Leaders of that day felt it their duty to oppose what they believed to be a false doctrine of 'Perfection in man'" taught at Keswick, was not going to stop

---

[1616] Pg. 27, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. "Indeed, it was within the ranks of the Evangelicals that the hostility was most pronounced" (pg. 81, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie), for "the whole holiness movement was subjected to violent criticism and opposition amongst evangelical Christians" (pgs. 31-32, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

[1617] Pg. 87, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875. Dr. Bonar, for example, wrote:

> One thing has struck me sadly in the authorized reports of the Brighton Conference—the number of perverted passages of Scripture; and this is really the root of the whole evil. The speakers first disclaim, I might say, derived theology, and then they proceed to distort the Word of God. . . . I was grieved beyond measure . . . these perversions are part of the system. It cannot stand without them. . . . One of my chief objections to the Perfectionst [Keswick] Doctrine is that it subverts the whole argument and scope of the epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews. . . . Have I written too strongly? I don't think so. Years are now upon me, and I may claim to be entitled to speak; and . . . have this as my testimony before God and the Churches, that I know few errors more subversive of what the Bible really teaches, and of what our fathers of the Reformation died for, than this modern Perfectionism. The thing now called holiness is not that which we find in Scripture, and the method of reaching holiness, by an instantaneous leap, called an act of faith, is nowhere taught us by the Holy Ghost. (pgs. 88, 90, 93, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875)

[1618] Pg. 87, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875. Ryle had a blessed and credible testimony to a genuine new birth:

> In 1837 Ryle experienced his own conversion. First, Algernon Coote, a friend from Eton, urged him to "think, repent and pray"; then he heard the epistle one Sunday afternoon in church: "By grace are ye saved (pause) through faith (pause) and that not of yourselves (pause) it is the gift of God." The succession of phrases brought full conviction to Ryle. "Nothing," he said, "to this day appeared to me so clear and distinct as my own sinfulness, Christ's presence, the value of the Bible, the absolute necessity of coming out of the world, and the need of being born again, and the enormous folly of the whole doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration." (pg. 573, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals,* ed. Larsen)

Some Keswick apologists affirm that Ryle changed his mind about his criticisms of Keswick; however, all that actually happened is that Ryle, in 1892, led in prayer the Sunday after a Convention ended on the platform where the Keswick Convention had been in session the week before. Ryle prayed during a meeting in which D. L. Moody, whose work Ryle commended, was speaking. Ryle supported Moody, while he did not support the Keswick Convention. The fact that Bishop Ryle would lead in prayer in a service where Moody was preaching by no means proves that he had become amenable to the Keswick theology, any more than the fact that he had preached at St. John's Anglican congregation in 1879 before the Keswick Convention proves his endorsement of Keswick, whose meetings in the Keswick Tent he never frequented. Consequently, affirmations such as that of Polluck that Ryle was a "foremost past critic" and his actions indicated that by "1892 . . . Keswick stood accepted by British evangelicals" is not supported by the evidence, at least in the case of Bishop Ryle (cf. pgs. 77-78, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck).

[1619] Pg. 27, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

Wilson and Battersby.[1620] Since that time "the Keswick message . . . [has been] carried . . . to almost every corner of the world";[1621] "its influence is seen to-day in every quarter of the globe."[1622] In modern times, Keswick Conventions are held in many cities throughout countries such as England, the United States, Australia, Canada, Romania, New Zealand, India, Jamaica, South Africa, Japan, Kenya, and "other parts of Africa, Asia, and South America"—there are "numerous conventions around the world on every continent which are modelled on Keswick."[1623] Keswick theology appears in devotional compositions by men such as Andrew Murray,[1624] F. B. Meyer,[1625] J. Oswald Sanders,[1626] and Hudson Taylor,[1627] and has "impact[ed] . . . the Welsh revival,[1628] the German holiness movement, Foreign Missions, Conventions Abroad, the American holiness movement, the American Pentecostal movement . . . the Christian and Missionary Alliance . . . American fundamentalism . . . [and] English fundamentalism or conservative evangelicalism,"[1629] as well as offshoots of Pentecostalism like the Health

---

1620 Pg. 38, *The Keswick Convention*, ed. Harford. Cf. pg. 40.

1621 Pg. 28, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1622 Pg. 30, *Forward Movements*, Pierson.

1623 Pgs. 11-12, 37, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

1624 Murray gave "testimony to the . . . Lord, and what He has done for me at Keswick . . . [and] was in close fellowship with . . . the great Holiness movement . . . [and] what took place at Oxford and Brighton, and it all helped me" (pg. 177, 180, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas; pg. 448, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis). Murray spoke "at Keswick . . . [in] 1895 . . . [and] for many years he led a similar Convention in South Africa," where he was a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church (pgs. 177, 182, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas). Note the discussion of Murray's theology in the chapter on him below.

1625 Note the chapter on Meyer below.

1626 Sanders acted as a "Keswick speaker" and "Chairman of the Upway 'Keswick' Convention, Australia" (pg. 143, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas), advocating the second-blessing doctrine of "Wesleyan Perfectionism" (pg. 110, *Keep In Step With The Spirit,* Packer), as "Chambers used the language of Wesleyan entire sanctification," having adopted "Keswick teaching . . . through F. B. Meyer" (pg. 49, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

1627 pgs. 150-152, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Hudson Taylor, who spoke at the Keswick Convention of 1883 (pg. 81, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck) after discovering "the Exchanged Life," held a partial-Rapture view, following the lead of Edward Irving and Robert Govett, as did D. M. Panton, Evan Roberts, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Otto Stockmeyer, Watchman Nee, and many other advocates of Keswick theology and the Pentecostalism that developed from it.

1628 Evan Roberts, co-laborer with Jessie Penn-Lewis and the center and leader of the Welsh holiness revival, was strongly impacted by the Keswick theology, as was Mrs. Penn-Lewis. Note the discussion of Roberts and Penn-Lewis in the respective chapter below.

1629 pg. 341, Review by Ian S. Rennie of *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements.* by D. D. Bundy. Wilmore, Kentucky: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975, in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 19:4 (Fall 1976) 340-343. Barabas even records that "Mrs. William Booth [cofounder, woman preacher, second blessing perfectionist, and coleader of the Salvation Army] . . . remarked that Keswick had been one of the principal means of establishing the Salvation Army" (pg. 151,

and Wealth or Word-Faith movement which "arose out of the classic Higher Life, Keswick, and Pentecostal movements."[1630] Keswick became extremely influential:

> Keswick-like views of sanctification [were] promoted by A. B. Simpson, Moody Bible Institute[1631] (D. L. Moody, R. A. Torrey, James M. Gray), Pentecostalism, and Dallas Theological Seminary (Lewis S. Chafer, John F. Walvoord, Charles C. Ryrie). Simpson founded the Christian and Missionary Alliance, Moody founded Moody Bible Institute, and Chafer cofounded Dallas Theological Seminary. Pentecostalism, which subsequently dwarfed Keswick in size and evangelical influence, is the product of Wesleyan perfectionism, the holiness movement, the early Keswick movement, Simpson, Moody, and Torrey. Dallas Theological Seminary, the bastion of the Chaferian view of sanctification, is probably the most influential factor for the [strong influence] of a Keswick-like view of sanctification in modern fundamentalism and conservative evangelicalism.[1632]

The tremendous influence of Hannah W. and Robert P. Smith continues to this day. Not only are their teachings being spread worldwide through the continuing widespread

---

So Great Salvation, Barabas; cf. pg. 151, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and Its Men*, ed. Charles Harford; pg. 20, *Forward Movements*, Pierson).

1630 Pg. 64, *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary Word of Faith Theologies*, Paul L. King. Note also the trajectory from the Keswick movement to Pentecostalism and the Health and Wealth heresy in the discussion of A. B. Simpson and John A. MacMillan in the respective chapters below.

1631 "From Northfield," Moody's annual conference, "Keswick speakers, with Moody's backing, were able to penetrate further into American evangelicalism," so that "in the 1890s Keswick was a significant force molding sections of the evangelical constituency in North America" (pgs. 56-59, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Moody's "old friend F. B. Meyer" was key in bringing Moody's ministry to the side of Keswick; "a Keswick speaker [was] . . . at every summer conference" at Northfield (pgs. 116-117, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck). Moody, with thousands before him, at the time Robert P. Smith was leading the Brighton Convention, asked the crowds to pray for a special blessing "on the great Convention that is now being held at Brighton, perhaps the most important meeting ever gathered together," a public endorsement of Brighton that Moody pronounced on both the first and last day of the Convention (pgs. 47, 319, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

1632 Pg. 255, *Keswick Theology: A Historical and Theological Survey and Analysis of the Doctrine of Sanctification in the Early Keswick Movement, 1875-1920*, by Andrew Naselli. Ph. D. Dissertation, Bob Jones University, 2006. Abbreviations employed in the source text for institutions have been expanded to give their full names. In addition to Dallas seminary, the influence of Moody and Scofield on the spread of Keswick theology in fundamentalism is very significant: "The return of the holiness teaching to America . . . i[n] [its] Keswick form, was . . . related to the work of D. L. Moody. . . . Moody . . . taught very similar views . . . [to] Keswick . . . and made them central in his work. . . . C. I. Scofield . . . eventually more or less canonized Keswick teachings in his *Reference Bible*" (pgs. 78-79, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, Marsden). D. L. Moody not only prayed for blessing upon the Higher Life meetings at Brighton during his evangelistic campaign in Convent Garden in 1875 (pgs. 23-24, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas) but also brought many Keswick speakers in who propogated Keswick theology at Moody's conferences at Northfield: "The visits of Rev. F. B. Meyer, and notably of Prebendary H. W. Webb-Peploe, of London, and Andrew Murray, of Wellington, S. Africa (who were at Northfield in 1895), and the late G. H. C. McGregor introduced into Northfield conferences the grand teaching of Keswick" (pg. 164, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, A. T. Pierson. New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900; cf. pg. 163, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas; pg. 6, *Out of His Fulness: Addresses Delivered in America*, Andrew Murray. London: J. Nisbet & Co, 1897). The Keswick theology of Moody, Scofield, and their associates were in turn very influential in Pentecostalism (cf. pgs. 111-113, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

propogation of Keswick theology, but their message is the root of other forms of error and apostasy in Christiandom, such as, most notably, the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements.

2.) The Scriptural Aspects of Keswick Theology

Regenerate proponents of the Keswick theology[1633] rightly exalt the Lord Jesus Christ, His power to sanctify sinners, and the necessity of faith in the Christian life. A high regard for these tremendous truths will indubitably strengthen the believer's spiritual walk, and Keswick's proclamation of these Biblical doctrines has unquestionably been a means of Divine blessing upon many. Furthermore, Keswick's preaching that believers must immediately surrender to the Lord and confess sin that is yet unrepented of is eminently Biblical. If, because of Keswick's calls to the surrender of the will, "no man can attend a Keswick Convention and be the same afterwords: he is either a better or a worse man for it,"[1634] such a fact is highly commendable. Strong Biblical preaching does not leave hearers unmoved.[1635] A call to the "renunciation of all known sin . . . and . . . surrender to Christ for the infilling of the Holy Spirit"[1636] is an excellent and commendable message, at least if terms are defined properly. When Keswick emphasizes "the exceeding sinfulness of sin"[1637] and seeks to have "laid bare . . . the cancer of sin eating at the vitals of the Christian . . . [so that] the Christian is urged to cut it out at once"[1638] and come to "an unreserved surrender to Christ . . . in . . . heart and life,"[1639] it does very well. Furthermore, Keswick deserves commendation when it seeks to have the "Holy Spirit exalted . . . [and] looked to as the divine Guide and Governor . . . [and] prayer is emphasized as the condition of all success and blessing."[1640] When some[1641]

1633 The fact that the Keswick theology developed very largely from the writings and preaching of unregenerate individuals such as Hannah and Robert Smith certainly does not mean that all advocates of Keswick theology or those sympathetic to the Higher Life system either endorse or hold to the gross errors of those associated with the development of Keswick. Indeed, the generality of modern advocates of Keswick are ignorant of the corrupt fountain from which their system flows.

1634 Pg. 32, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. While it is very hard to prove that "no man" has ever been the same after attending a Keswick Convention, such a goal is, at least, unquestionably commendable.

1635 Acts 2:37-41; 5:33; 7:54-58.

1636 Pg. 35, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1637 Pg. 39, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1638 Pg. 52, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1639 Pg. 58, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1640 Pgs. 131-132, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1641 Many classic Keswick and Higher Life founders and leaders, from William Boardman to Hannah and Robert P. Smith to Andrew Murray, denied that all believers have the Holy Spirit, affirming instead

modern Keswick writers teach that the Holy Spirit "dwells in every child of God . . . [but] not every Christian is filled with the Spirit . . . [and] to be filled with the Spirit is not presented in Scripture as an optional matter, but as a holy obligation that rests upon all Christians,"[1642] they do well. The Holy Spirit, although He does not speak of Himself (John 16:13), is nonetheless God, equal in essence to the Father and the Son, and worthy of all reverence, trust, and worship. Keswick is correct that the "Christian is expected to live in communion with the Spirit[.]"[1643] Furthermore, prayer is unquestionably key to a Biblical Christianity, to the extent that believers are characterized as those who call on the Lord (1 Corinthians 1:2). Keswick emphasis upon the impossibility of "mere moral processes to overcome sin"[1644] and upon the error of self-dependence in sanctification (cf. 2 Corinthians 1:9) is important and correct, as is its affirmation that the believer's "union with Christ in His death and resurrection . . . secures moral renovation as well as justifying grace."[1645] "Anyone who is sensitive to the high demands of the Christian vocation . . . must find himself in deep agreement with the earnest contrition which has characterized so many of the Keswick leaders and with their insistent plea for the appropriation and application of the resources of God's cleansing and sanctifying grace."[1646] Furthermore, Keswick is correct in its affirmation "that in Scripture sanctification comes by faith."[1647] Modern Keswick emphasis upon evangelism and missions[1648] is clearly Scriptural (Acts 1:8) and is a tremendous blessing. Believers who

---

that only those who entered into the Higher Life possess the Spirit. Stephen Barabas does well to reject this false teaching of many early Keswick leaders, although he does not do well when he ignores the facts, revises history, and affirms that the Scriptural position that all believers have the Spirit is universal Keswick teaching.

[1642] Pgs. 131-132, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1643] Pg. 137, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1644] Pg. 75, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1645] Pg. 104, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. The quotation comes from R. W. Dale, who is supposed to support the contention that "only since Keswick first called attention to the vital significance of [Romans 6] to the whole question of sin and sanctification have theologians even begun to give it its proper place." Barabas also quotes from "John Laidlaw," whom he alleges "bec[ame] one of Keswick's enthusiastic supporters." However, the "biography . . . by his son . . . [of the] great Birmingham Congregationalist, R. W. Dale . . . expressly states . . . that his father did not associate himself with Keswick. It is also highly doubtful that John Laidlaw of New College, Edinburgh, had any significant involvement" (pg. 341, Review by Ian S. Rennie of *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements.* by D. D. Bundy. Wilmore, Kentucky: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975, in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 19:4 (Fall 1976) 340-343. Barabas's employment of source material is too often hagiographal, revisionistic, and historically inaccurate.

[1646] Pg. 282, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 4, a review by Murray of *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1647] Pg. 97, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1648] The earliest Keswick Conventions, in keeping with the universalism of Hannah W. Smith and the denial of an eternal hell by many others, had no particular missions emphasis and rejected calls to have a missions meeting. When asked, the initial Keswick attitude was that appeals for missions were "quite out

gain a greater understanding and practice of Biblical truths such as these through hearing Keswick preaching or reading Keswick literature will be able to grow closer to God and be more effective in serving Him as a result. Such Keswick teachings explain why many have received definite spiritual blessings at Keswick Conventions.

However, while these aspects of the Keswick theology are Biblical, refreshing, and key to an increase in spiritual life, they are not unique to Keswick or to Higher Life doctrine. The historic Baptist doctrine of sanctification has taught all of these truths,[1649] and many old-line evangelical Protestants have done so likewise. One can learn all of these great truths from the Bible alone or from Christian writings without any connection with the Keswick movement. For example, J. C. Ryle, the classic nineteenth century devotional writer and opponent of the Keswick theology, wrote:

> As to entire "self-consecration" . . . of which so much is said in the new [Keswick] theology . . . I never in my life heard of any thorough evangelical minister who did not hold the doctrine and press it upon others. When a man brings it forward as a novelty I cannot help thinking that he can never have truly known what true conversion was. . . . [T]hat the duty and privilege of entire self-consecration is systematically ignored by Evangelicals, and has only been discovered, or brought into fresh light by the new [Keswick] theologians, I do not for a moment believe.[1650]

Nor is the doctrine that sanctification is through faith by any means a Keswick distinctive. The body of non-Keswick Bible-believing Christians hold to this truth:

> Sanctification is by faith . . . Whatever believers get from Christ, they must of necessity get by faith . . . faith is the one receptive grace, the sole apprehensive grace, that hand of the soul that lays hold upon Christ, and puts the believer in possession of the fulness that is in him[.] . . . [A]ll gifts of God come from grace, and all come to faith. Grace is the only fountain, faith the only channel. . . . That sanctification is by faith, then, is essentially a principle of Protestant theology, and is no distinctive feature of the new [Keswick] teaching. . . . [T]he doctrine of sanctification by Christ, through faith . . . had quite as prominent a place as is now assigned to it [in the Keswick theology] in the theology and preaching of the Reformers, of the Puritans, of the divines and preachers of the Second Reformation in Scotland . . . of the sturdy old Evangelicals of the English Church . . . and of the equally sturdy Evangelicals of the Nonconformists . . . [a]nd an equally prominent place does it hold in the dogmatic and homiletic and catechetic teaching of our evangelical contemporaries [in the late 19th century] in all sections of the Christian Church. It is not, then, in respect of these fundamental principles that we differ from the new [Keswick] school. On the contrary, we deny that they have any exclusive propriety in these principles[.] . . . [Rather, what is truly distinctive about Keswick is the idea] that there is a special act of faith . . .

---

of the question; you surely misunderstand; *these meetings are for* edification!" (pg. 275, *Forward Movements*, Pierson. Italics in original). Thankfully, this unscriptural Keswick attitude was eventually challenged and reformed.

[1649] See, for example, the historic Baptist doctrinal material in the various chapters of this work. Doctrines such as being filled with the Spirit are found among Baptists far before the advent of the Keswick movement, as documented in the chapter in this book on Ephesians 5:18 and the doctrine of being filled with the Spirit. It is not a little presumptuous to assert: "One has to go back to the book of Acts for a parallel to the exaltation of the Holy Spirit found in the meetings at Keswick" (pg. 38, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas).

[1650] Pg. 111, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875. Regretably, Stephen Barabas's bibliography provides no evidence that he read this critique of the Higher Life movement.

> subsequent to . . . conversion . . . [which] Mr. Boardman calls "second conversion," [and] Mrs. Smith calls "entire consecration."[1651]

Sanctification by faith is a Biblical teaching that is by no means a Keswick distinctive—only the unscriptural doctrine of the "second blessing,"[1652] which is connected with a quietistic idea of sanctification by faith alone, is a Keswick distinctive.

The necessity of experiential communion with Jesus Christ through the Spirit by faith is also by no means a Keswick distinctive. John Owen,[1653] who has led many away from Keswick theology to a more Biblical piety,[1654] wrote:

> [Christians ought to] make this observation of the lively actings of faith and love in and towards Jesus Christ their chiefest concern in all their retirements, yea, in their whole walk before God. . . . [T]he effects of his presence with us, and the manifestation of himself unto us[,] [are as follows:]
>
> (1.) Now the first of these is the life, vigor, and effectual acting of all grace in us. This is an inseparable consequent and effect of a view of his glory. Whilst we enjoy it, we live; nevertheless not we, but Christ lives in us, exciting and acting all his graces in us. This is that which the apostle instructs us in; while "we behold his glory as in a glass, we are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory," 2 Corinthians 3:18—that is, whilst by faith we contemplate on the glory of Christ as revealed in the gospel, all grace will thrive and flourish in us towards a perfect conformity unto him. For whilst we abide in this view and contemplation, our souls will be preserved in holy frames, and in a continual exercise of love and delight, with all other spiritual affections towards him. It is impossible, whilst Christ is in the eye of our faith as proposed in the Gospel, but that we shall labor to be like him, and greatly love him. Neither is there any way for us to attain unto either of these, which are the great concernments of our souls—namely, to be like unto Christ, and to love him—but by a constant view of him and his glory by faith; which powerfully and effectually works them in us. All the doctrinal knowledge which we have of him is useless, all the view we have of his glory is but fancy, imagination, or superstition, which are not accompanied with this transforming power. And that which is wrought by it, is the increase and vigor of all grace; for therein alone our conformity unto him does consist. Growth in grace, holiness, and obedience, is a growing like unto Christ; and nothing else is so. . . .

1651 Pgs. 257-259, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280. Similarly, Jacob Abbott, critiquing William Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, notes:

> Christians all believe that sanctification is the work of *faith:* that the victory which overcomes the world is our faith. They all hold that the renewal and purification of our sinful nature is, from first to last, the work of God; and that *faith* connects us with the source of life and power in God; that the ife which we now live in the flesh, we live by the faith of the Son of God. So that it may be as truly affirmed of sanctification, as of justification, that it is all of faith—by grace—and glorying is excluded . . . [for] *self-righteousness* . . . is such a foe to grace. (pg. 511, Review of William E. Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, Jacob Abbott. *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July 1860) 508-535)

1652 Compare, e. g., *The Two Covenants and the Second Blessing*, Andrew Murray. Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1898.

1653 Despite the profound impact John Owen's works have made on the Christian world's understanding of the doctrine of sanctification, and the importance non-Keswick evangelicals and historic Baptists place on his writings as a model of non-Keswick Biblical piety, Stephen Barabas's extensive bibliography in *So Great Salvation* does not include even one work by John Owen. Not a single work by Jonathan Edwards, John Bunyan, John Flavel, or many other classic writers on sanctification are listed either.

1654 E. g., "J.I. Packer's . . . earliest personal Christian experience [was] marked by frustration with Keswick piety then liberation through the influence of John Owen" (pg. 181, *The Theology of the Christian Life in J. I. Packer's Thought*, D. J. Payne). Note that while elements of Packer's doctrine of Christian sanctification are superior to those of Keswick, his theology as a whole contains serious errors.

This transforming efficacy, from a spiritual view of Christ as proposed in the Gospel . . . [is] the life of religion . . . there must be a view of Christ and his glory, to cause us to love him, and thereby to make us conformable or like unto him . . . [which] is by our beholding his glory by faith, as revealed in the Gospel, and no otherwise. . . . [S]o, unto our stability in the profession of the truth, an experience of the efficacy of this spiritual view of Christ transforming our souls into his own likeness, is absolutely necessary. . . . [T]he beholding of Christ is the most blessed means of exciting all our graces, spiritualizing all our affections, and transforming our minds into his likeness. . . . [I]t is a real experience of the efficacy that there is in the spiritual beholding of the glory of Christ by faith, as proposed in the Gospel, to strengthen, increase, and excite all grace unto its proper exercise, so changing and transforming the soul gradually into his likeness, which must secure us against all [sinful] pretences[.] . . .

[I]f we grow weak in our graces, unspiritual in our frames, cold in our affections, or negligent in the exercise of them by holy meditation, it is evident that [Christ] is at a great distance from us, so as that we do not behold his glory as we ought. If the weather grow cold, herbs and plants do wither, and the frost begins to bind up the earth, all men grant that the sun is withdrawn, and makes not his wonted approach unto us. And if it be so with our hearts, that they grow cold, frozen, withering, lifeless, in and unto spiritual duties, it is certain that the Lord Christ is in some sense withdrawn, and that we do not behold his glory. We retain notions of truth concerning his person, office, and grace; but faith is not in constant exercise as to real views of him and his glory. For there is nothing more certain in Christian experience than this is, that while we do really by faith behold the glory of Christ, as proposed in the Gospel, the glory of his person and office, as before described, and so abide in holy thoughts and meditations thereof, especially in our private duties and retirements, all grace will live and thrive in us in some measure, especially love unto his person, and therein unto all that belongs unto him. Let us but put it to the trial, and we shall infallibly find the promised event. Do any of us find decays in grace prevailing in us—deadness, coldness, lukewarmness, a kind of spiritual stupidity and senselessness coming upon us? Do we find an unreadiness unto the exercise of grace in its proper season, and the vigorous acting of it in duties of communion with God, and would we have our souls recovered from these dangerous diseases? Let us assure ourselves there is no better way for our healing and deliverance, yea, no other way but this alone—namely, the obtaining a fresh view of the glory of Christ by faith, and a steady abiding therein. Constant contemplation of Christ and his glory, putting forth its transforming power unto the revival of all grace, is the only relief in this case[.]

Some will say, that this must be effected by fresh supplies and renewed communications of the Holy Spirit. Unless he fall as dew and showers on our dry and barren hearts—unless he cause our graces to spring, thrive, and bring forth fruit—unless he revive and increase faith, love, and holiness in our souls—our backsliding will not be healed, nor our spiritual state be recovered. . . . And so it is. The immediate efficiency of the revival of our souls is from and by the Holy Spirit. But the inquiry is, in what way, or by what means, we may obtain the supplies and communications of him unto this end. This the apostle declares in [2 Corinthians 3:18]: We, beholding the glory of Christ in a glass, "are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even by the Spirit of the Lord." It is in the exercise of faith on Christ . . . that the Holy Spirit puts forth his renewing, transforming power in and upon our souls. This, therefore, is that alone which will retrieve Christians from their present decays and deadness. . . . [The] remedy and relief [of a] . . . dead [and] dull . . . condition . . . is, to live in the exercise of faith in Christ Jesus. This himself assures us of, John 15:4, 5, "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing."

There is a twofold coming unto Christ by believing. The first is that we may have life—that is, a spring and principle of spiritual life communicated unto us from him: for he is "our life," Colossians 3:4, and "because he liveth, we live also," John 14:19. Yea, it is not so much we that live, as he liveth in us, Galatians 2:19, 20. And unbelief is a not coming unto him, that we may

have life, John 5:40. But, secondly, there is also a coming unto him by believers in the actual exercise of faith, that they may "have this life more abundantly," John 10:10; that is, such supplies of grace as may keep their souls in a healthy, vigorous acting of all the powers of spiritual life. And as he reproacheth some that they would not come unto him that they might have life, so he may justly reprove us all, that we do not so come unto him in the actual exercise of faith, as that we might have this life more abundantly.

(2.) When the Lord Christ is near us, and we do behold his glory, he will frequently communicate spiritual refreshment in peace, consolation, and joy unto our souls. We shall not only hereby have our graces excited with respect unto him as their object, but be made sensible of his acting toward us in the communications of himself and his love unto us. When the Sun of Righteousness ariseth on any soul, or makes any near approach thereunto, it shall find "healing under his wings"—his beams of grace shall convey by his Spirit holy spiritual refreshment thereunto. For he is present with us by his Spirit, and these are his fruits and effects, as he is the Comforter, suited unto his office, as he is promised unto us.

Many love to walk in a very careless, unwise profession. So long as they can hold out in the performance of outward duties, they are very regardless of the greatest evangelical privileges—of those things which are the marrow of divine promises—all real endeavors of a vital communion with Christ. Such are spiritual peace, refreshing consolations, ineffable joys, and the blessed composure of assurance. Without some taste and experience of these things, profession is heartless, lifeless, useless; and religion itself a dead carcass without an animating soul. The peace which some enjoy is a mere stupidity. They judge not these things to be real which are the substance of Christ's present reward; and a renunciation whereof would deprive the church of its principal supportments and encouragements in all its sufferings. It is a great evidence of the power of unbelief, when we can satisfy ourselves without an experience in our own hearts of the great things, in this kind of joy, peace, consolation, assurance, that are promised in the Gospels. For how can it be supposed that we do indeed believe the promises of things future—namely, of heaven, immortality, and glory, the faith whereof is the foundation of all religions—when we do not believe the promises of the present reward in these spiritual privileges? And how shall we be thought to believe them, when we do not endeavor after an experience of the things themselves in our own souls, but are even contented without them? But herein men deceive themselves. They would very desirously have evangelical joy, peace, and assurance, to countenance them in their evil frames and careless walking. And some have attempted to reconcile these things, unto the ruin of their souls. But it will not be. Without the diligent exercise of the grace of obedience, we shall never enjoy the grace of consolation. . . .

It is peculiarly in the view of the glory of Christ, in his approaches unto us, and abiding with us, that we are made partakers of evangelical peace, consolation, joy, and assurances. These are a part of the royal train of his graces, of the reward wherewith he is accompanied. "His reward is with him." Wherever he is graciously present with any, these things are never wanting in a due measure and degree, unless it be by their own fault, or for their trial. In these things does he give the church of his loves, Song of Solomon 7:12. "For if any man," saith he, "love me, I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him," John 14:21—"yea, I and the Father will come unto him, and make our abode with him," verse 23; and that so as to "sup with him," Revelation 3:20—which, on his part, can be only by the communication of those spiritual refreshments. The only inquiry is, by what way and means we do receive them? Now, I say this is in and by our beholding of the glory of Christ by faith, 1 Peter 1:8, 9. Let that glory be rightly stated . . . the glory of his person, his office, his condescension, exaltation, love, and grace; let faith be fixed in a view and contemplation of it, mix itself with it, as represented in the glass of the gospel, meditate upon it, embrace it, and virtue will proceed from Christ, communicating spiritual, supernatural refreshment and joy unto our souls. Yea, in ordinary cases, it is impossible that believers should have a real prospect of this glory at any time, but that it will in some measure affect their hearts with a sense of his love; which is the spring of all consolation in them. In the exercise of faith on the discoveries of the glory of Christ made unto us in the Gospel, no man shall ever totally want such intimations of his

love, yea, such effusion of it in his heart, as shall be a living spring of those spiritual refreshments, John 4:14; Romans 5:5.[1655]

Such declarations were by no means an exception, centuries before the invention of the Keswick theology, in the Biblically-based piety of Owen and vast numbers of like-minded Christians. He wrote elsewhere:

> The . . . daily exercise of faith on Christ as crucified . . . is the great fundamental means of the mortification of sin in general, and which we ought to apply unto every particular instance of it. This the apostle discourseth at large, Romans 6:6-13. "Our old man," saith he, "is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Our "old man," or the body of sin, is the power and reign of sin in us. These are to be destroyed; that is, so mortified that "henceforth we should not serve sin," that we should be delivered from the power and rule of it. This, saith the apostle, is done in Christ: "Crucified with him." It is so meritoriously, in his actual dying or being crucified for us; it is so virtually, because of the certain provision that is made therein for the mortification of all sin; but it is so actually, by the exercise of faith on him as crucified, dead, and buried, which is the means of the actual communication of the virtue of his death unto us for that end. Herein are we said to be dead and buried with him; whereof baptism is the pledge. So by the cross of Christ the world is crucified unto us, and we are so to the world, Galatians 6:14; which is the substance of the mortification of all sin. There are several ways whereby the exercise of faith on Christ crucified is effectual unto this end: —
>
> (1.) Looking unto him as such will beget holy mourning in us: Zechariah 12:10, "They shall look on me whom they have pierced, and mourn." . . . A view of Christ as pierced will cause mourning in them that have received the promise of the Spirit of grace and supplication there mentioned. And this mourning is the foundation of mortification. It is that "godly sorrow which worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of," 2 Corinthians 7:10. And mortification of sin is of the essence of repentance. The more believers are exercised in this view of Christ, the more humble they are, the more they are kept in that mourning frame which is universally opposite unto all the interests of sin, and which keeps the soul watchful against all its attempts. Sin never reigned in an humble, mourning soul.
>
> (2.) It is effectual unto the same end by the way of a powerful motive, as that which calls and leads unto conformity to him. This is pressed by the apostle, Romans 6:8-11. Our conformity unto Christ as crucified and dead consists in our being dead unto sin, and thereby overthrowing the reign of it in our mortal bodies. This conformity, saith he, we ought to reckon on as our duty: "Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin;" that is, that you ought so to be, in that conformity which you ought to aim at unto Christ crucified. Can any spiritual eye behold Christ dying for sin, and continue to live in sin? Shall we keep that alive in us which he died for, that it might not eternally destroy us? Can we behold him bleeding for our sins, and not endeavor to give them their death-wound? The efficacy of the exercise of faith herein unto the mortification of sin is known unto all believers by experience.
>
> (3.) Faith herein gives us communion with him in his death, and unites the soul unto it in its efficacy. Hence we are said to be "buried with him into death," and to be "planted together in the likeness of his death," Romans 6:4, 5. Our "old man is crucified with him," verse 6. We have by faith communion with him in his death, unto the death of sin. This, therefore, is the first grace and duty which we ought to attend unto for the mortification of sin.[1656]

[1655] Pgs. 146-154, *Meditations and Discourses Concerning the Glory of Christ, in His Person, Office, and Grace*, John Owen.

[1656] Pgs. 36-37, *A Treatise of the Dominion of Sin and Grace*, John Owen. Note that in Owen's day "virtue" meant "power," as it does, at times, in the Authorized Version (Mark 5:30).

The precious Biblical truths set forth by Owen are by no means the peculiar perogative of the Keswick theology, as he wrote of them centuries before the Keswick movement came into existence. Just as Owen declares that "efficacy of the exercise of faith . . . unto the mortification of sin is known unto all believers by experience," and so the necessity of faith for sanctification is by no means a Keswick distinctive.

Perhaps the clearest way to indicate the positive truths affirmed by both Keswick and its critics is to examine the doctrine of sanctification confessed by that staunch advocate of the theology and revivalistic[1657] piety of Old Princeton and inveterate opponent of Keswick, B. B. Warfield. Truths confessed by both Keswick and by Warfield can by no means be labeled Keswick distinctives, but would evidently be the common inheritance of classic evangelical spirituality.[1658]

Warfield, receiving the truth common to old evangelicalism, emphasized the need to depend on the Christ and the Holy Spirit for strength in sanctification, rather than being self-dependent. Indeed, he recognized such dependence was the very essence of religion: "[The] attitude of trust and dependence on God is just the very essence of religion. In proportion as any sense of self-sufficiency or any dependence on self enters the heart, in that proportion religion is driven from it."[1659] The "central truth of complete dependence upon the free mercy of a saving God," Warfield affirmed, "is an absolutely essential element in evangelical religion" which "underl[ies] and g[ives] its form and power to the whole . . . movement" and is key to "a great revival of religion."[1660]

1657 While the theologians of Old Princeton, in light of their recognition that doctrinal error hinders revival, were careful to diagnose and warn about pseudo-revival, they rejoiced to both promote and experience genuine spiritual revival. The love for revival in Princetonians such as Archibald Alexander, who was himself converted in a revival (pgs. 68-69, *Studies in Southern Presbyterian Theology*, M. H. Smith. Jackson, MS: Presbyterian Reformation Society, 1962) and who wrote *Thoughts on Religious Experience* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publications, 1844), can hardly be disputed. Similarly, Warfield "experience[d] a revival while an undergraduate student at Princeton, one that left a deep and lasting impression" (pg. 568, *The Theology of B. B. Warfield: A Systematic Summary*, F. Zaspel).

1658 Warfield is probably the best choice to illustrate non-Keswick evangelical piety because of the tendency of Keswick apologists to create, in a historically inaccurate way, orthodox friends of their theology (cf. e. g., pg. 16, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas; pg. 108, *The Faith Response: Understanding and Applying a Biblical View of Dependence on God*, John R. Van Gelderen). Thus, Higher Life apologists could claim that writers who lived before the origination of the Convention and advocated classically orthodox piety were actually Keswick antecedents simply because of their advocacy of Biblical truths like living by faith and dependence on the Holy Spirit. Similarly, writers who lived after the origin of the Keswick Convention could be labeled by apologists for the system as teaching Keswick theology, just without knowing about it, for similar reasons. However, it is most doubtful that any Keswick writer would wish to affirm that B. B. Warfield was truly a defender of Higher Life truth, just in disguise. His writings, therefore, provide a safe avenue to a determination of what is involved in evangelical non-Keswick piety.

1659 Pg. 213, *The Power of God unto Salvation*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia: PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1903.

1660 Pg. 357, *Calvin and Calvinism: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 5, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 2008.

Warfield recognizes that confusing Christian holiness with mere "righteous conduct and of self-sanctification or moral character-formation," so that "the individual Christian sanctifies *himself*,"[1661] is part of a view of God, sin, and salvation that is a "profoundly immoral doctrine."[1662] The believer must not rely upon his own works for either justification or sanctification; teaching this, Warfield approvingly cited the "the words of the revival hymn" calling men to "'cast our deadly doing down' and make our appeal on the sole score of sheer helplessness . . . [rejecting] . . . self-dependence and [the] power of self-help."[1663] He states that the "very *cor cordis* of the Gospel" is expressed in the words of the hymn:

> Nothing either great or small,
> Nothing, sinner, no;
> Jesus did it, did it all,
> Long, long, ago. . . .
>
> Doing is a deadly thing,
> Doing ends in death . . .
>
> Cast your deadly doing down,
> Down at Jesus' feet,
> Stand in Him, in Him alone,
> Gloriously complete.[1664]

Consequently, helpless dependence on the perfectly sufficient Christ is the attitude of the Christian:

> [The] characteristic . . . [of] the children of the Kingdom . . . [is to] lay happy and thoughtless . . . in Jesus' own arms. Their characteristic was just helpless dependence; complete dependence upon the care of those whose care for them was necessary. . . . [T]he Kingdom of heaven is made up of those who are helplessly dependent on the King of the Heavens . . . [like] infants who are to be done for, who can not do for themselves.[1665]

Warfield stated:

> [The] evangelical quality of all really evangelical faith [is found in] . . . whoever recognizes in the recesses of his soul his utter dependence on God; whoever in all his thought of salvation hears in his heart of hearts the echo of the *soli Deo gloria* of the evangelical profession . . . these

---

[1661] Pg. 24, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part One*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 7, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008. Italics in original. Warfield is critiquing the theologically liberal perfectionism of Albrecht Ritschl.

[1662] Pgs. 160-161, 63-64; cf. pg. 100, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part One*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 7, B. B. Warfield. Warfield does not limit his reference to the immorality of Ritschl's system to the German rationalist's perfectionist doctrine of sanctification; Ritschl's doctrine of justification and other parts of his system are certainly included and are mentioned in the immediate context of some of the pages referenced.

[1663] Pg. 99, *Christology and Criticism: The Works of Benjamin B.* Warfield, vol. 3, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

[1664] Pgs. 323-324, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

[1665] Pg. 78, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

> fundamental principles—which underlie and give its body to all true religion—[ought] to work themselves freely and fully out in thought and feeling and action.[1666]

Warfield explained elsewhere that this utter dependence on the Holy Spirit is characteristic of the Christian piety of all Bible-believing Protestant denominations:

> The evangelical note is formally sounded by the entirety of organized Protestantism. That is to say, all the great Protestant bodies, in their formal official confessions, agree in confessing the utter dependence of sinful man upon the grace of God alone for salvation, and in conceiving this dependence as immediate and direct upon the Holy Spirit, acting as a person and operating directly on the heart of the sinner. It is this evangelical note which determines the peculiarity of the piety of the Protestant Churches. The characteristic feature of this piety is a profound consciousness of intimate personal communion with God the Saviour, on whom the soul rests with immediate love and trust.[1667]

Every single spiritual good comes from the Holy Spirit, Warfield taught, and Biblical religion necessitates utter dependence on Him. Possession of the Spirit is the highest glory of the believer:

> [T]he Spirit of God is the author of all right belief and of all good conduct,—to assure us that then, too, on Him depended all the exercises of piety, to Him was due all the holy aspirations and all the good accomplishments of every saint of God. And certainly the New Testament tells us in repeated instances that the Holy Spirit was active throughout the period of the Old Dispensation, in all the varieties of activities which characterize the New. The difference between the two lies not in any difference in the utter dependence of men on Him[.] . . . Paul . . . is full of joy . . . to have . . . God's Holy Spirit . . . working faith in him[.] . . . He claims no superiority [to other believers] in the matter. If he has a like faith, it is because he is made by God's grace to share in a like fountain of faith. The one Spirit who works faith is the common possession of them and of him; and therein he finds his highest privilege and his greatest glory. . . . [T]he operations of the Spirit . . . Paul represents as the height of Christian privilege to possess.[1668]

Warfield unabashedly identified himself with those in the history of doctrine who were the champions of the grace of God. Self-dependent moralism was the very antithesis of Biblical Christianity:

> The champion[s] of grace . . . entire system revolved around the assertion of grace as the sole source of all good in man as truly and as completely as did that of Pelagius around the assertion of the plenary ability of the unaided will to work all righteousness. . . . [W]e are aided by the grace of God, through Christ, not only to know but also to do what is right, in each single act, so that without grace we are unable to have, think, speak, or do anything pertaining to piety[.] The opposition between the two systems was thus absolute. In the one, everything was attributed to man; In the other, everything was ascribed to God. In them, two religions, the only two possible religions at bottom, met in mortal combat: the religion of faith and the religion of works; the religion which despairs of self and casts all its hope on God the Saviour, and the religion which puts complete trust in self; or since religion is in its very nature utter dependence on God, religion in the purity of its conception and a mere quasi-religious moralism.[1669]

[1666] Pg. 356, *Calvin and Calvinism: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 5, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 2008.

[1667] Pg. 87, *The Plan of Salvation: Five Lectures*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1915.

[1668] Pgs. 237-238, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

[1669] Pgs. 40-41, *The Plan of Salvation: Five Lectures*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1915.

Rejection of self-dependence, a recognition of the need to trust in the Lord Jesus and the power of the Holy Spirit for strength to live the Christian life, and a rejection of sanctification sourced in the believer's works, is by no means a Keswick distinctive.

Warfield taught that the essence of Christianity is that "all [is] of God and nothing of ourselves"—God's unmerited love gives His people all. Since "the Christian life as a life" is one "of continuous dissatisfaction with self and of continuous looking afresh to Christ as the ground of all our hope,"[1670] believers must always look to the Lord Jesus and depend on Him for grace:

> We may rightly bewail our coldness: we may rightly blame ourselves that there is so little response in our hearts to the sight of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, or even to the manifestation of His unspeakable love in the death of His Son. Oh, wretched men that we are to see that bleeding love and not be set on fire with a flame of devotion! But we may be all the more thankful that it is not in our frames and feelings that we are to put our trust. Let us abase ourselves that we so little respond to these great spectacles of the everlasting and unspeakable love of God. But let us ever remember that it is on the love of God and not on our appreciation of it that we are to build our confidence. Jesus our Priest and our Sacrifice, let us keep our eyes set on Him! And though our poor sinful hearts so little know how to yield to that great spectacle the homage of a suitable response, His blood will yet avail even for us.
>
> "Nothing in my hand I bring,
> Simply to Thy cross I cling"—
>
> here—and let us bless God for it—here is the essence of Christianity. It is all of God and nothing of ourselves.[1671]

Through the "gospel the eye is withdrawn from self and the face turned upward in loving gratitude to God, the great giver [in a] . . . continual sense of humble dependence on God and of loving trust in Him."[1672] Warfield noted the teaching of Scripture that, in the workings of the Lord towards His people, "[a]t every step it is God, and God alone, to whom is ascribed the initiative; and the most extreme care is taken to preserve the recipients of the blessings consequent on His choice from fancying that these blessings come as their due, or as reward for aught done by themselves, or to be found in themselves."[1673] Nothing was the product of the believer's own strength; thus, Warfield could encourage believers:

> Faint not! It is not your own strength—or rather weakness—that is . . . in question; it is the power of Almighty God. . . . It was of His own purpose that He called you; the grace that has come to you was given you from all eternity. . . . It is this Almighty God who is using you as His instrument and organ. Nothing depends on your weakness; all hangs on His strength.[1674]

1670 Pg. 90, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part One*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 7, B. B. Warfield.

1671 Pgs. 253-254, *The Power of God unto Salvation*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia: PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1903.

1672 Pg. 213, *The Power of God unto Salvation*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia: PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1903.

1673 Pg. 12, *Biblical Doctrines: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

1674 Pg. 408, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

Since every aspect of salvation was sourced in God alone, Warfield passionately warned of the dangers of self-sufficiency and called upon men to live by faith and to surrender themselves entirely to the Lord:

> The very point of this passage [Habbakuk 2:4] is the sharp contrast which is drawn between arrogant self-sufficiency and faithful dependence on God . . . [I]t is by faith that the righteous man lives . . . the righteous appear . . . as men who look in faith to God and trustingly depend upon His arm. . . . Here we have, therefore, thrown into a clear light the contrasting characteristics of the wicked, typified by the Chaldæan, and of the righteous: of the one the fundamental trait is self-sufficiency; of the other, faith. This faith, which forms the distinctive feature of the righteous man, and by which he obtains life . . . is a profound and abiding disposition, an ingrained attitude of mind and heart towards God which affects and gives character to all the activities.[1675]

Indeed, "[T]he very core of Old Testament religion . . . [is] entire self-commitment to God [and] humble dependence on Him for all blessings," so "[s]elf-sufficiency is the characteristic mark of the wicked . . . while the mark of the righteous is that he lives by his faith (Hab. 2:4)."[1676] Warfield wrote that trusting in God and rejecting self-dependence was not just the very core of Old Testament true religion, but of all true religion in any dispensation whatever: "Now this attitude of trust and dependence on God is just the very essence of religion. In proportion as any sense of self-sufficiency or any dependence on self enters the heart, in that proportion religion is driven from it."[1677] Consequently, Warfield extolled those in church history he understood as recognizing that the essence of true religion is dependence on God, despair of any confidence in themselves, and rejection of mere religious moralism. Such an understanding is key to being filled with love and joy in believing:

> Self-despair, humble trust, grateful love, fullness of joy—these are the steps on which his own soul[1678] climbed upward: and these steps gave their whole color and form both to his piety and to his teaching. In his doctrine we see his experience of God's seeking and saving love toward a lost sinner expressing itself in propositional form; in his piety we see his conviction that the sole hope of the sinner lies in the free grace of a loving God expressing itself in the forms of feeling. In doctrine and life alike he sets before us in that effective way which belongs to the discoverer, the religion of faith as over against the religion of works—the religion which despairing of self casts all its hope on God as over against the religion that to a greater or less degree trusts in itself: in a word, since religion in its very nature is dependence on God, religion in the purity of its conception as over against a quasi-religious moralism. . . . [W]e are admitted into the very life of [the godly man] and are permitted to see his great heart cleansing itself of all trust in himself and laying hold with the grasp first of despair, then of discerning trust and then of grateful love upon

---

1675 Pgs. 469-470, *Biblical Doctrines: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

1676 Pg. 11, *Biblical Doctrines: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

1677 Pg. 213, *The Power of God unto Salvation*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia: PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1903.

1678 Warfield speaks here of Augustine of Hippo. In light of Augustine's strong advocacy of sacramental salvation and of the idea that outside of the Catholic Church there was no salvation, Warfield's high estimation of Augustine needs not a little modification. Nevertheless, Warfield's statements still show what the Princetonian valued highly as true piety.

> the God who [is] his salvation . . . [such truths have] perennial attractiveness and [the] supreme position . . . [for] edification.[1679]

Warfield believed that the advocates of system of doctrine he embraced were in a special way "called upon to defend the treasures of truth that had been committed to the[m] from the inroads of that perpetual foe of the grace of God which is entrenched in the self-sufficiency of the natural heart."[1680] Warfield believed that part of his calling as a defender of the faith was, in a special way, to fight against that awful foe, self-sufficiency. He wrote: "As over against all teaching that would tempt man to trust in himself for any, even the smallest part, of his salvation, Christianity casts him utterly on God. It is God and God alone who saves, and that in every element of the saving process."[1681] Justification, sanctification, glorification, and everything else in the doctrine of salvation was all sourced in God, not in man himself. Since every aspect of salvation comes from God, Christian life involves despairing of confidence in oneself and a humble and joyful trust in the Lord alone. B. B. Warfield, and the old evangelical piety of his theological tradition, emphasized these truths—they were by no means the peculiar possession of the Kewick theology.

Warfield embraced and warmly advocated the life of faith as the distinctive mark of true piety, affirming the centrality of living by faith not only in the New Testament, but in the Old also:

> [F]rom the very beginning the distinctive feature of the life of the pious is that it is a life of faith[.] . . . Thus the first recorded human acts after the Fall . . . are expressive of trust in God's promise . . . in the great promise of the Seed (Gen. 3:15). Similarly, the whole story of the Flood is so ordered as to throw into relief, on the one hand, the free grace of God in His dealings with Noah (Gen. 6:8, 18, 8:1, 21, 9:8), and, on the other, the determination of Noah's whole life by trust in God and His promises (Gen. 6:22, 7:5, 9:20). The open declaration of the faith-principle of Abraham's life (Gen. 15:6) only puts into words, in the case of him who stands at the root of Israel's whole national and religious existence, what not only might also be said of all the patriarchs, but what actually is most distinctly said both of Abraham and of them through the medium of their recorded history. The entire patriarchal narrative is set forth with the design and effect of exhibiting the life of the servants of God as a life of faith, and it is just by the fact of their implicit self-commitment to God that throughout the narrative the servants of God are differentiated from others. This does not mean, of course, that with them faith took the place of obedience: an entire self-commitment to God which did not show itself in obedience to Him would be self-contradictory, and the testing of faith by obedience is therefore a marked feature of the patriarchal narrative. But it does mean that faith was with them the precondition of all obedience. The patriarchal religion is essentially a religion, not of law but of promise, and therefore not primarily of obedience but of trust; the holy walk is characteristic of God's servants (Gen. 5:22, 24, 6:9, 17:1, 24:40, 48:15), but it is characteristically described as a walk "with God"; its peculiarity consisted precisely in the

---

[1679] Pgs. 252-253, *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield,* vol. 4, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

[1680] Pg. 144, *Studies in Theology: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 9, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

[1681] Pg. 59, *The Plan of Salvation: Five Lectures*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1915.

> ordering of life by entire trust in God, and it expressed itself in conduct growing out of this trust (Gen. 3:20, 4:1, 6:22, 7:5, 8:18, 12:4, 17:23, 21:12, 16, 22). The righteousness of the patriarchal age was thus but the manifestation in life of an entire self-commitment to God, in unwavering trust in His promises. . . . The piety of the Old Testament thus began with faith.[1682]

Indeed, "faith . . . on the human side is the fundamental element of religion, as grace is on God's side."[1683] Consequently, the Christian must continually trust and look to God through Christ in every area of his daily life, for not to do so is "practical atheism." Believers are to commit all their cares, burdens, and needs to the Lord, trusting that He will take care of them:

> There is a formal atheism of opinions and words and reasonings which declares that there is no God and seeks to sophisticate the understanding into believing that there is none. This the Bible describes as an open folly: the fool has said in his heart, There is no God. But even when the lip and the mind behind the lip are true to right reason and confess that there is a God who rules the world and to whom we are responsible in our every thought and word and deed, there is often a practical atheism that lives as if there were no God. Formal atheism denies God; practical atheism is guilty of the possibly even more astounding sin of forgetting the God it confesses. How many men who would not think of saying even in their hearts, There is no God, deny Him practically by ordering their lives as if He were not? And even among those who yield, in their lives, a practical as well as a formal acknowledgment of God, many yet manage, practically, to deny in their lives that this God, acknowledged and served, is the Lord of all the earth. How prone we are to limit and circumscribe the sphere in which we practically allow for God! We feel His presence and activity in some things but not in others; we seek His blessing in some matters but not in others; we look for His guidance in some affairs but not in others; we can trust Him in some crises and with some of our hopes but not in or with others. This too is a practical atheism. And it is against all such practical atheism that [Matthew 6:33] enters its protest. . . . It protests against men reckoning in anything without God.
>
> How are we to order our lives? How are we to provide for our households—or, for our own bodily wants? Is it true that we can trust the eternal welfare of our souls to God and cannot trust to Him the temporal welfare of our bodies? Is it true that He has provided salvation for us at the tremendous cost of the death of His Son, and will not provide food for us to eat and clothes for us to wear at the cost of the directive word that speaks and it is done? Is it true that we can stand by the bedside of our dying friend and send him forth into eternity in good confidence in God, and cannot send that same friend forth into the world with any confidence that God will keep him there? O, the practical atheism of many of our earthly cares and earthly anxieties! Can we not read the lessons of the birds of heaven and the lilies of the field which our Father feeds and clothes? What a rebuke these lessons are to our practical atheism, which says, in effect, that we cannot trust God for our earthly prosperity but must bid Him wait until we make good our earthly fortunes before we can afford to turn to Him. How many men do actually think that it is unreasonable to serve God at the expense of their business activity? To give Him their first and most energetic service? How many think it would be unreasonable in God to put His service before their provision for themselves and family? How many of us who Have been able to "risk" ourselves, do not think that we can "risk" our families in God's keeping? How subtle the temptations! But, here our Lord brushes them all away in the calm words, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; land all these things shall be added unto you." Is this not a rebuke to our practical atheism?[1684]

1682 Pgs. 485-486, *Biblical Doctrines: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

1683 Pg. 155, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

1684 Pgs. 44-46, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

The need to daily—indeed, constantly—live by faith, looking always to the Lord in confident trust, is by no means a Keswick distinctive. It is a glorious truth held in common by classic Baptist and old evangelical piety, one fervently proclaimed for many centuries before the origin of the Higher Life theology.

Warfield emphasized the need for surrender and consecration to Christ. He rejoiced that the Bible revealed to him "a Christ to love, to trust and to follow, a Christ without us the ground of our salvation, a Christ within us the hope of glory."[1685] Indeed, Warfield taught that "[s]urrender and consecration . . . are the twin key-notes of the Christian life."[1686] Divine blessing in Christian ministry depends upon surrender and consecration, and in proportion as they are emphasized may the Christian hope for success: "[O]ur life as ministers of the Gospel is nothing else but one side of our Christian life—the flower and fruit of our Christian life—[so] surrender and consecration must be made also its notes. It is in direct proportion as they are made its key-notes that we may hope for success in our ministry[.]"[1687] Surrender and consecration can by no means be divorced from faith—they are inextricably bound together: "[T]he two essential elements of all religion [are] surrender and consecration—the passive and active aspects of that faith which on the human side is the fundamental element of religion, as grace is on God's side, when dealing with sinful men."[1688] Warfield also recognized the absolute need for the strength of the Holy Spirit to enable surrender and consecration; God the Spirit's work is always primary and initiatory, while the believer's response is dependent upon Divine working. Therefore, on account of the believer's weakness, constant dependence upon God, prayer to Him, and constant empowerment from the Holy Ghost is absolutely necessary:

> Thus, then, the Spirit helps our weakness. By His hidden, inner influences He quickens us to the perception of our real need; He frames in us an infinite desire for this needed thing; He leads us to bring this desire in all its unutterable strength before God; who, seeing it within our hearts, cannot but grant it, as accordant with His will. Is not this a very present help in time of trouble? As prevalent a help as if we were miraculously rescued from any danger? And yet a help wrought through the means of God's own appointment, that is, our attitude of constant dependence on Him and our prayer to Him for His aid? And could Paul here have devised a better encouragement to the saints to go on in their holy course and fight the battle bravely to the end?[1689]

Indeed, as Warfield emphasized that believers are always weak and in need of the enablement of the Spirit, so he taught that Christians are always unworthy and always in

---

1685 Pg. 73, *Revelation and Inspiration: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 1, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

1686 Pg. 155, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

1687 Pg. 155, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

1688 Pg. 155, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

1689 Pgs. 200-201, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

continual need of God's grace. Anything good in them whatsoever must be ascribed, not to themselves, but to grace alone, received from the Holy Spirit alone "[e]very grace of the godly life . . . [is] a fruit of His working."[1690] Warfield explained:

> IT belongs to the very essence of the type of Christianity propagated by the Reformation that the believer should feel himself continuously unworthy of the grace by which he lives. At the center of this type of Christianity lies the contrast of sin and grace; and about this center everything else revolves. This is in large part the meaning of the emphasis put in this type of Christianity on justification by faith. It is its conviction that there is nothing in us or done by us, at any stage of our earthly development, because of which we are acceptable to God. We must always be accepted for Christ's sake, or we cannot ever be accepted at all. This is not true of us only "when we believe." It is just as true after we have believed. It will continue to be true as long as we live. Our need of Christ does not cease with our believing; nor does the nature of our relation to Him or to God through Him ever alter, no matter what our attainments in Christian graces or our achievements in Christian behavior may be. It is always on His "blood and righteousness" alone that we can rest. There is never anything that we are or have or do that can take His place, or that can take a place along with Him. We are always unworthy, and all that we have or do of good is always of pure grace. Though blessed with every spiritual blessing in the heavenlies in Christ, we are still in ourselves just "miserable sinners": "miserable sinners" saved by grace to be sure, but "miserable sinners" still, deserving in ourselves nothing but everlasting wrath. That is the attitude which the Reformers took, and that is the attitude which the Protestant world has learned from the Reformers to take, toward the relation of believers to Christ.[1691]

Since every aspect of salvation, whether justification, sanctification, or glorification, arises purely from the grace decreed by the Father, purchased by the Son, and applied by the Holy Ghost, the believer's spiritual strengthening is not a self-dependent moralism, but is sourced in the Son and wrought by the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of faith:

> [S]piritual strengthening is contingent on, or let us rather say, is dependent on the abiding presence of Christ in their hearts. The indwelling Christ is the source of the Christian's spiritual strength. This is, of course, not to set aside the Holy Spirit. But he has read his New Testament to little purpose who would separate the Holy Spirit and Christ: Christ abides in the heart by the Spirit. The indwelling of the Holy Ghost is the means of the indwelling of Christ and the two are one and the same great fact. We are strengthened in the inner man with might by the Holy Spirit, because by the operation of the Spirit in our hearts, Christ abides there—thus and not otherwise. And here we learn then the source of the Christian's strength. Christ is the ultimate source. His indwelling is the ground of all our strength. But it is only by the Spirit—the executive of the Godhead in this sphere too—that Christ dwells in the heart. It is the Spirit that strengthens us, and He so strengthens us that He gives us "might" in our inner man. The way He does this is by forming Christ within us.
>
> The Apostle [Paul] is one of the most fecund writers extant, and thus it happens that he does not leave the matter even there. It is by the Spirit that Christ dwells in us—that is the objective fact. But there is a subjective fact too, and the Apostle does not fail to touch it—it is by our faith, too, that Christ dwells in us. "That Christ may abide in your hearts by your faith," he says. He does not say "by faith" merely, though he might well have said that, and it would have covered the

---

[1690] Pg. 129, *Biblical Doctrines: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

[1691] Pgs. 113-114, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part One: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 7, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

whole necessary idea. But, in his habitual fullness of expression, he puts in the article,[1692] and thus implies that he recognizes their faith as already existent. They are Christians, they already believe, Christ is already dwelling in them by faith; he prays that He may abide in them by their faith. The stress is everywhere laid on continuance. May God strengthen your inner man, he says, by His Spirit. That is to say, he adds, may that Christ whom ye have received into your hearts by faith abide continuously in your hearts by that faith of yours. As much as to say, Christ is brought into your hearts by the Holy Ghost. He abides there by that Holy Ghost. May God thus continually strengthen your hearts by His Spirit, and that, even with might. I pray to Him for it, for it is He that gives it. But do not think, therefore, that you may lose hold on Christ. It is equally true that He abides in your hearts by your faith. When faith fails, so do the signs of His presence within: the strengthening of the Spirit and the steady burning of the flame of faith are correlative. As well expect the thermometer to stand still with the temperature varying as the height of your faith not to index the degree of your strength. Your strength is grounded in the indwelling Christ, wrought by the Spirit by means of faith.

Thus we have laid before us the sources of the Christian's strength. It is rooted in Christ, the Christ within us, abiding there by virtue of the Spirit's action quickening and upholding faith in us. And only as by the Spirit our faith is kept firm and clear, will Christ abide in us, and will we accordingly be strong in the inner man.[1693]

Evangelical piety has long recognized the necessity of surrender and consecration to Christ, the believer's continual weakness and need for grace, and the supernatural Divine source of all spiritual growth in the Triune God. Keswick theology did not contribute any new Scriptural teaching or new positive emphasis in relation to these blessed truths.

Warfield also recognized, because of the absolute dependence of the Christian on God and His grace, the supreme importance of prayer. The believer is to live in perpetual communion with God and to seek Him earnestly in prayer:

The thing for us to do is to pray without ceasing; once having come into the presence of God, never to leave it; to abide in His presence and to live, steadily, unbrokenly, continuously, in the midst of whatever distractions or trials, with and in Him. God grant such a life to every one of us! . . .

We must not undervalue the purely subjective or reflex effects of prayer. They are of the highest benefit to us. Much less must we undervalue the objective effects of prayer. In them lies the specific meaning of that exercise of prayer which we call petition. But the heart of the matter lies in every case in the communion with God which the soul enjoys in prayer. This is prayer itself, and in it is summed up what is most blessed in prayer. If it be man's chief end to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever, then man has attained his end, the sole purpose for which he was made, the entire object for which he exists, when he enters into communion with God, abides in His presence, streaming out to Him in all the emotions, I do not say appropriate to a creature in the presence of his Maker and Lord, apprehended by him as the Good Lord and Righteous Ruler of the souls of men, but appropriate to the sinner who has been redeemed by the blood of God's own Son and is inhabited by His Spirit and apprehends his Maker as also his Saviour, his Governor as also his Lover, and knows the supreme joy of him that was lost and is found, was dead and is alive again,—and all, through the glory of God's seeking and saving love. He who attains to this experience has attained all that is to be attained. He is absorbed in the beatific vision. He that sees God shall be like Him. . . .

If there is a God who sits aloft and hears and answers, do we not see that the attitude into which prayer brings the soul is the appropriate attitude which the soul should occupy to Him, and

---

[1692] That is, Ephesians 3:17a reads: κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ *τῆς* πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. (This explanatory note was written by the author of this entire book, not by B. B. Warfield, who is being quoted.)

[1693] Pgs. 270-272, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

> is the truest and best preparation of the soul for the reception of His grace? The soul in the attitude of prayer is like the flower turned upwards towards the sky and opening for the reception of the life-giving rain. What is prayer but an adoring appearing before God with a confession of our need and helplessness and a petition for His strength and blessing? What is prayer but a recognition of our dependence and a proclamation that all that we dependent creatures need is found abundantly and to spare in God, who gives to all men liberally and upbraids not? What is prayer but the very adjustment of the heart for the influx of grace? Therefore it is that we look upon the prayerful attitude as above all others the true Christian attitude—just because it is the attitude of devout and hopeful dependence on God.[1694]

Warfield called believers to a passionate and intimate life of fellowship with their Triune Redeemer in prayer. Conscious, direct, and intimate fellowship with the Triune God through the Holy Spirit, and immediate dependence on Him, is the distinguishing mark that separates evangelical piety from false systems such as sacerdotalism and which gives true Christianity its joy and power:

> [T]he sacerdotal system separates the soul from direct contact with and immediate dependence upon God the Holy Spirit as the source of all its gracious activities. . . . The Church, the means of grace, take the place of God the Holy Spirit in the thought of the Christian, and he thus loses all the joy and power which come from conscious direct communion with God. It makes every difference to the religious life, and every difference to the comfort and assurance of the religious hope, whether we are consciously dependent upon instrumentalities of grace, or upon God the Lord himself, experienced as personally present to our souls, working salvation in his loving grace. The two types of piety, fostered by dependence on instrumentalities of grace and by conscious communion with God the Holy Spirit as a personal Saviour, are utterly different, and the difference from the point of view of vital religion is not favorable to sacerdotalism. It is in the interests of vital religion, therefore, that the Protestant spirit repudiates sacerdotalism. And it is this repudiation which constitutes the very essence of evangelicalism. Precisely what evangelical religion means is immediate dependence of the soul on God and on God alone for salvation.[1695]

Keswick teaching on prayer and fellowship with God added nothing to the store of Biblical truth already possessed and treasured by traditional evangelical piety.

Warfield taught that the believer must be filled with and empowered by the Spirit—the Spirit-filled life was the goal of Apostolic piety, and it was the goal towards which the Princeton theologian likewise pointed men:

> It is only in our Head that the victory is now complete: in us who are members, it appears as yet only in part: and it is only when we put off our flesh, according to which we are liable to infirmity, that we shall be filled with the power of the Holy Spirit.[1696]
>
> On the basis of this great declaration the Apostle erects, then, his exhortation. Nor is he content to leave it in a negative, or merely inferential form. In the accomplishment of the Spirit-filled life he sees the goal, and he speaks it out in a final urgency of exhortation into which he compresses the whole matter: "Having, therefore, such promises as *these* (note the emphasis), beloved," he says, "let us purify ourselves from every defilement of flesh and spirit and perfect holiness in the fear of God." It is perfection, we perceive, that the Apostle is after for his followers; and he does not hesitate to raise this standard before the eyes of his readers as their greatest incitement to effort.

1694 Pgs. 153, 438-439, 149, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

1695 Pgs. 81-82, *The Plan of Salvation: Five Lectures*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1915.

1696 Pg. 334, *Calvin and Calvinism: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 5, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 2008.

> They must not be content with a moderate attainment in the Christian life. They must not say to themselves, O, I guess I am Christian enough, although I'm not too good to do as other men do. They must, as they have begun in the Spirit, not finish in the flesh; but must go on unto perfection.[1697]

The work of the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential in every aspect of salvation:

> Let us remind ourselves moreover that the matters which fall under discussion here are of the order of what the Bible calls "things of the Spirit," things which are not to be had at all except as imparted by the Holy Ghost; and that it is therefore peculiarly infelicitous to speak of them as "attainable," merely on the ground of "natural ability." In so speaking of them, we seem gravely in danger of forgetting the dreadful evil of sin as the corruption of our whole nature, and the absolute need of the Spirit's free action in recovering us from this corruption. The unregenerate man cannot believe; the regenerate man cannot be perfect; because these things are not the proper product of their efforts in any case but are conferred by the Spirit, and by the Spirit alone. . . . The Scriptures do not . . . subordinate the Spirit's action to that of man; they do not think of the gifts of the Spirit as "attained," but as "conferred." . . . [We] rightly emphasiz[e] the supernatural nature of sanctification, as of regeneration, and of salvation at large. We do not sanctify ourselves by our own power; we do not even sanctify ourselves by using the Spirit as the instrument by which alone we can accomplish this great result. It is God who sanctifies us; and our activities are consequent at every step on His, not His on ours. . . . [We ought to] rise to the height of the Scriptural supernaturalness of sanctification . . . [and] recognize[e] the supernaturalness of the actual process of the sanctifying work[.][1698]

The old evangelical piety represented by Warfield taught that believers must not rest satisfied with moderate Christian attainments, but press on towards the standard of the absolute perfection of Christ. In this goal, they must not trust in the flesh, but be filled with the Spirit, for sanctification is absolutely and utterly depedent upon His work. Keswick contributed no new truth to the old orthodox piety in these key doctrinal and practical areas.

The following quotation summarizes the warm evangelical piety that Warfield, as a representative of old evangelical orthodoxy, embraced, preached, and defended:

> [T]he systematic theologian is preëminently a preacher of the gospel; and the end of his work is obviously not merely the logical arrangement of the truths which come under his hand, but the moving of men, through their power, to love God with all their hearts and their neighbors as themselves; to choose their portion with the Saviour of their souls; to find and hold Him precious; and to recognize and yield to the sweet influences of the Holy Spirit whom He has sent. With such truth as this he will not dare to deal in a cold and merely scientific spirit, but will justly and necessarily permit its preciousness and its practical destination to determine the spirit in which he handles it, and to awaken the reverential love with which alone he should investigate its reciprocal relations. For this he needs to be suffused at all times with a sense of the unspeakable worth of the revelation which lies before him as the source of his material, and with the personal bearings of its separate truths on his own heart and life; he needs to have had and to be having a full, rich, and deep religious experience of the great doctrines with which he deals; he needs to be living close to his God, to be resting always on the bosom of his Redeemer, to be filled at all times with the manifest influences of the Holy Spirit. The student of systematic theology needs a very sensitive religious nature, a most thoroughly consecrated heart, and an outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon him, such as will fill him with that spiritual discernment, without which all native intellect is in vain. He needs to be not merely a student, not merely a thinker, not merely a systematizer, not

---

1697 Pg. 255, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

1698 Pgs. 74-75, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part Two*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 8, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

> merely a teacher—he needs to be like the beloved disciple himself in the highest, truest, and holiest sense, a divine.[1699]

Non-Keswick Baptist and classical evangelical spirituality is a Christ-centered and Spirit-dependent piety found in the hearts and writings of Christians for many centuries before the origination of the Keswick theology. Both before and after the rise of the Keswick and Higher Life movements, old evangelical orthodox spirituality prominently preached and lived by the truths that were also proclaimed at Keswick.

Keswick's advocates and its staunch Baptist and classical evangelical opponents stand in full agreement upon the need for Christians to seek for close and sweet communion with Christ by the Spirit. They agree upon the necessity of recognizing the terrible evil of sin, of living by faith in Christ, of relying on the power of the Spirit, of the futility of self-dependence, of the need for whole-hearted surrender and consecration to the Lord, and of the centrality of prayer. Thus, the Biblical truths affirmed at Keswick were not newly originated by the Convention but were taught and accepted by countless multitudes during the centuries before it arose and thus by those with no knowledge of the Keswick theology. What is more, all the truths affirmed at Keswick were warmly defended by multitudes who were passionately opposed to the Convention after its origin in the latter portion of the nineteenth century. Keswick set forth no new truth.

While Keswick set forth no new truth, it did set forth many errors, both new and old. While one cannot but rejoice if a believer's spiritual life is strengthened on account of the emphasis upon the tremendous truths set forth in Keswick literature and preaching, the unscriptural aspects of the Keswick theology are extremely dangerous and must be avoided. Although the Lord Jesus is gracious and, in His great love for His yet sinful people, He condescends to commune with them even when they adopt theological errors, nonetheless the false teaching mixed with truth at Keswick hinders, rather than furthers, experiential communion with Jesus Christ by faith. Keswick errors dishonor God the Father, confuse the work of Christ, and grieve the Holy Spirit, and so restrain His work of shedding abroad the love of God in the Christian's heart. The believer can learn the fulness of truth on sanctification from the Bible and from sound Scripturally-based books that have no association with the Keswick theology. He would do well to do so, because Keswick promotes pernicious errors.

3.) The Unscriptural Aspects of Keswick Theology

[1699] Pgs. 86-87, *Studies in Theology: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 9, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008. Warfield's language of the outpouring of the Spirit here is not technically accurate (**reference the chapter on the historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism**) but his sense of and expressed need for the Spirit is indubitably both accurate and highly commendable.

Keswick theology has severe problems. These problems are natural in light of Keswick's corrupt roots. Keswick's errors and heresies include its ecumenicalism, its theological shallowness or even incomprehensibility, its downplaying of the role of God's Word in sanctification, its distaste for careful exegetical and systematic theology and the Biblical dogmatics arising from such theology, its allegorical hermeneutical methods and exegetical fallacies, its shallow views of sin, and its perfectionism. Furthermore, Keswick supports certain Pelagian or semi-Pelagian positions, improperly divorces justification and sanctification, is confused about the nature of saving repentance, denies that God's sanctifying grace always frees Christians from bondage to sin and changes them, and fails to warn strongly about the possibility of those who are professedly Christians being unregenerate. Keswick likewise supports an unbiblical pneumatology, supports continuationism as opposed to cessationism, advances significant exegetical errors, distorts the positions and critiques of opponents of the errors of the Higher Life movement, misrepresents the role of faith in sanctification, supports Quietism, and denies that God actually renews the nature of believers to make them less sinful and more personally holy. Keswick's grievous errors and heresies should have no place in any Christian's life.

The Keswick Convention intentionally "stands for no particular brand of denominational theology. It could not, and have on its platform men of many different denominational affiliations."[1700] There is an (alleged) "ecumenical value of Keswick . . . gathering together as it has done men and women of . . . almost all Protestant denominations,"[1701] for "denominational differences are put aside as of little importance in comparison with what all Christians hold in common. The motto of the Convention is, 'ALL ONE IN CHRIST JESUS.'"[1702] Following the great desire of Lord Mount-Temple and his associates to unite heresy, apostasy, and orthodoxy in a melting-pot of ecumenical spirituality,[1703] the Broadlands, Oxford, Brighton, and Keswick Conventions

---

1700 Pg. 29, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas.

1701 Pg. 9, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas.

1702 Pg. 186, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas. Similarly, at the Keswick-type Swanwick conferences led by Jessie Penn-Lewis, "[m]inisters of many denominations, lay workers, and spiritual teachers" came together around Keswick and mystical theology "in one spirit, and without controversy over divergent points of view" (pg. 276, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard; cf. pgs. 299-301). Visions were seen and expounded at such conferences, in accordance with the continuationism of the participants (e. g., pgs. 118-119, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

1703 Pg. 134, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

fulfilled the wishes of their ecumenical founders.[1704] Therefore, at Keswick, "men . . . forget their religious differences . . . [and the conflict] of creeds . . . [and] of sects," so that "Keswick has . . . no[t] weakened any of the old . . . denomination[s.] . . . Its aim has been to send back Church members . . . to their old circles."[1705] Keswick united Anglicans with their sacramentalism, Quakers with their false gospel, Lutherans with their baptismal regeneration, and many other religious organizations and individuals of "almost every shade of religious opinion."[1706] Keswick accepted the Broadlands idea that "[i]t is not our creed, but our conduct, that proclaims what our life is."[1707] The Keswick Convention consequently brings together "ministers of all denominations," uniting "High Churchmen and Low Churchmen," despite the damnable sacramental heresies of High Church Anglicanism, and in this union spiritual wolves and sheep discover that "the things on which they honestly differ are as nothing[.]" Keswick wishes to "hasten that day" when the Anglican "Church and Dissent join hands" and "Reunion is an established

---

[1704] Pg. 119, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890. Thus, for example, at Broadlands "all shades of religious opinion" were present (pg. 139, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890); at the Oxford Convention "High Churchmen and Low Churchmen sat side by side; and Nonconformist ministers [joined them,] [a]ll united in prayer[.] . . . It was surely a reason for praise to God that so many Christians, differing strongly on important subjects, should listen . . . [to the Higher Life] addresses on Holiness [by men including] Mr. R. Pearsall Smith [and] W. E. Boardman" (pg. 119, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Those of "the Society of Friends . . . Episcopalians . . . Presbyterians . . . Methodists . . . Congregationalists . . . Baptist[s] . . . Wesleyan[s]," and others all joined together in ecumenical unity (pgs. 262-263, 342; cf. 177-178). Oxford ministers also recognized the value of Western and Eastern Catholicism; they proclaimed: "Many of the [Russian Orthodox] priests are believers, and are circulating the Word of God" (pg. 230). One minister testified: "I was converted through the instrumentality of a monk" (pg. 191). Those who believed in the corrupt sacramental gospel of the Anglican High Church movement did not come under conviction and see their need to receive the true gospel; rather, they went away "comforted, consoled, peaceful, [and] joyful" in their false gospel (pg. 362).

[1705] Pg. 176, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

[1706] Pgs. 10, 427, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1707] Pg. 184, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. For Broadlands and Keswick, creed and conduct were to be set against each other. For Scripture and in true spirituality, creed and conduct mutually reinforce each other in evaluating the presence or strength of spiritual life.

The rise of the "People's Church" movement, which through the influence of the Brighton Convention rejected historical Christianity for a Higher Life agnosticism, illustrates where the unscriptural Keswick disjunction between creed and conduct can lead:

> [T]he Oxford-Brighton movement was . . . the means of forwarding the agnostic 'Peoples' Church' through an attendant at Brighton, who, in a joyous sense of a yielded will, and full trust, feeling the force of the historical difficulties in Christianity, tho [*sic*] he seemed as earnest, sincere, consecrated and true in heart as ever, felt led with the same sort of personal devotion to making a church for the large class of morally good men among the working classes whom he found seemingly incapable of Christian faith, in its historical sense, and he formed congregations out of such. (pg. 20, *Forward Movements*, Pierson)

fact."[1708] The piety of Keswick is such that "the dividing-lines between church and church are forgotten."[1709] Indeed, Keswick founder Canon Harford-Battersby's goal was "the Re-union of the Churches . . . bringing together on a common basis members of all Christian churches,"[1710] a goal which shall be fulfilled in the one-world religious system centered in Rome and described by the Apostle John as "BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH" (Revelation 17:5). Keswick follows the pattern of Robert and Hannah Smith's "preaching[,] [which] was not sectarian; they led no exodus from any of the Churches, but taught only the need for the Higher Life."[1711] Robert Smith "presented himself as an unattached teacher, who would fain serve all denominations alike."[1712] He would not visit a city and proclaim the Higher Life without broad and ecumenical support.[1713] He declared: "I am not aware of a single instance in which these [Higher Life] meetings have led Christian persons to change their denominational connection."[1714] On the contrary, he affirmed: "I have reason to believe that hundreds have been saved by . . . this line of teaching . . . from temptation to change . . . their ecclesiastical connections."[1715] After years of Keswick Conventions, its leaders could boast that their "movement, so far as is known, never resulted in a change of the Church connection of a single individual from that in which it found him."[1716] Keswick consciously and strongly embraced the teaching of the Broadlands Conference that "a desire to proselytize . . . is entirely opposed to the spirit and teaching of Jesus."[1717] Keswick maintained the passionate ecumenicalism of its founders and early leaders.

[1708] Pg. 191, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

[1709] Pg. 177, pg. 11, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie.

[1710] Pg. 221, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford.

[1711] Pg. 13, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey.

[1712] "The Higher Life Movement," Chapter 4 in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield.

[1713] Pg. 432, pg. 12, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1714] Pg. 432, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1715] Pg. 185, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

[1716] Pg. 19, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Arthur T. Pierson. New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900. The importance to Pierston of this ecumenical anti-separatism as one of the merits of Keswick was such that he emphasized it again on pg. 41; a "conspicuous result" of attendance at "Keswick meetings" was for people to "incline to stay where they are, ecclesiastically," even in denominations with a "dead and formal service"; "no man or woman ever yet being known, through its influence or under its teaching, to leave one communion for another" (pg. 41, *ibid*).

[1717] Pg. 150, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

The doctrinal confusion that results from Keswick ecumenicalism has plagued the Convention from the time of its founding until modern times. As at Broadlands a "great variety of spheres of thought were admitted for consideration, and wide and progressive views were presented and listened to,"[1718] so theological liberalism and apostasy was presented and listened to at Keswick. For example, following the steps of Hannah W. Smith in the rejection of eternal torment, George Grubb, a key Keswick leader from the 1880s onward, denied hell in favor of annihilationism or conditional immortality.[1719] In 1899 Grubb was the first Keswsick leader sent out to bring the Higher Life message to the world. He was an effective speaker, contributing, everywhere he went, to the rise of both Keswick theology and annihilationism.[1720] In response to the annihilationism of Grubb and other Keswick missioners such as Gelson Gregson, Keswick co-founder Robert Wilson declared: "If Keswick won't own those whom the Lord does—Grubb, Moore, Gregson, etc., where are we? High and *very* dry I fear?" In response to a query by a lady Keswick missionary who held to annihilationism, "John Battersby Harford, as honorary secretary of the Keswick Missionary Council, insisted . . . that there was no official Keswick opinion about whether conditional immortality was true or false."[1721] Rejecting what Jesus Christ plainly taught about hell was acceptable at Keswick. Thus, Grubb "travelled extensively in . . . [spreading the] ministry [of] . . . the Keswick message," being among a select number chosen by Keswick to spread the Higher Life "far afield" to countries such as "Australia, Canada, . . . India and the Far East . . . the United States . . . and other lands."[1722] Indeed, Grubb "was the first to be sent abroad as a 'Keswick deputation' speaker—a most fruitful aspect of the Convention's ministry . . .

[1718] Pg. 18, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1719] Pgs. 88-97, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

[1720] Pg. 110, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1721] Pgs. 113-114, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Italics reproduced from the original. After all, as an authorized statement of Keswick declares, "Conditional Immortality . . . [is] a doctrine . . . lying in that doctrinal limbo where revelation grants no sharp outlines . . . not . . . clearly heterodox. The matter lay rather within the scope of private judgment" (pg. 95, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck). God's Word states that the lost "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night" (Revelation 14:9-11), but, for Keswick, such texts are not clear. Who can tell from such a passage whether "tormented with fire and brimstone . . . for ever and ever . . . no rest day nor night" means the lost are tormented with fire and brimstone for ever and ever, and have no rest day nor night, or whether they are annihilated, so that they are never tormented with fire and brimstone, but rest peacefully day and night?

[1722] Pg. 21, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson.

Mr. Grubb traveled widely as an 'ambassador at large' of Keswick, and was greatly used . . . especially in India, Ceylon and Australia . . . his . . . 'return home' visits to Keswick . . . invariably had a stimulating effect," his messages making a "profound impression," so that he was among the "most renowned . . . [and] most distinguished exponents" of the Keswick theology.[1723] At his worldwide Keswick venues Grubb promoted his heresies, from annihilationism to the the Broadlands Conference doctrine[1724] that people could make Jesus Christ return more quickly,[1725] while exemplifying Keswick ecumenicalism by "cross[ing] the oceans" specifically to "conduct a mission" for the "extreme high church Bishop of Cape Town."[1726] Grubb similarly spread the Higher Life doctrine of a post-conversion Spirit baptism at Keswick in England and worldwide,[1727] being Keswick's "important influence . . . [and] advocate in the 1890s of the baptism of the Spirit,"[1728] as well as "drawing particular attention to th[e] subject [of] . . . [h]ealing . . . at Keswick . . . influences [that] were to find their way into Pentecostalism in Britain and North America."[1729]

Since the Broadlands Conference that led to the formation of Keswick promoted spiritualism with its free intercourse with devils, it is not surprising that Grubb was by no means the only heretic who used the ecumenicalism of Keswick to spread doctrines of demons.[1730] "James Mountain, Keswick's early song-leader," who led the singing at "the Brighton Convention of 1875, and at the first Keswick" and many following meetings, "subscribed to British Israelism . . . for forty years."[1731] The "liberal evangelicalism" that denied the verbal, plenary inspiration of Scripture and other key tenets of Christian

---

[1723] Pgs. 249, 17, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson. See pg. 141, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall, for the Keswick connection of George Grubb's nephew Norman.

[1724] E. g., those who adopted Broadlands doctrine could "hasten . . . the coming of the kingdom of God" (pg. 269, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910; the teaching of Broadlands included hastening both the current and eschatological aspects of the kingdom, hastening it "in any and every way.").

[1725] Pg. 247, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. This teaching of the Broadlands Conference was also promoted by other Keswick leaders such as Jessie Penn-Lewis; see pg. 181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913.

[1726] Pg. 90, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

[1727] Pgs. 51-52, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1728] Pg. 76, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1729] Pg. 178, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1730] See further, e. g., the biographical studies in the section "Keswick and Continuationism" below.

[1731] Pgs. 83, 134, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

orthodoxy found its place at Keswick among men such as John Battersby Harford, the "most prominent of the [Keswick] founder's sons."[1732] Keswick council members had "no agreement about the appropriateness of [the] term . . . 'inerrancy'" for the Holy Bible; Keswick President Graham Scroggie "stated that subscription to a particular theory of inspiration was not . . . a true test of doctrinal orthodoxy."[1733] In 1894, "John R. Mott, an American who became the foremost international and ecumenical misionary figure of his time, was at the Keswick camp."[1734] Sadhu Sundar Singh, who "was converted to Christianity by a vision on 18 Dec. 1904 . . . and donned the robe of a Sadhu (i.e. 'holy man') in an endeavour to present Christianity in a Hindu form,"[1735] and who "claim[ed] to have received many visions and experienced many miracles"[1736] validating his Hindu-Christian syncretism, spoke at Keswick despite "sympathy towards Hinduism and Spiritualism."[1737] Key Keswick leaders manifested a very spiritually dangerous willingness to share platforms at Holiness Conventions and other settings with false teachers and fanatical perfectionists—for example, shortly before speaking at Keswick in 1886, Handly Moule and other Keswick speakers preached at a Convention at Cambridge organized by Douglas Hamilton with the unabashed perfectionist Smyth-Piggott, as a result of which many Cambridge undergraduates, including Charles Harford, Canon Harford-Battersby's youngest son, came to believe "themselves to be quite free from all internal evil." A few months later, Hamilton joined the Agapemonites,[1738] and "[w]hen

---

[1732] Pg. 137, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; pg. 150, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

[1733] See pgs. 64-69, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1734] Pg. 117, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1735] Pg. 1568, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (3rd ed. rev.), F. L. Cross, & E. A. Livingstone.

[1736] Pg. 647, *Who's Who in Christian History*, ed. J. Douglas & P. W. Comfort.

[1737] Pg. 175, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1738] The *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* notes:

> [The] Church of the . . . Agapemone . . . [was a] small 19th-cent. English sect. It was founded by Henry James Prince (1811–99), who in 1840 was ordained as curate of Charlynch . . . in Somerset. Together with his rector, Samuel Starky, he started a revivalist movement which soon resulted in illusions of the grossest kind. Both left the Church of England and began a ministry of their own, asserting that they were the Holy Spirit personified, the Two Witnesses of Rev. 11, or Elijah. In 1849 they opened the "Agapemone" or "Abode of Love" in the village of Spaxton (in Somerset), being amply supported by their followers, who believed Prince to be a Divine being. The morals of the sect caused great scandal, and a trial in 1860 revealed the licentiousness of Prince and his followers. In the early 1890s the sect conducted a campaign in Clapton in NE London, calling themselves the "Children of the Resurrection." J. H. Smyth-Pigott, Prince's successor in the leadership, proclaimed himself to be Christ. The sect disappeared early in the 20th century. (pg. 27, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd rev. ed., Cross & Livingstone)

Likewise, the *New International Dictionary of the Christian Church* records:

Pigott joined him . . . the extremist wing of Holiness made shipwreck."[1739] As time passed, the Pentecostal movement found a home at Keswick, so that by the 1960s Keswick, along with its association with the wider ecumenical movement,[1740] invited charismatics to speak at the Convention, while their ministers became part of the Keswick council itself.[1741] Doctrinal confusion and apostasy has found a secure home in the ecumenical atmosphere of the Keswick Convention from the time of its founding. Keswick ecumenicalism has never been purged out. On the contrary, ecumenicalism has constantly been rejoiced in and fostered.

While Keswick rejects separatism for ecumenicalism, Scripture never commands individuals or true churches to ignore Biblical doctrine to come together in an ecumenical setting. Rather, God requires a strict separation of the faithful from false teachers and even disobedient brethren. They are to be separate from all false doctrine, false teachers, and error. So far from ignoring such, they must, to honor the Lord, specifically mark and reprove error and those who advocate it.[1742] Keswick denigrates creed to exalt conduct in relation to spiritual life, while Scripture exalts both creed and conduct (1 John 3:7, 14; 2 John 9) in relation to spiritual life. Faithful Biblical preaching deals with all that is in the Word, whether it is "in season" or "out of season" (2 Timothy 3:16-4:2), but those who

---

> Agapemonism [was a] religious movement founded by Henry James Prince (1811–99), an evangelical perfectionist. Ordained in 1840, Prince became a curate first in the Bath and Wells diocese and later in the diocese of Ely. Both bishops inhibited him. It was probably in 1843 that he began to make extravagant statements which gave the impression that he was claiming to be in some sense an incarnation of God. A community was formed at Spaxton where a magnificent residence was acquired and called Agapemone (Abode of Love). Prince declared that community of goods was binding upon believers, and numerous devotees handed over their property to him. The legal case *Nottidge* v. *Prince* revealed grave disorders, and the movement was generally discredited, though Prince and a number of followers continued to live in the Agapemone. In the 1890s the movement enjoyed a revival under J.H. Smyth-Pigott, formerly a curate of St. Jude's, Mildmay Park. Calling themselves "Children of the Resurrection," his followers built a meeting place known as the "Ark of the Resurrection." In 1902 Smyth-Pigott proclaimed himself to be Jesus Christ, and the movement lost its vogue. Some of Prince's writings breathe a spirit of devotion to Christ, but they are marred by an erotic element. Regarding himself and Samuel Starky, his former Somerset rector, as the two witnesses of Revelation 11, Prince proclaimed the doom of Christendom, for example in *The Council of God in Judgment.* ("Agapemonism," in *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, gen. ed. J. D. Douglas)

Since Oliphant and Smyth-Pigott held Holiness missions together, the erotic elements in the Agapemonite sect, which included spiritual wives with whom very physical immorality was committed, among many other shameful and unspeakable abominations, would be expected (pg. 68, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck; cf. "Agapemone," http://www.apologeticsindex.org/453-agapemone).

[1739] Pgs. 71-72, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck. Charles Harford later renounced Smyth-Piggot perfectionism.

[1740] Pg. 79, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; pg. 130, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

[1741] Pgs. 251-2, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1742] Romans 16:17; 1 Corinthians 5:11; 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1; 2 Thessalonians 3:6, 14; 2 Timothy 3:5.

speak at Keswick "consider themselves pledged . . . not to teach during the course of any Keswick Convention any doctrines or opinions but those upon which there is general agreement [at the Convention]. . . . Speakers are not permitted to discuss controversial matters at the Convention."[1743] True churches are to tolerate "no other doctrine" (1 Timothy 1:3), not overlook doctrine to become ecumenical. The fact that Keswick fails to expose, but rather tolerates and supports[1744] the heresies of Protestant denominations, such as the baptismal regeneration that plagues the large majority of the paedobaptist world,[1745] is a great failure on its part. Keswick's utter lack of strict association with the modern representatives of the congregations of the New Testament—historic Baptist churches—leaves the movement apart from the authority of the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Timothy 3:15) and the work of spiritual edification that God has ordained take place within that context (Ephesians 4:11-16). The movement thus lacks the promise which the Baptist congregation possesses—that Christ would build up or edify His church (Matthew 16:18).[1746] Error can take root firmly and easily as the movement is without the special protection that Christ provides as Head of His congregation. Keswick's heavy Quaker influence, to the extent that one of the co-founders of Keswick was a Quaker and that from its inception the Keswick convention allowed those in soul-

---

1743 Pg. 35, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas.

1744 For example, Barabas records the influence of Keswick on increasing ten-fold the giving of the congregation underneath the charge of H. W. Webb-Peploe to the Anglican Church Missionary Society, of which he was a Committee member, although (Barabas leaving this fact unmentioned) the society supported men who preached and associated with a sacramental false gospel and other soul-damning heresies, as well as charismatics (cf. pg. 165, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas; pg. 11, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck pg. 158, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). The natural, Biblical expectation mentioned by Barabas that "the Church Missionary Society would get no more out of that church 'now that a revivalist had come,'" was, unfortunately, disappointed. Rather, "the C. M. S. . . . [was among] the earliest [Society] to recognize Keswick's value" (pg. 85, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck). Webb-Peploe had been associated with the Higher Life and Keswick theology from the time of its founding at the first Broadlands Conference (pg. 148, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890; but see pg. 29, *Forward Movements*, Pierson).

1745 Compare pgs. 1-10, *Heaven Only For the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ versus Baptismal Regeneration* and "Were the Reformers Heretics?" by Thomas Ross. Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

1746 The defender of Keswick ecumenicalism can appeal in vain to the alleged command of Christ for unity within the universal church, for such an entity is itself another error and false doctrine Protestantism has taken from its corrupt Roman Catholic fountain. For representative refutations of the universal church dogma, see *Ecclesia,* B. H. Carroll (Emmaus, PA: Challenge Press, n. d. reprint ed.; *The Myth of the Universal, Invisible Church Theory Exploded,* Roy Mason (Emmaus, PA: Challenge Press, 2003) & *Landmarks of Baptist Doctrine,* Robert Sargent, vol. 4 (Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, 1990), pgs. 481-542. Erroneous ecclesiology also leads the Keswick theology into an erroneous view of the connection of Spirit baptism and sanctification; the Biblical doctrine of Spirit baptism is set forth in the appendix below, "Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism."

damning error, such as Hannah Whitall Smith, to mold its doctrinal position, illustrates the failure among its leadership to separate from even the most serious of errors and a lack of discernment about what is involved in even being a Christian at all.[1747] *Holiness, sanctification,* and *separation* share the same word group in the Hebrew and Greek languages. The disobedience of the Keswick Convention to the Biblical commands to practice ecclesiastical separation hinders its intention of promoting holiness. Compromise on any area of the truth hinders growth in holiness, which takes place by means of the truth (John 17:17).[1748] What the Keswick Convention boasts of as a strength, "that no man or woman has ever been known, through the influence or under its teaching, to leave one communion for another," so that "those who accept the Keswick teaching and enter into the [Keswick] experience . . . incline to remain where they are . . . [even in] moribund or dead churches,"[1749] is no strength at all, but a very serious weakness. Keswick unites those professing paedobaptism and believer's baptism; those who think that sprinkled infants are Christians and those who believe that one must be converted to become a Christian; those who advocate hierarchical denominational structures and those who practice congregational church government; those who believe in liturgical ritualism and those who accept the regulative principle of worship; those who preach the inherent goodness of man inherent in the Quaker "Divine seed" heresy and those who accept the total depravity of man; those who embrace corrupt sacramental gospels and those who profess the true gospel of justification by faith alone through Christ alone apart from religious ceremonies. When all such, together with sundry sorts

---

[1747] Compare Jessie Penn-Lewis' "deep conviction" that "many who have been reckoned 'Modernists,' even in the Mission field, are not really so in heart," but are really "servants of Christ" that Keswick partisans should "labour to help . . . all that is in our power" (pg. 280, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard). Many theological modernists are not, Penn-Lewis affirms, unregenerate false teachers who should be marked, avoided, and rejected, but servants of Christ who should be assisted as much as possible; they are simply in need of some Higher Life teaching so that all will be well. If even modernists should be accepted, it is no surprise that Penn-Lewis preached that "divergent views on prophecy, on sanctification, on healing, and other matters . . . should be put aside" to assist in bringing about "the UNITY of the Body of Christ in view of His soon Return" (pg. 283, *ibid*.). Since the Keswick co-founder, Canon Harford-Battersby, was himself High Church, then Broad Church, and only then an evangelical Anglican, and all without a conversion experience, Jessie Penn-Lewis's statements are not surprising.

[1748] A view of the truth that is lower than is proper is evident in the statement that "Keswick itself has been and is still criticized; but that is of no serious consequence. The truth of God is bigger than any one view or school of thought" (pg. 10, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas). Rather than lightly treating criticism of Keswick because the truth of God is allegedly bigger than any one view, such criticism should be evaluated Biblically and acted upon if it is accurate, or rejected if it is unscriptural. Of course, the statement that the truth of God is bigger than any one view is itself incoherent; if the truth of God is bigger than any one view, it is bigger than the view that it is bigger than any one view, in which case the truth of God is not bigger than any one view. True theology has the objective propositional content that was given by the Father to His Son as Mediator to reveal to the church by the Spirit through the Scriptures.

[1749] Pg. 35, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

of other doctrinal deviants, get together for a "united communion service,"[1750] one can be happy that the Lord's Supper is not really being practiced, as only true Baptist churches can celebrate it, for the gross doctrinal and practical disharmony might lead to many people to suffer serious illness or early death (1 Corinthians 11:30) as Divine judgment. In sum, Keswick ecumenicalism is unscriptural and dangerous.

A related error of Keswick, which developed out of the identical position at Broadlands[1751] and which accorded well with the ecumenicalism of the movement,[1752] is that it "is interested in the practical application of religious truth rather than in doctrinal or dogmatic theology."[1753] Biblically, no disjunction exists between doctrine and practice—on the contrary, sound doctrine and practice mutually reinforce each other (1 Timothy 4:16). Keswick has produced an ocean of books, "many volumes of devotional literature,"[1754] so that "the literature of the Convention . . . ha[s] circulated far and wide . . . throughout the world."[1755] Myriads of "addresses [have been] given at the Convention year after year for over seventy-five years." Nevertheless, "Keswick furnishes us with no

---

1750 Pg. 149, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas; cf. pg. 98, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. The open communion service would take place in the meeting place of T. D. Harford Battersby's Anglican congregation, where the severe errors of the Anglican communion liturgy were recited week by week (pgs. xiv-xv, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford).

1751 E. g., at the 1874 Broadlands Conference Robert P. Smith taught that the "purpose of this gathering together . . . was different from that of other religious gatherings. It was not for the teaching of religious truths," but for the inculcation of the Higher Life in which the "teaching of the Spirit should be heard" (pg. 120, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890), in accordance with the Quaker doctrines of the Inner Light and the Divine Seed. The "aim [was] less to enforce a creed than to inspire a life" for Broadlands preachers such as the universalist George MacDonald (pg. 59, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). "The Conferences were, as Lord Mount-Temple said at the opening of the first one, 'not for the promulgation of any new system, nor for the combined execution of any organized plan, but a meeting of grateful, loving hearts, united . . . to lead a higher and deeper Christian life'" (pgs. 119-120, *ibid.*).

1752 Thus, in the words of very sympathetic Methodist writers, whose purpose in writing was generally to defend the Keswick theology and perfectionism (as taught, in their view, most perfectly by Wesley) against Higher Life critics:

> The [Keswick] theology . . . does very seriously expose itself to misconception through its lack of systematic coherence and completeness. A certain consciousness of this seems sometimes to disturb the equanimity of the teachers, and tempts them to speak disparagingly of dogmatic theology[.] . . . It is not to be expected, of course, that the leaders of the movement . . . should publish to the world their precise creed . . . [since they] have generally been careful to disavow any connection with denominations and communions . . . on the principle of keeping out of view everything that might raise the question of sectarian differences . . . ignor[ing] . . . the formalities of worship, and ritual, and sacraments . . . effac[ing] . . . the distinction of pastorship and laity . . . [and] not always tak[ing] . . . sufficient care . . . to preclude . . . the imputation of Pelagianism . . . brought by almost all the censors against the movement. (pgs. 100-101, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875)

1753 Pg. 42, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1754 Pg. 42, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1755 Pg. 9, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

formal treatise of its doctrine of sin, and no carefully prepared, weighty discourses of a theological nature"[1756] of any kind. This lack was abetted by the total lack of formal theological training on the part of many early Keswick leaders.[1757] Keswick's neglect of carefully prepared theology is a definite weakness, although natural for those who accepted Robert P. Smith's view that for "souls i[n] vital conscious union with Christ . . . the effects of any errors of judgment are neutralised."[1758]

What was important at Keswick, as in the teaching and ministry of Hannah and Robert P. Smith, and at the Broadlands Conferences,[1759] was not the careful study of what Scripture said, but feeling happy—the secret of a happy life.[1760] While Keswick's

---

[1756] Pg. 51, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. This fact mentioned by Barabas does not mean that nobody associated with the Keswick theology has ever produced anything with at least a certain amount of scholarly value; it does mean that no Keswick advocate has ever composed a careful and scholarly presentation or theological defense of the distinctives of the Keswick doctrine. Rather, Keswick writings are "a mass of unsystematic literature, not always absolutely consistent with itself" (pg. 259, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280). Barabas is by no means the only Keswick advocate to recognize that no carefully prepared and theologically precise presentation of its position has even been written—this absence has been continually recognized from the very origin of the Keswick movement. R. W. Dale noted:

> I said to Dr. Boardman only a few months ago that it seemed to me that this [Higher Life] movement had prophets, but had not teachers; and he acknowledged that there was a great deal of truth in that. I asked where he could show me a theological book in which this doctrine was so stated as really to satisfy any theological mind, and he was obliged to acknowledge that it was very difficult indeed to name any such book. . . . I have been called upon as one not hostile to this movement, [but] as favorable to it. (pg. 450, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875)

[1757] E. g., Evan Hopkins & Webb-Peploe "had no formal theological training" (pg. 68, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck); neither did Hannah or Robert Pearsall Smith, Robert Wilson, or many other Higher Life leaders.

[1758] Pg. 186, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Smith's doctrine that errors of judgment have no negative consequences for people who experience the Higher Life as he had done helps explain both his adoption and continued propogation of the erotic Bridal Baptism doctrine. His judgment might indicate that he was propogating the vilest of perversions, but such judgment was to be set aside for the thrills of a "conscious union" where the rational could be set aside.

[1759] The wonder of the Higher Life resulted in "[t]he intense happiness experienced at Broadlands," which was "as the dawn of a fresh springtime in th[e] lives" of many (pg. 267, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910), even the vast body at the Conferences who had never been born again but were wretched and unconverted sinners. "[A]t Broadlands . . . changed lives and characters . . . could not be gainsaid . . . one noted a great and marked increase in gladness and cheerfulness" (pgs. 246-247, *ibid*). Indeed, the spiritualism and the presence at Broadlands of demons impersonating the spirits of dead people contributed to the great happiness of those present; as the Mount-Temples believed, "the presence of unseen heavenly ones added to the deep gladness that was felt" (pg. 262, *ibid*.).

[1760] Thus, at the Oxford Convention, people learned: "If our preaching does not make people glad, we have not got the right message" (pg. 263, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). For the Oxford Convention, then, it would seem that the Lord Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, did not have the right message when He proclaimed: "Blessed are they that mourn" (Matthew 5:4; cf. Luke 6:25; 7:32; 1 Corinthians 5:2; 2 Corinthians 7:7; James 4:9; Daniel 10:2; Joel 2:12, etc.). Rather than the message of

neglect of the careful study of Scripture suited the Quaker exaltation of immediate extra-canonical revelation, for those who wanted to know what God's Word said about sanctification, it was a great hinderance that at "the early Conventions . . . [a]ll the addresses were extemporaneous,"[1761] so that none of the spiritual guides who were to lead others into the way of holiness could preach carefully exposited Scripture. All speakers had to teach unprepared:

> Canon Harford-Battersby . . . . assigned . . . speaking roles each evening for the following day, after a time of prayer with the chairman [Robert Wilson] in his vicarage drawing room . . . informal planning of the speakers for each day, undertaken only during the week itself, characterized the Convention for more than fifty years. . . . Some may see in that a more noble leading of the Spirit, whilst others may call it flying by the seat of your pants[.][1762]

Keswick maintained "a remarkable absence of planning and organizing of speakers."[1763] It is not surprising that a later Keswick president thought that "the reason that Convention blessings were short-lived" was the "lack of solid exposition" at the Conference.[1764] Keswick's oft recognized[1765] lack of "carefully prepared" and theologically precise views

---

Christ and the Apostles, Hannah Smith taught at Brighton that the Holy Spirit is not "one to make us unhappy"—thoughts that make one unhappy "always come from Satan" (pg. 376, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875). The Christian is to enter into the Higher stage where "he abides in utter unconcern and perfect rest . . . perfect abandonment of ease and comfort . . . the Higher Christian Life" (Chapter 3, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*, Hannah W. Smith).

[1761] Pg. 16, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson. It is admitted that Keswick addresses were often "rather disjointed" because of this lack of study (pg. 17), even as at the Brighton Convention Robert P. Smith noted: "I do not think that there has been a single address arranged; I know there have been no formal preparations made in any respect," as not until late in the evening were speakers for the next day selected (pgs. 12, 437-438, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875). Likewise at the Oxford Convention it "was not so much what was said, in the purely extempore remarks or addresses," for all that the people heard were "unpremeditated extempore addressess," concerning which what mattered was "the preparedness of the heart to listen" (pgs. 180, 200, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). People were profoundly prepared to accept in their hearts whatever the speakers said or taught in their unprepared and unpremeditated addresses; this was possible because, as Robert P. Smith explained, for those in the Higher Life "the effects of any errors of judgment are neutralised" (pg. 186) so no negative effects would result from the many misinterpretations and misapplications of the Bible.

[1762] Pg. 205, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; pg. 44, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

[1763] Pg. 49, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck. Quotation marks within the reference above have been removed.

[1764] Graham Scroggie; see pg. 71, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[1765] For example, Hannah W. Smith stated:

> As to the matter of theology in this [doctrine of the Higher Life], I beg, as I always do, that nobody will listen to me with theological ears. It is very likely that I make plenty of mistakes in that direction, but if you get hold of the experience, then you can put the matter straight . . . [I may not give] a very clear or exact statement of Christian truth; but I am sure . . . that [I present] an exact statement of Christian experience. (pg. 54, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875)

of sin and the solution for it is evident in its inaccurate presentations and bungling refutations by Keswick advocates of alternative positions on sanctification, its failure to deal comprehesively and carefully with the scriptural data related to the believer's growth in holiness, its invalid arguments, its allegorization of Scripture, and its faulty exegesis of key texts on sanctification.[1766] In all these ways, while unfaithful to the Bible, Keswick continued faithful to its roots at Broadlands, where the misinterpretation of Scripture was tightly connected to the Quaker Divine Seed heresy.[1767] From the Divine Seed doctrine

---

Of course, it is impossible to have an exact view of Christian experience without an exact statement of Christian truth, and believers are always to evaluate what they hear with "theological ears" that are carefully sifting with Scripture what others affirm (Isaiah 8:20; John 5:39; Acts 17:11; 1 John 4:1-3). If Mrs. Smith admits that she makes many mistakes with Christian truth, she ought not to be preaching at all—a certainty in any case (1 Timothy 2:11-15).

[1766] The phenomena mentioned in this sentence are examined in more detail below.

[1767] For example, teachers at the Broadlands Conference proclaimed: "Whenever I meet a man, I know the germ of the Christ-life is there. . . . Christ is the life of men, the Divine seed in every one" (pgs. 178-179, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). The Divine Seed led to many allegorical misinterpretations of Scripture at Broadlands. For example, in Revelation 22:2, "The *leaves* of the tree are for the healing of the nations" is not about the leaves of the tree of life in the New Jerusalem, but really means: "We cannot live in this world without longing to be healers." (pg. 179, *ibid*). After all, the New Jerusalem only "signif[ies] glorified humanity" (pg. 132). With similar allegory, "The birds of the air came and lodged in the *branches*" (Matthew 13:32) means, to the amazement of the student of Scripture: "We are to be the support and sustainers of those who are seeking rest" (pg. 179, *ibid*. Italics reproduced from the original.) Indeed, Broadlands even made the astonishing discovery that in Luke 16 Lazarus was worse off than the rich man: "Lazarus was the most wanting in brotherly kindness, for Dives [the rich man] got *no* help from Lazarus . . . *They were both* in Hades. Better to be a sufferer than a helpless witness of suffering. . . . The only true heaven is a character like God's" (pg. 208, *ibid*. Italics in original.). Perhaps such an exaltation of the rich man in hell above Lazarus in paradise was assisted by the Broadlands confusion of the Antichrist with Christ in texts such as Revelation 6:2 (pg. 207, *ibid*), but such is uncertain.

Keswick allegorization and Scripture-twisting thus followed the pattern set at the Broadlands Conference and its successors. At Broadlands in 1874 a "very distinct feature of this Conference, [which] must not be omitted in any attempt to delineate it . . . [was] the conversations over passages in Scripture [where people] had not tarried in the *letter* of the Word, but had discerned everywhere beneath it the *living* Word . . . unveiling . . . the inward and spiritual meaning in the Jewish history and ceremonial" (pgs. 122-123, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890). Consequently, for example, the Oxford Convention took the fact that "[a]ll priests are Levites, but all Levites are not priests" and allegorized it to support the division of Christians into those living the Higher Life and those not; the number of days it took to cleanse the temple in 2 Chronicles 29:17 was allegorized into Higher Life truth; an address was given on "Joseph a type of the risen life"; Samuel's predictions about the conclusion of Saul's search for his father's donkeys, receipt of bread from people, and encounter with a company of prophets in 1 Samuel 10 "is a picture of the Christian life" where people are "first chosen, then consecrated"; the water coming from Ezekiel's Millennial temple (Ezekiel 47) teaches the Higher Life; the Valley of Achor (Joshua 7, 15; Isaiah 65; Hosea 2) is "the place of entire absolute renunciation of all discovered evil for a door of heavenly blessing"; "Kadesh Barnea" is allegorized into a font of Higher Life truth; the fact that Solomon wrote the Song of Songs teaches that the Higher Life is a "reign of peace," and so on (pgs. 58, 60, 124, 128-130, 148, 268-269, 306-7, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

Similarly, Keswick convention founder T. D. Harford-Battersby adopted the Higher Life theology after hearing an allegorical misinterpretation of John 4:46-53 by Evan Hopkins (cf. pgs. 157-158, *Memoir*

many an allegorization of Scripture came forth—what need was there of careful exegesis of the Bible when one has the Divine Seed within, and from his allegedly sinless spirit receives new revelations? Keswick does not do well to set against each other "exegetical skill" and "present illumination and anointing of the Holy Spirit," and claim to value the latter despite downplaying the former. Keswick's theological sickness is evident when it affirms that the "distinctive vitality" of "Keswick meetings" is "lost" if "exegetical skill instead of . . . present illumination" is employed in preaching.[1768] Keswick authors testify that the generality of those that accede to their theology do so not as a result of exegeting and searching the Scriptures (Acts 17:11), but because of feelings and experiences they have at Keswick conferences.[1769] It is consequently not surprising that the key requirement for ascending the Keswick platform during its founding decades was not doctrinal orthodoxy, but, as at Broadlands, the experience of entering into the carefree happiness of the Higher Life.[1770] Keswick's inability to support itself exegetically, and its reliance upon testimonies and pleasant words and deeds to lead people into its system, is explained by Robert P. Smith:

---

of T. D. Harford-Battersby; pg. 52, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, Harford; pgs. 113ff., 174, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Compare also the numerous examples of severe eisegesis in the elenctic examination of controverted passages on sanctification and the several vignettes of central Keswick leaders in the various chapters of this book. The Higher Life was found in countless texts when allegorized, although it was not in any when principles of grammatical-historical hermeneutics were applied.

[1768] Pg. 214, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

[1769] For instance, A. E. Barnes-Lawrence, in *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford, on pgs. 188-191 describes how a typical "cleric of devout mind who for the first time has come to Keswick, prepared to find fault, but for the moment is withholding his judgment" is brought to adopt the Higher Life doctrine. He goes to a prayer meeting, sees a lot of people who are fervent (pgs. 188-189), hears "the flood of melody as the hymn is taken up by the great assembly," is impressed by the "sudden hush and expectant quietness that falls" in the "Bible Readings," concludes that his own "best sermons" arouse "languid" interest in comparison with those at the Convention, and that people at the Convention are more "keen" than those in his congregation, and he therefore adopts the Keswick theology, even while averring: "It was not the address, certainly not . . . and I should have treated that last point quite differently myself" (pg. 190). By such impressions and feelings, rather than by careful study of the Bible, hundreds of ministers receive the Keswick message (pg. 191). "Such a testimony is not unfrequent, and it carries its own *imprimatur*" (pg. 190).

For further examples, note Griffith-Thomas's attempt to respond to Warfield's crushing critique of the Keswick theology by testimonial, rather than exegesis (**ref. the footnote that has this material**); cf. also pgs. 66, 85-86, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[1770] "The only qualification required from the speakers [at Broadlands] was that they should have personal experience of the truths they uttered" (pg. 120, cf. pg. 265, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Of course, Christian preachers should know experientially the truths that they proclaim, but testimony to having received a certain experience is by no means a sufficient standard for allowing a person behind a pulpit (cf. 1 Timothy 1:3, 13; 2 John 7-11).

> Do not press this fulness of the Gospel [the Higher Life], in its doctrinal, dogmatic side. It is not so much a doctrine to be argued as a *life* to be lived. *Confess* Christ—do not *profess* to be anything. . . . Your life must be your argument to those who see you constantly. Do not worry them by doctrinal statements, but love them into the fulness of salvation. It is usual to hear persons say, "I was wrong. I could meet the arguments, but *the life* of my friend has convinced me that she was right."[1771]

Thus, careful statements of Biblical teaching only "worry" the generality of those who accede to the Higher Life. Although arguments for Keswick doctrine from the text of Scripture can be easily met, as the Bible does not teach the theology of the Pearsall Smiths, the appearance of a carefree and happy life full of rest and quiet leads many to adopt it. The theological imprecision that results by setting the Holy Ghost against painstaking exegesis of the Word He dictated is also a major explanatory factor for the other Biblical errors in the Keswick theology. Keswick statements on theological issues are often better when they are not taken seriously, but only their general intention is considered; taking Keswick too seriously leads to serious error.

Keswick theology, following the practice of the Broadlands Conference[1772] and the devaluation of doctrinal truth by Hannah W. Smith,[1773] downplays the role of the Word of God in sanctification to exalt testimonials.[1774] While Deuteronomy 17:19

[1771] Pg. 291, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Italics in original. Cf. pg. 263. Note that the generic "friend" who leads another to adopt the Higher Life is a "she."

[1772] Compare the very similar statements of purpose of the Keswick Convention (cf. pgs. 108ff., *So Great Salvation*, Barabas) and the Broadlands Conferences (pgs. 262-263, 268, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).
Pg. 262, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

Hovey, discussing other pre-Keswick forms of Higher Life theology, noted that they "at least see[m] to depart . . . from the plain sense of Scripture by ascribing the believer's sanctification to the work of the Spirit, almost without the use of the truth. Very little comparatively is said of the office of truth . . . undervalu[ing] the sure word of God" (pgs. 126-127, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, Alvah Hovey).

[1773] E. g., note Mrs. Smith's denial of the Biblical unity between doctrine and practice and affirmation of the sufficiency of morality combined with doctrine so watered down that even a Deistic, non-Christian deity was acceptable:

> How true the old Friends were when they used to tell us that it was not what we believed but how we lived that was the real test of salvation, and how little we understood them! . . . And as thee says, my opinions about God may all be wrong, but if my loyalty to Him is real it will not matter. It seems as if it would be enough just to say, "God is," and, "Be good," and then all would be said. It is the practical things that interest me now. (Letter to Anna, August 4, 1882, reproduced in the entry for November 18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter)

[1774] The exaltation of testimonials over literally interpreted Scripture also suits Quaker theology very well; does not the Inner Voice arising from the Divine Seed within give a Word from God for today that is of greater value than the Word given thousands of years ago in the Bible? Should not testimonies to such modern day Words therefore hold the preeminent place? As Hannah Smith explained:

> A Quaker "concern" [alleged revelation] was to my mind clothed with even more authority than the Bible, for the Bible was God's voice of long ago, while the "concern" was His voice at the present moment and, as such, was of far greater present importance . . . the preaching I hear[d] was certainly calculated to exalt the

indicates that by studying and growing in knowledge of God's Word, one "may learn to fear the LORD his God," Keswick is "not interested in . . . adding to the store of Bible knowledge of those who attend."[1775] Maintaining a pattern set by earlier Keswick classics, Barabas's book, in the course of over two hundred pages, never once cites John 15:3; 17:17; Acts 20:32; Romans 10:17; Ephesians 2:20; 5:26; Colossians 3:16; 1 Timothy 4:6; 1 Peter 2:2; Psalm 119:7; 119:50; 119:93, or any other text that teaches that sanctification takes place through the instrumentality of the Word of God.[1776] Such neglect is a serious error. The Bible is the instrumentality the Father has ordained for the revelation of God's glory through the Son by the Spirit, the view of which transforms and sanctifies the believer (2 Corinthians 3:18; John 17:17, 26). Keswick's downplaying of the role of the Word of God in sanctification to exalt testimonials, a practice it inherited from the Broadlands Conference[1777] and earlier Higher Life perfectionisms, is associated

---

"inward voice" and its communications above all other voices . . . since God spoke to us directly. (pgs. 82-83, *The Unselfishness of God*, by Hannah W. Smith)

1775 Pg. 108, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1776 Barabas fallows in the footsteps of earlier Keswick classics such as *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford, which likewise never cites any of these passages in the course of its 249 pages. Harford's work itself follows the pattern of Keswick's most important exposition, Hannah W. Smith's *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*, which omits all mention of these texts. Andrew Murray's *Abide in Christ*, although it is supposed to exposit John 15, in the course of 236 pages never discusses any of these passages; even John 15:3 appears only within a quotation of John 15:1-12 at the very beginning of the book, never to appear again. Many other Keswick books manifest the same conspicuous neglect. (Of course, in the many hundreds and even thousands of devotional books and pamphlets by Keswick authors, at some point the verses above are cited somewhere; the affirmation is not made that no Keswick writer ever cites them anywhere, but that the de-emphasis upon such texts is striking.) Contrast the classical Baptist view as set forth in the chapter in this volume "The Means Of Sanctification," by James Petigru Boyce. What Jacob Abbott stated, reviewing the foundational Keswick classic *The Higher Christian Life* by William Boardman, is regretably true of the main body of Keswick theology in general:

> There is nowhere in [Boardman's] volume a recognition of the fact that the truth, as revealed in the holy scriptures, is the means of sanctification. More than this: he puts faith in *opposition* to the use of means. . . . [H]is theory as to the *means* of sanctification . . . [is that] it is derived *im*mediately from Christ, by *faith*, and not *mediately*, through the *scriptures*, appropriating *them* by faith, and finding Christ in them, and through them binging him into the soul. He quotes no such scriptures as these: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth;" [John 17:17] and John 15:3. 2 Pet 1:4. He has very little to do with the Scriptures, any way; it is all *theory*, supported by what he calls experience. He draws largely from the experiences of men; very little from the inspired oracles of truth, and then with a strange perversion or misapplication. . . . This *theory* as to the *means* of sanctification, by Christ alone, received immediately by faith, in opposition to the view that it is by the Spirit of Christ working in us through the truth, is the one idea of the book, to which all else is intended to be subservient. (pgs. 511-514, Review of William E. Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, Jacob J. Abbott. *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July 1860) 508-535. Italics in original.)

1777 E. g., at Broadlands when "the question of victory over temptation was considered," a careful exposition of what the Bible taught on resisting temptation (such as is found in John Owen's treatise *Of Temptation*) was not conducted; on the contrary, "personal testimony was the interesting feature" that provided the way to enter into victory (pg. 152, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Likewise, to prove that the Broadlands Conference was presenting the truth, "changed lives and characters were a witness to others that could not be gainsaid . . . by their actions and disposition, not by their words . . . [by] a great and marked increase in gladness and cheerfulness," the teachings of the Conference were validated (pgs. 246-

with its exaltation of the testimonial as the key instrumentality for spreading its teachings. In the Keswick system, oral or written testimonies of entering into and maintaining the Higher Life largely displaced the expository preaching of and exegetical study of God's Word.[1778] Legions of books about those who discovered the spiritual secret of Keswick theology, hundreds of testimonies of those who discovered the Keswick system, and swarms of revisionistic historical accounts of blessings received by individuals, churches, and communities who adopted the Higher Life system abound in Keswick settings. On the other hand, the "Convention is not interested in . . . adding to the store of Bible knowledge"[1779] of those who come to their meetings, and "Keswick furnishes us with . . . no carefully prepared, weighty discourses of a theological nature . . . for over seventy five years[.]"[1780] Not even one carefully prepared discourse or book expositing Scripture in a scholarly way has ever been written in favor of the Keswick theology, as Keswick authors themselves testify. By downplaying the study of and growth in knowledge of the Word of God and exalting uninspired testimonies instead, Keswick hinders the believer's sanctification.

D. Martin Lloyd-Jones comments on Keswick's failure to deal comprehesively and carefully with the scriptural data related to the believer's growth in holiness:

247, *ibid*). Of course, living a holy life is very important, but the infallible record of Scripture is the only inerrant testimony to the truth: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, *it is* because *there is* no light in them" (Isaiah 8:20).

[1778] The displacement of exposition of Scripture for testimonial among the advocates of the Keswick theology is so pervasive that W. H. Griffith Thomas, when seeking to respond to B. B. Warfield's crushing critique of the Keswick and Victorious Life movements in the *Princeton Review*, spends about half of his response ("The Victorious Life (I.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:303) July 1919, 267-288; "The Victorious Life (II.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:304) October 1919, 455-467) on testimonials to the value of the Higher Life. Thomas argues for the Keswick theology based on what he has "observed" (pg. 273), on "experience" (pg. 275), on "very many a Christian experience" (pg. 277). Warfield is wrong because "experience in general gives no suggestion" of his position and "there is no general evidence of" Warfield's doctrine, Thomas claims, "in Christian lives" (pg. 464). "Warfield . . . is disproved . . . by experience of everyday life" (pg. 275). The great majority of Thomas's second article is a compilation of testimonials to Keswick theology. He concludes:

> I submit, with all deference to Dr. Warfield, yet with perfect confidence, that the convinced acceptance of the Keswick movement by such [men as have given testimonials to it] . . . is impressive enough to make people inquire whether, after all, it does not stand for essential Biblical truth[.] . . . [T]he rich experiences to which testimony is given . . . the possession of an experience which has evidently enriched their lives . . . [is] not to be set aside by any purely doctrinal and theoretical criticism. (pgs. 462-466)

The Keswick experience, Griffith Thomas avers, is not to be set aside by criticism of its doctrine from Scripture alone.

For other examples of the spread of the Keswick theology by testimonial rather than exegesis, see, e. g., pgs. 54, 71, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie; compare also the foundational work *The Higher Christian Life*, William Boardman.

[1779] Pg. 108, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1780] Pg. 51, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. The seventy-five years was as of 1952, when Barabas wrote. Keswick has still produced no carefully prepared and weighty theological discourses as the 150 year mark approaches.

> Instead of expounding the great New Testament texts, [Keswick promulgators] so often started with their theory and illustrated it by means of Old Testament characters and stories. You will find that so often their texts were Old Testament texts. Indeed their method of teaching was based on the use of illustrations rather than on exposition of Scripture. An inevitable result was that they virtually ignored everything that had been taught on the subject of sanctification during the previous eighteen centuries. . . . Many of them boasted of this.[1781]

Indeed, even those who were passionately committed to the Higher Life theology, to the extent that they were willing to favor it in print in its official literature, admitted that sound Biblical interpretation was grievously lacking. Robert W. Dale testified:

> I agree with every word . . . about the singularly uncritical manner in which those who are associated with this doctrine quote passages from both from the Old Testament and the New. . . . But then let us remember that the gentlemen who represent this particular movement are frankly and constantly acknowledging that they have no claims to the kind of scholarship that is necessary to treat theological questions scientifically. . . . I . . . [am] not hostile to this movement, [but] favorable to it.[1782]

Similarly, another minister and friend of the Higher Life testified:

> If there has been anything to which exception might be taken it has been the fanciful and even absurd interpretation occasionally given to passages of Scripture, particularly those of the Old Testament. But where the end is so great . . . one is little disposed to find fault[.][1783]

Such admissions were regularly made by those who were contending, in print, for the Higher Life and Keswick theology. What, then, will those without partisan precommitments to Keswick conclude?

The gross abuse, exegetical fallacies, and silly allegorization of Scripture by advocates of the Higher Life contributed to the Keswick consensus that discussion of doctrine and careful exegesis of Scripture were not the way to spread the Blessing;[1784] by such means the Keswick theology was so far from being able to be propogated that it was certain to collapse. Examples of faulty Keswick exegesis are legion. For instance, consider the severe equivocation on the phrase "God's people" in the following argument by Barabas:

> Christians are too apt to think that only the unsaved are sinners. . . . This certainly is not Biblical. The truth is that God's Word has a great deal more to say about the sin of God's people than it does about the sin of those who do not know Him. It was the sin of God's people that delayed the entrance of Israel into Canaan for forty years. It was the sin of God's people that was responsible for the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities. It was the sin of God's people that caused the crucifixion of the Messiah. It was the sin of God's people, more than the unbelief of the heathen, that caused Paul heartache and sorrow. And it is the sin of God's people, more than anything else, that is hindering the manifestation of His saving power in the world today. . . Keswick is right in

---

1781 Pg. 321, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors: Addresses Delivered at the Puritan and Westminster Conferences, 1959-1978*, D. M. Lloyd-Jones. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1987.

1782 Pg. 450, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

1783 Pgs. 464-465, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

1784 Cf. pg. 59, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

> putting great stress on the fact that there must be a revival among Christians of a sense of sin in themselves.[1785]

The beginning and end of the argument draw conclusions about those who are true believers, but the examples in Scripture that are to prove the conclusion deal in each instance either primarily or totally with the sin of those who merely professed to be God's true people, that is, those who, in the Old Testament, were merely "of Israel" but not true spiritual Israel (Romans 9:6). As demonstrated above,[1786] those who died in the wilderness wanderings pictured the professing but unconverted, not backslidden saints. The idolators who brought upon themselves the Deuteronomic curses, including the Assyrian and Babylonian exile (Deuteronomy 28:63-68), went to hell (cf. Revelation 21:8), as Paul indicates that those who are under the Deuteronomic curse are the unsaved (Galatians 3:10; Deuteronomy 27:26) while all the spiritual seed of Abraham are free from this curse and its penalty (Galatians 3:11-14). The passage concerning Paul's sorrow for his fellow Israelites indicates his sadness on account of their coming damnation, not sorrow because they were on their way to heaven but without a Higher Life (Romans 9:1-6). And it was certainly not genuine believers, who were just a little backslidden, who conspired against and crucified Christ! The Keswick conclusion drawn from this argument—that Christians need to take sin in their lives very seriously—is excellent. The exegetical basis provided for the conclusion is a disaster.

Another example of invalid exegesis is Barabas's assertion: "Paul constantly urges Christians to make instantaneous decisions (as the aorist of his verbs shows) to yield their members unto God (Romans 6:13), to present themselves unto God (Romans 12:1), [and] to mortify the deeds of the body (Romans 8:13)."[1787] Such an argument, while based on the teaching of Robert P. Smith that surrender is "*a thing done once for all* . . . just as we look on our marriage for life,"[1788] misunderstands the nature of the aorist tense[1789]—even apart from the fact that the command to *mortify* in Romans 8:13 is

---

[1785] Pgs. 59-60, *So Great* Salvation, Barabas. Note that nothing that remotely approaches a comprehensive study of the NT word ἁμαρτωλός, "sinner," is undertaken by Barabas—an examination of its 47 uses in the New Testament gives strong support to the position that, although believers still sin, only the unconverted man is a "sinner" (Matthew 9:10–11, 13; 11:19; 26:45; Mark 2:15–17; 8:38; 14:41; Luke 5:8, 30, 32; 6:32–34; 7:34, 37, 39; 13:2; 15:1–2, 7, 10; 18:13; 19:7; 24:7; John 9:16, 24–25, 31; Romans 3:7; 5:8, 19; 7:13; Galatians 2:15, 17; 1 Timothy 1:9, 15; Hebrews 7:26; 12:3; James 4:8; 5:20; 1 Peter 4:18; Jude 15).

[1786] See the chapter "Hebrews 3-4 As An Alleged Evidence For Perpetually Sinning Christians."

[1787] Pg. 125, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1788] Pgs. 99, 136, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Italics in original.

[1789] Cf. pgs. 554-557; 713-724, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace; pgs. 67-73, *Exegetical Fallacies*, D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996.

not in the aorist tense at all but is a present tense imperative.[1790] Similarly, the classic *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, affirms that at Keswick "[t]he student becomes aware of the spiritual significance of the aorist tense in the programme of holiness"[1791] and proceeds to misinterpret a variety of texts based on an inaccurate view of the nature of the Greek aorist.[1792] Evan Hopkins follows the pattern of misinterpretation in his Keswick classic *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life*.[1793] Hopkins had a great "love [for] the Aorists of New Testament Greek," but, as a standard Keswick writer, he evidently did not understand the tense very well.[1794]

For "Keswick there was no passage of Scripture that was more frequently to the front" than Romans 6, so that "it is doubtful whether a Keswick Convention has ever been held in which one or more speakers did not deal with this chapter . . . [t]here is no understanding of Keswick without an appreciation of the place accorded by it to this chapter in its whole scheme of sanctification."[1795] Unfortunately, this chapter is also fundamentally misunderstood. As demonstrated above, Romans 6 is Paul's proof that the justified will not continue in sin, while Keswick reduces the chapter to a merely potential freedom from sin.[1796] For Keswick, "[i]t is possible to serve sin again, but not necessary,"[1797] but for the Apostle Paul in Romans 6, all believers are no longer the servants of sin, but are now the servants of righteousness. Furthermore, the *reckoning* of Romans 6 is commanded because the believer is already dead to sin, alive to God, and a servant of righteousness, not, as in Keswick theology, in order to activate an inactive and merely potential sanctification. Both the Keswick idea that victory over sin is only possible and potential for believers, not certain, and the idea that the *reckoning* of Romans 6 activates a merely potential and inactive progressive sanctification, come from the preaching of Hannah W. Smith at the 1874 Broadlands Conference, supported by an

---

1790 Θανατοῦτε.

1791 Pg. 179, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

1792 Pgs. 179-180, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

1793 Cf. pgs. 108, 223, *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life*, Evan Hopkins.

1794 See pgs. 95-96, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie; Hopkins's exposition of various texts based on this erroneous view that the aorist fundamentally specifies acts that take place in "one instant of time" follows.

Note also the chapters above dealing with Romans 7:14-25; Colossians 2:6-7; Galatians 2:20; and Hebrews 3-4. Keswick writers misuse all of these texts and passages, as is evidenced in the quotations in those chapters.

1795 Pg. 89, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas, cf. pgs. 90-92, 104.

1796 Note the chapter above entitled "The Just Shall Live by Faith."

1797 Pg. 92, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

experience she had and by the fact that she looked pretty, not by careful grammatical-historical exegesis of the chapter:

> [A]t the first Conference . . . [s]everal speakers had contributed valuable thoughts, and then Mrs. Smith rose. . . . [S]he stood with the dark oak background, her tall figure, lifted head, and radiant countenance. It was good to look at her, to observe her dear, beautiful face, shining hair, serene, deep-blue eyes, and absolutely natural, easy attitude, a personification of purity, joyous health, and vitality[.] . . . [S]he . . . told how she had found that if we but surrender our wills to Him and trust Him absolutely, we *can* conquer through Him. [That is, victory over sin is merely potential; believers "can," not "will," conquer through Christ.] She said some one had done her an injury of a particularly mean kind, and quick resentment rose in her heart. At once, she looked to God, and the words, "Reckon ye yourselves to be *dead* unto sin," came into her mind. She *did* reckon herself to be dead unto sin and alive to God, and what came to her, she said, was "like a spring morning." [That is, reckoning activated an inactive and merely potential victory over sin.] . . . ["]Friends, it is true, I have found it! *I have known it!*["] . . . All listened with breathless attention, not least so the many clergymen who were present, and surely, each heart felt a longing to reach the place at which Mrs. Smith had arrived[.] . . . Lord Mount-Temple wisely called for a few minutes of silent prayer.[1798]

Of course, meditating on the truths of Romans 6 can be of great aid in resisting temptation, but the chapter does not teach that reckoning activates an inactive and merely potential sanctification, no matter what Mrs. Smith claimed that she experienced, and no matter how many Keswick writers follow and reproduce her teaching. Keswick theology falls into serious error because of its misinterpretation of key passages of Scripture on sanctification.

While preaching about the sinfulness of sin, Keswick theology, following the teaching of Broadlands and its successor Conventions,[1799] the emphasis of Hannah W. Smith on attaining happiness and freedom from feelings of guilt, and in continuity with Pentecostalism,[1800] leads to lower views of the sinfulness of man by promising those who still possess the sinful flesh "victory over all known sin."[1801] No believer short of glory loves God will all his heart, soul, and mind (Matthew 22:37-38), is inwardly perfect, even as his heavenly Father is perfect (Matthew 5:48), or perfectly obeys other similar commandments. A believer's obedience to some commands, such as: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom" (Colossians 3:16), or "sin not" (1 Corinthians 15:34), is imperfect but progressive. Believers can be commanded to do more of what they are already doing to some extent (1 Thessalonians 5:11). The only way a believer can affirm, with Keswick, that the "cleansing work [of] . . . the Spirit . . . to remove . . .

1798 Pgs. 220-223, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in original.

1799 "Victory over all known sin" was the stated aim of the Broadlands Convention (pg. 21, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck).

1800 Pg. 235, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner.

1801 Pg. 20, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

sin . . . is as thorough as His revealing work . . . reveal[ing] sin,"[1802] is either by suppressing the Spirit's testimony that some sins are truly sin or by suppressing the Spirit's testimony to the Christian's failure to meet the Divine standard of absolute sinless perfection.[1803] While the Christian has the joy and privilege of walking in uprightness before the Lord and in genuine, glorious, and progressively growing victory over sin, he is not assisted spiritually by denying that his real failure to entirely conform to commands such as Matthew 22:37-38 or 5:48 is indeed sin, and should be known,[1804] consciously acknowledged, guarded against, and hated as sin.[1805] The Keswick

---

1802 Pg. 55, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1803 Baptist seminary professor Alvah Hovey notes:

> [Those who] claim to be saved from conscious transgression . . . lower the standard of holiness prescribed by the law of God, until it agrees with their own experience. . . . [T]he requirements of the divine law are so comprehensive and spiritual that no man can test his inward life by that law, without perceiving that he is a transgressor. If he fails to meet the exact, the utmost demands of that law, as set before him in the Scriptures, he is not saved from conscious transgression. When, for example, he is commanded to be holy, because God is holy, the standard is one of absolute moral perfection; and, measuring himself and others by it, he will see that the words of Christ are profoundly true, 'There is none good but one, that is, God;' as if Christ had said to the young ruler [of Matthew 19:16-22], 'By comparing yourself with any man, however upright and devout, you compare yourself with one who is morally imperfect, with a sinner; while the only true standard or right character for man is the holy character of God.' The same result will be reached, if he tests himself by the two great commands of the law: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;' and, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' For what is it to love God with all the heart, and soul, and mind? It is to love him as purely and intensely and constantly as a being of the same capacity, but without the least taint of evil in the heart to weaken, cloud, or interrupt the ardors of holy affection, could love him. It is to love him with the whole force of the soul, undiminished by the least remnant of selfishness. . . . [T]he law of God, as set forth in the Bible, require[s] of all a life without sin; for it commands them to be perfect or holy, while it brings forward the character of God as the standard of holiness. . . . And there is no greater absurdity in religion than to suppose that the standard of holiness has been lowered for the servants of Christ. (pgs. 59-62, 125, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures,* by Alvah Hovey)

1804 John Murray astutely notes:

> While Keswick stresses the gravity of sin, there is still an underestimation of the consequences for the believer of remaining indwelling sin[.] . . . Going hand in hand with this failure is a corresponding preoccupation with what it calls known sin, apparent in its definition that "the *normal* Christian life is one of uniform sustained victory over known sin" (pg. 84; cf. pg. 99 [of Barabas, *So Great Salvation*]). If sin still dwells in the believer, if there is still the tendency to sin, if corruption has not been eradicated, all of which Keswick admits, then we ought to be always conscious of that sin. It is not by any means a virtue to say, as Evan Hopkins says, that we need not be "*conscious* of that tendency" (p. 50). . . . Indwelling sin is still sin and the believer ought *always* to be conscious of it as such. To fail to be conscious of it amounts either to hypocrisy or self-deception. To have sin in us and not to be conscious of it is itself grave sin; it is culpable ignorance or culpable ignoring. As long as sin remains there cannot be freedom from conscious sin, for the simple reason that in the person who is sensitive to the gravity of sin and to the demands of holiness this sin that remains is always reflected in consciousness. Again, indwelling sin is defiling and it defiles the holiest of the believer's thoughts, words, and actions. The specifically deliberate and volitional is never immune to the defilement which proceeds from the corrupt nature and that is why the most sanctified of saints are oftentimes most acutely aware of their sinfulness just when by the power of Christ and the grace of the Holy Spirit they are engaged in the holiest of their undertakings. . . . [Indeed,] Keswick['s] . . . liabilities . . . are related to or stem from failure to take adequate account of the implications of the presence of sin in the believer and of the effects which must follow in his consciousness. This reflects a defective view of holiness and of its demands, which, in turn, gravely . . . impair[s] its effectiveness as a convention "for the promotion of *scriptural* holiness" (p. 30, [Barabas])." (pgs. 283, 286, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 4, a review of *So Great Salvation,* Barabas. Italics in original.)

1805 Hovey notes:

overemphasis upon the believer's personal happiness, evident in Hannah W. Smith's paradigmatic Keswick classic, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* and elsewhere, is connected with Keswick's denial of the Biblical truth that the fact of sin should always remain in the believer's consciousness. John Murray notes:

> The representatives of Keswick have a passionate concern for deliverance from the oppressing consciousness of sin and the dissatisfaction arising from this consciousness. Every person who has his eye upon the goal of redemption must be aware of the oppression which sin involves and must long for deliverance from it. But we must beware of the tendency to complacency which is the snare of perfectionism. As long as sin remains we must have the consciousness of it and the ensuing dissatisfaction. The more sanctified the believer becomes the more acute becomes his conviction of the sinfulness that is his, the more he loathes it and reproaches himself for it. Here again one feels the passion for freedom from the oppressing consciousness of sin, so characteristic of Keswick leaders, betrays a lack of appreciation of what the presence of sin ought to mean in the consciousness of the believer.[1806]

Christians should not aim for or be satisfied with anything less than the literal perfection set before them by the holy character of the triune God and the incarnate Son. When a saint sees his failure to conform to the standard set before him of God's own holiness, he is able to more humbly and closely walk after the Spirit (Romans 7:14-8:4). Biblical sanctification has a deeper view of the sinfulness of sin than does the Keswick theology, leading Scriptural and non-Keswick piety to a deeper repentance for and hatred of sin, and a greater glorification of and glorying in Jesus Christ, than is possible for the adherent of Keswick (Luke 14:11). The believer should repent, not only of his known sins, but also of his unknown sins, for the corruption of his heart, for the imputation of Adam's sin to himself, and for the corruption that adheres to even his holiest works,[1807]

> [Those who] assume that God has promised to deliver them now from all sin, if they believe aright . . . [who teach] "Holiness through Faith" . . . [teach that] there is a Christian, in distinction from a divine, an angelic, or even an Adamic perfection, and [use as a proof-text that] "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." . . . But according to this view the standard of holiness is a fluctuating one, and for aught we can see some of the followers of Christ, who have bound their fellow-Christians to the rack or the stake for what was believed to be the mortal sin of heresy, may have been acting at the time "up to the given measure of light upon their duty," and were therefore free from sin. The error in this view is a very dangerous one. Faith in Christ does not, as a matter of fact, render every act which partakes of it holy. Faith in Christ is acceptable to God, not because it makes the conduct of the believer in this life sinless, but because it unites the soul with Christ who has suffered for [him]. . . . Rahab and Samson had faith, but they were not free from sin. And of one thing at least we may be sure—that the Scriptures nowhere teach that "whatsoever is of faith is not sin." (pgs. 108-110, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures,* by Alvah Hovey)

1806 Pg. 286, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 4, a review of *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1807 Contrary to Keswick practice, a Biblical Christian spirituality recognizes that not only one's individual and willful sins in thought, word, and deed are ungodly and require repentance, but also unintentional sin, and even the corruption within one's best and holiest deeds, needs to be recognized and repented of. Consequently, Biblical piety contributes to a deeper hatred and repentance for sin, and a greater joy in the glorious righteousness of Christ wrought out for the believer on account of His free grace and love, than Keswick doctrine. A spirituality of the kind manifested in the following quotation by Robert Hawker has no place in the too-shallow view of sin of Keswick founder Hannah Whitall Smith:

> [M]y soul[,] thou needest not to look abroad into another's heart to see iniquity; for at home, in thine own, a voice may be heard continually proclaiming it. Renewed as thou art by grace, still thou feelest the workings of corrupt nature: and though, as the apostle said, "with thy mind thou thyself servest the law of God, yet

with thy flesh the law of sin," Romans 7:25. Pause over the solemn subject, and observe the working of a body of sin and death, which is virtually all sin: "the carnal mind, (the apostle saith) is enmity against God," Romans 8:7; not only an enemy, but in enmity: so that the very nature is so; it is averse, naturally averse to God, and is everlastingly rising in opposition to his holy law. And this not only (as some have supposed, but all men, if they would confess the truth, find to the contrary) before a work of grace hath passed upon the soul, but after. Else wherefore doth the apostle say, "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would?" Galatians 5:17. He saith this to the regenerate, to the [saints] at large. And consequently this conflict is after grace hath been manifested to the soul, and not before. A sinner unawakened may indeed feel at times compunctions of conscience, and be alarmed at what will be the consequence of his sins: but these are only the alarms of conscience, not the workings of grace: and for the most part, these alarms are but momentary. His affections are all on the side of sin. His soul still remains "dead in trespasses and sins;" and he himself, like a dead fish, swims down the stream of sin uninterrupted, without resistance, and without concern. But when a child of God is renewed, and the soul, that was before dead in trespasses and sins, becomes quickened and regenerated; then it is that the conflict between the renewed part in grace, and the unrenewed part in nature, begins, and never ends but with life. My soul, hath the Lord taught thee this, made thee sensible of it, and caused thee to groan under it? Dost thou find this heart of thine rebelling against God; cold to divine things, but warm to natural enjoyments; framing excuses to keep thee from sweet communion with the Lord; and even in the moment of communion, running with a swarm of vain thoughts, that "like the flies in the ointment of the apothecary causeth it to send forth an ill savour?" Are these in thy daily, hourly, experience? . . . Oh! precious, precious Jesus! how increasingly dear, under this view of a nature so totally corrupt, art thou to my poor soul! What but the eternal and unceasing efficacy of thy blood and righteousness could give my soul the smallest confidence, when I find that I still carry about with me such a body of sin and death? Let those who know not the plague of their own heart, talk of natural goodness; sure I am, there is nothing of the kind in me. "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." And were it not, dearest Lord, for the holiness of thy person, blood, and righteousness, the very sins which mingle up with all I say or do, yea, even in prayer, would seal my condemnation. Lamb of God! it is the everlasting merit of thy atonement and intercession, thy blood sprinkled upon my person and offering, by which alone the justice of God is restrained and satisfied, and that it breaks not forth in devouring fire, as upon the sacrifice of old, to consume me upon my very knees! Blessed, blessed for ever be God for Jesus Christ! (May 10e, *The Poor Man's Morning and Evening Portions*, Robert Hawker)

Compare also the words of John Owen:

[Believers] weigh their *own righteousness* in the balance, and find it wanting; and this two ways: —

1.) In *general*, and upon the whole of the matter, at their first setting themselves before God. . . . This the saints renounce; they have no confidence in the flesh: they know that all they can do, all that the law can do, which is weak through the flesh, will not avail them. . . . This they bear in their minds daily, this they fill their thoughts withal, that upon the account of what they have done, can do, ever shall do, they cannot be accepted with God, or justified thereby. This keeps their souls humble, full of a sense of their own vileness, all their days.

2.) In *particular*. They daily weigh all their *particular actions* in the balance, and find them wanting, as to any such completeness as, upon their own account, to be accepted with God.

> "Oh!" says a saint, "if I had nothing to commend me unto God but this prayer, this duty, this conquest of a temptation, wherein I myself see so many failings, so much imperfection, could I appear with any boldness before him? Shall I, then, piece up a garment of righteousness out of my best duties? Ah! it is all as a defiled cloth," Isaiah 64:6.

These thoughts accompany them in all their duties, in their best and most choice performances: —

> "Lord, what am I in my best estate? How little suitableness unto thy holiness is in my best duties! O spare me, in reference to the best thing that ever I did in my life!" Nehemiah 13:22.

When a man who lives upon convictions has got some enlargements in duties, some conquest over a sin or temptation, he hugs himself, like Micah when he had got a Levite to be his priest: now surely it shall be well with him, now God will bless him: his heart is now at ease; he has peace in what he has done. But he who has communion with Christ, when he is *highest in duties of sanctification and holiness, is clearest in the apprehension of his own unprofitableness,* and rejects every thought that might arise in his heart of setting his peace in them, or upon them. He says to his soul, "Do these things seem something to thee? Alas! thou hast to do with an infinitely righteous God, who looks through and through all that vanity, which thou art but little

committing himself to his infinitely precious High Priest who bears the inquity even of his holy things (Exodus 28:38). The related Keswick idea that, in this life, "sin . . . need not be a continued source of trouble,"[1808] is also unbiblical. Such an idea lays the groundwork for either self-deception in the believer who thinks he has arrived at such a state of complete triumph over sin, or hopeless despair in the believer who knows his own heart too well to make such an affirmation. Keswick affirmations of this nature, in addition to unabashed affirmations of the truth of perfectionism by Keswick leaders,[1809]

---

acquainted withal; and should he deal with thee according to thy best works, thou must perish."

3.) They approve of, value, and rejoice in, *this righteousness,* for their acceptation, *which the Lord Jesus has wrought out* and provided for them; this being discovered to them, they approve of it with all their hearts, and rest in it. Isaiah 45:24, "Surely, shall one say, in the LORD have I righteousness and strength." This is their voice and language, when once the righteousness of God in Christ is made known unto them: "Here is righteousness indeed; here have I rest for my soul. Like the merchant man in the gospel (Matthew 13:45,46) that finds the pearl of price, I had been searching up and down; I looked this and that way for help, but it was far away; I spent my strength for that which was not bread: here is that, indeed, which makes me rich for ever!" When first the righteousness of Christ, for acceptation with God, is revealed to a poor laboring soul, that has fought for rest and has found none, he is surprised and amazed, and is not able to contain himself: and such a one always in his heart approves this righteousness . . . [a]s full of *infinite wisdom* . . . as *full of grace.* He knows that sin had shut up the whole way of grace towards him; and whereas God aims at nothing so much as the manifestation of his grace, he was utterly cut short of it. Now, to have a complete righteousness provided, and yet abundance of grace manifested, exceedingly delights the soul; —to have God's dealing with his person all grace, and dealing with his righteousness all justice, takes up his thoughts. (Chapter 8, "How the Saints Hold Communion with Christ as to their Acceptation with God," in *Of Communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, John Owen)

Indeed, since Mrs. Smith rejected justification by imputed righteousness, not only was her view of sin too low, but her valuation of Christ's cross and righteousness was similarly blighted.

[1808] Pg. 36, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Compare Robert Pearsall Smith: "The Christian who has the faith [of the Higher Life] need never sin" (pg. 257, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875). Of course, Smith reduces "sin" to "conscious sin."

[1809] E. g., W. H. Griffith Thomas, responding to Warfield's critique of Keswick theology and attempting to justify Keswick, boldly stated: "'Keswick' stands for perfectionism. I have heard that scores of times, and so have you—and it does" (pg. 283, "The Victorious Life (I.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:303) July 1919, 267-288). Keswick leader A. T. Pierson said: "There is one kind of sinless perfection in which every Keswick teacher believes—the sinless perfection of *instantaneously and for ever renouncing every known sin*." Pierson proves this sort of perfectionism in the following manner: "There is no mistake in the attitude of our Lord. He says: 'Sin no more;' and He would not say that if He did not mean it." That is, God's obligation on man and man's ability to obey are coextensive, Pierson believes, so if God commands man not to sin, a fallen man with indwelling sin is able to be perfect; and, furthermore, "Paul preach[ed] perfect holiness," meaning the Keswick doctrine of perfectionism. However, other sorts of perfectionism were not accepted at Keswick, according to Pierson—only their peculiar brand was acceptable. Other than the distinctive Keswick perfectionism, "being sinlessly perfect" is not for the "present" (pgs. 8-10, *A Spiritual Clinique: Four Bible Readings Given at Keswick in 1907*, Pierson. New York, NY: Gospel Publishing House, 1907. Italics in original). During the "'turn of the century' era" from "1897 to 1909 . . . Dr. Pierson came to Keswick more often than any other speaker from America . . . and assumed from the first . . . a position of leadership unique in a speaker from overseas. Again and again we read of him guiding the proceedings in times of particular moment." The editor of the Keswick *Life of Faith* periodical verified that Pierson "dominated the Convention by his spiritual and intellectual powers, and thousands hung upon his words with an intense eagerness" (pg. 405, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson).

While Pierson was generally correct that the distinctive perfectionism of Hannah W. and Robert P. Smith was dominant at the early Keswick convention, he was not correct in his affirmation that other forms

explain why "from the first, opponents of Keswick have accused it of holding a shallow view of sin. . . . [and of being] perfectionist."[1810] Scripture does not present progressive sanctification as an instantaneous transition from a state of utter defeat to one of total victory, and the fact that sinless perfection is impossible in this life is Biblically a motive to continue striving for ever-greater progressive victory against sin, not, as is commonly argued by many groups of perfectionists, a reason to give up the fight in despair.[1811]

---

of perfectionism were not also acceptable at the Convention. Asa Mahan's early influence makes it clear that Oberlin Perfectionism was acceptable from the beginning. Moule was converted to the Keswick theology at a convention which included both Evan Hopkins and "an ardent Salvation Army captain," an advocate of the Army's standard Wesleyan perfectionism (pg. 42, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Likewise, the "Japan Evangelistic Band . . . formed at the Convention of 1893 . . . looked to Wesleyan holiness speakers" (pg. 115, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; cf. pg. 81, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck; the Band was founded by Webb-Peploe's curate Barclay Buxton). "Another vital link between Keswick and the Wesleyan holiness tradition was through Charles Inwood," who spoke at twenty-one Keswick conventions and represented Keswick internationally while receving prophetic impressions through which he predicted the future (pg. 112, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). "As a Wesleyan Methodist himself, Inwood actively sought to influence Keswick thinking from within the movement . . . Inwood was deeply indebted to the Wesleyan revivalist tradition" (pg. 50, *ibid*). The Methodist perfectionist, continuationist, and woman preacher Amanda Smith, who preached at Keswick and was then invited to and preached at Broadlands by invitation of Evan Hopkins and Lord Mount-Temple in the 1880s, is another example of Methodist perfectionism being propogated at Keswick (pg. 116, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck; *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life: The Unpublished Personal Writings of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. Dieter, entry for December 30; Chapter 20-21, *An Autobiograpy: The Story of the Lord's Dealings with Mrs. Amanda Smith, The Colored Evangelist, Containing an Account of her Life Work of Faith, and her Travels in America, England, Ireland, Scotland, India, and Africa, as an Independent Missionary*, Amanda Smith. Chicago, IL: Meyer & Brother, 1893; pgs. 71-73, 114, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). The ecumenicalism of the Keswick Convention embraced a variety of conflicting perfectionisms, predominently the type taught by Hannah W. and Robert P. Smith, but also that of the Oberlin and Wesleyan theologies, in its seeking for a Higher Life spirituality.

[1810] Pg. 40, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1811] As already noted, Keswick does not (usually) teach actual sinless perfection. However, by teaching that continued struggle with sin in the Christian life, and anything less than "perfect and constant victory over temptation" is "heart-breaking defeat" (pgs. 95, 76, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas), it lends itself to the argument of other and more radical perfectionisms that anything less than the possibility of perfection (of whatever kind is advocated by a particular perfectionst theology) in this life is a ground for despair. Snodgrass notes:

> [Doctrines of] perfectionism . . . [and] entire sanctification . . . fee[d] the mind with the notion of entire freedom from sin; and this is, at once, the essence of the system, and the reason of its danger. . . . [T]hose who anticipate better effects [in holier Christian living] from the doctrine of Perfection than from the common doctrine of Sanctification, reason falsely[.] . . . The question is asked . . . "Who would expect an army to fight, with energy, under the impression of inevitable defeat?" And this, it is taken for granted, is a parallel case to that of the Christian, who entertains no hope of entire sanctification in the present life. But, is it so? Has he the impression of inevitable defeat, because he expects the war to be somewhat protracted? Does he lay down his arms, in despair, because he believes that more than one battle is to be fought? Does he cease from the contest, because he does not anticipate a perfect triumph, until the "last enemy" shall "be destroyed," which "is death"? The truth is, that, on his own principles, he has an expectation of victory, which is qualified by no peradventure; he anticipates it, with unwavering faith, and with joyful hope; it is as certain to him, as the love and faithfulness of God can make it;—nay, he has the earnest of it, in his present

Barabas states: "The value of a system of thought or of a doctrine therefore depends upon the manner in which it proposes to deal with the problem of sin. Any failure here means failure all along the line."[1812] Unfortunately, the Keswick theology does not properly deal with sin. While some who have been helped spiritually because of Keswick preaching are blessedly inconsistent, consistent belief that sin no longer need trouble the believer is only possible by disregarding the true nature of sin or by adopting perfectionism. Furthermore, to the extent that Keswick lowers the standard of God's requirement from literal and absolute sinlessness to a lower and subjective standard of "known sin" that downplays the evils of sins of ignorance,[1813] it leads believers to be

---

success;—he has already come off as a conqueror in many a struggle;—he is pursuing his advantage from one battle-field to another; and he has no doubt, that the time is near, when all the armies of the aliens shall be put to flight, "And death, the last of all his foes,/ Lie vanquished at his feet." So far, therefore, as the certainty of success is concerned, he has the same reason to persevere and be active, with those who anticipate a speedier triumph.

Again: it is wrong, in principle, to say, that the hope of success, in order to be an efficient motive, must terminate upon acquisitions to be made within the limits of the present life. This is neither consistent with Scripture, nor in accordance with actual experience. The hope of the apostles and primitive Christians, was a hope, which "entereth into that within the veil," and, this was the reason why it was an "anchor to the soul." . . . It transported its subjects beyond the region where sin and sorrow dwell, and brought them into communion with the inhabitants and felicities of heaven. And this was the true secret of its animating influence. It derived its energy from the importance and glory of its object; and this was something entirely above and beyond any degrees of sanctification to be anticipated here. "Every man," says an apostle [1 John 3:3], "that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself." Such a hope will undoubtedly sanctify those in whom it dwells; but a similar influence is never ascribed to any hope, the object of which is to be realized on this side of the grave.

Moreover: it is incorrect to assume, that the Christian derives his strongest impulses for holy living, from direct meditations upon his prospect of success. No doubt, he has "respect unto the recompense of the reward," both here and hereafter; and yet, his experience will bear me out in saying, that his heart is never assailed by more irresistible motives to active and entire consecration to God, than when his mind is most fully occupied by other considerations than those which relate immediately to himself. . . . [A greater motive than being] taken up with reflections on the degree of proficiency at which he [is] expecting to arrive . . . [is] "the love of Christ constraineth us" [2 Corinthians 5:14]! Here [is] the main-spring of [Christian] activity . . . with his face towards Calvary, with his eye on the cross, and with his mind intent upon the compassion and condescension of a suffering Saviour, he [is] carried beyond himself, and [is] borne away, by the impulse of a mightier and more generous motive. So it is in all the higher achievements of the Christian life. It is not by sitting down to meditate upon the prospect of our perfect sanctification that we gather the strongest motives to the pursuit of holiness. Our best seasons, both of feeling and action, are those, in which we think least of ourselves, and most, of the love of God, of the compassion of Christ, of the claims of gratitude and duty, and of the beauty and excellency of holiness itself. We are not servants, who work merely for wages, but we are bound to our employment, by love and gratitude to the master, as well as by the happiness we find in the service itself. . . . And in these considerations, are contained our highest inducements, to persevere in his service, and live to his glory. "For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself; for whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." [Romans 14:7-8] (pgs. 95-101, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*, Snodgrass).

1812 Pg. 101, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1813 Lyman Atwater notes:

Some of our most dangerous sins are sins of ignorance. Nay, the very ignorance of moral and Christian duty is itself often most culpable, and incurs the divine condemnation, even the woe upon those who call good evil and evil good; who put light for darkness and darkness for light [Isaiah 5:20]. It is the very essence of sin to be deceitful, to disguise itself, to hate the light, and refuse to come to the light which would unveil it—and is not this declared by the Light of the world to be eminently its condemnation? What! Do men become innocent by blinding themselves to their guilt, and sinless by ignoring their sin? Paul "verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth" [Acts 26:9]. Can a man be innocent and

satisfied with less than what God requires and discourages them from striving after the actual standard of perfect conformity to the absolute holiness of the Most High.[1814]

Associated with the Keswick idea that sin need no longer trouble believers who have entered into the Higher Life is the Pelagianizing and perfectionist idea, adopted by Keswick from the Broadlands Conference,[1815] that the obligation of the believer to obey God is coextensive with his ability to do so.[1816] "A saying frequently heard at Keswick is this[:] 'God's commandment is his enablement,' meaning that God never issues a command that He does not give us grace to fulfil."[1817] The Keswick theology asks, "Does God therefore make demands of human beings that they cannot fulfil? Does He expect of them conduct beyond their reach? . . . God's requirements cannot be greater than His enablements. If they were, man would be mocked. . . . What He demands He makes possible."[1818] Barabas cites no texts from the Bible to prove his position, since none teach his equation of obligation and ability. His argument, however, stands squarely in the line of centuries of perfectionist argumentation and arises out of the denial of total depravity that accompanied the Divine Seed heresy of the Broadlands Conference

---

perfect in persecuting the Church, whatever his ignorance or sincerity therein? Out [with] such casuistry, no matter how plausible and acceptable it may be to a worldly and backslidden church, or those who think they are something when they are nothing, or who "say they are perfect," by whatever names sanctioned! (pg. 407, "The Higher Life and Christian Perfection," Lyman H. Atwater. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* (July 1877) 389-419)

1814 B. B. Warfield incisively notes concerning this sort of teaching:

Nothing can be more important than that the conception of perfection be maintained at its height. If there is an eternal and immutable distinction between right and wrong . . . then [g]oodness must be everywhere and in all beings essentially the same. The fundamental principles of right moral action, must be the same to God and to his creatures; and there must be one rule of duty—one standard by which to test character—to angels and to men. . . . True perfection is one and the same thing in all beings[.] The habit of conceiving of perfection as admitting of many imperfections—*moral* imperfections, glossed as infirmities, errors and inadvertences—not only lowers the standard of perfection and with it the height of our aspirations, but corrupts our hearts, dulls our discrimination of right and wrong, and betrays us into satisfaction with attainments which are very far from satisfactory. There is no more corrupting practice than the habit of calling right wrong and wrong right. That is the essence of antinomianism, if we choose to speak in the language of the schools. To give it its least offensive description, it is acquiescence in sin. And this is the real arraignment of all perfectionist theories[.] They lull men to sleep with a sense of attainments not really made; cut the nerve of effort in the midst of the race; and tempt men to accept imperfection as perfection—which is no less than to say evil is good. (pgs. 457-458, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part Two*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 8, B. B. Warfield)

1815 As Hannah W. Smith taught at Broadlands: "God's commands are not grievous, but they would be if He commanded what we could not do" (pg. 128, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Because of the Divine Seed, "We have in our hearts the germ that can receive" (pg. 185, *ibid*); no monergistic and supernatural regeneration of the totally spiritually dead sinner is necessary.

1816 The doctrine that fallen man's obligation to obey is limited to his ability to do so is refuted in the chapter in this book "Is Fallen Man's Obligation To Obey God Limited To His Ability To Do So?"

1817 Pg. 30, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1818 Pg. 63, 188, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Indeed, that "What He expects of us He gives us the power to do, both in sanctification and service" is stated to be "the message of Keswick" (pg. 155, cf. pg. 88).

and the Quakerism of the Pearsall Smiths. Consistency with the affirmation that man has the inherent ability to perform all that God demands of him requires sinless perfection, since God's standard for man is nothing less than the perfect purity and holiness of His own nature. Affirming that, in this life, one can be entirely without sin is a dangerous heresy affirmed only by unregenerate individuals (1 John 1:8, 10).

Keswick, however, since it at times recognizes the dangerous and unscriptural character of a more consistent perfectionism,[1819] does not usually take its perfectionist doctrine that obligation is limited to ability to its actual conclusion, but stops with the affirmation that believers can live without known sin, while at the same time affirming that all believers still are sinners and do sin, although unwittingly. It is certainly true that believers can have a clear conscience and not be deliberately refusing to forsake sin, and that genuine and ever-greater progressive victory over sin—although not the absolute victory coming in heaven—is given to the saints on earth (Romans 6:14). However, the restricted Keswick perfectionism is not compatible with its doctrine that obligation is limited to ability. God commands all men and angels to be perfect, just as He is perfect (Matthew 5:48), but the Holy One of Israel is not just free from certain areas of conscious sinning. God does not lower His standard to what is possible for either unregenerate fallen man or pre-glorified regenerate man who still has indwelling sin. Consistency with its affirmation that man's obligation is limited to his ability would require Keswick to affirm either literal, absolute perfectionism for fallen men or to downgrade the character of God's holy character and law, and the nature of sin, to something less than absolute conformity to the holiness of Jehovah.[1820] Such conclusions cannot be avoided by Keswick's affirming that grace enables ability to meet Divine obligation. Absolute perfection or a downgrade in the nature of sin must still follow—only the sinless perfection would now be allegedly enabled by grace.[1821] God certainly will give all His people the grace to be sinlessly perfect, but He will only do so when they are forever with Him, not during this life. The necessary consequences of the Keswick doctrine of ability

---

[1819] Keswick opposes consistent perfectionism, at least most of the time—however, sometimes more consistent strains break out. For instance, Robert P. Smith permitted "an aged minister by his side to assert roundly that he had lived for thirty-five years as purely as Jesus" ("Die Heiligungsbewegung," Chapter 6, *Perfectionism*, B. B. Warfield, vol. 1).

[1820] This dilemma faces all perfectionist positions that attempt to deal with any kind of seriousness with the data of Scripture. Note also that inability to sin because of a will permanently and immutably inclined to holiness is not a little of the bliss of the saint's heavenly holiness, as it is a glorious characteristic of the Divine holiness (Deuteronomy 32:4; Romans 9:14; 1 John 3:2-3).

[1821] Furthermore, once such a state of sinless perfection had been entered, grace would no longer be necessary to sustain the believer in his state of holiness; as God is perfectly holy and unable to sin, so the Christian would be inherently perfectly holy and unable to sin.

and obligation explain why "opponents of Keswick have accused it [of being] perfectionist."[1822] Happily, Keswick advocates do not usually believe what is truly involved in their affirmation that God's standard for fallen man is limited by the sinner's ability. But would it not be better to simply represent the teaching of the Bible on sanctification accurately than to affirm a Pelagian and perfectionistic view of obligation and ability, but inconsistently deny its consequences?

Keswick adopted the error of the Broadlands Conference[1823] and its successors[1824] that Christians can be justified but unsanctified[1825] if they do not enter into the secret of the Higher Life. The related Keswick weakness, likewise adopted from Broadlands,[1826] on saving repentance[1827] and surrender to the Lordship of Christ at the point of the new

---

[1822] Pg. 40, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas must ignore the many affirmations of perfectionism by Keswick's greatest leaders to label the charge of perfectionism a mere "accusation." He would have been more faithful to actual historical facts had he stated: "[O]pponents of Keswick have accused it [of being] perfectionist, and they were right," or "the facts clearly demonstrate that Keswick stands for perfectionism."

[1823] E. g., at Broadlands people who were allegedly already true Christians came to a post-conversion point where "they took Christ to be their Saviour, not only from the guilt but [also] from the power and practice of sin" (pg. 125, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890). Broadlands affirmed that one could be spiritually alive and yet manifest no outward evidences of it whatever (pg. 249, *ibid*.). Then again, since Mrs. H. P. Smith, as a Quaker universalist, believed that every man on earth has spiritual life because of the Divine Seed in him, yet it is painfully obvious that the vast majority of men do not live holy lives, the effete impotence of the Broadlands and Keswick view of spiritual life is very easily explicable.

[1824] For example, at the Oxford Convention:

> [The] testimonies all agreed in this, that the speakers had not for a greater or less period after their conversion experimentally known the secret of victory, and that consequently for a longer or shorter time their Christian lives had been full of failure and defeat; but that at last they had been taught either directly by the Spirit through the Scriptures, or through the testimony of others—that the Lord Jesus Christ was able and willing to deliver them, not only from the guilt of their sins, but also from their power [for He had not delivered them from the power of sin at their conversion]; . . . [t]he convincing nature of these testimonies, and the Scriptural teaching that was brougth forward, seemed to carry the truth home to many hearts[.] (pgs. 290-291, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874)

[1825] "The Disjunction Between Justification and Sanctification in Contemporary Evangelical Theology," by William W. Combs (*Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 6 (Fall 2001) 17-44), provides a useful overview of the historical development of the concept that justification and sanctification may be divided and a critique of this erroneous and dangerous theological affirmation.

[1826] Thus, e. g., "Lord Mount-Temple was not only a believer but a disciple" (pg. 44, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910), for one could be the former without being the latter. A Broadlands evangelistic appeal could be, not to repentance and faith in the finished work of the crucified and risen Christ, but to "Come to God . . . for the forgiveness of sins, which all might have, who really desired and asked for it" (pg. 224, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). If, in Broadlands teaching, men are lost at all—and such is very, very far from clear, so that an eternal hell, for example, is not to be mentioned—salvation allegedly comes by asking, rather than, as in the Bible, by the instrumentality of repentant faith alone, asking or no asking.

[1827] Early Keswick weakness on repentance carries over to modern advocates of classic Keswick theology. For example, modern Keswick evangelist John R. Van Gelderen misdefines the primary verb in the NT for *repentance*, *metanoeo*, as merely "to change one's mind," and then argues that to "make

birth and the necessity of a conscious and clear conversion[1828] is another fearful error. Keswick's related idea that Christians can be brought into bondage to sin in the same way that unsaved people are under the dominion of sin[1829] is similarly erroneous and very dangerous. God swears in the New Covenant: "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people" (Hebrews 8:10). Scripture promises the saints: "[S]in shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Romans 6:14). Indeed, this blessed promise undergirds the command to the believer to yield to God (6:13). Thus, when Keswick affirms that "such sins as . . . falsehood, theft, corrupt speech, bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, railing, [and] malice[,] may gain such dominion over [believers] that [they] forfeit [their] freedom, and . . . become like a second nature"[1830] it is clearly in error. Indeed, based on Romans 6:13-14, such Keswick teaching hinders believers from yielding to God by taking away from them the precious promise that sin will not dominate them. Keswick follows Robert P. Smith and the Oxford Convention[1831] to state

---

repentance more than this exchange of ways of thinking is to make repentance something additional to the other side of the theological coin of faith . . . this violates the usage of Scripture," for faith is also, it seems, simply exchanging one's way of thinking. Consequently: "If repent means turning from sins, why did Jesus die?" (http://revivalfocusblog.com/series/repentance; cf. pgs. 190-200, *The Evangelist, the Evangel and Evangelism*, John R. Van Gelderen). Contrast Ezekiel 33:11; Revelation 16:11; 1 Thessalonians 1:9-10, etc.

[1828] Thus, e. g., at Broadlands three stages in spiritual life were set forth—but not one of the three was genuine conversion. One could have spiritual life and "advance to higher life" with a conversion that was as clear as the mudpit of a sinner's unregenerate life, or without any conversion and regeneration at all (pgs. 191-193, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). After all, as the Quakers taught, the supernatural impartation of a new nature in regeneration and conversion were unnecessary—all men have the Divine Seed, and they thus do not need and ought not to be evangelically converted.

[1829] In light of the fact that Hannah W. Smith confused conversion with mental assent to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and both she and her husband, the theological sources of the Keswick theology, were unconverted, it is not surprising that Keswick downplays the power and certainty of the change associated with true conversion. The influence on Keswick of Anglicanism, a denomination teeming with religious but unconverted people, and of Quakerism, which denied the necessity of conversion at all, also make it easy to understand how the weakness of the Keswick doctrine of regeneration and conversion developed. The demons called up by Lord and Lady Mount Temple at Broadlands would also have offered mighty supernatural assistance in the perverting of the gospel (cf. Matthew 13:19).

[1830] Pg. 47, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1831] E. g., on pg. 153, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874, Robert P. Smith teaches that Christians are under the dominion of sin until they "accept the glorious emancipation" offered in the Higher Life, an affirmation he supports by forcing Romans 6:14 to mean exactly the opposite of what it actually states. The "saint . . . having been freed from the guilt of sin," is then to "com[e] to Christ to be freed from its power" (pg. 43, *ibid*).

that Christians "are to be freed from the dominion of sin,"[1832] but Scripture states that Christians *are* freed from the dominion of sin (Romans 6:14). The Christian's freedom from sin is actual, not merely potential.[1833] It is a blessed fact that Keswick is in error when it declares that "a Christian . . . [can] become an entire worldling."[1834] The power of the Son is greater than what is stated in Keswick theology: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36).[1835] There are no exceptions—Hallelujah!

[1832] Pg. 63, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Compare the misrepresentation by William Boardman: "The bulk of professing Christians . . . [are] indifferent, or opposed to the glorious truth that Jesus can deliver from the dominion of sin," but the minority who enter the Higher Life discover that "sin had no longer dominion over them" (pgs. 58, 141, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman).

[1833] John Murray notes:

> While Keswick . . . places a much-needed emphasis upon Paul's teaching in Romans 6, there is at the same time shortcoming in the interpretation and application of this passage and of others of like import. The freedom from the dominion of sin of which Paul speaks is the *actual* possession of every one who is united to Christ. It is not merely *positional* victory which every believer has secured (cf. pp. 84ff. [in Barabas]). When Paul says in Romans 6:14, "Sin shall not have dominion over you," he is making an affirmation of certainty with respect to every person who is under the reigning power of grace and therefore with respect to every one who is united to Christ. . . . This victory . . . is the once-for-all gift of God's grace in uniting us to Christ in the virtue of his death and resurrection. But it is not simply positional, far less is it potential; it is actual. And because it is actual it is experimental. . . . It is true that there are differing degrees in which the implications of this freedom from the dominion of sin are realized in experience. In other words, there are differing degrees in which the "reckoning" to which Paul exhorts in Romans 6 is applied and brought to expression in the life and experience of believers. But the victory over sin is not secured by the "reckoning"; it is secured by virtue of union with Christ [at the time of] . . . initial faith . . . and is therefore the possession of every believer, however tardy may be his advance in the path of progressive sanctification. Reckoning ourselves to be dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God is not the act of faith whereby victory is achieved; this reckoning is the reflex act and presupposes the deliverance of which Paul speaks in Romans 6:14. If we fail to take account of this basic and decisive breach with sin, specifically with the rule and power of sin, which occurs when a person is united to Christ in the initial saving response to the gospel, it is an impoverished and distorted view of salvation in Christ that we entertain and our doctrine of sanctification is correspondingly impaired. (pgs. 284-285, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 4, reviewing *So Great Salvation,* Barabas)

[1834] Pg. 56, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1835] The Keswick affirmation that "there are . . . two kinds of Christians . . . depending upon whether the flesh or the Spirit is in control in their lives" (pg. 54, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas) is also liable to abuse. Certainly some Christians are right with God and walking in sweet and conscious fellowship with Him, while others are backslidden. To affirm, however, that an underclass of Christian exists in whom "sin and failure are still master" and for whom "it is impossible to receive spiritual truth" (pg. 54) is simply false. Those who cannot know spiritual truth are the unregenerate, not an alleged Christian underclass (1 Corinthians 2:14). Furthermore, one wonders how any backslider could ever be reclaimed, if for believers who have fallen into sin, it is "impossible" to receive spiritual truth. Nor does 1 Corinthians 3:1ff. establish that sin is still the master in some Christians—it simply affirms that Corinthian believers were allowing sinful envying and divisiveness in their ranks. Paul could tell the very same assembly that they had been freed from the dominion of sin and been changed by God a few chapters later in the same letter (1 Corinthians 6:9-11). 1 Corinthians 3:1ff. does not by any means establish that sin is still the master of some of the regenerate, or that it is impossible for some true believers to receive spiritual truth. The idea of a distinct class of Christian, "the 'carnal' Christian [who] is . . . characterized by a walk that is on the same plane as that of the 'natural' man . . . [whose] objectives and affections are centered in the same unspiritual sphere as that of the 'natural' man" (pgs. 10-12, *He That is Spiritual*, Lewis Sperry Chafer, rev. ed.), that is, a class of "Christian" that is just like the unregenerate, is a fiction not taught in 1 Corinthians 3 or in any other portion of the Bible.

Keswick, following the rejection of self-examination Hannah and Robert P. Smith adopted from Madame Guyon and other reprobates, and in keeping with the teaching of the Broadlands pre-Keswick Convention[1836] and its Oxford and Brighton successors,[1837] fails to warn strongly about the possibility of professing believers not truly being regenerate, although this is a clearly Biblical theme (Matthew 7:21-23; 2 Corinthians 13:5; Hebrews 12:15). Keswick also adopts a dangerous teaching when, following Robert and Hannah W. Smith,[1838] it states, without any explanation or qualification,[1839] that "some are regenerated without knowing when."[1840] What is more, its unbiblical

---

[1836] The Broadlands Conference followed Hannah W. Smith to affirm: "Those who love have Him whether they recognize it or not" (pg. 239, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910), so self-examination concerning whether one had consciously been converted was certainly unnecessary.

[1837] E. g., the Oxford Convention proclaimed as truth: "Madame Guyon said, 'Let us have no self-reflective acts'" (pg. 107, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Robert P. Smith stated: "Let us have no retrospective acts," since when "we have given up ourselves to a life of full consecration and faith, we need not now be analysing our experience" (pgs. 275, 323, *ibid*), an error that helped both Mr. and Mrs. Smith remain without true conversion and which allowed them to adopt and spread the erotic Bridal Baptism heresy.

[1838] E. g., Robert Smith preached "some do not know the hour of their conversion" while setting forth his doctrine of post-conversion Spirit baptism (pg. 251, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874), and testimonies of those who received "the baptism of the Holy Spirit" through "Mr. Smith's address" but "cannot remember . . . [their] conversion" were considered valuable enough witness to the truth of his doctrine to be printed and publicly distributed in the standard record of the Oxford Convention (pg. 384, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). William Boardman likewise downplayed the importance of knowing the time of one's conversion; see pg. 149, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

[1839] No one would dispute that a believer who has a serious head injury and loses his memory, including that of his conversion experience, is still saved. Under other limited sets of circumstances it is possible that a genuine convert might not know when he was born again. For example, a person might, with his whole heart, recognize his lost condition and came to Jesus Christ in repentant faith, but later conclude that he was not really converted, believe he was lost, and therefore seek to repent and believe again to receive pardon. Such a one might be unsure, looking back, on which occasion he was really saved. However, in light of the conscious workings of the mind and will associated with repentance and faith, and the radical transformation involved in regeneration, one who has been born again will almost certainly know when this change took place. It is most unusual that one could repent, be given a new heart and a new nature, pass from being God's enemy to being His dear child, and receive all the other effects of salvation without knowing about it. The convert who cannot remember when he came to Christ in repentant faith and was regenerated should be about as rare as the husband who cannot remember or say anything about what happened on his wedding day. Likewise, the paedobaptist error, afflicting many Reformed churches, that allows people to allegedly have salvation "sealed" to them by infant baptism so that they do not need to know when they were regenerated but can assume that it happened at some point as long as they live a moral life, and other common errors that fill the world with unconverted people who claim they have been regenerated, but do not know when, must be warned of and cried out against—but Barabas provides no such cautions, instead simply making the unqualified statement that people can be regenerated and not know when the new birth and their conversion took place.

[1840] Pg. 124, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

concept that believers can be justified but not sanctified, coupled with its rejection of separatism and its stand with broad Protestantism, rather than with Biblical Baptist churches composed of visible saints, leads Keswick to make statements such as the following:

> Christians . . . not advancing in holiness at all . . . [is] widely prevalent . . . [or] almost universal[.] . . . The vast majority of Christians . . . [are] apparently . . . making no advance or increase at all . . . [but live in] defeat and failure . . . full of futile wanderings, never enjoying peace and rest . . . their own spiritual condition absolutely unsatisfactory . . . stop[ping] short in their experience of the blessings of salvation with the . . . forgiveness of past sins and with the hope of Heaven.[1841]

The idea that the "vast majority of Christians" never grow but live in an "absolutely unsatisfactory" spiritual condition is a very dangerous misdiagnosis of the spiritual need of the generality of Protestant church members, who are lost and who need to be truly converted and then to separate from their false religious denominations and be baptized into historic Baptist congregations.[1842] Such people need spiritual life, not Higher Life preaching. Backslidden saints are certainly a serious problem which should not be minimized. However, neither should the Biblical fact that all believers will be different or the possibility of false profession be neglected. Keswick's setting aside of Biblical self-examination, its teaching that the vast majority of Christians make no advance in spiritual life at all, and its many other weaknesses on the nature and power of the gospel, are extremely spiritually dangerous. Many are in hell today because of these toxic Keswick errors.

As already note, Keswick theology is right to call believers to the "renunciation of all known sin . . . and . . . surrender to Christ for the infilling of the Holy Spirit."[1843] Keswick does well to affirm that the Holy Spirit "dwells in every child of God . . . [but] not every Christian is filled with the Spirit . . . [and] to be filled with the Spirit is not presented in Scripture as an optional matter, but as a holy obligation that rests upon all Christians."[1844] Keswick is correct that the "Christian is expected to live in communion with the Spirit."[1845] Nonetheless, the Keswick pneumatology differs at important points

---

1841 Pgs. 67-68, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1842 Unregenerate Protestants would certainly not be helped by those Higher Life preachers who denied the necessity of being converted and regenerated at a particular moment of time, and taught instead the extremely dangerous error of gradual conversion, as was proclaimed, e. g., at the Brighton Convention: "Some are suddenly converted, others gradually; and perhaps in each case of conversion there has been a blending of both gradual and sudden work. There has been a [converting] work going on gradually, perhaps through years of our life" (pg. 203, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

1843 Pg. 35, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1844 Pgs. 131-132, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1845 Pg. 137, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

from the pneumatology of Scripture.[1846] Barabas is incorrect when he affirms that only some isolated "statements . . . from addresses and books by Keswick speakers . . . seem to . . . outrun Scripture."[1847] Some of the Keswick theology of the Spirit not only seems to, but does, in fact, outrun Scripture. The historic Baptist position that Spirit baptism was a first century corporate blessing authenticating the church, which was accompanied by miraculous signs and wonders, and which does not take place today, is the teaching of Scripture.[1848] It is incorrect to hold either to a view that affirms that Spirit baptism is a

---

[1846] While perhaps Barabas was simply employing hyperbole when he stated that for "multitudes of Christians the Holy Spirit is an impersonal divine influence" (pg. 130, *So Great Salvation*; cf. pg. 137, *Forward Movements*, Pierson), such a declaration is careless, as one who truly denies the Trinity to affirm that the Holy Spirit is simply an impersonal influence is an idolator, not a Christian. However, it is not clear that Barabas is simply employing hyperbole in his denial of the necessity of faith in the Trinity since his anti-Trinitarian affirmation has clear precedent among Keswick leaders. Hannah W. Smith did not (she thought) need the Triune God of the Bible; a mystic, non-Trinitarian "bare God" was enough for her. Keswick leaders such as F. B. Meyer taught that all believers in the Old Testament thought that the Holy Spirit was not a Person, but a force, and denied that a saving conversion involves belief in the Trinity. If Barabas meant what he said, he was true to much of Keswick piety, although a traitor to the Trinitarianism confessed in Christian baptism (Matthew 28:19).

[1847] Pg. 138, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas, on this page, does not actually concede that even isolated statements from Keswick speakers and books do in fact outrun Scripture, but only that they seem to do so. If not even an isolated statement from any Keswick speaker or writer, for decade after decade, outran Scripture, the conference truly would be remarkable, as it would differ from every other conference of similar length held by fallen men that has ever existed in history. H. C. G. Moule, while very favorable to the Keswick theology, is more admirably honest than Barabas: "I venture to think that some new statements made [at Keswick], particularly at first, in the course of the movement we have here before us, failed in either scriptural accuracy or scriptural balance. . . . There is no such thing on earth as a vast assembly where, in the utterances of day after day, no mistake is made, no sin of excess or defect in speech committed" (pgs. xi, xiii, preface by Moule in Harford, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*). Similarly, Harford-Battersby noted: "I am not going to deny, indeed I am sadly conscious of the fact, that certain elements of error have been imported into the movement . . . by some less cautious speakers and writers, which, if not eliminated . . . might prove of considerable danger to the minds of those who receive them" (pgs. 173-174, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby*, Harford). Thus, "there were elements of danger connected with Mr. Smith's presentation of truth" (pg. 174, *ibid*). Evan Hopkins likewise believed that at early Keswick conventions and other Higher Life meetings "things had been said . . . which did lack balance and had a dangerous drift . . . things were certainly said there . . . which were not balanced, and which only disturbed my mind and soul" (pgs. 11, 13, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). Barabas would have done well to acknowledge such concessions by the founders and pillars of the Keswick theology.

[1848] See the chapter in this book "Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism." The fact that Luke 11:13 does not teach the Keswick doctrine that "Christians [should] ask for the Holy Spirit" (pg. 140, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas) is also examined there. The Keswick view of Luke 11:13 was also taught at the Broadlands Conference (e. g., pg. 265, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). What is more, Keswick writers like Andrew Murray even taught that the unconverted could be saved by asking for the Holy Spirit (cf. pg. 14, *Why Do You Not Believe?: Words of Instruction and Encouragement for All Who Are Seeking the Lord*, Murray). Such an idea is totally contrary to Scripture's consistent teaching of justification by faith in Christ alone, not by prayer, and the direct object of saving faith as Christ crucified (cf. John 3:14-18), not specifically the Person of the Spirit. Of course, it is also true that faith in Christ really involves faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (cf. John 5:24).

post-conversion blessing for today that bestows special powers, or to the doctrine that "the Holy Spirit, on the condition of faith, baptizes a man into Christ and joins him permanently and eternally to Him, [so that Spirit baptism makes] a man 'in Christ,' in union with both the person and the work of Christ . . . [a teaching allegedly] clearly set forth in the sixth chapter of Romans."[1849] Scripture nowhere, and certainly not in the sixth chapter of Romans, teaches that "every Christian . . . has been baptized by the Spirit."[1850] Nor does God's Word teach that the "full blessing of Pentecost is the inheritance of all the children of God,"[1851] as all the children of God today are not wonder-working apostles with the miraculous ability to speak in foreign languages, the spiritual gift of healing, and other supernatural powers that ceased early in Christian history—a fact that is itself denied by the strongly dominant Keswick continuationism or anti-cessationism in the matter of spiritual gifts.[1852] Furthermore, if Keswick "distinguishes between being 'full' and being 'filled'" with the Spirit, so that the latter refers to a "filling, or momentary supply . . . as special difficulties arise,"[1853] such a distinction is difficult to reconcile with the fact that the command in Ephesians 5:18 is to be filled, not to be full, of the Spirit.[1854] Furthermore, when the Keswick theology employs Acts 5:32[1855] to make a point about being "endue[d] with the divine power"[1856] to serve the Lord, or as a proof-text for recommended means of believers becoming Spirit-filled, it misinterprets Scripture. In Acts 5:32, Peter teaches that God gives the Holy Spirit to believers,[1857] while God does not give the Holy Spirit to those, such as the

---

1849 Pgs. 103-104, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1850 Pg. 132, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1851 Pg. 139, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas follows Andrew Murray in the quoted affirmation. Murray, since he believed that all the gifts, from healing to tongues, were for the entire church age, could, with the modern charismatic movement, consistently make this affirmation. Modern non-charismatics who seek to combine cessationism with Keswick theology cannot do so, and nobody should do so, since the Bible teaches that the sign gifts have ceased.

1852 Note the discussion below of Keswick and continuationism.

1853 Pg. 133, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1854 Such a distinction also needs to be more carefully and specifically defined if it is to be employed of the terms in the book of Acts. Careful consistency in terminology is not employed by Barabas himself, as he quotes Evan Hopkins's affirmation for a filling/full distinction on pg. 133, and then on pg. 134 quotes G. Campbell Morgan making a different distinction between a "perpetual filling [not perpetual fulness] of the Spirit" and "specific fillings to overflowing."

1855 Barabas does so on pgs. 141, 145, 188. Acts 5:32 is the only verse quoted or referenced by Barabas from pgs. 134-145, the section where he sets forth the Keswick position on how to become Spirit-filled. It is unfortunate that the only verse cited has nothing to do with the question, other than the fact that one cannot be Spirit filled until he has been converted, a fact which is not at all the point made by Barabas in his use of the text.

1856 Pg. 141, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1857 Cf. Acts 2:38; 11:17; 15:8; Romans 5:5; 8:15; 2 Corinthians 1:22; Galatians 4:6; 1 John 3:24. Compare also the uses of δίδωμι in Acts 5:31 & 11:18.

council of Pharisees and Sadducees that the Apostle was addressing, who reject Jesus Christ, disobeying the command of God to receive Him as the risen Lord and Savior (Acts 5:28-33, 38-42). Consequently, every Christian on earth has the Spirit in the sense mentioned in Acts 5:32. What is more, the obedience mentioned in Acts 5:32 is a result of the receipt of the Spirit at the moment of regeneration, not a means to obtain spiritual power.[1858] The Christian should consequently recognize that the power of God the Holy Ghost is essential for his effective sanctification and service, but reject the unbiblical aspects of the Keswick pneumatology.

Stephen Barabas, cleaving closely to Keswick tradition, well illustrates Keswick's inaccuracy and bungling attempts at refutation of alternative positions on sanctification. Dealing with "wrong ways of seeking sanctification," inaccuracy of presentation and theological imprecision are apparent.[1859] The erroneous views he examines are:

> 1.) [T]he sanctification of the believer is a matter of course, and that he need not trouble himself about it . . . sanctification will proceed automatically without our doing anything about it.[1860] . . .
> 2.) [M]any people . . . regard sanctification as merely a matter of gradual growth, not to be stopped or hindered or accelerated by anything the Christian may do. . . . [D]eliverance from conscious sinning . . . is just a question of time. . . . it . . . is necessarily imperceptibly slow and . . . cannot be retarded or hastened by anything the believer may do.[1861] . . .
> 3.) [The] theory . . . that it is possible in this life, either at regeneration or at some subsequent crisis of religious experience . . . to reach a point in spiritual development where the sin nature is eradicated and therefore no longer operative. . . . A theory of gradual eradication is held by others.[1862] . . .
> 4.) Perhaps the most widely-held view of sanctification is that it is to be gained through our own personal efforts by trying to supress the flesh in us.[1863] . . .
> 5.) Other Erroneous Methods.[1864]

Very few people actually believe false theories #1 or 2. The perfectionist theory of sinlessness through instanteous eradication of the sin principle mentioned in #3 is indeed held by some and is erroneous. In relation to #4, the problem of self-dependence in sanctification is certainly serious and is a false idea. If someone actually believes that sanctification will proceed automatically without the believer doing anything about it, he will find the refutation of this view helpful. However, since views #1 and 2 are entirely

---

1858 That is, in Acts 5:32 God gave (aorist) the gift of the Spirit (τὸ Πνεῦμα . . . τὸ Ἅγιον, ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς) to those who are now obeying Him (present participle, τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ). The verse does not affirm that God will give the Spirit to those who will obey, or that the Holy Spirit was given to those who had gone through some process of obedience or certain steps set forth in Keswick theology in order to obtain Him, but that He was given through the new birth to those who are now obeying Him—a description of all regenerate people.

1859 Pgs. 68-84, *So Great Salvation*.

1860 Pgs. 69-70, *So Great Salvation*.

1861 Pgs. 70-71, *So Great Salvation*.

1862 Pgs. 71-73, *So Great Salvation*.

1863 Pgs. 74-83, *So Great Salvation*.

1864 Pgs. 83-84, *So Great Salvation*.

absent from any standard confession by any evangelical group in church history, one wonders if positions #1-2 are really a caricature of Biblical truths about sanctification.

If Barabas's position #1 is supposed to refute the Scriptural fact that believers *will* be different, it is a gross misrepresentation; God works in the believer to will and do (Philippians 2:13) and the fact of the certainty of the sanctification of the regenerate is a basis for Biblical exhortation to grow, not a hinderance to it or an encouragement to neglect growth (Romans 6:13-14). So far from #2 being held by "many" Christians, the idea that growth cannot be accelerated or hindered or stopped is a very unusual position. Among the alleged "many" that advocate view #2, Barabas provides not even one original source, perhaps because no such source exists. One wonders if it has ever been advocated in print in any work of evangelical Christian literature in history.[1865]

Barabas very unfortunately combines the idea of a second blessing of instantaneous sinlessness in #3 with the position, represented by a quotation from Warfield, that the Holy Spirit weakens the remnants of sin in the believer and strengthens the new nature over time. The argument on the pages dealing with #3 make some valid points against the instantaneous perfectionist second blessing position, but Barabas's examination of Warfield's view sets up a straw man and is very weak. Similarly, while people can certainly deceive themselves into thinking that they can serve the Lord in their own strength, and the believer's indwelling sin constantly seeks to lead him to live in an independent manner, self-dependence is not "the most widely-held view of sanctification."[1866] The Keswick presentation by Barabas in #4 contains severe confusion between an unbiblical self-dependent attempt to sanctify onself apart from the power of God and the Biblical truth that sanctification does indeed involve God-dependent, faith-filled personal effort, striving, and struggle. Finally, Barabas's presentation of erroneous views of sanctification never deals with actual commonly held erroneous views of sanctification, from Wesleyan and Methodist to Oberlin perfectionism, to liturgical and Romanist *ex opere operato* sorts of sacramentarianism, to Quaker Quietism. Furthermore, if Barabas's positions #1-5 are not intended to caricature and oppose important elements of the Biblical doctrine of sanctification, from the certainty that believers will be different to the fact that God actually does inwardly make the believer less sinful and more holy, then these truths are entirely passed over in utter neglect, and

---

1865 While Barabas does not cite even one advocate of this allegedly common position on sanctification, he does reference J. Elder Cumming, *Through the Eternal Spirit* (Stirling, Stirling Tract Enterprise, 1937), pgs. 112-114 (pgs. 152ff. in the 1896 ed.). Unfortunately, Cumming, in his Keswick classic, likewise provides not a shred of documentation for this allegedly common view.

1866 Pg. 74, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

the Keswick position is set forth as if it were the only alternative to what is stated in #1-5. Either Barabas's presentation of non-Keswick positions on sanctification is grossly deficient because it ignores its theologically conservative alternatives, or it severely misrepresents and mischaracterizes those alternative positions. Barabas effectively illustrates that Keswick presentations of sanctification are not "carefully prepared, weighty discourses"[1867]—a truth both patently evident and most unfortunate.

Barabas's attempt to support Keswick by refuting the classical Biblical doctrine that in sanctification the believer through mortification and vivification actually becomes less sinful and more holy in his nature[1868] misrepresents the Biblical view and fails miserably as a refutation.[1869] In dealing with Warfield's confession of the classical orthodox position that supernatural sanctification involves the Spirit's working to "eradicate our sinfulness and not merely to counteract its effects,"[1870] Barabas argues—without exegeting or citing a single passage of Scripture that could reasonably be taken as relevant as an argument against progressive eradication of the strength of the sin

---

1867 Pg. 51, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1868 The classical orthodox affirmation that indwelling sinfulness is progressively eradicated and the regenerate man progressively strengthened, so that believers really and personally become more holy, rather than indwelling sin merely being counteracted in them, as in the Keswick theology, is evident in documents such as the *2nd London Baptist Confession of Faith*:

> 1. They who are united to Christ, effectually called, and regenerated, having a new heart, and a new Spirit created in them, through the virtue of Christ's death, and resurrection; are also (Acts 20:32; Romans 6:5, 6) farther sanctified, really, and personally, through the same virtue, (John 17:17; Ephesians 3:16, 17, 18, 19; 1 Thessalonians 5:21, 22, 23) by his word and Spirit dwelling in them; (Romans 6:14) the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, (Galatians 5:24) and the several lusts thereof, are more and more weakened, and mortified; and they more and more quickened, and (Colossians 1:11) strengthened in all saving graces, to the (2 Corinthians 7:1; Hebrews 12:14) practice of all true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.
> 2. This Sanctification is (1 Thessalonians 5:23) throughout, in the whole man, yet imperfect (Romans 7:18, 23) in this life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a (Galatians 5:17; 1 Peter 2:11) continual, and irreconcilable war; the Flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the Flesh.
> 3. In which war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much (Romans 7:23) prevail; yet through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ the (Romans 6:14) regenerate part doth over-come; and so the Saints grow in Grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God, (Ephesians 4:15, 16; 2 Corinthians 3:18; 7:1.) pressing after an heavenly life, in Evangelical Obedience to all the commands which Christ as Head and King, in his Word hath prescribed to them. (Article 13, "On Sanctification")

1869 Barabas's discussion and attempted refutation is on pgs. 71-84 of *So Great Salvation*.

1870 Barabas cites Warfield, *Perfectionism* vol. 2, pgs. 579-583. He does, commendably, at least quote Warfield's position correctly, even if much of his argument against Warfield is based upon misunderstanding. The statements quoted by Barabas from Warfield represent part of the truth on sanctification, although Warfield's theology has other problems. Since historic Baptist and non-Calvinist theology is taught in Scripture, the Presbyterian Calvinist Warfield certainly had areas where he deserved criticism, from his paedobaptism, to his advocacy of TULIP soteriology, to his opposition to young-earth creationism, to his acceptance of unbelieving textual criticism as opposed to a faith-based acceptance of the *Textus Receptus*, and so on.

principle,[1871] but following Hannah W. Smith,[1872] that "Keswick is plainly right in rejecting the theory of eradication,[1873] whether instantaneous or gradual, as the divine way of sanctification" in favor of the position that "holiness . . . is a *maintained condition*, never a *state*."[1874] That is, in Keswick theology, as in the teaching of the

---

1871 The only texts Barabas cites in his argument are 1 Corinthians 9:27; 2 Timothy 4:10; 1 John 1:8 & John 15:5. None of them are especially relevant as a refutation of Warfield's position and the classical orthodox doctrine of progressive sanctification.

1872 While Scripture does not support Barabas, Hannah W. Smith does; she wrote: "I am inclined to think [there] is in reality no change in me" in sanctification, "but only my being 'filled with the Spirit'" in "the Baptism of the Holy Ghost" (Letter to Sally, August 1867, reproduced in the entry for March 19 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Mrs. Smith was confirmed in this Quaker false doctrine through "an old book" she received from "a Friend" that taught that "Christ is in the believer instead of all created habits of grace," so that neither "meekness, or wisdom, or any other virtue" is in the believer "from any habits formed" by him, "or store of these things laid up within" (Letter to Abby, May 28, 1867, reproduced in the entry for March 18 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). The believer, she thought, is never made the slightest bit more holy, never actually being "filled with any goodness . . . nor with any righteousness . . . but simply with Jesus"—indeed, he does not even have a real new nature, but "the new nature in us" is nothing "more than Christ in us." (Letter to a Friend, March 28, 1867 & Journal, 1867, reproduced in the entries for March 10 & 27 of *ibid*). Conseequently, Romans 6:6 does not mean that the body of sin is truly progressively destroyed, but instead the "indwelling presence of Christ" merely "renders inert" the body of sin, leaving the believer totally unchanged (pg. 149, *The Record of a Happy Life: Being Memorials of Franklin Whitall Smith*, Hannah W. Smith. Boston, MA: Willard Tract Repository, 1873).

1873 Keswick is actually plainly wrong in rejecting the orthodox Christian doctrine of progressive eradication. As John Murray explained:

> Keswick insists upon counteraction as opposed to suppression and eradication. . . . If we are to use any of the terms mentioned above with reference to the grace of God as it is brought to bear upon the corrupt nature . . . eradication . . . is the only proper one. It is by progressive renewal of heart and mind that we are progressively sanctified. And that is just saying that it is by progressive eradication of inward corruption that we are progressively conformed to the image of Christ; a progressive conformation which comes to expression in the life of conscious understanding, feeling, and will. It is only as we are sanctified within that we can be [truly] sanctified in what is more overt and voluntary. B. B. Warfield comes in for criticism at Barabas' hands in this connection. But the criticism exposes the fallacy and even inconsistency of the Keswick position. What Warfield said was that the Holy Spirit 'cures our sinning precisely by curing our sinful nature; He makes the tree good that the fruit may be good' (p. 71). This Barabas regards as 'unscriptural and dangerous' (p. 72). But on any scriptural view of human nature and of sanctification how could progressive conformation to divine holiness be by any other process than by that of cleansing the heart of its inherent corruption? And this is nothing if it is not eradication of that corruption, an eradication, of course, which will not be complete until sanctification is complete. Besides, Warfield means in principle what is formally expressed [though, unfortunately, never shown to be consistent with the dominant Keswick paradigm, nor ever developed] by Barabas himself when he speaks of 'a gradual transformation by the Holy Spirit who works within' (p. 85). And Warfield would be the first to say of this process that it can 'never be complete in this life' (*id.*). Barabas' averment to the effect that on Warfield's position 'it should be practically, if not entirely, impossible to sin' (p. 73) toward the end of the believer's life evinces again a failure to assess the gravity and liability of any remaining corruption, a gravity of which Warfield took full account. (pgs. 283-284, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, review of *So Great Salvation*, Barabas)

1874 Pgs. 72-73, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Compare the view of Evan Hopkins, who taught that Keswick "has rejected the doctrine of eradication . . . and has insisted on the wiser doctrine, and the happier experience, of counteraction," on the misrepresentation and false assumption, comparable to that of Barabas, that the classic Baptist and Protestant doctrine of the progressive eradication of indwelling sin meant that "the soul . . . w[as] secure now from contamination and incapable of defilement . . . [this is] the doctrine of eradication" (pg. 82, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). Hopkins, having misunderstood the classical doctrine, concludes instead: "There is no eradication of sin . . . but there may

Keswick precursor Conventions,[1875] the believer is not personally and actually the slightest bit more holy after decades of what may be improperly termed progressive sanctification, but is hardly sanctification that is progressing, than he was the moment he was regenerated. Barabas very regretably tries to deal at the same time with the false "second blessing" concept that at an instant during this life one can have his sin nature entirely eliminated and the Scriptural position of Warfield that only at the moment of a Christian's death the sin nature is entirely eliminated, while the Holy Spirit's mortifying and renewing work actually gradually weakens and eradicates the remnants of sin in the believer and strengthens his new nature. To combine these two views as if they were truly closely related leads Barabas to a serious misrepresentation of Warfield's position and a very off-base attempt at a refutation of it on the assumption that it is somehow the close relative of the idea that one enters into sinless perfection through a second blessing.

Barabas argues against Warfield: "The word of God does not teach us to expect, in this life, either the *eradication* or the *improvement* of the 'flesh.'"[1876] While he does not cite the verse, Romans 7:18 clearly teaches that the flesh does not improve in any way. Barabas's statement, however, equivocates on the word *eradication*—if he means "absolute elimination of the flesh," he is entirely correct. If, however, Barabas wishes to refute Warfield's position, he must demonstrate that the influence and power of the flesh is absolutely unchanged, which he fails to demonstrate or even argue for effectively. Instead of refuting Warfield, Barabas sets up a false dichotomy, arguing that "the tendency to sin is not extinct, but is simply counteracted,"[1877] as if those were the only two options. The classical orthodox position represented by Warfield is that while indwelling sin does not itself get any better (Romans 7:18), mortification weakens the power of the sin principle and vivification strengthens the power of the new nature. The ethically sinful flesh itself does not improve, but progressive sanctification weakens its influence as it is put to death or mortified, a process only completed when the believer

---

be the continual *counteraction of sin* in our heart and history . . . a 'condition of purity' maintained in the man by Another" (pgs. 92-93, *ibid.* Italics in original.).

1875 For example, the Oxford Convention taught:

> The natural tendency of Peter was to sink [when walking on the water]. Jesus counteracted this, and Peter walked on the water until he took his eye off from Jesus and looked at the waves. Our tendency by nature is to sin, but faith in Jesus meets this tendency to evil [and] . . . brings into operation the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which sets us free from the law of sin and death. (pg. 53, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874)

For Keswick and its antecedents there is no actual growth in the believer's inward holiness—indwelling sin is not eradicated, only counteracted.

1876 Pg. 72, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Italics in original.

1877 Pg. 49, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

reaches heaven. In this sense only did Warfield affirm gradual eradication, and in this sense Barabas does not touch his position.

Barabas goes on to argue that Warfield's position would require that "the longer a person lived the Christian life the less possible it should be for him to sin . . . [b]ut . . . spiritual growth is not determined by the length of time [one] has been a Christian."[1878] Since Warfield never taught that simply surviving for a longer time as a Christian resulted in one's growing less able to sin, Barabas's criticism again leaves Warfield's doctrine untouched. Warfield would affirm that the more the Christian mortifies sin and his new nature is renewed by the Spirit, the more holy he is. He never taught that sanctification was in direct and sole proportion to the length of time since the believer's regeneration.

In association with the misrepresentation of Warfield's position as one of sanctification by survival, by a Christian's existing for a longer period, Barabas argues that the record of Demas in 2 Timothy 4:10 proves that living longer as a Christian does not necessarily involve greater sanctification. Furthermore, Barabas employs 1 Corinthians 9:27 to prove that "years after his conversion on the Damascus road, Paul himself declared that he dared not be careless[.]"[1879] Unfortunately for Barabas's arguments, in addition to the severe problem that he is refuting a position Dr. Warfield did not advocate, Demas is presented as an example of a professing but unconverted individual, one who has no true love for the Father and who will not abide forever with God but will go to hell (2 Timothy 4:10; 1 John 2:15-17), while Paul's spiritual growth led him to ever-greater carefulness. To aver that Warfield's position is in error because if Paul were more holy years after his conversion he would be more careless about sin, rather than more careful to avoid it, is an astonishingly poor argument.

Barabas's last and presumably crowning argument against Warfield's position is:

> [I]f Dr. Warfield were right . . . [then] [i]f we lived long enough . . . we must reach a stage of spiritual development where the old nature was completely eradicated [and] sin were no longer in us . . . such injunctions as "reckon," "yield," "put off," . . . would no longer have any meaning for us. . . . And when we reached this state of purity we would no longer have to depend upon Christ and the Holy Spirit to enable us to live a holy life. . . . Keswick is plainly right in rejecting [Warfield's view, because of] . . . 1 John 1:8 . . . [and] John 15:5 . . . [his theory] tempts the Christian to negligence . . . carelessness [is] . . . easily fostered by a belief that sin was eradicated from one's nature.[1880]

Barabas seems to have neglected the fact that a huge emphasis in Warfield's two volume work against perfectionism is that sin never is "no longer in us" at any moment before the

---

1878 Pgs. 72-73, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1879 Pg. 73, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1880 Pg. 73, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

believer reaches heaven. Since Warfield confessed that "[t]he moment we think that we have no sin, we shall desert Christ,"[1881] to argue against his position by making it into almost exactly its reverse is a terrible caricature. Those who affirm the Biblical fact that God actually makes the believer more holy—such as Warfield—do not say that the more Christlike a believer grows the more self-dependent, careless, and negligent he becomes,[1882] and the less concerned he is about yielding to God, putting off sin, and the like.[1883] To argue that God cannot make Christians more holy in this life because growing more holy makes one ever the more careless and negligent about spiritual things would mean that the saints in heaven would be the most careless and negligent of all. What is more, if carelessness and negligence are only avoided by eliminating real progressive sanctification and the supernatural eradication of indwelling sinfulness, replacing this blessed truth with a mere counteraction of sin, then, to keep them from carelessness and negligence, believers in heaven must also not have their sinfulness eradicated, but only counteracted. On the contrary, the more the victory over sin described in Romans 6-8 becomes manifest in the believer's life, the greater is his abhorrence of his remaining indwelling sin—the more he loathes it, longs for perfect deliverance from it, and guards himself against it (Romans 7:14, 20-24). While Barabas may not recognize it, Scripture teaches that the Spirit actually makes believers more holy and less sinful, and a concomitant of that greater holiness is greater, not lesser, watchfulness, carefulness, and God-dependence.

1881 Pg. 129, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part One*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 7, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

1882 One wonders if Barabas was aware that Warfield, in his "The Biblical Doctrine of Faith" (*Biblical Doctrines*, vol. 2 of *Works*), made statements such as: "Freed from all illusion of earthly help, and most of all from all self-confidence, [the believer] is meanwhile to live by faith (Habakkuk 2:4)." Perhaps instead of grossly misrepresenting Warfield and affirming that the Princeton theologian's position leads a believer to more and more self-dependence, carelessness, and negligence, Barabas should have considered what Warfield actually said, and noted that Warfield warned that the life of faith requires, "most of all," a rejection of "all self-confidence."

1883 Indeed, the Keswick doctrine that the believer "need . . . not . . . be *conscious* of [his] . . . tendency to sin" (pgs. 49-50, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas) and that he must desist from "struggle and painful effort . . . earnest resolutions and self-denial" (pg. 90) is more likely to lead one to let down his guard than the doctrine of Scripture that sin, although progressively eradicated by the Spirit, remains within the believer until the return of Christ or the end of his life, and he ought to always be conscious of it, guard against it, and strive against it. However, while Barabas dangerously affirms that the Christian does not need to be conscious of his tendency to sin, he does at least warn that one must not "be ignorant of Satan's devices" (pg. 50) about sinlessness. Hopefully the Christian who hears Keswick preaching will not take the affirmation of freedom from the consciousness of sin too seriously, while taking the warning not to be ignorant of Satan's delusions on this matter very seriously, and consequently not be much less watchful than if he believed what Scripture actually teaches.

The following extensive quotation from Warfield, discussing the old evangelical piety of another of its staunch defenders, Thomas Adam,[1884] both explains well the truly Scriptural and old evangelical orthodox position that Barabas opposes and shows just how radically Barabas misrepresents Warfield's position:

> [T]he eighteenth century . . . . English Evangelicals . . . [embraced] "miserable-sinner Christianity" . . . for themselves[.] We may take Thomas Adam as an example. His like-minded biographer, James Stillingfleet, tells us[37] how, having been awakened to the fact that he was preaching essentially a work-religion, he was at last led to the truth . . . particularly by the prayerful study of the Epistle to the Romans. "He was," writes his biographer, "rejoiced exceedingly; found peace and comfort spring up in his mind; his conscience was purged from guilt through the atoning blood of Christ, and his heart set at liberty to run the way of God's commandments without fear, in a spirit of filial love and holy delight; and from that hour he began to preach salvation *through faith in Jesus Christ alone*, to man by nature and practice lost, and condemned under the law, and, as his own expression is, *Always a sinner*." In this italicized phrase, Adam had in mind of course our sinful nature, a very profound sense of the evil of which coloured all his thought. In one of those piercing declarations which his biographers gathered out of his diaries and published under the title of "Private Thoughts on Religion,"[38] Adam tells us how he thought of indwelling sin. "Sin," says he, "is still here, deep in the centre of my heart, and twisted about every fibre of it."[39] But he knew very well that sin could not be in the heart and not in the life. "When have I not sinned?" he asks,[40] and answers, "The reason is evident, I carry myself about with me." Accordingly he says:[41] "When we have done all we ever shall do, the very best state we ever shall arrive at, will be so far from meriting a reward, that it will need a pardon." Again, "If I was to live to the world's end, and do all the good that man can do, I must still cry 'mercy!'"[42]—which is very much what Zinzendorf said in his hymn. So far from balking at the confession of daily sins, he adds to that the confession of universal sinning. "I know, with infallible certainty," he says,[43] "that I have sinned ever since I could discern between good and evil; in thought, word, and deed; in every period, condition, and relation of life; every day against every commandment." "God may say to every self-righteous man," he says again,[44] "as he did in

---

1884 See, e. g., pg. 183, *The Biographia Leodiensis, or Biographical Sketches of the Worthies of Leeds and Neighbourhood*, R. B. Taylor (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co, 1865), for a brief biographical sketch of Thomas Adam (1701-1784).

37 "Private Thoughts on Religion," by the Rev. Thomas Adam: ed. Poughkeepsie, 1814, pp. 22 ff. There are many other editions.

38 "These entries from his private diary, which were meant for no eyes but his own, bring before us a man of no common power of analytic and speculative thought. With an intrepidity and integrity of self-scrutiny perhaps unexampled, he writes down problems started, and questionings raised, and conflicts gone through; whilst his ordinarily flaccid style grows pungent and strong. Ever since their publication these 'Private Thoughts' have exercised a strange fascination over intellects at opposite poles. Coleridge's copy of the little volume (1795) . . . remains to attest, by its abounding markings, the spell it laid upon him, while such men as Bishop Heber, Dr. Thomas Chalmers, and John Stuart Mill, and others, have paid tribute to the searching power of the 'thoughts.' " A. B. Grosart, in Leslie Stephen's "Dictionary of National Biography," i. 1885, pp. 89, 90.

39 "Private Thoughts on Religion," as cited, p. 72

40 P. 74.

41 P. 218.

42 P. 212.

43 P. 71.

44 P. 129. In the same spirit with these quotations, but with perhaps even greater poignancy of rhetorical expression is this declaration of Alexander Whyte's ("Bunyan Characters," iii. 1895, p. 136): "Our guilt is so great that we dare not think of it. . . . It crushes our minds with a perfect stupor of horror, when for a moment we try to imagine a day of judgment when we shall be judged for all the deeds that we

the cause of Sodom, 'show me ten, yea, one perfect good action, and for the sake of it I will not destroy.'"

There is no morbidity here and no easy acquiescence in this inevitable sinning. "Lord, forgive my sins, and suffer me to keep them—is this the meaning of my prayers?" he asks.[45] And his answer is: "I had rather be cast into the burning fiery furnace, or the lion's den, than suffer sin to lie quietly in my heart."[46] He knows that justification and sanctification belong together. "Christ never comes into the soul unattended," he says;[47] "he brings the Holy Spirit with him, and the Spirit his train of gifts and graces." "Christ comes with a blessing in each hand," he says again;[48] "forgiveness in one, and holiness in the other, and never gives either to any who will not take both." But he adds at once: "Christ's forgiveness of all sins is complete at once, because less would not do us good; his holiness is dispensed by degrees, and to none wholly in this life, lest we should slight his forgiveness." "Whenever I die," he says therefore,[49] "I die a sinner; but by the grace of God, penitent, and, I trust, accepted in the beloved." "It is the joy of my heart that I am freed from guilt," he says again,[50] "and the desire of my heart to be freed from sin." For both alike are from God. "Justification by sanctification," he says,[51] "is man's way to heaven, and it is odds but he will make a little [sanctification] serve the turn. Sanctification by justification is God's, and he fills the soul with his own fulness." "The Spirit does not only confer and increase ability, and so leave us to ourselves in the use of it," he explains,[52] "but every single act of spiritual life is the Spirit's own act in us." And again, even more plainly:[53] "Sanctification is a gift; and the business of man is to desire, receive, and use it. But he can by no act or effort of his own produce it in himself. Grace can do every thing; nature nothing." "I am resolved," he therefore declares,[54] "to receive my virtue from God as a gift, instead of presenting him with a spurious kind of my own." He accordingly is "the greatest saint upon earth who feels his poverty most in the want of perfect holiness, and longs with the greatest earnestness for the time when he shall be put in full possession of it."[55]

Thus in complete dependence on grace, and in never ceasing need of grace (take "grace" in its full sense of goodness to the undeserving) the saint goes onward in his earthly work, neither imagining that he does not need to be without sin because he has Christ nor that because he has Christ he is already without sin. The repudiation of both the perfectionist and the antinomian inference is made by Adam most pungently. The former in these crisp words:[56] "The moment we think that we have no sin, we shall desert Christ." That, because Christ came to save just sinners. The latter more at length:[57] "It would be a great abuse of the doctrine of salvation by faith, and a state of dangerous security, to say, if it pleases God to advance me to a higher or the highest degree of holiness, I should have great cause of thankfulness, and it would be the very joy of my heart; but nevertheless I can do without it, as being safe in Christ." We cannot set safety in Christ and holiness of life over against each other as contradictions, of which the one may be taken and

---

have done in the body. Heart-beat after heart-beat, breath after breath, hour after hour, day after day, year after year, and all full of sin; all nothing but sin from our mother's womb to our grave."

45 P. 103.

46 P. 99.

47 P. 180.

48 P. 179.

49 P. 209.

50 P. 216.

51 P. 219.

52 P. 242.

53 P. 234.

54 P. 247.

55 P. 225.

56 P. 231.

57 Pp. 223 f.

the other left. They go together. "Every other faith," we read,[58] "but that which apprehends Christ as a purifier, as well as our atonement and righteousness, is false and hypocritical." We are not left in our sins by Him; we are in process of being cleansed from our sins by Him; and our part is to work out with fear and trembling the salvation which He is working in us, always keeping our eyes on both our sin from which we need deliverance and the Lord who is delivering us. To keep our eyes fixed on both at once is no doubt difficult. "On earth it is the great exercise of faith," says Adam,[59] "and one of the hardest things in the world, to see sin and Christ at the same time, or to be penetrated with a lively sense of our desert, and absolute freedom from condemnation; but the more we know of both, the nearer approach we shall make to the state of heaven." Sin and Christ; ill desert and no condemnation; we are sinners and saints all at once! That is the paradox of evangelicalism. The Antinomian and the Perfectionist would abolish the paradox—the one drowning the saint in the sinner, the other concealing the sinner in the saint. We must, says Adam, out of his evangelical consciousness, ever see both members of the paradox clearly and see them whole. And—*solvitur ambulando*. "It is a great paradox, but glorious truth of Christianity," says he,[60] "that a good conscience may consist with a consciousness of evil." Though we can have no satisfaction in ourselves, we may have perfect satisfaction in Christ.[1885]

It is clear that "miserable-sinner Christianity" is a Christianity which thinks of pardon as holding the primary place in salvation. To it, sin is in the first instance offence against God, and salvation from sin is therefore in the first instance pardon, first not merely in time but in importance. In this Christianity, accordingly, the sinner turns to God first of all as the pardoning God; and that not as the God who pardons him once and then leaves him to himself, but as the God who steadily preserves the attitude toward him of a pardoning God. It is in this aspect that he thinks primarily of God and it is on the preservation on God's part of this attitude towards him that all his hopes of salvation depend. This is because he looks to God and to God alone for his salvation; and that in every several step of salvation—since otherwise whatever else it might be, it would not be salvation. It is, of course, only from a God whose attitude to the sinner is that of a pardoning God, that saving operations can be hoped. No doubt, if those transactions which we class together as the processes of salvation are our own work, we may not have so extreme a need of a constantly pardoning God. But that is not the point of view of the "miserable-sinner Christian." He understands that God alone can save, and he depends on God alone for salvation; for all of salvation in every step and stage of it. He is not merely the man then, who emphasizes justification as the fundamental saving operation; but also the man who emphasizes the supernaturalness of the whole saving process. It is all of God; and it is continuously from God throughout the whole process. The "miserable-sinner Christian" insists thus that salvation is accomplished not all at once, but in all the processes of a growth through an ever advancing forward movement. It occupies time; it has a beginning and middle and end. And just because it is thus progressive in its accomplishment, it is always incomplete—until the end. As Luther put it, Christians, here below, are not "made," but "in the making." Things in the making are in the hands of the Maker, are absolutely dependent on Him, and in their remanent imperfection require His continued pardon as well as need His continued forming. We cannot outgrow dependence on the pardoning grace of God, then, so long as the whole process of our forming is not completed; and we cannot feel satisfaction with ourselves of course until that process is fully accomplished. To speak of satisfaction in an incomplete work is a contradiction in terms. The "miserable-sinner Christian" accordingly, just as strongly emphasizes the progressiveness of the saving process and the consequent survival of sin and sinning throughout the whole of its as yet unfinished course, as he does justification as its foundation stone and its true supernaturalness throughout. These four articles go together and form the pillars on which the whole structure rests. It is a structure which is adapted to the needs of none but sinners, and which, perhaps, can have no very clear meaning to any but sinners. And this is in reality the sum of the whole matter: "miserable-sinner" Christianity

---

58 P. 220.

59 P. 225.

60 P. 253.

1885 Pgs. 126-133, *Perfectionism, Part One*, vol. 7 of *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, by B. B. Warfield.

> is a Christianity distinctively for sinners. It is fitted to their apprehension as sinners, addressed to their acceptance as sinners, and meets their clamant needs as sinners. The very name which has been given it bears witness to it as such.[1886]

Warfield—and old evangelical piety in general—emphasized both the Spirit's work in progressively eradicating indwelling sin and making the believer more holy and the Spirit's work in reminding the Christian that he is *simil iustus et peccator*—both righteous and a sinner. Such teaching—which is eminently Biblical—leads the Christian to recognize and hate his indwelling sin the more, and cling the more passionately to Christ alone, the more the Spirit makes him holy. Steven Barabas's attempt to set aside old orthodox position represented by Warfield fails utterly as a refutation. Indeed, Barabas fails to even understand and represent accurately the position he so strongly opposes.

While one cannot rule out that Barabas's bungled misrepresentation of Warfield is deliberate, charity hopes that it was merely accidental. Support for accidental misrepresentation of Warfield appears from the entire absence in Barabas's presentation of the fact that Warfield believed that both *eradication*, *control*, and *counteraction* of indwelling sin were taught in Scripture. Barabas presents Warfield's position simply as *eradication*. No acknowledgment of statements by Warfield such as the following, in his prominent critique of Lewis Sperry Chafer's *He That is Spiritual*, are acknowledged:

> Mr. Chafer conducts his discussion . . . on the presupposition that . . . "[w]e are either to be delivered by the abrupt removal of all tendency to sin, and so no longer need the enabling power of God to combat the power of sin, or we are to be delivered by the immediate and constant power of the indwelling Spirit." This irreducible "either—or" is unjustified. In point of fact, both "eradication" and "control" are true. God delivers us from our sinful nature, not indeed by "abruptly" but by progressively eradicating it, and meanwhile controlling it. For the new nature which God gives us is not an absolutely new somewhat, alien to our personality, inserted into us, but our old nature itself remade—a veritable recreation, or making of all things new.[1887]

Furthermore, in his bibliography Barabas cites no works by Warfield other than his *Perfectionism*,[1888] supporting the possibility that Barabas's astonishing misrepresentation of the Princeton theologian is a product of shallow understanding of his theology. However, to avoid the conclusion that Barabas has deliberately misrepresented Warfield,

---

1886 Pgs. 130-132, *Perfectionism, Part One*, Warfield.

1887 "A Review of *He that is Spiritual*," Benjamin B. Warfield. Orig. pub. *Princeton Theological Review* 17 (April 1919) 322-327, reviewing *He That is Spiritual*, Lewis Sperry Chafer. (New York, NY: Our Hope, 1918. Reprinted on pgs. 211-218 of *Christ the Lord: The Reformation and Lordship Salvation*, ed. Michael Horton. Note that Barabas makes the same sort of false dichotomy that Chafer does—perhaps a further line of evidence that Barabas was ignorant of Warfield's argument.

1888 Pg. 201, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas would have done well to carefully investigate the writings of what is very likely the most prominent historical Keswick critic before composing a Keswick critique of Warfield's theology. Then again, his sloppy study of Warfield is an accurate reflection of the Higher Life methodology overall, as "Keswick furnishes us with . . . no carefully prepared, weighty discourses of a theological nature" (pg. 51, *So Great Salvation*).

one must assume not only that he neglected to read Warfield's critique of Chafer, but that Barabas has not even read carefully the pages he cites[1889] where Warfield explains his position. On those very pages the Princetonian states: "Counteraction there is; and suppression there is; but most fundamentally of all there is eradication; and all these work one and the self-same Spirit."[1890] Barabas's Keswick classic never states or even hints that Warfield taught counteraction,[1891] suppression, and eradication—the reader of *So Great Salvation* who did not consult Warfield's own writings would certainly never know what Warfield actually believed. Barabas, in a number of pages of confused critique, never summarizes Warfield's position as clearly as does Paul Schaefer in a single sentence: "Warfield's emphasis on divine sovereignty and on regeneration mean[t] that God both controls by the power of the Spirit the remnants of indwelling sin and progressively eradicates them in the one whom he has remade, as that person grows in faith."[1892] Whether a matter of deliberate misrepresentation of inexcusable sloppiness and carelessness, Barabas's attempt to rebut Warfield in *So Great Salvation* falls so short of success that it does not even state the position of the great Princeton theologian accurately.

Since Barabas so strikingly misrepresents Warfield's position[1893] as one that "tempts the Christian to negligence," leads him to turn from "continued reliance upon the

---

[1889] On pg. 72 of *So Great Salvation*, Barabas cites pgs. 579-583 of Warfield's *Perfectionism* vol 2, where Warfield explicitly states that the Holy Spirit counteracts the sin principle as well as suppressing and progressively eradicating it. Indeed, Warfield's affirmation "Counteraction there is; and suppression there is; but most fundamentally of all there is eradication; and all these work one and the self-same Spirit" (pg. 583, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2) is made in-between two quotations Barabas makes from pgs. 583 and 584 of Warfield's work, a mere handful of sentences after the end of Barabas's quotation. Barabas's failure to state Warfield's position correctly in such a situation is both most regrettable and inexcusable.

[1890] Pg. 583, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part Two*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 8, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

[1891] In the sense Warfield employs the word *control* and *counteract* the words can be legitimately employed to describe one aspect of the Spirit's work in sanctification. However, the Keswick quietistic and perfectionistic penumbras associated with *counteract* make *control* a generally superior designation.

[1892] Pg. 164, "An American Tale," Schaefer, in *Christ the Lord: The Reformation and Lordship Salvation*, ed. Horton.

[1893] Regretably, Barabas is not alone in his misrepresentation of Warfield. John Walvoord, reviewing Warfield's *Studies in Perfectionism* from a Chaferian, pro-Higher Life perspective, makes the astonishing affirmation that "Warfield never seems to have adequately distinguished spirituality from perfectionism" (pg. 358, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 116:464 (October 1959)). A more accurate assessment, made by a comprehensive study of Warfield's works rather than by the utterly unwarranted assumption that opposition to Keswick is opposition to deep Christian spirituality and passionate fellowship with God, was made by Fred G. Zaspel:

> Warfield . . . glories in the lavish provisions of salvation in Christ. The Christian's privileged standing as a saint; his status as a child of God in the realization of the Father's love and fellowship; his rich enjoyment of the Spirit; his freedom of conscience despite his sin; the fullness of righteousness imputed to him in justification; the new life, "repristination," purity, and inward and outward transformation all inevitably

keeping power of God," and teaches that "we must reach a stage of spiritual development where the old nature was completely eradicated . . . [and we] become ethically self-sufficient,"[1894] it is appropriate to provide an extended quotation from Warfield's *locus classicus* on progressive eradication. One can easily judge whether Warfield's concern, in refuting the Higher Life model of mere counteraction, is to advocate ethical self-sufficiency, or whether Warfield actually meant what he said when he confessed a "supernatural sanctification" in which "the Spirit leads us in all our acts, as well as purifies our hearts . . . [so that] to grace always belongs the initiative." One can also easily discern whether Barabas's critique of Warfield's classical orthodox model of progressive eradication, or Warfield's critique of the Keswick model of mere counteraction, is the more accurate representation of the teaching of Scripture:

> It is a fatally inadequate conception of salvation which so focuses attention on deliverance from the penalty of sin and from continued acts of sin, as to permit to fall out of sight deliverance from sin itself—that corruption of heart which makes us sinners. Laying one-sided stress on deliverance from acts of sin—especially when these acts of sin are confined by definition to "deliberate transgressions of known law"—is too poverty-stricken a conception of salvation to satisfy any Christian heart. Christians know that their Lord has come into the world to save them from sin in all its aspects, its penalty, its corruption and its power: they trust Him for this complete salvation: and they know that they receive it from Him in its fulness. [Victorious Life leader] Mr. Trumbull and his associates have no doubt been betrayed into neglect or denial of our deliverance from the central thing—"the corruption of man's heart"—by a certain prudence. They are set upon the assertion of the possibility and duty for Christians of a life free from sinning. Grant them that, and they are willing to allow that their unsinning Christians remain sinners at heart. They do not appear to see that thus they yield the whole case. An astonishing misapprehension of the relation of action to motive underlies their point of view; and a still more astonishing misapprehension of the method of sanctification which is founded on this relation. To keep a sinner, remaining a sinner, free from actually sinning, would be but a poor salvation; and in point of fact that is not the way the Holy Spirit operates in saving the soul. He does not "take possession of our will and work it"—thus, despite our sinful hearts, producing a series of good acts as our life-manifestation and thereby falsifying our real nature in its manifestation. He cures our sinning precisely by curing our sinful nature; He makes the tree good that the fruit may be good. It is, in other words, precisely by eradicating our sinfulness—"the corruption of our hearts"—that He delivers us from sinning. The very element in salvation which Mr. Trumbull neglects, is therefore, in point of fact, the radical

---

realized in renewal and in sanctification; the hope and final realization of glory with Christ—these are all common themes in Warfield. (pg. 508, *The Theology of B. B. Warfield: A Systematic Summary*, F. G. Zaspel)

[1894] Pg. 73, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Ironically, one of Warfield's critiques of the Higher Life theology is that it hinders the genuine dependence on God fostered by the classic evangelical doctrine:

> Nevertheless, the open teaching of the whole [Higher Life] movement is to the effect that God acts—and can act—in the matter of sanctification, as in the whole matter of salvation, only as man, by his prior action, releases Him for action. This is not a wholesome attitude to take towards God. It tends to looking upon Him as the instrument which we use to secure our ends, and that is a magical rather than a religious attitude. In the end it inhibits religion which includes in its essence a sense of complete dependence on God. (pgs. 554-555, *Studies in Perfectionism, Part Two*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 8, B. B. Warfield.)

Would Warfield criticize the Higher Life system for inhibiting that "sense of complete dependence on God" which is the "essence" of religion if he were truly an advocate of ethical self-sufficiency? Let his own words indicate his attitude toward being ethically self-sufficient: "Ethicism and solafideanism—these are the eternal contraries, mutually exclusive. . . . [It must be] Christ Only, Christ All in All, with us; only then, do we obey fully Paul's final exhortation: 'Let your joy be in the Lord'" (pgs. 324-325, *Faith and Life*, B. B. Warfield. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916).

element of the saving process, and the indispensable precondition of that element in salvation which he elects to emphasize to its neglect. We cannot be saved from sinning except as we are saved from sin; and the degree in which we are saved from sinning is the index of the degree in which we have been saved from sin. Here too, as in every other sphere of activity, the *operari* follows and must follow the *esse*: a thing must be before it can act, and it can act only as it is. To imagine that we can be saved from the power of sin without the eradication of the corruption in which the power of sin has its seat, is to imagine that an evil tree can be compelled to bring forth good fruit—or that it would be worth while to compel it to do so—which is the precise thing that our Lord denies. What Mr. Trumbull in point of fact teaches is exactly what Hannah Whitall Smith ridicules in a vivid figure which she uses in a less felicitous connection: that what Christ does is just to tie good fruit to the branches of a bad tree and cry, Behold how great is my salvation![42]

It is astonishing that nevertheless even Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas falls in to some extent with this representation. Dr. Thomas does not forget, indeed, that we are to be delivered from the corruption of sin—ultimately. When he wishes to bring into view the whole deliverance which we have in Christ, he enumerates the elements of it thus: "Deliverance from the guilt of sin, deliverance from the penalty of sin, deliverance from the bondage of sin, and deliverance hereafter from the very presence of sin."[43] The insertion of the word "hereafter" into the last clause tells the story. We must wait for the "hereafter" to be delivered from the "presence of sin"—that is to say from the corruption of our hearts—but meanwhile we may very well live as if sin were not present: its presence in us need not in any way affect our life-manifestation. Dr. Thomas enters the formal discussion of the matter,[44] apparently, as a mediator in "the old question, 'suppression or eradication?' "[45] on this side or the other of which perfectionists have been accustomed to array themselves as they faced the problem of the sin that dwells in us. He comes forward with a new formula, by which, supposedly, he hopes that he may conciliate the parties to the dispute. "Suppression," he declares, says too little, "eradication" says too much; let us say, "counteraction," he suggests, and then we shall have the right word. Does "counteraction," however, come between "eradication" and "suppression," saying less than the one and more than the other? Does it not say less than either? Whether the "sinful principle" in us be "eradicated" or "suppressed," it is put out of action: if it be merely "counteracted," it not only remains but remains active, and enters as a co-factor into all effects. The illustration which Dr. Thomas himself uses, to make his meaning clear, is what he speaks of as the counteraction of gravitation by volition. In the same way, he says, "the lower law of sin and death can be counteracted by the presence of the Holy Ghost in our hearts." Of course volition does not directly counteract gravitation: we cannot by a mere volition rise at will upwards from the earth. What volition is able to do is to set another physical force in operation in the direction opposed to the pull or push of gravitation: and if this new physical force pulls or pushes more powerfully in a direction opposite to that in which gravitation pulls or pushes—why, the effect will be in the direction of the action of the new force, and will be determined by the amount of its superiority to the force of gravity. We throw a ball into the air. We have not suppressed gravity. It pulls the ball all the time. We only counteract its effect in the exact measure in which the force we apply exceeds the pull of gravity. If Dr. Thomas intends this illustration to be applied fully, it appears to imply that the "principle of sin" operates in all our acts with full power, and therefore conditions all our acts: only, the Holy Spirit dwelling in us is stronger than indwelling sin, and therefore the effect produced is determined by Him. We do not sin, not because the principle of sin in us is suppressed or eradicated, but because it is counteracted. If this be Dr. Thomas' meaning, one would think that he ought to declare not, as he does declare, that Christians need not sin, but that they cannot sin—not even to the least, tiny degree. If the Holy Spirit who is the infinite God dwells in them for the express purpose of counteracting the principle of sin in them; and if He operates invariably, in every action of the

---

42 For example, "Every-Day Religion," 1893, p. 165. [Footnote in Warfield.]

43 "Grace and Power," 1916, p. 62. [Footnote in Warfield.]

44 "Grace and Power," chapter viii. pp. 131 ff.; also printed in tract form under the title of "Must Christians Sin?" [Footnote in Warfield.]

45 The phrase is taken from O. A. Curtis, "The Christian Faith," p. 390. [Footnote in Warfield.]

Christian; it would seem to be clearly impossible that the principle of sin should ever be traceable in the effect at all. The ball that we throw into the air will rise only a certain distance and ever more and more slowly until, its initial impulse being overcome by the deadly pull of gravity, it turns and falls back to earth. If, however, it was propelled by an infinite force, the pull of gravity, though always present, could have no determining effect on its movement. On this theory of counteraction Dr. Thomas should teach therefore not that Christians need not sin, but that they cannot sin—as indeed the passages in I John on which he immediately depends in his exposition of his view would also compel him, on his system of interpretation, to teach.

From the point of view of Scripture, however, this theory of counteraction is quite inadequate. It renders it impossible for the Christian to sin—and the Scriptures do not teach that: but it leaves the "principle of sin" in him unaltered and in full activity, and most emphatically the Scriptures do not teach that such is the condition of the Christian in this world. It surely would be better to be freed from the "principle of sin" in us than merely from its effects on our actions. And this is in fact what the Scriptures provide for. What they teach, indeed, is just "eradication." They propose to free us from sinning by freeing us from the "principle of sin." Of course, they teach that the Spirit dwells within us. But they teach that the Spirit dwells within us in order to affect us, not merely our acts; in order to eradicate our sinfulness and not merely to counteract its effects. The Scriptures' way of cleansing the stream is to cleanse the fountain; they are not content to attack the stream of our activities, they attack directly the heart out of which the issues of life flow. But they give us no promise that the fountain will be completely cleansed all at once, and therefore no promise that the stream will flow perfectly purely from the beginning. We are not denying that the Spirit leads us in all our acts, as well as purifies our hearts. But we are denying that His whole work in us, or His whole immediate work in us, or His fundamental work in us, terminates on our activities and can be summed up in the word "counteraction." Counteraction there is; and suppression there is; but most fundamentally of all there is eradication; and all these work one and the self-same Spirit. We are not forgetful that Dr. Thomas teaches an ultimate eradication; and we would not be unwilling to read his recognition of it "with a benevolent eye" and understand him as teaching, not that the eradication is not going on now, but only that the eradication which is going on now is not completed until "hereafter." That would be Scriptural. But we fear Dr. Thomas will not permit us so to read him. And, if we mistake not, this difference in point of view between him and the Scriptures is in part, the source of his misconception and misprision of the seventh chapter of Romans. That chapter depicts for us the process of the eradication of the old nature. Dr. Thomas reads it statically and sees in it merely a "deadly warfare between the two natures"; which, he affirms,[46] "does not represent the normal Christian life of sanctification." He even permits himself to say, "There is no Divine grace in that chapter; only man's nature struggling to be good and holy by law." What is really in the chapter is Divine grace warring against, and not merely counteracting but eradicating, the natural evil of sin. To Paul the presence of the conflict there depicted is the guarantee of victory. The three things which we must insist on if we would share Paul's view are: first, that to grace always belongs the initiative—it is grace that works the change: secondly, that to grace always belongs the victory—grace is infinite power: and thirdly, that the working of grace is by process, and therefore reveals itself at any given point of observation as conflict. In so far as Dr. Thomas's representation obscures any one of these things it falls away from the teaching of the New Testament. Grace assuredly "means a new life, a Divine life, which lifts us above the natural, and is nothing else than the life of Christ Himself in His people." It is, in substance, as sanctifying grace, the occupation of our hearts by the Holy Spirit, and the undertaking by Him, not only of their renewal, but of their control. It is they alone who are "led" by the Spirit who are sons of God. But the work of the Holy Spirit in our hearts is not confined to the direction of our activities. Dr. Thomas says truly[47] that grace does not merely "educate the natural heart." But he errs when he says that "grace does not improve the old nature, it overcomes it." He errs when he teaches only that "it promises hereafter to extirpate it," but

---

[46] pp. 93, 94. On the ill-treatment which the Seventh Chapter of Romans has received in general from the members of this school see some interesting remarks by H. A. Boardman as cited, chapter vii. pp. 98 ff. [Footnote in Warfield.]

[47] P. 93. [Footnote in Warfield.]

> meanwhile, only "counteracts its tendencies." It is progressively extirpating it now, and that is the fundamental fact in supernatural sanctification. The sanctifying action of the Spirit terminates on us, not merely on our activities; under it not only our actions but we are made holy. Only, this takes time; and therefore at no point short of its completion are either our acts or we "perfect."[1895]

A comparison of Barabas's attempt to critique Warfield and Warfield's own words brings to mind Barabas's admission that Keswick theology, despite around a century in which it has produced book after book, has produced no "carefully prepared, weighty discourses of a theological nature."[1896] It is consequently not surprising that Barabas's own book fits the Keswick pattern, so that rigorous analysis demonstrates that his presentation of Keswick arguments is neither weighty nor carefully prepared. In any case, whatever the reason, Barabas's critique of Warfield's classically orthodox position that sanctification includes the Spirit's work in progressively eradicating indwelling sin is a disasterous failure.

Barabas also argues against the position he terms "supression of the old nature."[1897] He writes: "Perhaps the most widely-held view of sanctification is that it is to be gained through our own personal efforts by trying to suppress the flesh in us. Justification, it is believed, is by faith, but sanctification is by works—at least to a large extent."[1898] Barabas argues against this position by setting forth the erroneous Keswick view of Romans 7:14-25,[1899] by setting forth the teaching Keswick adopted from Hannah W. Smith and the Broadlands Conference[1900] that sanctification is by faith alone, not works,[1901] and by making arguments such as: "Neither a tree nor a man grows by effort.[1902] . . . It is a kind of sanctification of the flesh. . . . the [failed attempt at] the

---

1895 Pgs. 579-584, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield: Perfectionism, Part Two* (Vol. 8 of *Works*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

1896 Pg. 51, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1897 Pg. 74-83, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1898 Pg.74, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1899 Romans 7:14-25 is analyzed in "Romans 7:14-25: A Depiction of Part of the Normal Christian Life." The Keswick position is evaluated in that chapter. It will not be discussed further here.

1900 Indeed, the Broadlands doctrine of faith was "[s]ome of the most valuable of the teaching at Broadlands," preached there by "Mrs. Smith" (pgs. 263-264, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

1901 The question of whether sanctification is by faith alone, just as justification is by faith alone, is evaluated in the chapter "Does Colossians 2:6-7 Teach Sanctification by Faith Alone?"

1902 Effort is certainly involved in a man's growing—if he stops eating, drinking, exercising, and the like, he will grow weak and sickly with great speed. The man who grows physically strong so that he can become the winner of a race works very hard (1 Corinthians 9:24). So spiritual eating, drinking, and exercise are necessary for spiritual growth. It is pushing an analogy far beyond its proper limits, and ignoring the many plain statements about the striving and struggle God commands the believer to employ in sanctification, to draw Keswick conclusions from growth metaphors. While Keswick conclusions about effortlessness in the Christian life are not validated by the metaphors of Scripture, they are the indisputable fruit of the pre-Keswick Conventions at Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton, e. g.: "Fruit is an effortless thing, it comes by abiding in the vine . . . not by struggles" (pg. 241, *Account of the Union Meeting for the*

conquest of self by self . . . [the] legalism . . . to assume that justification is by faith, [but] sanctification is somehow by struggle."[1903] To "fall back upon mere moral processes to overcome sin is not Christianity, but pagan philosophy, which offers nothing better than self-effort as the only way of improvement."[1904] Barabas concludes, based on these arguments: "It is the teaching of Keswick that an important reason for the defeat and failure of so many Christians is that they try to *supress* the old nature. . . . Sanctification is therefore not by works but by faith. . . . That is the distinctive method of Keswick."[1905]

Barabas's argument is based upon a key confusion of two entirely different ideas, combined with some faulty exegesis. If all he wished to prove was that anyone who attempted to be holy without depending upon the Triune God for strength was doomed to failure, and that believers need, consequently, to live by faith (Habakkuk 2:4), his exhortation would be correct, and its warning well taken. The necessity of living by faith and of experiential and personal communion with Jesus Christ by the Spirit is extremely important, and it has been regarded as such by Christians who lived centuries before the invention of the Keswick theology in association with the preaching of Hannah W. Smith. If self-dependence, seeking the ultimate ground for growth in holiness within one's own person, and "mere moral processes to overcome sin" as in "pagan philosophy" were all Barabas wished to combat when he warned of the "man who is trying to be good and holy by his own efforts and is defeated every time,"[1906] he would be right on target, warning against a serious sin that the believer's fleshliness naturally inclines him to commit.

However, the "most widely-held view of sanctification," which Barabas seeks to argue is in error, is not an independent moralism, based on pagan philosophy, that does not depend upon Christ and the Spirit—although such errors are indeed taught in large portions of the apostate denominations Keswick ecumenicalism refuses to repudiate. Rather than restricting his argument to the real error of an independent moralism, Barabas argues that believers are not to try to suppress the old nature or struggle against sin in sanctification. If Barabas is against the "man who is trying to be good and holy by his own efforts," and by this he means the Christian himself should not personally make effort and strive to mortify sin, depending upon Christ and the power of the Spirit, he is

---

Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

[1903] Pg.74-75, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1904] Pg. 75, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1905] Pg. 83, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1906] Pg. 75, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

definitely wrong. Unfortunately, this latter sense of opposition to effort is in fact what Barabas decries. His view that "sanctification . . . by struggle" is an error ignores the many texts such as "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin" (Hebrews 12:4). Indeed, Paul's conclusion, after in a detailed chapter setting forth the necessity of living by faith (Hebrews 11), is "wherefore"[1907] (Hebrews 12:1)—in light of Hebrews 11 and those who lived by faith in that chapter—"lay aside every weight . . . run with patience . . . consider [Christ] . . . resis[t] unto blood, striving against sin . . . nor faint . . . endure chastening . . . be in subjection . . . [be] exercised . . . lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees, and make straight paths for your feet . . . follow peace . . . and holiness. . . loo[k] diligently," and so on (Hebrews 12:1-16). Living by faith, Biblically, is not only compatible with struggling and striving for holiness, but it necessarily produces it. Biblical sanctification does not state: "We cease from labor because we trust in God," but "we . . . labour . . . because we trust in the living God" (1 Timothy 4:10). For Paul, living by faith means one will "run . . . striv[e] for the mastery . . . fight . . . keep under [the] body, and bring it into subjection" (1 Corinthians 9:24-27). The Bible says to do exactly what Barabas says not to do. The Christian's attitude must not be "let go and let God,"[1908] but "trust God and get going!"[1909] Faith in sanctification

---

[1907] τοιγαροῦν; "a particle introducing an inference, *for that very reason, then, therefore"* (BDAG), an "emphatic marke[r] of result, often associated with exhortation — 'for this very reason, therefore, hence, therefore indeed, so then'" (Louw-Nida).

[1908] This phrase became a popular Keswick cry through its use by Victorious Life leader Mark Trumbull. Note the comments on pgs. 155-157, *Keep in Step with the Spirit*, Packer. Snodgrass notes:

> [S]anctification [is] the work of God. . . . [b]ut . . . it is important in another view that we should regard it as the work and the duty of man. The subject of it . . . is bound to be holy[.] . . . [H]e is properly dealt with in the use of arguments, exhortations, and motives. He has a duty to perform and work to do; and that is to follow holiness, to purify himself, to cleanse himself from all filthiness both of the flesh and of the spirit. In prosecuting this work, his reliance for success must be [o]n the Spirit of God working by appointed means. He must be active, yet he must not depend on himself. He must have recourse to meditation and prayer, to watchfulness and self-examination, to [C]hristian intercourse and counsel, and to all positive institutions, especially the reading and hearing of the word; but, in all this, he must remember that the means are nothing without an influence from God to render them effectual. Their whole efficiency lies in the fact . . . that they are of God's appointment, and that he has promised to bless them. And hence, our only encouragement to be active in the use of means, is made to rest upon our knowledge of the interposition and the agency of God. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" [Philippians 2:12-13]. Nor is the[re] any inconsistency or confusion in the idea of these two agencies as working together in the production of the same result. They are not of the same kind; the sphere of their operation is not the same; one is efficient, the other instrumental. And, so accustomed are we to assign to each the place and position of a real agency, that we often ascribe the same event, sometimes to God, and sometimes to man. We say of an individual that he has risen from indigence to affluence, or from obscurity to distinction, by the Providence of God; but we are not supposed to contradict ourselves, if we afterwards say, that he has succeeded by his own prudence, wisdom, and skill. Both statements are true, though in different senses. And accordingly they are both adopted by the sacred writers in reference to the work of sanctification. In one place, we are taught to call upon God to sanctify us; in another, we are commanded to sanctify ourselves. One introduces God as promising us a new heart and a right spirit, and another commands us to make to ourselves a new heart and a right spirit. And both these views are important in practice, as well as true and consistent in theory. We need the idea of human agency to incite us to activity; and we need the doctrine of Divine influence and efficiency to remind us of our dependence, to

does not lead the believer to cease striving, but to strive ever the harder, trusting in the Lord for strength to fight. He does not labor independently and faithlessly, but "labour[s], striving according to [God's] working, which worketh in [him] mightily" (Colossians 1:29). For Keswick to affirm a genuine dichotomy between independent moralism and ending all "trying to conquer the old nature . . . effort . . . [and] struggle,"[1910] so that one must choose the one or the other, is a serious misrepresentation, one that ignores the true position that sanctification involves a faith-based, God-dependent struggle.[1911] By discouraging believers from striving to mortify their indwelling sin, Keswick theology hinders the work of sanctification.

Barabas affirms that the Keswick theology recognizes other "other erroneous methods"[1912] of sanctification. Following Hannah W. Smith,[1913] Barabas warns that believers must not "trust for their sanctification to a diligent use of the means of grace, to watchfulness over their own heart and life, taking themselves to task ever and again for the coldness of their heart."[1914] It is an amazing thing that Barabas's book explaining the

---

make us "pray without ceasing[.]" . . . [Thus] sanctification . . . [is properly] considered both as the work of God and the duty of man. (pgs. 13-18, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification*, W. D. Snodgrass)

1909 Cf. pg. 128, *Keep In Step With the Spirit*, J. I. Packer.

1910 Pg. 74-75, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1911 Thomas Smith wrote:

> Another evil that necessarily follows from the erroneous [Keswick] conception of holiness is the representation that pervades these writings of the attainment of holiness by the believer without effort on his part. The idea which they have suggested to us is that of a man put into a boat, lying in it in absolute rest, and being carried down a gently flowing stream; whereas that suggested by the apostolic writings is that of a strong rower, straining every muscle to stem the current, with the knowledge that he shall ultimately succeed in reaching the goal, but only in virtue of strength imparted to him by Christ, and received by faith. The one representation is that of faith dispensing with effort, the other of faith enabling for effort. The one seems to say, "*Work not* out your salvation, for God worketh *for* you;" the other says, "*Work* out your salvation, for God worketh *in* you." In both cases a certain work of God is the premise, but the conclusions are directly the opposite of each other, just because the works postulated in the premises are altogether different. Somewhere in the course of our reading of [Higher Life] works, we have fallen upon the expression, "sanctification by works," as opposed to "sanctification by faith," and descriptive of the prevalant [classical evangelical, non-Keswick] view of sanctification. No one who understands that view, and who does not design to misrepresent it, could possibly state such an antithesis. . . . The question is as to the specific action of faith in the production of holiness in the heart and life of the believer. We hold as strongly as our [Higher Life] friends can hold that Christ is made to his people sanctification, quite as really and quite as much as he is made unto them righteousness or justification; but in ways according with the essential difference between justification and sanctification, between judicial righteousness and personal holiness. (pgs. 267-268, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280)

1912 Pgs. 83-84, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1913 While Scripture does not support Barabas, at least Hannah W. Smith's writings do so. She taught: "[W]e are passive of choice and willingly . . . are to grow . . . without any concern about our own growing[.]" We are to "tak[e] no . . . care for . . . spiritual growth" (Letter to Daughter, May 25, 1878 & Letter to Anna, July 27, 1878, reproduced in the entries for August 26-28 & September 3 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

1914 Pg. 84, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Of course, one must trust ultimately in Christ, not in the means through which Christ gives His people grace, but Barabas does not merely speak against such an error.

Keswick theology never once quotes any of the numerous verses in Scripture that connect sanctification with the Word of God, but attacks as an "unscriptural wa[y] of pursuing holiness"[1915] employing the means that God has given to increase and strengthen inward grace, such as, centrally, the Word.[1916] Rejecting watchfulness over one's heart and life as a means of avoiding sin and growing holy is astonishing when the Son of God specifically states that watching and praying protect one from temptation (Matthew 26:41) and are essential for spiritual preparedness for His second coming (Mark 13:33-36). The Lord Jesus said, "Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy"[1917] (Luke 21:36), so watching helps the believer be more holy. Scripture is filled with commands to watch,[1918] and the Lord Jesus Himself commanded, "What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch" (Mark 13:37)—but Barabas rejects such watchfulness as an unscriptural means of growing in grace! As for it being "unscriptural" to take oneself to task over the coldness of one's heart, it is evident that some of the psalms, which the Spirit-filled Christian is to sing (Ephesians 5:18-19), are not appropriate for the advocate of Keswick. God's inspired songbook teaches the righteous man to pray: "For in thee, O LORD, do I hope: thou wilt hear, O Lord my God" (Psalm 38:15) and yet complain: "*There is* no soundness in my flesh because of thine anger; neither *is there any* rest in my bones because of my sin. For mine iniquities are gone over mine head: as an heavy burden they are too heavy for me" (Psalm 38:3-4).[1919] The saint

---

1915 Pg. 84, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1916 Note the chapter "The Means Of Sanctification," by James Petigru Boyce, for the role of the Word of God in sanctification and its connection with other things termed "means of grace" in Protestantism, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper. Were Barabas warning against sacramentarianism or an *ex opere operato* form of doctrine, his warning would be wholesome and welcome. Unfortunately, he never even mentions or gives a single word of warning against sacramental corruptions, while attacking as unscriptural the idea that sanctification comes through the means God has appointed for the believer's growth in holiness.

1917 καταξιόω, clearly a sanctification term; compare the other uses of the verb in Luke 20:35; Acts 5:41; 2 Thessalonians 1:5.

1918 1 Corinthians 16:13; Colossians 4:2; 1 Thessalonians 5:6; 1 Peter 4:7; Revelation 3:3, etc.

1919 The whole of Psalm 38 is entirely against this Keswick concept that the righteous man should not complain about the sinfulness of his own heart:

> Psa. 38:0 A Psalm of David, to bring to remembrance. 1 O LORD, rebuke me not in thy wrath: neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure. 2 For thine arrows stick fast in me, and thy hand presseth me sore. 3 *There is* no soundness in my flesh because of thine anger; neither *is there any* rest in my bones because of my sin. 4 For mine iniquities are gone over mine head: as an heavy burden they are too heavy for me. 5 My wounds stink *and* are corrupt because of my foolishness. 6 I am troubled; I am bowed down greatly; I go mourning all the day long. 7 For my loins are filled with a loathsome *disease*: and *there is* no soundness in my flesh. 8 I am feeble and sore broken: I have roared by reason of the disquietness of my heart. 9 Lord, all my desire *is* before thee; and my groaning is not hid from thee. 10 My heart panteth, my strength faileth me: as for the light of mine eyes, it also is gone from me. 11 My lovers and my friends stand aloof from my sore; and my kinsmen stand afar off. 12 They also that seek after my life lay snares *for me*: and they that seek my hurt speak mischievous things, and imagine deceits all the day long. 13 But I, as a deaf *man*, heard not; and *I was* as a dumb man *that* openeth not his mouth. 14 Thus I was as a man that heareth not, and in whose mouth

who can say "I waited patiently for the LORD . . . thou *art* my help and my deliverer" (Psalm 40:1, 17) also prays, "mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head: therefore my heart faileth me" (Psalm 40:12). The holy man in the Bible, who says "I put my trust in thee" (Psalm 25:20), can nonetheless pray: "Mine eyes *are* ever toward the LORD; for he shall pluck my feet out of the net. Turn thee unto me, and have mercy upon me; for I *am* desolate and afflicted. The troubles of my heart are enlarged: *O* bring thou me out of my distresses. Look upon mine affliction and my pain; and forgive all my sins" (Psalm 25:15-18). Keswick is dead wrong when it condemns sanctification through the diligent use of the means God has appointed to grow in grace, when it deprecates watchfulness, and when it affirms that the saint should not take himself to task over the coldness of his heart. Following this unscriptural advice of Keswick will hinder the believer's sanctification.

Barabas's Keswick critique of the Biblical fact that believers grow inwardly more holy by sanctification, and indwelling sin is actually reduced in its strength through mortification, is a total failure. Barabas misrepresents the classical orthodox doctrine of sanctification held by his theological opponents, such as Warfield, refutes straw men of his own creation, and then concludes that actually untouched non-Keswick alternatives have been refuted. Scripture employed by Barabas is often misused, and Scripture that refutes the Keswick position is often ignored. One who was actually convinced by the Keswick position would despair of any hope that the Holy Spirit would make him a particle more holy, would cease striving to mortify indwelling sin, would stop seeking to diligently study the Word of God to grow in grace, would cease from watchfulness as a means to avoid sin and become more holy, and would no longer lament the remaining sinfulness of his heart. These positions of Keswick theology are blatently unscriptural and will hinder the sanctification of God's people if adopted.

Having completed his exceedingly problematic attempt at a refutation of alternative positions on sanctification, Barabas goes on to positively set forth the Keswick method of becoming holy. Keswick considers "sanctification as a process, as a

---

> *are* no reproofs. 15 For in thee, O LORD, do I hope: thou wilt hear, O Lord my God. 16 For I said, *Hear me*, lest *otherwise* they should rejoice over me: when my foot slippeth, they magnify *themselves* against me. 17 For I *am* ready to halt, and my sorrow *is* continually before me. 18 For I will declare mine iniquity; I will be sorry for my sin. 19 But mine enemies *are* lively, *and* they are strong: and they that hate me wrongfully are multiplied. 20 They also that render evil for good are mine adversaries; because I follow *the thing that* good *is*. 21 Forsake me not, O LORD: O my God, be not far from me. 22 Make haste to help me, O Lord my salvation.

Such a song would be a very poor fit at a Keswick convention, and Hannah. W. Smith would be much displeased with the Scriptural holiness set forth in it.

crisis, and as a gift."[1920] The order places "process" first, because it "is the best understood, and not because it is the first in the order of time,"[1921] for in the Keswick theology any process in sanctification only takes place in a significant way[1922] after the experience of crisis and the receipt of the gift. Over the course of a chapter of twenty pages[1923] on the crisis of consecration, Barabas states that it is "very characteristic of Keswick" and "some of its basic teachin[g]" to affirm that "sanctification is a process beginning with a crisis,"[1924] following the teaching of Hannah and Robert P. Smith and the Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions.[1925] The "crisis must take place before we really know the process. . . . The process succeeds the crisis."[1926] The crisis takes place when one makes a "complete personal consecration" to God, "also referred to as dedication and full surrender."[1927] The crisis has a "positive side . . . surrender or the committal of oneself to Christ and the pledge to be eternally loyal to Him as Lord and Master . . . [and] a negative side[,] . . . [t]o deny self . . . [to] definitely and for ever

---

[1920] Pg. 85, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas states on the same page that Keswick accepts the classical doctrine that "experimental sanctification is the day-by-day transformation of the believer into the image of Christ, and is progressive in nature. Beginning at regeneration, it continues all through life, but is never complete." However, the description of sanctification as process, crisis, and gift is "more characteristic of Keswick" and is "more often" employed than the classical doctrine.

[1921] Pg. 99, Chapter 5, *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life,* by Evan Hopkins. Barabas indicates his dependence upon Hopkins's exposition (pg. 85, *So Great Salvation*). Hopkins's "discussion of 'God's Gift of Holiness'" at Keswick in 1899 was also "quoted at length by Steven Barabas, in *So Great Salvation*" (pgs. 404-405, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson; the actual address by Hopkins follows on pgs. 436-442).

[1922] Barabas states: "Much is made by Keswick of sanctification as a crisis. It is true, Keswick says, that sanctification invariably begins at regeneration. There can be no question about this. On the other hand, many Christians do not make the progress in sanctification that they should. . . . For this reason real progress is often not made until they come to a spiritual crisis" (pg. 86, *So Great Salvation*).

[1923] Pgs. 108-127, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1924] Pg. 110, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Keswick writers do indeed regularly affirm such a crisis/process model; for example, Watchman Nee wrote that sanctification "usually takes the two-fold form of a crisis leading to a continuous process" ("A Gate and a Path," *The Normal Christian Life*, Watchman Nee).

[1925] See, e. g., Hannah W. Smith's preaching of Keswick's crisis-process model on pgs. 125ff., *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Robert proclaimed at Oxford:

> It is to bring you to a *crisis* of faith that we have come together[.] . . . We preach this, not as a finality, but as the only true *commencement* of a life of progress[.] . . . [T]he Rest of Faith . . . is not a finality but the true and only commencement of a life of progressive sanctification. . . . It was constantly pointed out that, so far from [the Higher Life] being the finality of Christian experience, it was *but the commencement of a course of "progressive sanctification*[.]" (pgs. 42, 51, 278-279, 332, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Italics in original.)

[1926] Pg. 114-115, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Compare the belief of Evan Hopkins in "the crisis that prefaced the process . . . the crisis must take place before the process has its beginning" (pgs. 56, 94-95, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie).

[1927] Pgs. 109-110, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

cho[ose] the will of the Lord Jesus Christ as [one's] Guide and Director through life, in place of [one's] own will."[1928] In fact, "God's blessing of deliverance from the power of sin is not to be had" until a Christian makes this full surrender,[1929] for "the divine Potter . . . cannot shape the human vessel unless it is committed into His hands and remains unresistingly and quietly there."[1930] In the Keswick theology, "Consecration is . . . the starting point of the sanctification process," which is only continued as "the response made to God at consecration is continued."[1931] The crisis "decision is the inescapable condition of progressive sanctification."[1932]

In terms of sanctification as a gift, explicated by Barabas for twenty-one pages,[1933] Keswick teaches that we are "asked . . . to accept holiness by faith in the same way that we accept justification by faith."[1934] According to "Keswick, we are not sanctified by self-effort or by works, but by faith in what Christ has done for us at Calvary. Sanctification, like justification, is by grace alone."[1935] Keswick affirms that "if we wish to make any progress in holiness, we have to give up belief in the value of self-effort in holiness. . . . sanctification . . . is not something for which we have to struggle or strive[.] . . . Sanctification is primarily and fundamentally 'neither an achievement nor a process, but a gift, a divine bestowal of a position in Christ.'"[1936] It is "the heart and essence . . . of Keswick teaching . . . [that] [f]reedom from the dominion of sin is a

---

[1928] Pg. 116-117, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1929] Pg. 109, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1930] Pg. 112, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1931] Pg. 116, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1932] Pg. 125, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Interestingly, Barabas wrote concerning this crisis decision: "For many people the crisis is prolonged—perhaps even over years—and the decision is made piecemeal; for some there are stages in the crisis and in the decision[.] . . . The decision is the inescapable condition of progressive sanctification" (pgs. 124-125). One wonders what state the person is in who makes the decision piecemeal and in stages; is he still a carnal Christian, has he ascended to the Higher Life of the spiritual Christian, or is he a third type, the carnal/spiritual Christian, a sort of half-and-half that has both not yet met the condition that begins progressive sanctification and yet has also met it, so that progressive sanctification can begin and yet has not begun? Note that this carnal/spiritual Christian has, because he has surrended much, but not yet all, of his life to God, made progress in sanctification, as he is certainly further along than the alleged category of Christian that is still totally in charge of his own life. However, although he is further along, since he has not yet fully surrendered, he still cannot even begin the process of progressive sanctification, according to Barabas. Barabas's contradictory arguments are just another example of the fact that "Keswick furnishes us with no carefully prepared, weighty discourses of a theological nature" (pg. 51). His contradictions, unintelligibility, and incoherence are good Keswick teaching.

[1933] Pgs. 86-107, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1934] Pg. 86, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1935] Pg. 86, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1936] Pg. 88, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Barabas quotes Ruth Paxson, *Life on the Highest Plane,* Vol. II, pg. 107.

blessing that we may claim by faith, just as we accept pardon."[1937] Since believers are "identified with Christ in His death to sin . . . [they] need no longer serve sin,"[1938] although it is supposedly possible for "all Christians . . . [to] be in terrible bondage . . . under the power of sin."[1939] They "have a legal right to be free," however, and obtain "[d]eliverance . . . not . . . by struggle and painful effort, by earnest resolutions and self-denial, but . . . by simple faith."[1940] The "special message . . at Keswick . . . [is that it] is possible to serve sin again, but not necessary, for Christ has freed us."[1941] This "freedom is only potential . . . [and] Keswick leaders often say that God's method of sanctification is not *suppression* or *eradication,* but *counteraction*."[1942] Keswick reproduced the teaching of Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton[1943] to affirm that the sinfulness within the believer "is something fixed and permanent, and will remain in us as long as we live. . . . The principle of counteraction is . . . basic to Keswick teaching."[1944] The "*locus classicus* on" the Keswick doctrine of sanctification as gift is "Romans vi."[1945] As the Holy Spirit counteracts indwelling sin in the Christian, the believer "ceases from his own struggles to live a holy life, and enters the 'rest of faith' . . . the secret of perfect and constant victory over temptation."[1946] Thus, "the heart and core of Keswick teaching is

---

1937 Pg. 89, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1938 Pg. 89, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1939 Pg. 90, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1940 Pg. 90, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1941 Pg. 92, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1942 Pg. 94, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1943 For example, the Oxford Convention set forth the Keswick doctrine of counteraction:

> The natural tendency of Peter was to sink [when walking on the water]. Jesus counteracted this, and Peter walked on the water until he took his eye off from Jesus and looked at the waves. Our tendency by nature is to sin, but faith in Jesus meets this tendency to evil [and] . . . brings into operation the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which sets us free from the law of sin and death. (pg. 53, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874)

Thus, for Keswick, as at Oxford, there is no actual growth in the believer's inward holiness—indwelling sin is not eradicated, but only counteracted, so that the Higher Life keeps one above water, but devoid of any actual progress.

1944 Pg. 95, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Compare the teaching at the Oxford Convention:

> [S]ettle it once for all that we shall never find anything good in ourselves of any kind whatsoever. Christians are apt to think they can have stocks of virtues laid up in themselves [that is, that God actually makes them holy in progressive sanctification, but this is false.] . . . God's way is . . . just like drawing on a bank. Our money is in the bank, not in our pockets. God never gives us anything [inwardly.] . . . We get up each morning with nothing, and we go to bed with nothing. (pgs. 302-304, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874)

1945 Pg. 89, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1946 Pg. 95, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. It is noteworthy that an examination of the personal journals of T. D. Harford-Battersby, co-founder and chairman of the Keswick convention, "do not bear witness to unfailing victory, to neverbroken peace," but to a kind of spiritual life that is entirely consistent with the classical Baptist and old evangelical view of Romans 7:14-25 (pgs. 188ff., *Memoir of T. D. Harford-*

its doctrine of sanctification by faith. . . . The Keswick position,"[1947] which is derived from Hannah W. Smith,[1948] "is that in Scripture sanctification comes by faith, and not in any other way."[1949] The believer, to be sanctified, must recognize the truth of the Keswick doctrine, "the scriptural method of progressive sanctification," have "proper faith," which involves "the believer's consent to die to every fleshly desire in him," and then "hand over the fleshly deeds of the body to the Spirit for mortification . . . Romans 8:13 . . . [and] stand in faith in the knowledge that he died to sin in Christ at Calvary. It is the Holy Spirit's responsibility to do the rest. Sanctification is thus the result, not of attempts at suppression of the flesh, but of faith in the finished work of Calvary."[1950]

Sanctification as a process, which is dependent in the Keswick theology upon experiencing the sanctification crisis and receiving of sanctification as a gift, is discussed by Barabas on half a page.[1951] Barabas discusses sanctification as a crisis for over twenty pages, and sanctification as gift for over twenty pages, while he has only a tiny discussion of sanctification as process for one-half of one page. This huge contrast exists because, for Keswick, "Sanctification is primarily and fundamentally 'neither an achievement nor a process, but a gift[.']"[1952] Little emphasis is placed upon sanctification as a process because Keswick believes that through the course of the Christian life the "indwelling tendency to sin . . . is as fixed and constant as any of the laws of nature,"[1953] so "purity can become a maintained condition, but never a state,"[1954] the "tendency to evil" being merely "counteracted"[1955] but left entirely unchanged, and "the tendency to sin [being] . . . simply counteracted."[1956] Victory over sin "is not a question of progressive

---

Battersby, Harford). Mr. Harford-Battersby's private journal was more honest about the continuing reality and influence of indwelling sin in the regenerate than was the public preaching of the Keswick theology.

1947 Pg. 100, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1948 Mrs. Smith wrote: "We can do nothing . . . [o]ur only part . . . is to stop working" (Journal, 1867, reproduced in the entry for March 26 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Compare Evan Roberts's exhortation to be "simply trusting and not trying," a maxim on sanctification that was also adopted by Pentecostalism (pg. 65, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan).

1949 Pg. 100, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1950 Pgs. 106-107, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1951 Pg. 85, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1952 Pg. 88, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1953 Pg. 47, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1954 Pg. 47, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1955 Pg. 49, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Keswick theology often affirms that Romans 6:6 does not actually teach that the body of sin is progressively, through mortification, "destroyed," but that it is merely "counteracted." As noted in the discussion above in the section "The Body of Sin Is Indeed Destroyed, Not Merely Counteracted," this conclusion of Keswick is false.

1956 Pg. 49, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

attainment."[1957] Little emphasis is placed upon sanctification as a process because there is little or nothing that actually changes within the believer. Keswick believes that it "is astonishing that theologians have not seen this"[1958] theology of counteraction and rejection of actual inward renewal in the Bible.

While Keswick is correct and commendable in calling believers to surrender themselves completely to God, in its emphasis upon the believer's union with Christ, and in its affirmation that strength to grow spiritually is derived from the Lord Jesus through the Holy Spirit, there are serious problems with the Keswick doctrine of sanctification as crisis, gift, and process. First, it is certainly true that when a believer is deliberately allowing and tolerating sin in his life his growth in holiness will be greatly hindered or even reversed. However, it is not true that real steps in sanctification cannot take place before a post-conversion crisis because "God's blessing of deliverance from the power of sin is not to be had" until such a crisis takes place.[1959] All Christians are delivered from the power of sin. It is not true, as Keswick affirms, that "all Christians . . . [can] be in terrible bondage . . . under the power of sin"[1960] or that, as Hannah W. Smith taught[1961] and Keswick proclaims, Christian "freedom [from sin] is only potential."[1962] To state that, for Christians, "our individual self is entirely and completely under the power of sin"[1963] is flatly false. Since believers are "not under the law, but under grace," God promises that "sin shall not have dominion" over them (Romans 6:14). Such freedom is not merely potential, but actual. Romans six does not establish the mere possibility of freedom from sin for the Christian, but establishes that all Christians are indeed free from the bondage of sin, and as a result, they will—not merely may—grow in holiness. The commands to the believer in Romans six to reckon and yield are not based upon a mere possibility of change, but upon the certain promise that grace guarantees that sin "shall not" dominate them. Keswick, adopting the emphasis and Broadlands teaching of Hannah W. Smith,[1964] affirms that death to sin and spiritual life are not in any sense a practical reality until, by an act of reckoning, the Higher Life is entered into—Scripture,

---

1957 Pg. 96, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1958 Pg. 104, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1959 Pg. 109, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1960 Pg. 90, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1961 E. g., pg. 128, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1962 Pg. 94, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1963 Pg. 139, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1964 E. g., pg. 128, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

on the contrary, commands a believer to reckon himself dead to sin and alive to God because he already is so and is already freed from the dominion of sin and under the reign of grace (Romans 6:11, 14). The power and promises God made in the New Covenant ratified in Christ's blood secure the certainty of the believer's sanctification. The Keswick doctrine of a merely potential deliverance from sin for the saint is far too weak.

The Keswick doctrine, adopted from the preaching of Hannah W. Smith at Broadlands,[1965] that "the divine Potter . . . cannot shape the human vessel unless it is committed into His hands and remains unresistingly and quietly there"[1966] is a Higher Life error associated with its crisis, gift, and process model of sanctification. It is also connected with other serious errors about the means of holiness.[1967] Such a view does not properly deal with the fact that God works in the believer both to will and to do (Philippians 2:13)—Biblically, sanctification is intimately tied in with God's work upon the human will, but Keswick, following the ideas Hannah and Robert P. Smith obtained from medieval Quietism, downgrades the power of God for the sovereignty, libertarian freedom, and autonomy of the human will.[1968] Keswick, following Broadlands, undermines the power of God when it affirms that He "cannot" do a variety of things, including sanctifying His creatures, without their sovereign, uninfluenced and

---

[1965] E. g., Mrs. Smith preached at the 1874 Broadlands Conference that through a "step of faith" where the believer "surrender[s] himself and trust[s] . . . we put ourselves into the hands of the Divine Potter . . . [we] can do nothing [else]" (pgs. 124-125, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Broadlands taught that the "potential force of the Holy Spirit" by such means becomes "the actual, when we are *willingly* receptive of His inflowing powers. We must be willing . . . [t]here must be complete *acquiescence*" (pgs. 190-191, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics reproduced from the original.). For Mrs. Smith, the Broadlands Conference, and the Keswick Convention, the Holy Spirit falls helpless before the sovereign human will, while Scripture teaches that the Holy Spirit is the sovereign God who works to incline and renew the will through His Almighty works of regeneration and progressive sanctification, leading men to fall in worship before the Triune Jehovah, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

[1966] Pg. 112, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1967] In addition to the errors mentioned below, one wonders, for example, if unbelievers in rebellion against God, such as Esau and the Pharoah of the Exodus, were unresisting and quiet in the divine Potter's hands before He hardened them (Romans 9:18) and they were fitted for destruction (Romans 9:14-24). While Keswick affirms the Divine Potter "cannot" work until the clay acts a certain way, Scripture says the Divine potter makes the clay what He wills by His own power: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (Romans 9:21).

[1968] E. g., at the Oxford Conference Robert P. Smith proclaimed: "President Edwards' teaching of the affections governing the will [in, e. g., his *The Religious Affections*] I believe to be untrue. I believe in the yet older saying [of the Quietists Madame Guyon and Archbishop Fénelon], that 'True religion resides in the will alone'" (pg. 134, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; also pgs. 279, 331). Nothing positive is said about the views of Jonathan Edwards at the Oxford Convention, and nothing negative is said about Madame Guyon, Archbishop Fénelon, or the Catholic Quietism of the Dark Ages.

autonomous wills allowing Him to.[1969] Sanctification, and all the other blessings promised by God in the gospel, for the Keswick theology as for Hannah W. Smith and the Broadlands Conference,[1970] are totally inactive until they are switched on by the decision to enter the Higher Life, somewhat as electricity from a power plant is totally inactive in lighting up a room until one flips on the light switch. Keswick, adopting the Broadlands doctrine of "full surrender,"[1971] affirms that the believer is in bondage to sin until he makes a "complete personal consecration" to God, "also referred to as dedication and full surrender,"[1972] so that he "commit[s] [himself] to Christ and . . . pledge[s] to be eternally loyal to Him as Lord and Master . . . den[ies] self . . . [and] definitely and for ever choos[es] the will of the Lord Jesus Christ as [his] Guide and Director through life, in place of [his] own will."[1973] But how, if the believer is in bondage to sin until he makes this decision, could such a surrender ever take place? Is not the Christian's pledge of eternal loyalty to Christ as Lord, denial of self, and a choice in the will of the Son of God as Guide and Director, rather a result of freedom from the bondage of sin than a prerequisite to obtain it? Must a will in bondage to sin free itself by its own power before God steps in to do anything, or, on the contrary, must not God free the will first before it is able to be consecrated to God? Ironically, while Keswick theology criticizes the idea that "sanctification is . . . to be gained through our own personal efforts,"[1974] it requires incredible personal effort—indeed, personal effort that is utterly impossible for a will in bondage to sin, as Keswick claims the believer's will is until he enters the Higher Life—to make the surrender Keswick claims is the prerequisite to God beginning any good work within the saint at all.

[1969] For example, Broadlands affirmed that men need to feel sorry for God because He is suffering when men rebel against Him: "Looking at the sins and sufferings of men, we must remember God is suffering too, and we must have sympathy not with men only, but with God" (pg. 175, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Men are not only to fulfill their duties to God, but God supposedly has duties to creatures that He must fulfill; indeed, "Jesus is the revelation of God fulfilling His duty to His creatures" (pg. 213, *ibid*). Indeed, the Triune God is not, it seems, self-sufficient, but creatures are necessary to Jesus Christ: "The Church, the body, is necessary to Christ the Head" (pg. 210, *ibid*). The Keswick doctrine of Divine inability and human ability was developed by Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts into the doctrine of the inability of God to Rapture the saints who have not entered into the Highest Life, and by the Word of Faith movement into the doctrine of men as gods.

[1970] Compare Mrs. Smith's exposition of the impotence and total inactivity of spiritual blesings until individually activated by faith on pgs. 128-129, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1971] E. g., pg. 120, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910; pg. 26ff., *Forward Movements*, Pierson.

[1972] Pgs. 109-110, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1973] Pg. 116-117, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1974] Pg. 74, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

The problem in the Keswick doctrine of full surrender as a prerequisite to sanctification is connected to the fact that the Keswick argument against literal perfectionism is untenable and contradictory given its own theological premises. Keswick affirms that one must absolutely surrender before sanctification can truly begin; that through an act of total surrender and of faith in Christ for deliverance, one enters into a state where one is free from all known sin; and that a Christian's ability to obey (by grace) and his obligation are coextensive. However, Keswick's majority deny literal sinless perfection because, although "from the side of God's grace and gift, all is perfect, [yet] from the human side, because of the effects of the Fall, there will be imperfect receptivity, and therefore imperfect holiness, to the end of life."[1975] The exact nature of this "imperfect receptivity" is not defined, but since the Keswick theology defines man's role in sanctification as surrender and faith, the imperfect receptivity must signify either imperfect surrender or imperfect faith. If absolute surrender truly is required before God's grace even begins to effectively work in sanctifying the believer, then a Keswick affirmation that the Fall precludes a truly absolute surrender would mean that sanctification can never really begin at all. If an imperfect faith and surrender allows the believer to move through progressive degrees of battle with sin to progressive degrees of spiritual victory, so that the more perfect the believer's surrender is, the more victory over sin and spiritual strength the believer possesses, then the Keswick doctrine that believers instantly flip-flop from a state of spiritual defeat, carnality, and domination by sin to one of total victory by means of the sanctification crisis is replaced with something closer to the classic doctrine of sanctification, for victory over sin and surrender to the Lord become progressive.[1976] Furthermore, if the believer's ability is truly equal to his

---

1975 Pg. 99, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

1976 This problem with the Keswick theology has been pointed out since the time of its invention. For example, in 1876 Thomas Smith pointed out this flaw in the Keswick doctrine as explained by its founder, Hannah W. Smith:

> Mrs. Smith's requirement of "entire consecration" as preliminary to sanctification . . . [is] utterly subversive of the very doctrine that it is designed to establish, subversive not only of the doctrine of holiness by faith, as that doctrine is held by Mrs. Smith and her friends, but subversive of the doctrine of holiness by faith, as held by the universal [body of believers belonging to] Christ. Be it distinctly noted that this entire consecration is uniformly represented as preliminary to the obtaining of holiness by faith, and as a necessary and indispensable condition thereto. . . . Mrs. Smith . . . places this consecration absolutely before the exercise of faith in Christ for sanctification, making no allusion to any aid to be received from Christ, or any working or co-working of the Holy Spirit, in order to the making of this consecration. But what in reality is consecration but sanctification? What is entire consecration but perfect holiness? Either they are identical, or consecration is the result of sanctification. In no possible sense can it be said truly that consecration goes before and sanctification follows. . . . Mrs. Smith's system is simply this—Make yourself perfectly holy first, then go to Christ, believe that he will make you perfectly holy, and he will do it. Of course she does not know that this is the meaning of her system; but all the more is she blameworthy for putting herself forward as the teacher of a system whose meaning she is incapable of comprehending. . . . [In the Keswick theology people] are saved [only] by illogicality and inconsistency from the legitimate fatal result of their erroneous beliefs.

obligation, then God's "perfect . . . grace and gift" would give him truly perfect ability, and there would be no reason why literal sinless perfection would be impossible for the Christian. After all, "God's requirements cannot be greater than his enablements"[1977]—so since God gives perfect grace, and the gift of "holiness [that He] requires of His creatures . . . He first provides,"[1978] the literal perfection of God's grace necessarily requires that the Christian can be literally sinless. While one can be happy that most advocates of the Keswick theology do not believe in the literal perfectionism inherent in their theological position, nonetheless Keswick opposition to absolute perfectionism is contradictory and incoherent.[1979]

Furthermore, when Keswick affirms, following the Pearsall Smiths and the Broadlands Conference,[1980] that the believer's sole responsibility in sanctification is to lie

---

> In another and quite a different respect, all the [Keswick] writers . . . err, not by excess, but by defect, in stating the doctrine of sanctification by Christ. . . . [I]n no one of the [testimonies mentioned by them] was there any approach to [gradual and progressive sanctification from the time of conversion.] One was five years, another ten, another twenty years living in undoubting assurance of pardon before adopting the method of sanctification which they now advocate so strenuously. But during these several intervals they had each made some progress in holiness, a very unsatisfactory progress indeed, but still some real progress. But that progress, such as it was, was effected, according to their present shewing, not by that faith which they now inculcate, but by that striving which they now condemn as legal and carnal. According to their view, then, there must be two distinct ways of sanctification—one far better, indeed, than the other, by taking Christ by faith [alone] for sanctification; the other inferior, indeed, but still real, by dispensing with Christ, and simply striving. Now this is a far less evangelical and a far more legal doctrine than the orthodox, which maintains that there is but one way of holiness, as there is but one way of righteousness; and that Christ's being made of God sanctification to his people, is as exclusive of sanctification in any other way as his being made to them righteousness is exclusive of justification in any other way. In answer to this they would probably say that, in the interval betwixt their first and second conversion, they did not altogether reject Christ as their sanctification, but trusted partly to him and partly to their own endeavours, and that so much of sanctification as they then achieved was in virtue of the measure of faith which even then they exercised. If they say this, then it is an important modification of their present system, quite different from what they have said hitherto. But more than this, it will be fatal to their system, for it would utterly destroy the analogy between justification and sanctification, for which they so strongly contend. For they will admit that he who trusts partly to Christ and partly to himself for righteousness, does not, while he so trusts, attain to righteousness at all; and by parity of reason, it ought to follow that he who trusts partly to Christ and partly to himself for holiness, must equally fail to attain any holiness at all. . . . It is enough to point out that t[heir] system, as it now stands, utterly fails to account for the admitted fact that some measure of holiness is attained by many otherwise than as th[e] [Keswick] system prescribes, and that some measure was attained by the present advocates of the system before they adopted it. (pgs. 263-264, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280)

Unfortunately, although the severe problems in the Keswick doctrine were pointed out from the time of its inception, Keswick writers and agitators tend to be either unwittingly or intentionally ignorant of critiques of their system of sanctification, and consequently continue to testify to and promulgate it, fatal errors and all.

[1977] Pg. 63, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1978] Pg. 88, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1979] Early opponents of the Higher Life theology noted "Mr. Pearsall Smith's . . . confused and confusing theology" (pg. 87, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875).

[1980] E. g., Robert P. Smith set forth what became the standard Keswick Quietism on pg. 220ff. *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Hannah W. Smith preached at Broadlands: "We have the Divine life; we

"quietly" in the Potter's hands, to "give up belief in . . . struggl[ing] or striv[ing]"[1981] and cease from "struggle and painful effort . . . earnest resolutions and self-denial,"[1982] it teaches an unbiblical Quietism,[1983] exemplified in the Victorious Life motto, "Let go and let God."[1984] Barabas alleges that "Keswick is very careful to point out that its doctrine of sanctification by faith is not Quietism," quoting "Bishop Handley Moule"[1985] to support this alleged opposition to Quietism by Keswick. However, Barabas either overlooks or misrepresents[1986] the fact that Moule himself, who Barabas affirms was the

---

must see to it that we let it live, that we let no other life live" (pg. 182, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). That is, our own human life must cease, and we must allow the Divine Seed, the Christ-life, to live instead of us.

[1981] Pg. 88, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1982] Pg. 90, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[1983] While Keswick is quietistic, its Quietism is often milder than many of the historical manifestations of Quietism, and thus, while its Quietism hinders the believer's sanctification, it is not as theologically aberrant as, say, the Quietism of the medieval Romanist mysticism that influenced it. Keswick happily, though inconsistently, denies that sanctification involves "the destruction of the Christian's personality" (pg. 134, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas) while still affirming that, rather than the world, the flesh, and the devil, "the greatest danger . . . the individual has to dread is the inordinate activity of the soul with its powers of mind and will" (pg. 335, *The Spirit of Christ*, Andrew Murray; also cited in chapter 8, *Soul & Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis).

[1984] This phrase was popularized by Victorious Life leader Mark Trumbull in his tract, "What is Your Kind of Christianity?" and examined by B. B. Warfield in "The Victorious Life," Chapter 5 of *Perfectionism*, vol. 2. Compare, in Trumbull's book *Victory in Christ*, the title to chapter 5: "Victory without Trying" (Elec. acc. http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com).

However, to his credit, "at Keswick . . . [William Graham] Scroggie," who "[i]n 1950 . . . was called 'indisputably the foremost living Keswick teacher' . . . had opposed the idea of 'Let go–and let God' and had said that victory came through 'fighting and striving to make true in experience what is true for us positionally.'" Unfortunately, "Scroggie did not deny the possibility of contemporary speaking in tongues," and, "[s]peaking at one Keswick Convention on the subject of the Apostles' Creed, he argued that given the conflicts of the 1920s over theological modernism (with fundamentalists calling for evangelicals to leave the existing denominations), it was preferable to use the Apostles' Creed as a widely accepted basis of faith than for small groups to construct their own bases of belief and split from the wider [universal] church" ("Scroggie, William Graham," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, pgs. 593-594). Furthermore, "Scroggie . . . did accept that the gift of tongues might still be available to Christians" (pg. 71, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). While Scroggie sought to reform the dominant Keswick Quietism, he maintained its unbiblical continuationism or anti-cessationism and its ecumenicalism.

[1985] Pg. 97, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Packer, commenting on Barabas's denial that Keswick is quietistic, notes:

> [Barabas's denial is based] on the ground that intense activity in using the means of grace is necessary to keep up one's consecration and to maintain faith. But such activity, as is explicity stated in the passage from Bishop Moule which he quotes, is merely *preparatory:* "the temptation of the hour will be met less by direct efforts of the will than by indirect"—i. e., by handing the matter over to the Spirit and *ceasing to act in it oneself.* This is the quietism of Keswick teaching. (pg. 161, "'Keswick' and the Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification," J. I. Packer. *The Evangelical Quarterly*, vol. 27 (1955) 153-167).

[1986] It is possible that Barabas borrowed his misuse of Moule from W. H. Griffith Thomas, who quoted Moule to respond to Warfield's criticism of Keswick Quietism on pgs. 278-279, "The Victorious Life (I.)," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 76:303 (July 1919), 267-288. Griffith Thomas was Barabas's predecessor in ignorance of or the passing over of the fact that, decades before Thomas wrote, Moule himself specifically affirmed,

greatest scholar to ever adopt the Keswick theology,[1987] wrote that the believer's part in the Keswick model of sanctification is "a blessed and wakeful Quietism," so that "Quietism . . . express[es] one side of [the] truth" in sanctification.[1988] The explicit

---

in print, the Quietism of his beloved Keswick doctrine of sanctification. Perhaps if ignorance of or bypassing of inconvenient facts worked well enough for Griffith Thomas, it might work well enough for Barabas also.

[1987] "The adherence of Dr. Moule to the Keswick platform was a great accession of strength . . . there is no doubt that Dr. Moule was [Keswick's] greatest . . . scholar" (pg. 175, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas). Moule adopted the Keswick theology through the influence of Evan Hopkins (pgs. 106, 148, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). Nevertheless, even Bishop Moule did not write any works for the world of scholarship, a fact put in the most favorable light by his biographers:

> Those who knew Dr. Moule's powers often longed that he would give to the Church some great work, which would appeal to the world of pure scholarship and advanced studies; but . . . he deliberately consecrated all his powers to meet the needs of the general body of Christian people . . . it is not surprising that Dr. Moule should have felt that he could best serve his day and generation by using his all-too-scanty leisure upon such writings as were in the line of his pulpit and platform ministrations. (pg. 173, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*, John B. Harford & Frederick C. Macdonald)

Thus, Moule did not write any exposition or defense of the Keswick theology for the world of scholarship, just as nobody else has done, despite what will soon be a century and a half of the worldwide promulgation of the Keswick theology. Perhaps such an exposition has never been written because Keswick doctrine is unscholarly and cannot be defended at an advanced level.

[1988] Pg. 197, *Veni Creator: Thoughts on the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit of Promise*, by H. C. G. Moule. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1890; cf. repr. ed., Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1977. Thankfully, although Moule affirmed Quietism was one side of the truth, he also affirmed it was "only" one side of it, adding: "In the history of theological language [Quietism] has some associations with dangerous error." While such a warning is better than an unqualified endorsement of Quietism, it is far too bland and nonspecific; nobody knows who exactly is teaching "dangerous error" or what "some associations with" such error actually means, so that Moule's disclaimer has no practical value. It seems that Moule thought that those teaching "dangerous error," or at least error that was damnable and really and truly serious, did not include the actual promulgators of Roman Catholic mystical Quietism such as Archbishop Fenélon, for Moule wrote concerning him: "There are assuredly many Roman [Catholics] that know that light [of salvation], as Fenelon and his friends [such as Madame Guyon] so beautifully did" (pg. 215, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*, John B. Harford & Frederick C. Macdonald). If beautiful knowledge of the light of Christ is found in such a central figure of medieval Romanist Quietism as Archbishop Fenélon, despite his rejection of core elements of the gospel such as justification by faith alone, and despite the fact that he was so zealous as a partisan for Rome and against Protestantism that he led a mission to bring French Huguenots back into the fold of Mystery Babylon and her idolatry, one wonders what advocates of Quietism actually qualified as dangerous.

Unfortunately, Moule's lack of a Christ-like, pointed, and specific denunciation of false teachers and false teaching (cf. Matthew 23) was not limited to applying a feather duster to Roman Catholic Quietism instead of hewing it in pieces with the sword of the Spirit. Moule himself held to numerous serious heresies. He was "quite willing to read" the creation account in "Gen i-iii . . . as hieroglyphics [rather] than as pictures or photographs of scenery." He wrote:

> We are not bound to believe that the Creator literally spoke syllables meaning "Let there be light." We are not bound to literalism in the mysterious details of the creation of woman. We are not bound to every particular of the temptation. They are . . . fact not necessarily painted exactly as it happened, but conveyed in hieroglyphic signs . . . a prophecy of fact, conveyed through non-literal symbols . . . I think the action of the serpent in Gen. iii. may be of the same class. We thus have Scripture beginning . . . with facts so mysterious that they need in our present state mysterious representation. (pg. 175, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*, John B. Harford & Frederick C. Macdonald)

God's Word did not have to mean exactly what it says in the account of the Creation and Fall; rather, this portion of the Mosaic narrative may be "hieroglyphic signs" filled with sound and fury, signfying nothing, or at least nothing anyone could know for certain. Moule also affirmed that a "new and higher law for the Christian mind" made it well if portions of the Psalter were "omit[ted] . . . [from] public use . . . in common

worship," as parts of God's Word in songs such as Psalm 69 and 109 were allegedly sub-Christian (pgs. 175-176), despite profuse references to these very psalms in the New Testament (Matthew 27:34, 48; Mark 15:36; Luke 23:36; John 2:17; 15:25; 19:28-29; Acts 1:16, 20; Romans 11:9-10; 15:3, etc.). Concerning "Old Testament Criticism" Moule wrote: "I do not forget that large recognition has often and obviously to be given to the presence of many documents or 'sources' in one writing, and to many an after note or comment usefully embodied in the text" (pgs. 295-296). Moule also "showed a large-hearted tolerance" for those, including "many of his pupils and some of his colleagues," who "took more advanced positions," that is, who delved further into the hellish pits of the Higher Criticism than he did himself; such people were certainly not false teachers in need of deliverance from the kingdom of darkness, but could be "loyal to the Master Himself" while holding to higher critical heresies (pg. 176). It is not surprising that many of Moule's pupils accepted Higher Criticism when Moule taught them: "The Lord . . . stated no theory of th[e] construction . . . [of] the Scriptures" (pg. 174), such as the Biblical fact that the Bible was dictated, although not mechanically, by the Holy Ghost, in such a manner that its very words, and all of its words, were inspired by God. But if the Creation and the Fall could be "hieroglyphic signs," why could not the saving work of Christ be a mere symbol also—does not the Apostle Paul parallel the fall of men in Adam and their deliverance through Christ in Romans five?

Furthermore, despite the fearful warnings of Scripture against such practices, and the terrible opportunities they gave to the devil, Moule also claimed to communicate with the dead and offered prayer for them, in a manner reminiscient of the interactions with the dead of the spiritualist Higher Life pillars Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple. Moule also commended such frightfully unscriptural practices to others. It was his "sweet solace" to offer "[p]erpetual greetings to" his "beloved ones" who had "gone" to the grave. He stated: "I daily and by name greet my own beloved child, my dearest parents, and others precious to me," although they were already dead. Prayers for the dead were "no sin;" rather, communication with and prayers for the dead were a "sweet and blessed help" in the spiritual life (pgs. 220-221), so Moule himself engaged daily in such spiritualistic exercises. Moule stated: "I cannot think . . . that warrant for such prayer is a fact of revelation," but although no support whatever for prayers for the dead appeared in Scripture, he stated: "I for one cannot condemn such exercises of the soul," and he both practiced such himself and accepted such communications as a legitimate "devotional" practice of other "Christians who so pray." He even commended a "beautiful . . . prayer" for the dead for the use of Christians, which included not only intercession for the dead but a wish for communication with the dead person: "[I]f there be ways in which [he] may come. . . grant me a sense of [his] presence" (pgs. 96-98, *Christus Consolator*, Moule). Such interaction with the dead—who, Moule knew, really came back, as such communications certainly were not simply the work of deceiving demons—contributed to the Bishop's belief in the continuation of spiritual gifts and his opposition to cessationism. As a result of such fellowship with and prayers for the dead, Moule believed that "the Lord grants what can only be called visions," so that the dead return and grant an even greater level of communication with the living than can be obtained by invisible communication with the afterlife. Moule himself had received supernatural and "deeply sweet dreams" where dead people he communicated with and prayed for appeared to him and looked on him "with an extraordinary look of bliss" (pgs. 220-221, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*, John B. Harford & Frederick C. Macdonald). Moule likewise commended others who had "veritable vision[s] of God" coming to them and telling them things, and encouraged and supported those who received such visions to trust in their veracity (pg. 287). In light of his continuationism, Moule's sympathy for the leader of early British Pentecostalism, Alexander Boddy, is unsurprising (pgs. 23-24, 88, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee). Furthermore, Moule also had the ability as a Anglican Bishop to convey special powers through the laying on of his hands. One who received such power from Moule testified: "At my interview, he laid his hands on my head, and gave me his solemn blessing for the work. I distinctly felt that it was something very real. This was not a matter of faith, but a distinct physical experience, as definite as an electrical shock. It was not like an electric shock, but something both spiritual and physical which I cannot properly describe. . . . It had results, for both in my parish, and where I was Bishop's Messenger, the Mission was much more successful than it usually was" (pgs. 222-223).

Moule was also ecumenical, warmly accepting as brothers in Christ High Anglican and Romanizing Anglican baptismal regenerationists and other heretics within his denomination, instead of seeking to purge such false teachers out. "His breadth of view gained for him in a marked degree the confidence of all schools of thought," and his "genial tolerance" of non-evangelicals brought him the "war[m] prais[e]" of the "High Anglicans" (pgs. 186-187; cf. Luke 6:26). It probably helped that Moule

could make "strongly worded sacramental statement[s]" about "the Lord as present on the Table" in the sacrament of Communion (pg. 95, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). The Roman Catholic sacrament of Confirmation could bring one into the Anglican communion, Moule held—even if the Anglican "Canons might say otherwise." "[P]ublic renunciation" of Rome and her heresies should be "waive[d]" for entrance into Anglicanism (pg. 215). Incense could be used in association with the sacrament of Holy Communion (pg. 218-219). Moule permitted those under his authority to practice the "Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament" as an act of "real helpfulness" in certain situations in worship, although it was a practice involving the worship of the communion bread in Roman Catholicism (pg. 220). Sharing wine and meals with his fellow clergy (pg. 201), Moule became "most devoted and loving friends" with "the leading Ritualist in the North of England," whom Moule regarded as a "Christian man and minister wholly devoted to his Lord" and to whom Moule "took special delight" in providing ecclesiastical advancement (pg. 194). Moule "quite recognized that those who held the Catholic standpoint had a perfect right to be included in the Anglican Church. And his letters breathe the spirit of kindly sympathy with this point of view. He desired that 'all essential requirements of the High Anglicans should be met'" (pg. 196), and, as a Bishop, he "rejoice[d]" to put "important . . . living[s]" with "most important point[s] of vantage" into the hands of those with "extreme opposite" views to his generally evangelical Anglicanism (pg. 195). Thus, he happily worked as an Anglican Bishop, not to purge, but to promote those under his charge who led countless precious souls into false ritualistic gospels and the fires of an eternal hell. Moule was so far from seeking to remove those who believed a false gospel that "he would have erred in favour to High Churchmen lest he should even appear to be unkind" (pgs. 196-197). He wrote:

> It has been my happiness, not least in my later years, to know and to love, as friends in Christ, holy men of other types and schools, and to see with reverence their Lord's likeness in the countenance of their lives. . . . These men are beyond shadow of question at least as much Christ's own as I dare to think myself. From their example, from their words, sometimes from words definitely shaped by their distinctive tenets, I have often received exhortation and edification. (pg. 197)

That is, Moule thought both rationalist Higher Critics and Romanist Anglicans were as much Christians as himself, and he often received exhortation and edification from their distinctive tenents, although these were damnable heresies. To Moule, in his appointments of ministers to lead the people of God, "the question of views was secondary" (pg. 203); "nor was he a good judge of character" (pg. 211; contrast 1 Timothy 3). In his bishopric he brought about "entire freedom . . . from ritual trouble and partisan division" (pg. 200), although the gospel itself had to be jettisoned to do so. Thus, Moule was "scrupulous" to treat well "High Churchmen in [his] Diocese[.] It fell to his lot to appoint incumbents to many parishes where the teaching and practice were not in accord with his personal convictions, but he was always at pains to secure the continuity of the tradition of such churches" (pg. 203). That is, when a false gospel was being preached by a minister of Satan in a parish overseen by Moule, the Bishop was very diligent to make sure that the true gospel was not brought in, but upon the retirement of one minister of Satan, Moule consecrated another servant and preacher of Antichrist. While the Bible affirms that believers must "earnestly contend for the faith" (Jude 3), and although the Anglican denomination decended ever further into rationalism and Romanism as Moule grew older, he nonetheless wrote: "As life advances, I feel less and less the value of controversy, where spiritual matters are concerned" (pg. 215).

In light of his willingness to praise and commend ritualism, it is not surprising tht Moule could write: "Only it is right that I should say for my own part that not one word . . . has been written [by me] in forgetfulness of my obligations as a presbyter of the English Church, or with faltering convictions as to the rightness of the language of its sacramental ritual" (pg. 80, *Veni Creator*). Moule thus endorsed the language employed in, for example, the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, in "The Ministration of Publick Baptism of Infants, to be Used in the Church," which requires the priest to pray:

> By the Baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, [Thou, God] didst sanctify Water to the mystical washing away of sin. . . . We call upon thee for this Infant, that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration. Receive him, O Lord, as thou hast promised . . . that this Infant may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. Amen.

The form for "The Ministration of Private Baptism of Children" requires the priest to act as follows:

> [P]our Water upon [the infant], saying these words; "I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." Then, all kneeling down, the Minister shall give thanks unto God, and say, "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this Infant with thy

endorsement of a form of Quietism by Keswick leaders was simply a continuation of the teaching of Lord Mount Temple,[1989] reproduced at the Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton conferences, where "Quietism . . . was taught . . . in the sense of [the poem], 'Sweet to lie passive in His hands/And know no will but His.'"[1990] In sanctification, the believer is "simply to . . . lie passive."[1991] Passivity is of the highest importance: "[I]n the disciple's life, the . . . first quality of a true instrument is *passivity*. An *active* instrument would defeat its own purpose . . . and then it not only becomes useless, but it works damage and disaster. . . . [I]n the Word of God, we meet so frequently the symbols of passive service."[1992] Hannah and Robert Smith sought to bring others into a life of carefree and

---

> Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own Child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church. And we humbly beseech thee to grant, that as he is now made partaker of the death of thy Son, so he may be also of his resurrection; and that finally, with the residue of thy Saints, he may inherit thine everlasting kingdom; through the same thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The Ministration further commends the "baptizing of [a] Child; who being born in original sin, and in the wrath of God, is now, by the laver of Regeneration in Baptism, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life." The binding Anglican Confession of Faith, the *39 Articles,* affirm that as "by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; [and] the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed" (Article XXVII). While one can be glad that Moule personally denied baptismal regeneration and strove, albeit with questionable efficacy, to make the sacramental language of his denomination cohere with more evangelical views (cf. pgs. 259ff., *Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, H. C. G. Moule. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1890), he nonetheless swore commitment to the Anglican documents that actually did teach sacramental salvation, and he had good "Christian" fellowship with the multitude of his fellow Anglican ministers and members that took more seriously than he the language of Anglican creed and ritual and consequently affirmed baptismal regeneration.

Moule personally accepted grave errors, from weak views on the inspiration of Scripture, continuationism, and ecumenicalism, to prayers for the dead. He also had a terrible lack of discernment about heresy. It is consequently not surprising that unregenerate false teachers such as Hannah W. Smith and Robert P. Smith were accepted as Christian brethren by Moule, and their Keswick theology adopted and promulgated by him.

[1989] E. g., pg. 124, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[1990] Pgs. 421-422, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875. The pages affirm that "Quietism it may have been also in [another] sense," so that Quietism was the explicit teaching of the foundational meetings that originated the Keswick theology in at least two senses. This Higher Life Quietism is explicitly tied to that of the "most renowned of the quietists, Madame Guyon . . . one can only wish that more went half as far as she did, in the passion for saving the sinful" (pgs. 421-422), which she somehow was capable of doing, although she believed a false gospel. The only qualification stated to the commendation of Guyon's Quietism is that she "may"—it is only a possibility, not a certainty—have "gone somewhat further than was right"—what is certain is that "one can only wish that more went half as far as she did."

[1991] Pg. 295, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Cf. pg. 299.

[1992] Pgs. 68-69, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Arthur T. Pierson. New York, NY: London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900. Italics in original. Pierson goes on to illustration the Higher Life passivity by comparing his doctrine of the Christian's role in sanctification with impersonal, unthinking objects: the "machine . . . plane . . . knife . . . axe . . . bow . . . rod . . . staff . . . saw . . . hammer . . . sword . . . spear . . . threshing instrument . . . flail . . . vessel." The idea that the believer is in willful, deliberate cooperation with God by grace is definitively and deliberately excluded, and solely impersonal symbols are

quietistic happiness, since the Higher Life was "an easy life of rest and ease . . . without effort," indeed, "the only easy life."[1993] Unfortunately, when Moule and other Keswick writers followed the Smiths and warned of "letting the self-life intrude itself into the work of God,"[1994] they were not warning only of the danger of fallen, sinful volitions in man, or of making one's own self rather than the glory of God one's goal. Rather, they were teaching the quietistic doctrine that the human personality itself needed, in unbiblical ways, to be passive, as Hannah W. Smith taught when she opposed the "self-life" in favor of the Quietism of Quakerism and Roman Catholic mysticism, or when Lord Mount-Temple and others exhorted at Broadlands, "Let us give up the self-life" for the Higher Life flowing from the Divine Seed within.[1995] Not sin—including the sin of selfishness—but "self," the active human personality, was the problem for Keswick. Thus, Bishop Moule, the man Keswick recognizes as its most scholarly advocate, consciously and deliberately labeled the Keswick theology he loved and defended a form of Quietism, a fact supported by other Keswick writers such as Andrew Murray and Jessie Penn-Lewis.[1996] The plain historical facts indicate, contrary to the revisionistic history set forth by Barabas, that "the Quietists and other Catholic mystics [were] widely accepted as part of the true holiness movement."[1997] Thus, classic statements of the Keswick theology by its proponents affirm: "The Keswick message . . . [is] 'quietism.'"[1998] According to Keswick, by a cessation from effort, the believer can pass

---

employed. The Biblical metaphors for a Christian that show his active willing and doing are all passed by—the Christian is not the servant who obeys, the sheep that follows the Shepherd, the watchman who is vigilant, the warrior who fights, and the athlete who wrestles, boxes, and runs. He is only the "plane" or the "machine" that runs when an electric current flows through it.

[1993] See pgs. 58, 84, 86, 211, 313-314, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; also pgs. 276, 292, etc., *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

[1994] pg. 172, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas.

[1995] Pgs. 184-185, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[1996] Barabas himself (pg. 138-139, *So Great Salvation*) quotes Murray's quietistic affirmation (from pgs. 65-73, *The Full Blessing of Pentecost*, by Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Revell, 1908) that, for the Christian, "My life must be expelled; then the Spirit of Jesus will flow in," so that, Barabas concludes, "our own life must be utterly cast aside, to make full room for the life of God." For the influence of the Romanist mystical Quietist Madame Guyon on Jessie Penn-Lewis, see the section "Keswick Theology and Continuationism or Anti-Cessationism" below, the chapter on "Evan Roberts and Jessie-Penn Lewis."

[1997] Pg. 64, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan.

[1998] Pg. 181, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Its Method, and its Men*, ed. Charles Harford. In another chapter explaining "some characteristics of the message," of Keswick, the book affirmed: "[P]eople might call it Quietism. Call it what they would, it was very real and very beautiful to see" (pg. 99).

from the state where the "Lord [is] unused" to one where he can "use the Lord"[1999] to become sanctified. The secret of victory and sanctification by faith alone was that "we had nothing to do but remain quiet, and the Lord would do everything for us."[2000] Keswick, following Hannah W. and Robert P. Smith and the Broadlands Conferences,[2001] affirms that one is to "hand over the fleshly deeds of the body to the Spirit for mortification . . . Romans 8:13 . . . [and] stand in faith[.] . . . It is the Holy Spirit's responsibility to do the rest. Sanctification is thus the result, not of attempts at

---

[1999] Pg. 174, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. The plain Biblical truth is that God uses the believer—the phraseology of the believer using God is unscriptural and repulsive, and too much like the thought of the later Word of Faith heresy. Nevertheless, at least among certain (though, happily, not all) prominent Keswick writers, following the theological trajectory of the Keswick precursor Conventions, the believer deciding to "use the Lord" or "use Christ" or "use God" to become sanctified was a regular part of the terminology of sanctification. For example, W. H. Griffith Thomas, trying to clear up what he alleged were misrepresentations of the Keswick theology by B. B. Warfield, and trying to put the most orthodox and moderate view he could on the Keswick doctrine, quoted as paradigmatic Moule's preaching at Keswick and stating four different times that "we can use . . . Christ" for our sanctification, and another Keswick convention minister stating that "Keswick . . . is the idea of Christ . . . used fully" (see pgs. 279, 287, 455, 456, 458, "The Victorious Life (I.)," & "The Victorious Life (II.), W. H. Griffith Thomas, *Bibliotheca Sacra* July & October 1919, 267-288 & 455-467). Later Keswick writers, such as Watchman Nee's successor Witness Lee, could speak of "qualified" people who "can properly use the Holy Spirit" (pg. 137, *Guidelines for the Lord's Table Meeting and the Pursuit of* Life, Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 2005). Warfield incisively notes:

> It would probably be no exaggeration to say that no heresy could be more gross than that heresy which conceives the operations of God the Holy Spirit under the forms of the action of an impersonal, natural force. . . . [This] deals with God the Holy Spirit, the source of all grace, in utter neglect of his personality, as if he were a natural force, operating, not when and where and how he pleases, but uniformly and regularly wherever his activities are released. . . . The conception is not essentially different from that of storing electricity, say, in a Leyden jar, whence it can be drawn upon for use. How dreadful the conception is may be intimated by simply speaking of it with frankness under its true forms of expression: it is equivalent to saying that saving grace, God the Holy Spirit, is kept on tap, and released at [one's] will to do the work required of it. . . . [Men] contain in them the Holy Spirit as a salvation-working power which operates whenever and wherever it, we can scarcely say he, is applied. . . . And this obviously involves, in the third place, the subjection of the Holy Spirit in his gracious operations to the control of men. . . . The initiative is placed in [men] . . . and the Holy Spirit is placed at their disposal. He goes where they convey him; he works when they release him for work; his operations wait on their permission; and apart from their direction and control he can work no salvation. It ought to be unnecessary to say that this is a degrading conception of the modes of activity of the Holy Spirit. Its affinities are not with religion in any worthy sense of that word, which implies personal relations with a personal God, but with magic. At bottom, it conceives of the divine operations as at the disposal of man, who uses God for his own ends; and utterly forgets that rather God must be conceived as using man for his ends. (pgs. 82-84, *The Plan of Salvation: Five Lectures*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1915)

[2000] Pg. 173, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[2001] E. g., Hannah W. Smith taught "the plan of handing over your temptations to Him to conquer" instead of resisting them in His strength (Letter to her cousin Carrie, February 26, 1867, reproduced in the entry for February 20 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter). Robert P. Smith proclaimed, based on a misinterpretation of Galatians 2:20, that the believer's part is not to actively mortify sin: "[O]ur work is simply to hand everything over to Him. . . . Suffer Christ to live out His own glorious life in you hour by hour . . . [you will be] more . . . free from effort each day" (pg. 220, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

suppression of the flesh, but of faith in the finished work of Calvary."[2002] In contrast to Keswick, the Bible says that the believer is himself to actively "mortify the deeds of the body . . . through the Spirit" (Romans 8:13; Colossians 3:5), not refuse to mortify them but hand them over to the Spirit. Keswick teaches that the Christian is not to try to suppress the flesh, but Scripture commands him not merely to suppress his ethically sinful flesh, but to go far beyond that, and put it to death. The Biblical relationship between faith and effort in sanctification, which has already been explicated,[2003] is dramatically different from the Quietism inherent within the Keswick theology. Scripture denies passivity and Quietism in sanctification, and thus denies Keswick theology.[2004]

Keswick unbiblically depreciates the importance of sanctification as a process, as progressive growth. This fact is evident in direct statements such as that, for Keswick, "[s]anctification is primarily and fundamentally . . . no[t] a process"[2005] and that the "conventional threefold division" which considers sanctification as positional, progressive,[2006] and ultimate is not characteristic of Keswick in the way the crisis, gift, process division is.[2007] This neglect of progressive sanctification also evidences itself in that Barabas spends only half a page on this aspect of the doctrine, while he spends forty pages describing sanctification as a crisis and a gift—progressive sanctification gets 1.25% the treatment that the other aspects receive in Keswick. Indeed, considering the

---

[2002] Pgs. 106-107, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. Note the false dichotomy Barabas makes between faith in the finished work of Christ and active effort to mortify the flesh; in Biblical sanctification the two are the most intimate friends, not the irreconcilable opposites Barabas makes them.

[2003] See the chapters "The Just Shall Live by Faith" and "Does Colossians 2:6-7 Teach Sanctification by Faith Alone?" above.

[2004] Packer notes:

> Passivity means conscious inaction—in this case, inner inaction. A call to passivity—conscientious, consecrated passivity—has sometimes been read into certain biblical texts, but it cannot be read out of any of them. Thus, for instance, to "yield" or "present" oneself to God (Romans 6:13; 12:1), or as it is sometimes put, to "surrender" or "give ourselves up" to him, is not passivity. Paul's meaning is not that having handed ourselves over to our Master, we should then lapse into inaction, waiting for Christ to move us instead of moving ourselves, but rather that we should report for duty, saying as Paul himself said on the Damascus road, "What shall I do, Lord? . . ." (Acts 22:10) and setting no limits to what Christ by his Spirit through his Word may direct us to do. This is activity! Again, being "led by the Spirit of God" (Romans 8:14; Galatians 5:18) is not passivity. Paul's meaning is not that we should do nothing till celestial promptings pop into our minds, but that we should resolutely labor by prayer and effort to obey the law of Christ and mortify sin (see Galatians 5:13-6:19; and Romans 8:5-13, to which v. 14 looks back). This too is activity!
>
> Surely we need not go further. The point is plain. Passivity, which quietists think liberates the Spirit, actually resists and quenches him. Souls that cultivate passivity do not thrive, but waste away. The Christian's motto should not be "Let go and let God" but "Trust God and get going!" . . . [P]assivity [is] . . . unbiblical . . . and hostile to Christian maturity. (pg. 128, *Keep In Step With The Spirit,* J. I. Packer)

[2005] Pg. 88, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[2006] Barabas' substitution of "experimental" for "progressive" in the division of sanctification into positional, progressive, and ultimate on pgs. 84-85 is noteworthy. The term "experimental" does not carry within it necessarily the idea of progress and growth.

[2007] Pgs. 84-85, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

entire scope of Barabas's discussion of "God's Provision For Sin" and "Consecration," where the Keswick doctrine of sanctification as crisis, gift, and process is explicated and contrasted with the views he deems erroneous, the discussion of progressive sanctification receives attention only 0.75% of the time.[2008] This vast underemphasis stands in stark contrast to the tremendous amount of Biblical material dealing with progress in sanctification.

What Barabas writes in his half-page on progressive sanctification is, however, sound; although it is not properly prominent, nonetheless Keswick is said to accept the classical doctrine that "experimental sanctification is the day-by-day transformation of the believer into the image of Christ, and is progressive in nature. Beginning at regeneration, it continues all through life, but is never complete."[2009] Barabas indicates his dependence in his discussion of progressive sanctification upon the exposition of *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life* by Evan Hopkins.[2010] Hopkins learned the Higher Life theology from William Boardman and Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith[2011] and was brought to adopt Keswick theology after looking at the placid face of one who had received it,[2012]

2008 Pgs. 61-127, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas, 66 pages. 0.5/66=0.75%.

2009 Pg. 85, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

2010 Pg. 85, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

2011 Thus, Hopkins read "Dr. W. E. Boardman's volume on *The Higher Christian Life* . . . [and] a series of papers by the American, Robert Pearsall Smith, on the subject of Holiness," and then went to a meeting where he heard R. P. Smith preach. Hearing Smith, Hopkins affirmed: "I felt that he had received an overflowing blessing, far beyond anything that I knew"—and by means of Robert Smith's self-testimony overflowing Christian joy—although, in truth, Robert P. Smith was a miserable unconverted wretch who was promulgating sexual thrills as Spirit baptism at the time—Hopkins came to adopt the Higher Life doctrine of Boardman and Smith that was then promulgated at the Keswick Convention. The key passage that led Hopkins to the Higher Life was Mr. Smith's misinterpretation of 2 Corinthians 9:8, which was, Mr. Smith averred, an affirmation that Christ "would do *all,* and would live in [the Christian] His Own Holy Life—the only Holy Life possible to us," not, as an examination of the context and grammatical-historical interpretation would affirm, an affirmation that God would provide physically for His people who give generously to the needy. Mr. Smith's view of 2 Corinthians 9:8 became "Mr. Hopkins['s] . . . *locus classicus*, his Gospel within the Gospel, the sure ground where he had cast his anchor," so that "[m]any a time, in the Conventions of the years that followed, Mr. Hopkins would read this text" and lead many others to the bright discovery of the Higher Life which was taught by it, when ripped from its context and interpreted allegorically (pgs. 52-55, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). In 1875 Hopkins took over the work of Robert P. Smith's magazine, *The Christian Pathway to Power*, after Smith's public disgrace as a result of being caught in a woman's bedroom teaching the erotic Baptism. Hopkins continued to edit the magazine until 1913, renaming the magazine *The Life of Faith* in 1883 (pgs. 73-74, *ibid*). Even forty years later in 1913, Hopkins testified at the Keswick Convention to the centrality of the teaching he had received from Robert P. Smith in 1873 (cf. pgs. 24-25, 38-39, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

2012 Pg. 176, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Many at Broadlands, it seems, had special-looking faces that, at least in a culture strongly under the influence of Romanticism, validated the truth of the Higher Life theology, and formed part of the indissoluable link between Higher Life spirituality and the continuationistic Faith Cure, that is, the Higher Life for the soul and for the body. "So many faces quite

having sat at the feet of the Smiths and Mr. Boardman from the time of the first spiritualist-hosted Broadlands Conference onwards[2013] even to the last one.[2014] He "was

changed their character in those days" of the 1874 Conference (pg. 128, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple). The transformation was comparable to the miraculous "shining of [the] face . . . of Moses" (pg. 131, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscenses of the Broadlands Conventions*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). At Broadlands "Hannah Smith was radiant," (pgs. 132-134, *Memorials*), for "her face gained a soft, Madonna-like beauty . . . her . . . sparking glance . . . [and] pure face spoke for her. . . . She looked as if she knew the [spiritual] secret. Fair and pure and glad, a piece of nature fresh and racy, and simple, and full of vitality" (pgs. 49-50, 160, 222, *The Life that is Life Indeed*). Even many an "inspired face" was present at Broadlands (pgs. 132-134, *Memorials* & pg. 59, *The Life that is Life Indeed*)—it was not in Hannah Smith alone that the "inner light" shone in the "inspiration that came from her shining face" (pgs. 121-123, *The Life that is Life Indeed*). The "face" of the universalist "George MacDonald . . . [was] very beautiful . . . very like the pictures of our Lord" (pg. 57, *The Life that is Life Indeed*), such pictures apparently being good, not sinful and idolatrous (cf. Exodus 20:4-6). Indeed, "looks that were Christ's . . . on human faces" were found at Broadlands, where "a desire for the heavenly light . . . sh[one] on [many an] uplifted face," in line with truth learned from "Swedenborg" (pg. 82, *ibid*). Such glowing faces were similar to the faces of the cute baby-like cherubs that allegedly helped God make Adam out of dust, as seen in a painting of Michelangelo—"how their faces shine" as they usurp the uniquely Divine work of creation! Like such mythic cherubs, the perfectionist "Amanda Smith" possessed a "glowing face" as she petitioned the moon and the stars to tell God that she was a sinner and ask Him to forgive her (pgs. 73-74, 130, *The Life that is Life Indeed*). The hell-rejecting theological liberal F. D. Maurice was a paradigmatic example of the fact that the "*faces* of some of God's children shine" (pg. 199, *ibid*. Italics in original.). Ion Keith Falkoner had an "angel face." Theodore Monod possessed such a "glowing countenance" that one "felt" he was in the presence of a holy man, for "his face was transfigured" and "holy fervor and deep reverence were expressed in face and . . . revealed, in a way no words could do," even the words of Scripture, "the blessedness of communion with God." Canon Carter of Truro had a "sweet, pure face with morning peace upon it." The "radiant . . . lovely face[s]" of the "queens of beauty of [their] time" were present at Broadlands; indeed, "the whole company" went "streaming through the garden with radiant faces" at the Conferences (pgs. 76, 85, 102, 130, 176, 221, *ibid*). Mr. Mount-Temple gained, through the truths proclaimed at Broadlands, a "sacred illumination of face, too sacred to speak of . . . [which] was noticed . . . and tenderly recorded . . . [a] blessed face . . . placid and often illuminated with wonderful flickerings of light from beyond" pgs. 132-134, *Memorials*). After all, at especially spiritual times "a radiant, joyous, wondering glow often lights up the face of [those] who have soared beyond the shadow of our night" (pg. 170, *ibid*), even as "such brightness [had] appeared in [the] angelic face" of the Catholic monk "St. Cuthbert" (pgs. 7-8, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conventions*). Thus, the generality of the "goodly company" at Broadlands "were beautiful, and what an attraction there always is in beauty! . . . [P]hysical beauty is . . . a source of real bliss, and . . . it takes the impress of the spiritual . . . Beauty always attracts us; we enjoy it, wish for it . . . beauty is truly an expression of character" (pgs. 35-36, *ibid*). Consequently, the shining faces at Broadlands proved the truth of the Higher Life, since "[s]uch faces are truly . . . windows, through which we see the soul" (pg. 46, *ibid*). Such validation of Higher Life teaching by shiny faces and other similarly utterly unathoritative and extra-Scriptural chimeras passed through Broadlands to the Keswick movement.

[2013] Both the Smiths and Boardman were Higher Life teachers at Broadlands, as well as at the Oxford and other Higher Life gatherings; cf. pg. 20, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck; pg. 20, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Note the lists of names of those who met at Broadlands, where Evan Hopkins, Webb-Peploe, and other early Keswick leaders are listed along with the Pearsall Smiths, on pgs. 118, 148, of *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple.

[2014] Pg. 202, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Thus, Hopkins regularly was present and preached regularly at the Broadlands Conferences, as he was present and preached at the Keswick Conventions.

for years the acknowledged leader of the Keswick teaching" and "the theologian of the movement. . . . He spoke at the first Keswick Convention, and appeared at Keswick as a leader for thirty-nine years without a break. No one was regarded with greater respect there than he."[2015] While Hopkins was deeply influenced by the heretics surrounding him at Keswick and Broadlands, what he states in the section of his book on which Barabas depends[2016] is as Scriptural[2017] as what Barabas derives from him. Hopkins even admirably affirms, quoting another writer, that in sanctification "the whole aspect of human nature is transformed."[2018] Barabas claims Keswick acknowledges that the process aspect of sanctification includes "a soul that is continually increasing in the knowledge of God, and abounding in fruits of righteousness . . . [and] continued progress in the development of Christ-like character."[2019] Such an affirmation is certainly Biblical.

What is unusual about such affirmations by the Keswick advocate is that they sound remarkably like the statement by Warfield that the "Holy Spirit . . . cures our sinning precisely by curing our sinful nature; He makes the tree good that the fruit may be good,"[2020] yet Barabas inveighs against the doctrine of Warfield as an unscriptural position that Keswick opposes. If there is no real difference between the doctrine of Keswick and that of Warfield, Barabas's attack on Warfield is, at this point, inexplicable and unjustifiable; if there is a difference, Barabas does not make its character clear at all. It would have been of great value to see Barabas attempt to reconcile the classical model of sanctification as positional, progressive, and ultimate and the "more characteristic" division of sanctification by Keswick as process, crisis, and gift. Had he successfully done so, one could not claim that such a reconciliation is impossible. Unfortunately,

---

2015 Pgs. 158-159, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas. Polluck affirms that Hopkins, after skipping the first Keswick Convention, attended the next forty-one, not thirty-nine as Barabas stated, without a break (pg. 39, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck). Hopkins learned the Higher Life doctrine "after listening to Robert Pearsall Smith on the subject of Holiness," and an address by Hopkins "was the means of winning T. D. Harford-Battersby," co-founder of the Keswick Convention with the Quaker Robert Wilson, "over to the Higher Life movement" (pgs. 158-159, *So Great Salvation;* cf. pgs. 75ff., *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie).

2016 Pgs. 99-102, *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life,* Hopkins.

2017 Unfortunately, other things Hopkins taught were not a little less Scriptural; for example, his preaching at the Oxford Convention that one must "begin" in the Higher Life by rejecting the active obedience of Christ in redemption (pg. 93, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874), is, one hopes, simply loose language.

2018 Pg. 101, *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life,* Hopkins.

2019 Pg. 123, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. While Barabas does not have a specific section on sanctification as a process other than half of pg. 85, scattered statements about process are occasionally found within his comparatively massive discussions of sanctification as gift and as crisis.

2020 Pg. 71, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas, quoting Warfield, *Perfectionism* vol 2, pgs. 579-583.

Barabas simply asserts that Keswick accepts, although it deemphasizes, the classic model alongside of its usual and characteristic process, crisis, and gift model, without the slightest explanation of how the two apparently strongly divergent positions can both be true. The palpable contradictions between the two models are ignored, probably because the "Convention is not interested in academic discussions of theology or ethics, or even adding to the store of Bible knowledge of those who attend"[2021] and "Keswick furnishes us with . . . no carefully prepared, weighty discourses of a theological nature."[2022] Since the classic position that sanctification involves the progressive transformation of the believer into the image of Christ appears to directly contradict the Keswick position that God the Holy Ghost does not make the Christian himself more inwardly holy and less sinful, Keswick's affirmations that "purity [is] never a state,"[2023] and that "holiness does not consist in a state of purity"[2024] seem utterly irreconcilable with the classic doctrine of progressive sanctification it claims to uphold.[2025] Keswick's affirmation of both its

---

[2021] Pg. 108, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[2022] Pg. 51, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[2023] Pg. 47, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

[2024] Pg. 49, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas. The page adds the qualifier "apart from Christ," but its point in context is not simply to assert the obvious fact that Christ is the Author of all spiritual strength, life, and growth. Rather, it denies the progressive inward renewal of the believer and the progressive death of the principle of indwelling sin to affirm that nothing happens within the Christian besides counteraction.

[2025] Barabas does not clearly set forth the insufficient view that progress in sanctification is merely an increased appropriation of Christ, while the person himself remains unchanged—indeed, his quotation of Hopkins appears to deny this view—but other Higher Life writers have done so. Warfield refutes this position while discussing the doctrine of the German Lutheran Higher Life leader Theodore Jellinghaus (who affirmed typical Lutheran heresies, such as baptismal regeneration and opposition to eternal security, among other very serious errors on the way of salvation). Jellinghaus had learned of the Higher Life from Robert Pearsall Smith and his associates. Keswick's leading to the rise of German Pentecostalism brought Jellinghaus to renounce the Higher Life as he saw its fruits more clearly. Warfield records:

> [The Higher Life doctrine of Jellinghaus is that] [a]s we received forgiveness of sins at once on our first believing, so do we receive our full deliverance from the power of sin at once on this our second believing. But, along with this, emphasis is thrown on the continuousness of both the cause and the effect. Jesus saves us *now*—if I believe now; and the believer is to live in a continuous believing and consequent continuous salvation. This is, of course, the well known "moment by moment" doctrine of the Higher Life teachers. The main purpose of this teaching is to prevent us from supposing that the source of our holiness is in ourselves. But it has the additional effect of denying with great emphasis that the seat of our holiness—any of it, at any time—is in ourselves. It thus makes our holiness in all its extent purely a holiness of acts, never of nature. What we obtain by faith is Christ—as a Preserver from sinful acts. By continuous faith we obtain Him continuously—as Preserver from sinful acts; and only from those particular sinful acts with which we are for the moment threatened. We do not at any time obtain Him as Savior from all possible sins, but only as Savior from the particular sinful acts for protection from which we, from time to time, need Him. Thus we are never made "holy" in any substantial sense, so that we are ourselves holy beings. And also accordingly we are never made "holy" in any conclusive sense, so that, being holy in ourselves, naturally we continue holy. This is the way Jellinghaus expresses himself . . . [w]e are, says Jellinghaus, like a poor relation living in a rich man's house as a dependent, and receiving all he needs day by day from his benefactor, but never being made rich himself.
>
> The purpose in view here is to emphasize our constant dependence on Christ. But this is done so unskilfully as to end in denying the possibility of our sanctification. We never are ourselves made holy; only our acts are provided for. We ask nothing and we get nothing beyond the meeting of our daily needs in

characteristic crisis, gift, and process model and the classic doctrine of progressive sanctification appears unintelligible.

Illuminating further the tension between the Keswick attempt to affirm both its standard model of sanctification and classical orthodoxy, Barabas states: "Much is made by Keswick of sanctification as a crisis. It is true, Keswick says, that sanctification invariably begins at regeneration. There can be no question about this. On the other hand, many Christians do not make the progress in sanctification that they should. . . . For this reason real progress is often not made until they come to a spiritual crisis."[2026] The affirmation that sanctification invariably begins at regeneration is certainly Scriptural—the affirmation that many Christians do not grow as much as they should could only be improved by affirming that no Christian grows as much as he really ought to. Keswick is to be applauded for affirming with the Scriptures and historic Baptist doctrine that

---

sustaining our struggles on earth. As for *ourselves*, we remain unholy, apparently forever. . . . There is a confusion here between the source and the seat of [sanctification]. . . . [Jellinghaus writes,] "The Christian can be pure only as a member of Christ our Head, as a branch of the vine. In himself every Christian is a branch of sinful humanity and is prone to sin. Only through implantation into Christ's death and resurrection can he be and remain holy. Separated from Christ and His purifying blood (blood signifies the life of Christ given in death and resurrection), he is sinful and has sin." . . . If this be true then salvation is impossible. We are never saved. We only seem to be saved, because Christ works through us the works of a saved soul. That is not the way John conceived it, or Christ. Naturally most painful results follow from such representations. For example, our aspirations are lowered. We are never to wish or seek to be holy ourselves, but are to be content with being enabled to meet in our unholiness the temptations of the day. We lose the elevating power of a high ideal. And we are to be satisfied with never being "well-pleasing to God." . . . What the Scriptures teach is that we shall be more and more transformed into Christ's image until at last, when we see Him as He is, we shall be like Him, and therefore in ourselves—as He has made us—well-pleasing to God.

There is expressly included in this doctrine a provision for a progressive sanctification, along the ordinary lines of the teaching of the Higher Life Movement in this matter. We have seen Jellinghaus in passages just quoted limiting the ability of the Christian to enter "immediately" into the victorious power and peace-bringing leading of Christ, by such phrases as "according to the measure of his knowledge," and "for the needs of which he is presently conscious." The Christian is freed from all the sinning which at the stage of Christian knowledge to which he has attained he knows to be sinning; and as his knowledge grows so his objective sanctification increases. It is apparently also repeatedly suggested that it depends entirely on the Christian's own action whether or not he retains his hold on Christ and so continues in his sanctifying walk. Undoubtedly this is in accordance with Jellinghaus' fundamental conception of the relation of the Christian to Christ and the way of salvation. He continually suggests that our standing in Christ depends absolutely on ourselves. Those that believe in Christ, he tells us for example, "have in Him forgiveness and righteousness, and also shall retain it *so long as they abide in Christ*." It is, he continues, like a king granting public amnesty in terms like these: He who appears within a year at a particular place, lays down his weapons, and swears fealty—to him then shall be handed an already prepared diploma of pardon, and he will remain pardoned so long as he maintains his loyalty. . . . Our continued justification depends therefore absolutely on our continued faith, and the implication is that this is left wholly in our hands. Justification cannot therefore be made to cover our future sins—the sin, for example, of failing faith. . . . What Jellinghaus is really laboring for here is to make room in some way for "falling from grace." He is possessed with the fear that if he does not limit the scope of justification, at least with respect to the grosser future sins, he will give license to sin, which in the end means merely that he has more confidence in man's efforts than in God's grace. What he has succeeded in doing is only to destroy all possibility of assurance of salvation. Men are cast back on their own works, whether of faith or of conduct, for their hope of ultimate salvation. God's justification is valid only if they maintain their faith and commit no sins of malice aforethought, or of conscious indifference, or unlovingness. (Warfield, *Perfectionism* vol. 1, Chapter 7, "The German Higher Life Movement in its Chief Exponent.")

[2026] Pg. 86, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

sanctification begins with regeneration, but the nature of this pre-crisis sanctification is difficult to determine on characteristic Keswick theological presuppositions. Furthermore, if only "often" does "real progress" fail to take place without a crisis, then sometimes "real progress" does take place without a crisis. If Barabas means what he says, then Keswick concedes that sanctification always begins at justification and that believers can grow in a great way without ever having a post-conversion crisis experience of the sort that the Convention emphasizes. What, then, becomes of the Keswick criticism that those who affirm that sanctification is certain for all the regenerate, and no Keswick crisis is required, are teaching that growth is "automatic"?[2027] How can Keswick unite this concession to the clear teaching of the Bible with its typical doctrine that "sanctification is a process beginning with a crisis"?[2028] How can sanctification both begin at regeneration, and yet not begin until after regeneration one experiences a crisis? The tension between these positions is palpable in Barabas's successive quotations from Hopkins and Andrew Murray. Hopkins affirmed: "No one . . . can be really trusting Christ to save him from the penalty of sin who is not as sincerely desiring to be saved from its power. . . . The essence of conversion is the turning away from sin unto God. The soul that truly receives forgiveness is set also upon holiness." Murray stated: "[V]ery many Christians at conversion . . . never think of saying that they are no more going to have their own will . . . there is real need [therefore, after conversion], to put one's whole life under the management of Jesus."[2029] Barabas states later that "so many . . . Christians . . . have never faced a crisis in their lives—a crisis involving who will be the master of their lives: they themselves, or Christ,"[2030] and that "not many . . . Christians . . . know what is meant by [Christ's] lordship over their lives."[2031] How can someone turn from sin, sincerely desiring to be saved from its power, and become set

---

2027 A non-Higher Life, historic Baptist doctrine of sanctification denies that Christian growth is "automatic." It affirms that "voluntary agency" is involved in sanctification, so that, as Hovey explains:

> [A] believer's progress in sanctification must therefore be determined in no small degree by his readiness to obey the commands of Christ. It is not, then, surprising that some are far in advance of others . . . growth is not uniform through all the periods of Christian life. . . . [There are] times, therefore, when growth seems to be arrested . . . [and] also times of manifest and rapid advance . . . and these times would be far more frequent if Christians were more given to prayer and labor. (pgs. 135-137, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, Alvah Hovey)

For that matter, the classic evangelical Protestant doctrine of sanctification likewise denies that sanctification is "automatic." While there may be someone on earth who believes that sanctification is in truth automatic, if Keswick represents its opponents as advocates of an automatic sanctification, it misrepresents the overwhelming majority of them.

2028 Pg. 110, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

2029 Pg. 112, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas, quoting Hopkins from *The Life of Faith*, August 1890, pg. 141, and Murray from *What Full Surrender Means*, pg. 9.

2030 Pg. 124, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

2031 Pg. 143, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

upon holiness (Hopkins) without even thinking about not having his own will, without putting his life under the management of Christ, and without deciding who will be the master of his life (Murray)? Is this another instance where Keswick's lack of "carefully prepared, weighty discourses of a theological nature"[2032] places its system in at least apparent contradiction, so that a demonstration of how such affirmations can be reconciled is required, but lacking? Or is the fact of the matter rather that the Keswick theology is truly contradictory,[2033] caught between the teaching of Scripture that all who are justified are also changed and the development of its system from its historical roots in the Broadlands Conference and in Higher Life ideas that water down the power of regeneration to exalt a post-conversion crisis at which alone sanctification is initiated? The Keswick doctrine of sanctification as process is both greatly underemphasized and is unintelligible.[2034]

Keswick theology rightly exalts the Lord Jesus Christ, His power to sanctify sinners, and the necessity of faith in the Christian life. Its call to immediate surrender to God and the renunciation of sin are Scriptural, as are its emphasis upon union with Christ, the power of the Holy Spirit, prayer, and evangelism. However, while these aspects of the Keswick theology are Biblical, refreshing, and key to an increase in spiritual life, they are not unique to Keswick, as vast numbers of Christians who reject Keswick theology embrace them also. On the other hand, the problems in the Keswick theology are severe. Because of its corrupt roots, Keswick errs seriously in its ecumenical tendencies, theological shallowness or even incomprehensibility, neglect of the role of the Word of God in sanctification, shallow views of sin and perfectionism, support of some tenants of Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism, improper divorce of justification and sanctification, confusion about the nature of saving repentance, denial that God's sanctifying grace always frees Christians from bondage to sin and changes them, failure to warn strongly about the possibility of those who are professedly Christians being unregenerate, support for an unbiblical pneumatology, belief in the continuation of the sign gifts, maintainance of significant exegetical errors, distortion of the positions and critiques of opponents of the errors of Keswick, misrepresention of the

---

2032 Pg. 51, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

2033 Barabas is not alone in setting forth the contradictory character of the Keswick doctrine of sanctification as process. Althouse notes: "Thus, in the Keswick articulation of sanctification, a tension existed between the crisis and the progressive" ("Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation).

2034 For a study of the question of whether Keswick critics misrepresent Keswick, or whether Keswick doctrine is itself contradictory and unintelligible, see the chapter, "Do Keswick Critics Misunderstand Keswick Theology?"

nature of faith in sanctification, support for a kind of Quietism, and denial that God actually renews the nature of the believer to make him more personally holy. Keswick theology differs in important ways from the Biblical doctrine of sanctification. It should be rejected.

Applications from the Analysis and Critique of Keswick Theology

The believer who trembles at the Word of the Lord can learn much from the examination and critique of Keswick theology. First, since charity rejoiceth in the truth (1 Corinthians 13:6), he can greatly delight in the blessed truths retained by the Keswick Convention from the older orthodoxy. Does Keswick seek to exalt Christ? Hallelujah! Does not the heart of the upright child of God cry, "Oh that the Lord Jesus would be exalted the more—in my own life, in my congregation, in my city, in my country, and in the world!" Does not such a one long for the day when every knee shall bow before Him, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father? Jesus Christ cannot be too highly exalted, and the feebleness the Christian recognizes in his own exaltation and glorying in Christ is exceedingly grievous to him. Does he not look with expectant joy for the time when the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea, and his own heart will be free from indwelling sin forever? "Come, come Lord Jesus!" is the upright's cry.

Furthermore, the blessed fact that Jesus Christ is full of truth and grace—that He is an overflowing treasury of grace who fills His dear redeemed and upright ones with the communicable Divine attributes by His Spirit, based on His purchase of them at infinite cost, is an unspeakable consolation. The Lord's purchased people marvel at their Father's infinite power, exerted on their behalf to sanctify them. They rightly renounce all self-confidence, self-dependence, and self-righteousness, to wait in an active faith upon their God in Christ, and upon Him only. He alone must receive all the glory for their sanctification, for it is only His power that can affect that supernatural transformation from glory to glory into the image of their Head, Christ Jesus. To whatever extent the Keswick theology has led believers to such spiritual motions, to that extent they can thank God for the truth within its Higher Life system. If Keswick preaching has led them from backsliding to being right with God—if it has led them to the immediate renunciation of sin—if it has led them to renounce all self-dependence—if it has led them to greater communion with the Holy Spirit—if it has brought them to greater fervency in prayer—if it has led them to proclaim the sweet name of Jesus Christ

with greater passion, so that the world is more filled with the savor of His name than it would have been otherwise—can any not rejoice at these things and praise the Lord?

Indeed, those precious elements of truth emphasized at Keswick are what make the Convention's system appealing to the Christian heart. Reader, do not by any means turn away from these blessed truths because your renewed mind cannot bear any longer the corruptions and errors mixed with them at Keswick. Some critique Keswick because of a fervent zeal for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, rejoicing in the truths affirmed by Keswick but deploring its errors. Others critique Keswick because they have no zeal for the truth and use the corruptions of the Keswick theology as an excuse to live a life of carnal self-pleasing. Do you reject the errors of the Keswick theology? You do well—but the devil knows that Keswick errors are false also, and such knowledge does not make Satan a whit more holy. Are you, in your opposition to Keswick errors, yet carnal, worldy, selfish, self-dependent, faithless, non-evangelistic, false-worshipping, careless, cold, and unspiritual? Then you are a vile hypocrite, and you need to get right with God. *Now*. Do not use the mote in your Keswick brother's eye as an excuse to smack people on the head with the two-by-four protruding from your own. Do not think you please the Lord if you yourself downplay God's white-hot holiness, diminish the immense loathsomeness of sin—of all sin, even the least—shrink from making pointed and specific application of Scripture to your life and the lives of those you are responsible to guide, dabble with pelagian or humanistic ideas, live by sight instead of by faith, and are openly and rebelliously ecumenical or are merely softly separatistic, happy to coexist with the Amalekites instead of putting them all under the ban and hewing Agag in pieces. Indeed, consider the warning of the Lord Jesus to the doctrinally sound church at Ephesus:

> I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: and hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted. Nevertheless I have *somewhat* against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent. (Revelation 2:2-5)

You do well to labor and work for God, and you do well to expose false apostles, such as those who originated the Keswick theology—but have you left your first love? Woe to you! Without love for Christ, all your works profit you nothing (1 Corinthians 13:1-3). Or are you even worse, so that you do not even labor with patience, expose false apostles, and serve the Lord without fainting? Will you then presume to take the Lord's statutes into your mouth, criticize Keswick, and speak about spiritual things, when you are a weak and worldly compromiser and a desperately backslidden and wicked sinner? It is

not enough to reject pseudo-spirituality—you must have a genuine and living Christian piety. Do not think that the Lord will be pleased with you if you reject, or fail to live, the truths affirmed at the Keswick Convention because of the errors also propogated there. Embrace and passionately love the truth, all of it, for the sake of He who is Truth Himself, and despise and passionately hate error, all of it, for the sake of Him who is Truth Himself.

Recognize that the ineffably precious gospel of Christ is a priceless jewel filled with beauties that the angels desire to look into (1 Peter 1:12). Consequently, all aspects of the gospel, in all its revealed fulness as the mind of Christ revealed to us in the Scripture, must be treasured and defended at all costs. You cannot be too precise with the gospel. Consequently, every one of the many errors and corruptions of the redeeming and sanctifying gospel propogated at Keswick must be absolutely and uncompromisingly rejected. Reject Keswick's Pelagianism. Reject Keswick's divorce of justification and sanctification. Reject Keswick's confusion on saving repentance, saving faith, and true conversion. Reject Keswick's practice of giving Christian assurance to the unregenerate and making them into two-fold children of hell. Reject Keswick's ecumenical embrace of wolves who devour God's flock. Reject Keswick's weakness on the efficacy of sanctifying grace, its shallow and often incomprehensible or contradictory theology, its corruption of the revealed truths about the work of the glorious Holy Ghost, its perfectionism, its eudemonism, its Quietism, its neglect of the role of the Word in sanctification, its Spirit-grieving and Bible-twisting experiential hermeneutic, and its denial of the mortifying and vivifying work of God the Spirit in progressively eradicating indwelling sin. Purge all the unbiblical influence of Keswick from your mind, and cast out any affection for Keswick theology from your heart. Keswick's false teachings are vile trash. Let them stink in the garbage bin and no longer corrupt the savor of Christ in the temple of the living God, whether the individual temple of the believer or the corporate temple of the congregation of Christ. We are not talking about the ideas of men, but the truths of God, the rejection of which constitutes sin for which the Lord Jesus had to shed His blood. Reject the Keswick theology for the Biblical and historic Baptist doctrine of sanctification.

The sufficiency of Scripture, and the abundance of Christian literature presenting truth on sanctification that is free from Keswick influence and error, makes it entirely unnecessary for believers to read or recommend Keswick authors. Keswick ideas should be purged from the heads of Christian preachers. Keswick theology should be purged from the seminaries, Bible colleges, Bible institutes, and all other teaching institutions of the churches—and all such teaching institutions ought themselves to be ministries of

particular churches (1 Timothy 3:15). Keswick books should be purged from Christian bookstores, as the massive and easy-to-read devotional literature of Keswick has been wildly successful in propogating Keswick spirituality. Hymns propogating Keswick theology should be recognized and dealt with appropriately. Keswick advocates of the past and present should be warned about, not set up as models of Biblical piety. Your soul, and the souls of those whom you influence spiritually, can be filled with a deep longing for revival, a zeal for evangelism and missions, a confidence in the power of the Holy Ghost, and, most of all, a love for Jesus Christ and His Father, with a resultant passion for holiness, without filling your head and the heads of others with Keswick theology. Pray and preach against the Keswick theology, that it may be abolished from the earth and be found only in the eternal dwelling place of the gospel-rejectors who hatched it.

Learn, by the example of the unhappy worldwide spread of the Keswick theology, the unmistakable fact that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Corinthians 5:6; Galatians 5:9). Keswick theology has profoundly influenced world-wide Christiandom and corrupted the doctrine of sanctification confessed by countless churches of Christ, because of a failure to mark, reprove, and separate from unrepentant advocates of Keswick errors. Whether deliberately or in ignorance, Barabas's sugar-coating of the deadly poison propagated by the wolves that originated the Keswick theology is inexcusable. Do not follow his example. Carelessness by God's pastors in protecting their flocks, and preachers' unthinking appropriation and propogation of unbiblical ideas wrapped in the tinsel of high-sounding testimonies, have contributed tremendously to the spread of Keswick. Many sincere preachers have unknowingly adopted, are proclaiming, and are imparting Keswick ideas to the next generation of church leaders, because such ideas were passed on to them by their ministrial forefathers. Now is the time to end this cycle of ignorance and error. Exercise great discernment as you hear the preaching of others. It is proper to exercise Biblical judgment when you hear the Word brought forth (cf. 1 Corinthians 14:29). Furthermore, if Biblical passages on separation would be violated by attendance at a meeting, fellowship with some person, or in any other way whatsoever, follow Scripture and remain separate. It does not matter if the speakers you will not hear are dynamic. It does not matter if it appears (in the short term, which is all that finite men can effectively gage) that great results arise from their work. The unscriptural work of Mr. and Mrs. Smith seemed to have glorious results in the short term; but in the long term the doctrine of sanctification in countless churches has been corrupted, hindering the holiness of vast numbers of God's people. Furthermore, entirely new heresies have arisen in Christiandom, in large part because of the Smith family's

continuationism. Ecumenicalism—and all other disobedience to Scripture—is never the right course, and never, in truth and in the long term, the most effective or even pragmatically the best course. However, the world, the flesh, and the devil can make tremendous harm seem beneficial by pointing to the short-term benefits and pleasures of sin. Oh man of God, have you failed to protect the people over whom the Holy Ghost has made you an overseer from unscriptural Higher Life theology, either by its promotion, its toleration, or by communion with its unrepentant propagators? Today is the day to repent and to determine, by God's grace, that you will no longer dishonor your Lord by such carelessness, but will allow only the uncorrupted truth on sanctification to be taught to the flock of God.

Recognize that the simple fact that someone is non-Keswick in his theology of sanctification does not mean that his teaching is automatically reliable. In addition to the errors on sanctification of non-Keswick perfectionisms, whether Roman Catholic, Quaker, Wesleyan, or Pentecostal, be on guard against the errors of Reformed, non-Baptist theology propogated by Puritanism. Do not move from accepting everything that Hannah Whitall Smith believed to accepting everything that John Owen, Jonathan Edwards, B. B. Warfield, or J. I. Packer believed simply because their writings obliterate the errors of Keswick. Follow Scripture alone, and find refuge in the protection offered by the pastors and teachers of the sound, separated, historic Baptist church of which you are—or ought to be—a member. The church is the place of the corporate manifestation on earth of the wisdom of God (Ephesians 3:10). How important it is to carefully exegete Scripture in the context of a true church, where the special presence and blessing of the Lord and the protection of church leadership is found!

Rather than hoping that you will come to a point where you will be satisfied with your spiritual progress, recognize that the more Christ-like the Spirit makes you, the more dissatisfied with your indwelling sin and your remaining unlikeness to God you will become, and the more you will be dissatisfied with your spiritual progress. Satisfaction with your spiritual state is not a sign of superior holiness or of the entrance into a Higher Life but of severe spiritual myopia. God punishes those that are at ease and settled on their lees (Jeremiah 48:11; Zephaniah 1:12). Do not seek for satisfaction in your spiritual attainments but for speedier progress in mortification and vivification, while finding sweet consolation and refreshment in communion with Jesus Christ. Very frequently people turn to Keswick theology—and other errors and false teachings—because they have not themselves truly tasted and seen the goodness of the Lord in their Christian experience. He who genuinely walks with God will see the shallow and trite writings of a Hannah Whitall Smith for what they truly are. Do not look within for happiness

through ease and quietistic rest, but look to Jesus for blessedness and true joy and run the quicker and with the greater endurance the race that it set before you. Reject the Keswick siren-song and false promise of perfect, undisturbed, perpetual, and carefree happiness, peace, and rest before heaven. Yes, God calls you to "rejoice evermore" (1 Thessalonians 5:16) and wishes you to pray and cast your burdens on Him instead of being full of care, so that you can experientially know "the peace of God, which passeth all understanding" (Philippians 4:7; cf. Isaiah 26:3-4). Nonetheless, indwelling sin will always be lusting against the Spirit as long as you are in this body of death. Greater fellowship with the Triune God in Christ, greater degrees of His grace, greater experience of His transforming power, and deeper eyeing of His beauty and glory, are intimately conjoined with greater self-abhorrence and deeper repentance over sins of commission, omission, and of the pervasive corruption engendered by the sin of your nature itself. Embrace and seek for, rather than rejecting, the "negative" side of Christian spirituality, for it is the necessary adjunct of the positive side. The lower down you fall in humility before the Lord, the higher He will lift you up—and the higher He lifts you up, the more dissatisfied you will be with what you yet lack, and the deeper down you will abase yourself in shame.

Finally, recognize that, while the battle will be prolonged, as a child of the living God, you are on the winning side. Glorious growth in Christlikeness is possible for you now, and perfect conformity to your Lord's perfect standard is your coming and certain blessedness. Enabled by the Spirit's grace, and trusting in Christ alone, strive mightily against and mortify your indwelling sin and all its manifestations. Diligently use the means God has appointed for your growth in grace. Read, study, meditate on, talk of, hear the exposition of, and practice the Word. Remember and hate the remaining coldness of your heart. Be watchful, pray, and eye Christ in faith and love, relying on His Spirit to transform you. Rejoice that your loving Father has decreed that your progressive sanctification, while not automatic, is certain, and fight the harder, recognizing that you are indeed judicially dead to sin, and that He who works in you both to will and do of His good pleasure will continue His good work in you until the day of Jesus Christ. Hallelujah!

Excursus XII: Do Keswick Critics Routinely Misrepresent Keswick Theology?

The contradictory nature and unintelligibility of the Higher Life position[2035] explains why defenders of Keswick can complain that its critics employ "inaccuracy" and "major misrepresentation" when discussing the movement.[2036] Unlike Scripture, which is the non-contradictory and clear revelation from God about how to live a holy life for His glory, the contradictions, shallow understanding of theology, and ecumenical confusion evident at Keswick produced the following self-assessment by Keswick leaders:

> Defining the fine points of Keswick teaching is not a simple exercise, for there has never been in its history an agreed system of the particular truths it has purported to proclaim. A supposed *Keswick view* on something may depend on who is speaking at the time. When it is stated fairly emphatically that "Keswick teaches such and such," as has often been done, it is usually possible to find teaching from the Keswick platform that has given a different slant, an alternative interpretation, or a completely contradictory one altogether. . . . Critiquing "Keswick teaching" is a little like trying to hit a moving target, or getting hold of a piece of soap in the bath. . . . It is important to keep in mind the . . . sharply different views of different speakers. . . . [M]any phases of the doctrine of holiness have been presented by a wide variety of speakers, some of them contradictory. . . . Baptists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Brethren, Reformed, charismatics, and those of other persuasions can stand shoulder to shoulder [at Keswick.] . . . Any attempt, therefore, to survey the preaching at Keswick and create a systematic picture . . . is bound to be unsatisfactory.[2037]

2035 For example, Jacob Abbott, reviewing the foundational *The Higher Christian Life* by William Boardman, notes:

> [W]e will proceed to state, as clearly as fairly as we can, the results of our investigation [of Boardman's book]. . . . [T]he book is a difficult one to analyze satisfactorily[.] . . . In a word, the book has no method at all; no development, no progress, no "lucidus ordon." We are not sure it would suffer (with trifling qualifications) by arranging its eighteen chapters in any order different from the present, even if that were by chance.
>
> But to the treatise. What is the subject treated? What does the writer mean by the "higher life?" and by "second conversion?" as its equivalent, or the stepping-stone to it? Precisely what he does mean, we will not attempt to say; because it is not said *intelligibly* in the book, and cannot be inferred from the book. On the contrary, it can be inferred, most certainly, from the book, that he had no well-defined idea, in his own mind, on the subject (see p. 57). . . . Let us now pass on to that which is obtained in "second conversion." And here . . . we have got to the end of the author's self-consistency, and shall henceforth wander about, in fogs thicker than those of the Grand Bank. . . . We are aware that he, or a defender of his system, may take the same book and convict us of unfairness[,] [f]or we have already given some examples of the contradictions it contains. There are others.
>
> (pgs. 508-509, 516, 527, Review of William E. Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jacob J. Abbott. *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July 1860) 508-535)

Similary, Stephen Barabas notes: "Keswick [has] furnishe[d] us with no formal treatise of its doctrine of sin, and no carefully prepared, weighty discoursces of a theological nature . . . for over seventy-five years" (pg. 51, *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*). Since the Higher Life position itself is a murky muddle of confusion it is just about inevitable that those who criticize specific representative statements and affirmations by Keswick advocates will be accused of misrepresentation by those who can cite conflicting and contradictory Higher Life statements.

2036 See, e. g., John Van Gelderen in "Keswick: A Good Word or a Bad One?" Elec. acc. http://www.bcmedu.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=73&Itemid=138, reprinted on pgs. 101-111, *The Faith Response: Understanding and Applying a Biblical View of Dependence on God*, John R. Van Gelderen. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 2011. Keswick's defenders regularly affirm critics misrepresent; see also, e. g., the defense of Keswick and critique of Warfield on pgs. 213-215 of *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2037 Pgs. 34-35, 222-226, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

Rather than following the Biblical model and allowing no other doctrine than the truth (1 Timothy 1:3), separating from all error (Romans 16:17), and earnestly contending for all of the faith (Jude 3), Keswick will allow speakers to contradict each other and mislead their hearers with false teaching. Keswick critics are then accused of misrepresentation when they point out heresies and errors in Keswick writers and speakers. In a similar manner, separatists who point out that goddess worship goes on at the World Council of Churches can be accused of misrepresentation by ecumenists, since only some, but not all, those at the World Council worship goddesses. Thus, certain Keswick critics may represent Keswick inconsistently because Keswick is not itself consistent—inconsistency in representations of Keswick may, ironically, be the only consistent representation of the movement. Of course, a critic of Keswick certainly may fail to present its position fairly, just as critics of any position are not universally fair and accurate. However, a statement by a critic of the Higher Life such as Bruce Waltke that "the Keswick teaching [affirms] that from the inner passivity of looking to Christ to do everything will issue a perfection of performance"[2038] is an accurate statement of the dominant classical formulations of Keswick theology as taught by its founding leaders, not a misrepresentation. There is no evidence that critics of Keswick are more liable to engage in misrepresentation than others engaged in theological critique.

J. Robertson McQuilkin, arguing for the Keswick doctrine of sanctification in *Five Views of Sanctification*, wrote: "Two authors who attack the [Keswick] movement and are universally held by Keswick speakers to have misunderstood the teaching [are] Packer [in his] *Keep in Step With the Spirit* [and] Warfield [in his] *Studies in Perfectionism*."[2039] The only evidence McQuilkin advances that Warfield misunderstood the Keswick theology is an anecdote. McQuilkin recounts:

> [M]y father, Robert C. McQuilkin, a leader in the movement known as the Victorious Life Testimony, told me that when [Warfield's *Studies in Perfectionsim*] was published, he went to Warfield and discussed the matter of Keswick teaching and perfectionism at length. Afterward Warfield admitted, "If I had known these things, I would not have included the last chapter ["The Victorious Life"] in my work."[2040]

J. R. McQuilkin provides no actual instances of misunderstanding of the Keswick theology, misquotations of Keswick writers, or any other kind of hard evidence of misrepresentation by Warfield. Such hard evidence is very difficult to come by since

---

[2038] Pg. 22, "Evangelical Spirituality: A Biblical Scholar's Perspective." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31:1.

[2039] Pg. 183, *Five Views of Sanctification*. Melvin E. Dieter, Anthony A. Hoekema, Stanley M Horton, J. Robertson McQuilkin & John F. Walvoord, authors; Stanley N. Gundry, series ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987.

[2040] Pg. 245, *Five Views of Sanctification*, Dieter et. al.

more objective historiography describes Warfield's *Studies in Perfectionism* as "meticulous and precise . . . extensive and detailed analysis . . . [of] the higher life, victorious life, and Keswick movements. Warfield's treatment of these teachings . . . serves as a vivid sample of his thoroughness as a historical theologian."[2041] Recording in 1987 in his *Five Views* chapter what McQuilkin claims his father told him Warfield had said in the early 1930s, long after the parties who allegedly engaged in the conversation were dead, is hardly actual evidence of misrepresentation, especially since both McQuilkins have a clear and strong interest in undermining the credibility of Warfield. Furthermore, J. R. McQuilkin has overlooked the overwhelming historical problems that make it certain that his anecdote is inaccurate. David Turner notes: "Something is amiss here, since Warfield's . . . will provided for the publication of his critical reviews in book form, which occurred in 1932. Thus Warfield . . . could not have referred to retracting this last chapter of his book—he had been dead eleven years when it was published."[2042] Similarly, Warfield scholar Fred G. Zaspel indicates:

> Interesting as this [quote by McQuilkin] may be, the quote cannot be accurate. First, Warfield never saw the publication of his book *Studies in Perfectionism*. This two-volume work is a collection of essays that were originally published in various theological journals from 1918 to 1921, the last of which was published posthumously (1921); the two-volume work to which McQuilkin refers was not published until 1931-1932, some ten or eleven years after Warfield's death. Second, the "last chapter" of the book to which this McQuilkin quote refers is the chapter on the higher life, which was in fact not the last but the very first article of the series published (1918). As to the accuracy of the substance of the remark . . . [w]e only know that while Warfield continued to write on the broader subject of holiness-perfectionism, he made no retractions.[2043]

Unless a Keswick continuationist raised Warfield from the dead so that he could recant of his critique of the Higher Life, McQuilkin's quote concerning Warfield is historically impossible mythmaking. McQuilkin does not even provide hearsay to support his statement about Packer's alleged misrepresentation. Perhaps these severe problems with McQuilkin's affirmation explain why he affirms that Packer and Warfield are "universally held by Keswick *speakers* to have misunderstood the teaching"—Keswick *writers* might have to provide actual evidence, while *speakers* can simply make undocumented and inaccurate statements. Then again, McQuilkin does not just speak his attempt to discredit Warfield and Packer—he does register his charge in writing. While McQuilkin did actually write down the alleged but mythological recantation by Warfield, the Keswick apologist did not put his quotation in the main body of his chapter in the

---

2041 Pg. 465, *The Theology of B. B. Warfield: A Systematic Summary*, Fred G. Zaspel.

2042 Pg. 98, Review by David L. Turner of *Five Views on Sanctification*, by Melvin E. Dieter, Anthony A. Hoekema, Stanley M. Horton, J. Robertson McQuilkin, and John F. Walvoord. *Grace Theological Journal* 10:1 (1989) 94-98.

2043 Pgs. 473-474, *The Theology of B. B. Warfield: A Systematic Summary*, Fred G. Zaspel.

Five Views book, but in a concluding section, with the result that the other non-Keswick contributors were unable to point out the problems with and the vacuity of his affirmation. If one wishes to prove that Keswick has been misunderstood and misrepresented, mythmaking about Warfield and a passive voice verb, that Warfield and Packer "are universally held" to have misunderstood the system, fall abysmally short of the standard of real evidence.

Keswick apologists Price & Randall, discussing J. C. Ryle and J. I. Packer's critiques of Keswick, join McQuilkin in bringing the standard charge of misrepresentation of Keswick.[2044] Again, no actual documentation of misrepresentation is forthcoming. Packer, for instance, is criticized for "misunderstand[ing]"[2045] Stephen Barabas's Keswick work, *So Great Salvation*, when Packer simply quoted Barabas's own words without any distortion whatever. Keswick authors have had a century[2046] to put in print actual evidence of Warfield or other Keswick critics misquoting Keswick authors or otherwise engaging in misrepresentation, manipulation, or misunderstanding. They have provided no proof of this kind. The hard facts indicate that the prominent Keswick critics Warfield, Packer, and Ryle understood Keswick theology very well.

Shortly after Warfield published his critique of the Higher Life, Keswick, and Victorious Life movements in the *Princeton Review*, W. H. Griffith Thomas wrote two articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* as a response to Warfield's critique of the Victorious Life.[2047] Thomas affirmed that advocates of the Keswick theology "do not believe Dr. Warfield's interpretation of their position is always and necessarily the true one,"[2048] possibly originating the common affirmation by later advocates of the Keswick theology that Warfield misrepresented the Higher Life doctrine. Thomas made "[n]o attempt . . . to deal with every contention, but only an effort to consider the more outstanding of [Warfield's] criticisms."[2049] Griffith Thomas makes some striking and eye-opening statements in his response to Warfield, such as: "I am convinced that Dr. Warfield has failed to recognize the element of truth, even in what he calls Pelagianism,"[2050] and:

2044 Pgs. 210-227, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2045 Pg. 221, *Transforming Keswick*, Price & Randall.

2046 The chapter on the Victorious Life movement by Warfield, as reprinted in his *Perfectionism*, volume 2, was originally printed in *The Princeton Theological Review* 16 (1918) 321-373.

2047 "The Victorious Life (I.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:303) July 1919, 267-288; "The Victorious Life (II.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:304) October 1919, 455-467.

2048 Pg. 267, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2049 Pg. 267, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2050 Pg. 279, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

"'Keswick' stands for perfectionism. I have heard that scores of times, and so have you—and it does."[2051] Modern Keswick apologists who charge critics with misrepresentation for associating Keswick with perfectionism need to similarly affirm that early defenders and promulgators of Keswick theology like Griffith Thomas also were guilty of misrepresentation. Not only early critics of Keswick, such as Warfield, but also early defenders, such as Griffith Thomas, must have failed to see Keswick's opposition to perfectionism—only modern Keswick apologists have apparently discerned the truth invisible to those living far closer to the time the Higher Life system originated.

While making striking concessions to Warfield, Griffith Thomas also seeks to moderate Keswick errors, sometimes through a certain historical revisionism. For example, he wrote: "[H]ow free Mr. Pearsall Smith really was from the errors attributed by some people to him[!]"[2052] Griffith Thomas's revisionism leads him, at times, to affirm positions directly contrary to those of central leaders of the Higher Life and Victorious Life movement whom Warfield critiques. Nonetheless, one can be thankful for whatever Scriptural affirmations Griffith Thomas makes, even if they contradict the actual affirmations of Keswick founders and promulgators.

Thomas makes a variety of criticisms of Warfield's affirmations,[2053] a few of which are valid,[2054] but many of which are not themselves especially accurate. Thomas criticizes Warfield's affirmation that the Keswick theology denies the possibility of actually becoming more sanctified or holy, but then strongly affirms that "there is no present . . . deliverance from corruption . . . . [no] essential difference between the youngest and the oldest Christian in regard to remaining corruption . . . no eradication . . . or even improvement . . . [only] counteraction,"[2055] demonstrating that Warfield has not misunderstood the Keswick position at all. Thomas attempts to separate the Keswick theology from its roots in Wesleyan, Oberlin, and other earlier perfectionisms. Nonetheless, he concedes that the first Keswick convention had Oberlin leader Asa Mahan as speaker and admits that Warfield can "quote [Keswick] writers"[2056] that support his affirmations. Griffith Thomas himself even stated elsewhere that "the roots of the distinctive teaching . . . [of the] Keswick Convention . . . can easily be traced in the

---

2051 Pg. 283, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2052 Pg. 285, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2053 Pgs. 267ff. "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2054 E. g., Griffith Thomas is correct that Warfield downplays the resistibility of grace (pg. 279, "The Victorious Life (I.).").

2055 Pgs. 272-274, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2056 Pg. 269, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

writings of . . . John Wesley [and his proposed successor in the Methodist movement] Fletcher of Madeley."[2057] Indeed, Thomas very rarely seeks to demonstrate that Warfield quoted any Higher Life writer out of context, and Thomas never quotes any Keswick writer warning about or reproving the errors Warfield exposes in those founders and writers of Keswick theology that the Princetonian examines. The best Thomas can do is to find, in certain situations, certain Keswick writers who are more sane and orthodox than Higher Life and Keswick founders such as H. W. and R. P. Smith or Mark Boardman, and then state that these authors—rather than the Keswick teachers, leaders, and founders upon which Warfield focuses his critique—truly represent the Higher Life position. However, while criticizing Warfield for exposing the errors of Keswick founders, Thomas freely admits:

> [T]he modern Holiness Movement came to England very largely, if not almost entirely, through Mr. R. Pearsall Smith . . . 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[.] . . . [M]any thousands who have been definitely helped [by Keswick theology] little know how much they owe to "R. P. S." for the life more abundant that they enjoy.[2058]

Griffith Thomas avers that "Mr. Trumbull . . . H. W. Smith . . . Mr. Boardma[n] . . . [are] men and women . . .sincere and . . . earnest"[2059] and fails to whisper the slightest warning about the severe errors they held. Thomas's critique of Warfield is largely unsuccessful.

Griffith Thomas's response to Warfield, very regrettably but perhaps unsurprisingly, is not based solely on the results of grammatical-historical exegesis. In addition to making some very curious and unsustainable affirmations about the meaning of passages,[2060] Thomas argues for the Keswick theology based on what he has "observed," on "experience," and on "very many a Christian experience."[2061] In Griffith Thomas's mind, Warfield is wrong because "experience in general gives no suggestion" of his position and "there is no general evidence of" Warfield's doctrine "in Christian lives."[2062] While affirming, though not expositing passages to prove it, that Warfield contradicts Scripture in affirming progressive eradication and renewal, Thomas also

---

2057 Pg. 223, "The Literature of Keswick," Griffith Thomas, in *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Its, Method, and Its Men*, ed. Charles Harford. In this work, Thomas also lists other antecedents to Keswick theology, such as the Roman Catholic mystic and heretic Madame Guyon.

2058 Pgs. 285-286, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2059 Pg. 463, "The Victorious Life (II.)."

2060 E. g., Romans 8:1ff., pg. 271-272, "The Victorious Life (I.)." Thomas also states that he has "long ceased to be concerned about whether [Romans 7:14-25] refers to a believer or an unconverted man" (pg. 276) and makes arguments that would lead to the conclusion that he is neither saved nor unsaved.

2061 Pgs. 273, 275, 277, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2062 Pg. 464, "The Victorious Life (II.)."

argues that "Warfield . . . is disproved . . . by experience of everyday life."[2063] Thomas's second article, "The Victorious Life (II.)," is almost useless for someone who wishes to build doctrine from Scripture alone, as the great majority of it is essentially nothing but testimonials from various people about how wonderful the Keswick theology is and how it has helped them, a sort of compilation that the most extreme Word-Faith proponent, or a member of Mary Baker Eddy's cult, or a Mormon, could compile to support their respective heresies. After telling stories about how people adopted Higher Life theology and felt better afterwards, Griffith Thomas concludes: "I submit, with all deference to Dr. Warfield, yet with perfect confidence, that the convinced acceptance of the Keswick movement by such [men] . . . is impressive enough to make people inquire whether, after all, it does not stand for essential Biblical truth."[2064] Griffith Thomas would have done far better had he carefully exposited Scripture to develop his theology of sanctification, and to have placed "perfect confidence" in the Word of God, the true sole authority for faith and practice, rather than placing such confidence in men and their testimonials. Properly exegeted Scripture, not testimonial, is the touchstone for truth. Unfortunately, rather than arguing from Scripture alone, Thomas concludes that since "Evangelical clergymen . . . have found" the Keswick theology "to be their joy, comfort, and strength," it must be true:

> [We are] more and more certain that in holding [Keswick theology] and teaching it we are absolutely loyal to the "old, old story." . . . [A]ble and clear-minded Christian men bear testimony to [Keswick] experience . . . [n]o experience which carries moral and ethical value can be without a basis of some truth . . . the rich experiences to which testimony is given . . . the possession of an experience which has evidently enriched their lives . . . [is] not to be set aside by any purely doctrinal and theoretical criticism.[2065]

The Keswick experience, Griffith Thomas avers, is not to be set aside by criticism of its doctrine from Scripture alone. Thomas illustrates, in the final paragraph of his critique, his paradigmatic response to Keswick critics. He tells a story about a time when he was in the presence of an "Evangelical clergyman in England who took a very strong line against Keswick and reflected on it for what he regarded as its errors, in the light of . . . old-fashioned Evangelicalism."[2066] Thomas did not, in response, show from the Bible alone the truth of the Keswick theology; rather, he "told" the critic of his "experience in the spiritual life" and entrance into "a spiritual experience of light, liberty, joy, and power," so that "the messages . . . of the Keswick Convention" provided "confirmation . .

2063 Pg. 275, "The Victorious Life (I.)."

2064 Pgs. 462-463, "The Victorious Life (II.)."

2065 Pgs. 465-466, "The Victorious Life (II.)."

2066 Pg. 466, "The Victorious Life (II.)."

. of my personal experiences."[2067] Thus, Scripture must be interpreted in light of Keswick experiences.[2068] While one who rejects *sola Scriptura* might find such argumentation of value, those who build their doctrine from the Bible alone and evaluate spiritual experience from the truth of its teaching alone will find Griffith Thomas's case remarkably unconvincing. If the Apostle Peter's incredible experience of seeing the transfiguration of Christ was subordinate to Scripture, a "more sure word of prophecy" (2 Peter 1:16-21), what place can the experiences of Keswick proponents have in comparison to Scripture? Thomas does, however, effectively illustrate the methods through which the Keswick theology spreads among the people of God. By means of personal narrations of having "received the blessing," entered the Higher Life, and the like, by means of written testimonials and devotional works, and by means of special conventions and gatherings where careful exegesis and Bible study are not undertaken, the Keswick theology spreads among those who are not well-grounded in a Biblical doctrine of sanctification, despite its abysmal failure to effectively deal with devastating, unrefuted, and irrefutable exegetical and theological critiques of Keswick.[2069]

It is possible that Griffith Thomas's failure to build his doctrine of sanctification from Scripture alone is related to his toleration of weakness on the inspiration of Scripture. Thomas "had a deep sympathy with . . . James Orr,"[2070] to whom, among a few other theologians, he dedicated his *The Holy Spirit of God* and of whom he spoke very highly in that book.[2071] Dr. Orr "was unconcerned to defend a literal interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis, and . . . took the view that an insistence on biblical inerrancy was actually 'suicidal.'"[2072] Consequently, "as the fundamentalist–modernist controversy broke out in America[,] [Griffith Thomas] consistently refused to utter the shibboleths (which he blamed on 'puritanism') about historical criticism or biblical inerrancy or matters of science that were essentials for many."[2073] However, to Griffith Thomas's credit, even if he did refuse to take as strong a stand as he should have in some very important areas of Bibliology, what he does say about the doctrine when he exposits it[2074]

2067 Pg. 467, "The Victorious Life (II.)."

2068 Pg. 466, "The Victorious Life (II.)."

2069 For other examples of the spread of the Keswick theology by testimonial rather than exegesis, see, e. g., pgs. 54, 71, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie.

2070 Pg. 667, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

2071 Compare pgs. x-xi, *The Holy Spirit of God* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913).

2072 Pg. 492, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

2073 Pg. 667, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

2074 See pgs. 147-163 of *The Holy Spirit of God* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913).

is commendable and consistent with a regenerate state. Credit should, therefore, be given to him where it is due.

Unfortunately, as an Anglican, Griffith Thomas defended baptismal heresy in his comments on his denomination's doctrinal creed, the *Thirty Nine Articles*:

> Baptism . . . is an instrument of regeneration under five aspects; (a) Incorporation with the Church; (b) ratification of the promise of remission; (c) ratification of the promise of adoption; (d) strengthening of faith; (e) increase of grace. . . . Baptism introduces us into a new and special relation to Christ. It provides and guarantees a spiritual change in the condition of the recipient[.] . . . The words "new birth" suggest that Baptism introduced us into a new relation and new circumstances with the assurance of new power. . . . [T]he Reformers in their own books and also in the Formularies for which they are responsible, did not intend to condemn all doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration . . . in the theology of the Reformation the controversy did not turn on the question whether there was or was not a true doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, for the Reformers never hesitated to admit that Baptism is the Sacrament of Regeneration.[2075]

Thomas also defends the Anglican Baptismal Service, which declares: "Seeing now that this child is regenerate" after the administration of the "sacrament." He likewise defends the Anglican Catechism, in which the catechumen speaks of: "My Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ." However, Griffith Thomas, as a low-church Anglican, seeks to minimize and explain away such terrible sacramental heresies in his denomination in a way that is, one hopes, consistent with his own genuine new birth, making arguments similar to the sort of minimalization and confusion of language that Bishop Handley Moule employed in his attempts to reconcile Anglican liturgy and the Pauline gospel of justification by faith alone.

Not surprisingly, Griffith Thomas was also a continuationist, although, just as his Keswick theology was more moderate and sane than that of many of his fellows, so his continuationism, although still a rejection of Scriptural cessationism, was of a more moderate form than that of the Keswick trajectory represented by the Christian and Missionary Alliance and Pentecostalism. Thomas wrote the introduction to R. V. Bingham's book *The Bible and the Body*,[2076] and affirmed that Bingham's position was "the true position" which Thomas was glad to "cal[l] attention to."[2077] Bingham, the founder of "Canadian Keswick,"[2078] while making a great number of excellent points against more radical continuationism, taught in *The Bible and the Body* that the sign gifts have not ceased, but that on "most of the foreign fields"—Bingham was the founder of the Sudan Interior Mission—the "repetition of the signs" had appeared, so that "[m]issionaries could duplicate almost every scene in the Acts of the Apostles." God

---

2075 Article 27, "Of Baptism," *Thirty-Nine Articles*.

2076 *The Bible and the Body*, R. V. Bingham. Toronto, Canada: Evangelical Publishers, 1921 (1st ed.); 4th ed. 1952.

2077 Pg. vii, *The Bible and the Body,* Bingham.

2078 Pg. 53, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

"gives the signs" today.[2079] To describe the first century as "the age of miracles" which is now "past" is an error.[2080] In "this dispensation" God still gives "the gift of healing,"[2081] and in answering the question about whether the signs of the book of Acts are for today, Bingham answers that, in some "conditions, yes."[2082] Griffith Thomas and Bingham are also far too generous to proponents of more radical continuationist error. Thomas "plead[s], as Mr. Bingham does, for liberty, and [is] . . . ready to give it to those who believe" in the exact errors on "Healing" that are very effectively refuted in his book—he will not separate from those who promulgate errors on healing, but will speak of those in "the healing cults" as "our friends" who have "honoured and saintly leaders."[2083]

Thus, as Griffith Thomas defended the errors of Keswick sanctification, although in a more cool-headed way than many of his Keswick contemporaries, so he likewise defended Keswick continuationism or anti-cessationism, although likewise in a more cool-headed way than many. He also followed the traditional Keswick refusal to separate from the more radical ideas on sanctification and sign gifts of many of his fellow promulgators of the Keswick theology. His defense of Keswick against B. B. Warfield, while superior to McQuilkin's promulgation of Warfield's mythological posthumous recantation, still remains fundamentally a failure to those who hold consistently to *sola Scriptura*. Keswick's apologists have both failed to provide solid exegetical answers to critics and failed to demonstrate that Keswick critics generally misunderstand or misrepresent the Higher Life system. While Keswick critics in the world of scholarship are far from infallible, no convincing evidence exists that they routinely misrepresent Higher Life theology.

Keswick Theology and Continuationism or Anti-Cessationism: Vignettes of Certain Important Advocates of Keswick or Higher Life Theology and their Beliefs Concerning Spiritual Gifts and Other Matters: William Boardman, Andrew Murray, Frederick B. Meyer, Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis, A. B. Simpson, John A. MacMillan, and Watchman Nee

I. Introduction

2079 Pg. 66, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.
2080 Pg. 91, *The Bible and the Body,* Bingham.
2081 Pg. 113, *The Bible and the Body,* Bingham.
2082 Pg. 113, *The Bible and the Body,* Bingham.
2083 Pg. 69, *The Bible and the Body,* Bingham.

Scripture[2084] and history[2085] require cessationism, the view that miraculous spiritual gifts and specific sign miracles ceased in apostolic days.[2086] Keswick, on the

---

2084 First Corinthians 13:8-13 teaches that tongues would cease before the completion of the canon of Scripture (as verified by the middle voice of παύσονται in v. 8), while the other gifts would cease by the time of the completion of the canon (as verified by the two uses of καταργηθήσονται in v. 8), "that which is perfect," for "when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away" (1 Corinthians 13:10). The canon view of the "perfect" is ably demonstrated in "1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts," R. Bruce Compton. (*Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 [2004] 97-144). In 1 Corinthians 13:8, παύω is not a deponent middle but retains its middle force:

> There are three arguments against the deponent view [of παύω in the New Testament], however. First, if παύσονται is deponent, then the second principal part (future form) should not occur in the *active* voice in Hellenistic Greek. But it does, and it does so frequently. [A search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database revealed *hundreds* of such instances, normally bearing the meaning "stop something." Further, the future middle of παύω was consistently used in the same period with the meaning of "stop" or "cease."] Hence, the verb *cannot* be considered deponent. Second, sometimes Luke 8:24 is brought into the discussion: Jesus rebuked the wind and sea and they *ceased* (ἐπαύσαντο, aorist middle) from their turbulence. [Again, the *TLG* database revealed that the third principal part, like the second principal part, was an active form in Koine Greek.] The argument is that inanimate objects cannot cease of their own accord; therefore, the middle of παύω is equivalent to a passive. But this is a misunderstanding of the literary features of the passage: If the wind and sea cannot cease voluntarily, why does Jesus *rebuke* them? And why do the disciples speak of the wind and sea as having *obeyed* Jesus? The elements are personified in Luke 8 and their ceasing from turbulence is therefore presented as volitional obedience to Jesus. If anything, Luke 8:24 supports the indirect middle view. Third, the idea of a deponent verb is that it is middle in form, but *active* in meaning. But παύσονται is surrounded by *passives* in 1 Corinthians 13:8, not actives. [Although it is true that the future middle is occasionally used in a passive sense (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 390 [§1715]; Winer-Moulton, 319), it is apparently so with certain verbs because of a set idiom. Such is not the case with παύω.] The real force of παύω in the middle is *intransitive*, while in the active it is transitive. In the active it has the force of stopping some other object; in the middle, it ceases from its own activity. (pgs. 422-423, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace; two abbreviations expanded for clarity)

The New Testament contains further evidence for the cessation of tongues. One of the benefits of sign gifts was edification. Yet Ephesians 4:12-13 says the churches are edified by gifted ministers. Ephesians was written c. A. D. 64, five years after 1 Corinthians (A. D. 59). In A. D. 59 God was still getting the gospel to the whole world using sign gifts such as tongues (Mark 16:15-20), but no record of the continuing use of sign gifts appears in Ephesians (cf. Colossians 1:6, which, roughly contemporaneous with Ephesians, indicates that the gospel had by that time come to "all the world"). Hebrews 2:3-4, which was also written c. A. D. 64, indicates through the uses of the past tense verb "confirmed," upon which the participle "bearing *them* witness . . . with signs and wonders . . . and with . . . miracles, and gifts" depends (ἐβεβαιώθη . . . συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος), that the confirmatory value of the sign gifts was a past event. By that point in the dispensation of grace, tongues had completed their purpose of confirmation and authentication. The Jews, for whom signs were given (1 Corinthians 1:9), had received ample evidence that the church had replaced Israel for the time being as God's institution, that Israel had fallen under judgment (1 Corinthians 14:21; Deuteronomy 28:49; Isaiah 28:11-12; Jeremiah 5:15), and that Gentiles were included.

2085 After the Apostolic Age, tongues speaking cannot be historically verified among any group of orthodox Christians (cf. pgs. 87-92, *Tongues in Biblical Perspective*, Smith). Before the revival of what are called "tongues" in Pentecostalism near the beginning of the twentieth century, only various heretics and demon-possessed people, like the Shakers, Irvingites, and Mormons, laid claim to the Biblical gift of tongues (pgs. 16ff., *ibid*.), while pagans, practitioners of Voodoo, Buddhist and Shinto priests, and other worshippers of the devil practice "tongues" without affirming their continuity with the New Testament record (pgs. 20ff., *ibid*.). Meanwhile, "Christian Science, the Father Divine movement, and Spiritualism . . . [place] emphasis upon . . . divine healing and Spirit-inspired speech" (pg. 217, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

other hand, has possessed from the time of its founding a strong belief in continuationism, the view that all the spiritual gifts given to the first century churches continue to the present day. All of Keswick's most important advocates were continuationists.[2087] Indeed, in continuity with the advocacy of Faith Cure

---

[2086] Cessationism is emphatically not, as it is sometimes represented by continuationists, a sort of modern Deism or rationalism that affirms that God no longer supernaturally interacts in the world. As strident a cessationist as B. B. Warfield affirms: "[N]o one who is a Christian in any clear sense doubts that God hears and answers prayer for the healing of the sick in a generally supernatural manner[,] [as taught by James 5:14-15.] . . . All Christians believe in healing in answer to prayer" (pgs. 214, 247, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield). The dispute between the cessationist and the continuationist is one of the continuation of the specific sign gifts of the apostolic age. "[T]he question is not: 1.) Whether God is an answerer of prayer; nor 2.) Whether, in answer to prayer, he heals the sick; nor 3.) Whether his action in healing the sick is a supernatural act; nor 4.) Whether the supernaturalness of the act may be so apparent as to demonstrate God's activity to all right-thinking minds conversant with the facts. All this we believe" (pg. 252, *ibid*). Other cessationists and anti-continuationists similarly embrance God's continuing supernatural involvement in the world (cf. pg. 77, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900,* Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

It is noteworthy also that just as B. B. Warfield is likely the most influential single advocate for classical evangelical piety and opponent of Keswick theology, so likewise "[h]e more than any other single writer has shaped evangelicals' negative attitude to Pentecostalism and charismatic renewal" (pg. 220, "Miracles, Charismata and Benjamin B. Warfield, Philip L. Barnes. *Evangelical Quarterly* 67:3 [1995] 219-43).

[2087] Other Keswick leaders not specifically examined below were continuationists. Keswick generally accepted that "[t]here may be . . . there are . . . supernatural manifestations made today . . . as were made 1800 years ago," as evidenced by testimonials of "multitudes of people" (pg. 312, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson, in Canon Hay H. M. Aitken's message "Thirsty Christians" from 1902). Supernatural visions were expounded upon at Keswick conferences (e. g. pg. 158, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Keswick historians testified that "we cannot do without a vision . . . if such souls as Joan [of Arc] and Socrates needed visions, and had them vouchsafed to them, how much more do we[?]" (pgs. 13-30, *Visions; With Addresses on the First Epistle of John,* J. B. Figgis. London: James Nisbet, 1911. Figgis is the author of the Keswick history *Keswick from Within*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1914.). Continuationism was the belief of all early Keswick leaders.

Evan Hopkins once "claims to have had . . . a vision of Charles Haddon Spurgeon conveying a comforting message to him" (pg. 47, Price and Randall, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present and Future*). Although Spurgeon had died in 1892, and despite numerous and serious Biblical prohibitions on communicating with the dead, Spurgeon, it is said, knew Mr. Hopkins was feeling ill and came back from the dead to pay a visit in "January 1919[.] . . . [Evan Hopkins] told Mrs. Hopkins that Mr. Spurgeon had just visited him . . . and had repeated to him that great assurance of the New Testament, *All things are yours*[.] . . . 'It was very solemn,' he said, 'but it was not sad. It was bright and a comfort. . . . It made me cry. . . . [I]t was so kind of him. . . . Spurgeon . . . knew I was weak . . . and so he came.'" (pg. 219, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). No warnings against such visions were issued. On the contrary, Hopkins's "vision of the strongly evangelical Baptist, C. H. Spurgeon . . . appearing to him with a message of comfort . . . was a sign for Hopkins and others of the solidity of Keswick's evangelical heritage" (pg. 47, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall)! It was clear that receiving visitations from the dead in visions validated Keswick's orthodoxy, especially when the visitations were from men such as Spurgeon, who rejected the Keswick theology when they were actually alive. Hopkins would also travel about seeking to heal people (pgs. 190-195, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie. Note that some of what Hopkins did is justifiable in that God is able to heal people in answer to prayer). However, Hopkins's healings, unlike those miraculous ones recorded in the Bible, would not always take effect right away (pg. 194). Indeed, at one point Hopkins was called to heal someone along with that great exponent of modern healing marvels,

William Boardman, who was running the Faith-Cure Bethshan Faith Hospital at the time. Unfortunately, Boardman was not able to come to heal the person, as he could not heal himself, but died the very day he was to assist in the healing session with Hopkins (pg. 193).

G. Handley Moule, while expressing admirable cautions about signs and wonders (as, indeed, Evan Hopkins was also commendably more moderate than the body of later Pentecostalism), was nonetheless a continuationist: "I would not be mistaken, as if I meant to relegate off-hand to the apostolic age alone all manifestations of the presence and power of God through His people in the way of sign and wonder . . . [nor] deny *a priori* the possibility of signs and wonders in any age, our own or another, since the apostolic [time]" (pgs. 214-215, *Veni Creator*, Moule). As Evan Hopkins's communications with the dead supported his continuationism, so likewise did Moule's communications with the dead support his own continuationism. It was the Bishop's "sweet solace" to offer "[p]erpetual greetings to" his "beloved ones" who had "gone" to the grave. He stated: "I daily and by name greet my own beloved child, my dearest parents, and others precious to me" who had died. Prayers for the dead were "no sin;" rather, communication with and prayers for the dead were a "sweet and blessed help" in the spiritual life. As a result of such communications with and prayers for the dead, Moule believed that "the Lord grants what can only be called visions," so that the dead return and grant an even greater level of communication with the living than can be obtained by invisible communication with the afterlife. Moule himself had had supernatural and "deeply sweet dreams" where dead people he communicated with and prayed for appeared to him and looked on him "with an extraordinary look of bliss" (pgs. 220-221, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*, John B. Harford & Frederick C. Macdonald). Moule likewise commended others who had supposedly experienced "veritable vision[s] of God" Himself coming to them and telling them things. He encouraged and supported those receiving such visions to trust in the visions' veracity (pg. 287, *ibid*).

Pastor "Theodore Monod, of Paris, and . . . Stockmayer, of Switzerland, were probably the best known" representatives of Keswick theology on the European mainland and were also pillars of the "early [Keswick] meetings in England" who "took a leading share in the Convention in early days" (pgs. viii, 107, 162, 186, 198, 225, 230, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford; cf. pg. 58, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Both men were continuationists. Monod accepted the Higher Life continuationism of Robert P. Smith (cf. pg. 156, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). He had entered the Higher Life only "a few weeks" before the Oxford Convention; pg. 215, *ibid*), having heard of it at the spiritualist and continuationist Broadlands Conference of 1874 (pgs. 53-54, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

Stockmayer, who received his post-conversion Spirit baptism at the Oxford Convention under Robert Smith's leadership (pgs. 130-133, 208-209, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874), believed in and supported William Boardman in his Faith Cure practices, such as the idea that physical healing for every disease in this life was purchased by the atonement (pg. 45-46, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman). He likewise contributed to Andrew Murray's adoption of the Faith Cure (pgs. 113, 115, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger) and influenced for Pentecostalism the leading early German Pentecostal, Pastor Jonathan Paul (pgs. 239, 243, *ibid;* cf. pgs. 42-43, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee), and many others (cf. pg. 353, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger). Indeed, "Stockmayer . . . believed that sickness and death could be conquered in the life of a sanctified Christian" and proclaimed his views at special healing conferences (pg. 353, *ibid*). He was "one of the principal advocates of divine healing in Switzerland" (pg. 115, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis). Stockmeyer "opened a house in . . . Switzerland for the reception of those seeking healing through faith," established an "institute for faith healing," and published literature to spread the Faith Cure (pg. 90, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman; pg. 339, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis; pg. 143, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis). He was even recognized as the "theologian of faith-healing" (pg. 233, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield). He promoted the Keswick "holiness" doctrine of "pardon, sanctification, and physical healing . . . in the death and resurrection of Christ" when "accepted personally by us" as individual and separate benefits (pg. 224, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman).

continuationism in the Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions and the

---

William Graham Scroggie, who became Keswick's leading figure in the 1950s, "did not deny the possibility of contemporary speaking in tongues" (pgs. 593-594, "Scroggie, William Graham," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, pgs. 593-594). On the contrary, "Scroggie . . . did accept that the gift of tongues might still be available to Christians" (pg. 71, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

A. T. Pierson expected a restoration of the sign gifts, and, indeed, greater manifestations of signs than took place in the Apostolic Era, when Christians entered into the Higher Life. Knowledge about a "new endeument" of power could come through a revelatory "dream of the night," for "God himself, in midnight vision, revealed" facts such as the causes and character of diseases in this present day (pgs. 73, 349, *Forward Movements*, Pierson). Had not the missionary to Greenland, Hans Egede, "sought with prayers and tears the gift of healing . . . then ventured in the name of Christ, to lay his hands upon the sick, and scores of them were made whole," as in "the apostolic age" (pg. 392)? (Egede's Lutheran sacramentalism and his utter failure to perform apostolic healings are set aside.) Clearly, then, the people of God could look for the coming "a new Pentecost" in which "new displays of divine power might surpass those of any previous period," even the "supernatural signs" of "the apostolic age" (pg. 401). Continuationism was validated by the triumphs of the Faith Cure:

> ["S]igns," similar to those of primitive days[,] appear to have been wrought by devoted missionaries and their simple converts, where the gospel has been brought into contact with a people rude, unimpressible [and] ignorant[.] . . . These statements were not generally doubted by believer[s] until zeal to overthrow the "faith-cure delusion" led to rash attempts to prove that all supernatural signs long since answered their purpose and entirely ceased; and so, classed with miracles, they have been treated as impossible[.] . . . Hans Egede . . . [received] . . . the gift of healing . . . [i]n Pastor Blumhardt's Prayer cure . . . both body and soul are restored to wholeness in answer to prayer, and the only remedy applied is that divine panacea, the Gospel. . . . Edward Irving and many other such saints have risen from the sick bed to undertake for God work that demanded the full strength of body[.] . . . If, therefore, supernatural signs have disappeared in consequence of the loss of primitive faith and holiness, a revival of these latter may bring new manifestations of the former. Supernatural signs appear to have survived the apostolic age . . . [i]f in these degenerate days, a new Pentecost should restore primitive faith, worship, unity and activity, new displays of divine power might surpass those of any previous period. (pgs. 398-408, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Arthur T. Pierson. New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1905. While a continuationist, Pierson also affirmed admirable notes of caution; e. g., pg. 400.)

Furthermore, Pierson "did not condemn tongues *per se*, . . . [nor] deny that the gift of tongues was possible or claim that it belonged only to the apostolic age. . . . Pierson advocated judging each case on its own merits. . . . Pierson agreed with the [P]entecostals that the days of miracles had not passed with the apostolic age . . . [he] believed in miracles such as divine healing and revelation[.] . . . Pierson drew parallels between empowerment for holy living and divine healing" (pgs. 344-346, *Arthur Tappen Pierson and Forward Movements of Late-Nineteenth-Century Evangelicalism*, Dana L. Robert. Ph. D. Diss., Yale University, 1984). In Pierson's view, all the sign gifts were for the present day, a view he tied in closely to his Keswick theology.

W. H. Griffith Thomas believed that "the true position" was that the sign gifts have not ceased but that on "most of the foreign fields . . . repetition of the signs" had appeared, so that "[m]issionaries could duplicate almost every scene in the Acts of the Apostles." God "gives the signs" today, he explained, and to describe the first century as "the age of miracles [which is now] past" is an error (pgs. vii, 66, 91 *The Bible and the Body*, R. V. Bingham (Toronto, Canada: Evangelical Publishers, 1921 [1st ed.]).

The magazines of the Higher Life were continuationist also; for example, Carrie Judd Montgomery's *Triumphs of Faith: A Monthly Journal Devoted to Faith-Healing, and to the Promotion of Christian Holiness*, became "a primary vehicle for spreading the doctrines of divine healing." The periodical argued "that the pathway to bodily health followed the same route as the road to spiritual sanctification" —by faith alone, the Keswick doctrine (pgs. 92-96, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis). Citing the works of Stockmeyer and "the American Holiness evangelists" as examples of the tendency to purge Pentecostal ideas from Keswick and Higher Life compositions, Walter Hollenweger notes that "the writings of the ancestors of the Pentecostal movement," the Keswick writers, have experienced "revision . . . since the Pentecostal movement proper started" (pg. 113, *The Pentecostals*).

spiritualism that spread from Broadlands onward, an "emphasis on . . . faith healing and the 'gifts of the Spirit' . . . marked the Keswick movement."[2088] At Brighton, meetings advocating both the Higher Life and the Faith Cure were held regularly from the time of the original Convention onwards. The Oxford Convention likewise stood in continuity with the Faith Cure practices of "the Faith Houses of Dorothea Trudel."[2089] Rejection of medical means in favor of healing by prayer alone and the Keswick theology of sanctification were the physical and spiritual corollaries of the full blessing received immediately by faith alone. As a result, there was little to no cessationism in the Higher Life movement.[2090]

Consequently, history indisputably records that the "immediate origins of the Pentecostal movement are to be found in the nineteenth century Holiness movement. . . . [T]he Pentecostal movement drew much of its membership and nearly all of its leadership from Holiness ranks."[2091] Keswick perfectionism is intimately connected with both the Faith or Mind Cure and the Pentecostal movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, respectively.[2092] On the other hand, "the cessationist view of

---

[2088] Pg. 86, "The Non-Wesleyan Origins of the Pentecostal Movement," William W. Menzies, pgs. 81-98 of *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. Menzies "is widely known as his church's [the Assemblies of God] leading historian" (pg. 81).

[2089] Pg. 107, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; cf. pgs. 97-98, 105-106, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. Boardman. The teachings of the Oxford Convention and "the Faith Houses of Dorothea Trudel, at Mannedorf, Switzerland" were one (pg. 107, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). People at Oxford were reported healed by the Faith Cure when hands were laid on them (pg. 190): the Faith Cure and the Higher Life as taught by Trudel and at Oxford were one (pg. 242). At Oxford, it was proclaimed that today "Jesus does give signs and wonders," even as He "has given them to some here" (pg. 114), through healing disease (cf. pg. 231) and other methods. Of course, the physical thrills of the Bridal Baptism taught by Robert P. Smith would also, in his mind at least, constitute a miraculous sign and wonder.

[2090] Pg. 133, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

[2091] Pg. 28, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; cf. pg. 228 for the continuationist background of "the vast majority of recruits to Pentecostalism" in the Holiness movement, emotionalistic revivalism, or continuationistic Catholicism.

Of course, even as Keswick itself was influenced by earlier perfectionisms, notably Wesleyan and Oberlin perfectionism, so Keswick was not the sole Higher Life or Holiness theological influence upon the rise of Pentecostalism; Methodist perfectionism and continuationism were likewise influential alongside Keswick perfectionism and continuationism. The "Finished Work" Pentecostal majority, who did not require an initial second blessing of consecration as a certain prerequisite to Spirit baptism and tongues, leaned more heavily upon the Keswick Holiness teaching. The "Second Work" minority, which required a second blessing of consecration before one could achieve the third blessing of Spirit baptism and tongues, was influenced more strongly by Methodist Holiness teaching (cf. pgs. 173-175, *ibid.*).

[2092] Compare pgs. 115ff., *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

miracles proved a major hindrance to th[e] embrace of faith cure."[2093] An examination of forty-five representative Pentecostal pioneers indicated:

> Nearly all[2094] of the forty-five Pentecostal leaders . . . came out of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, or . . . other . . . Holiness factions that advocated healing and other gifts of the Spirit. . . . All looked for a Second Pentecost having both collective and individual aspects, which would restore the miraculous gifts and powers of the Apostolic Church—a notion that lay at the heart of the Keswick movement . . . acceptance of the new movement seemed both logical and natural.[2095]

In fact, Robert Pearsall "Smith himself spoke of the possibility of the restoration of the spiritual gifts of the Apostolic age," a view that "was from the beginning an element in the [Keswick] movement,"[2096] as the Faith Cure continuationism, associated at Broadlands with spiritualism, was publicly proclaimed at the Keswick-predecessor Conventions. Mrs. H. W. Smith taught at Brighton that supernatural and "[g]reat manifestations" were received today, and that they were regularly from God. She preached: "[D]on't think . . . that those who are favoured with [such manifestations] are enthusiasts."[2097] Similarly, Robert P. Smith taught the Faith Cure doctrine that those who have entered into the Higher Life have Christ live both their spiritual and physical life vicariously—the Christ-life—as allegedly taught in Galatians 2:20. He assured those who entered into such a Christ-life that they would never be sick nor lose their "power to work all [their] days for the Lord Jesus." Rather, he proclaimed, they "will not wear [themselves] out" but will live perpetually with bodies as healthy as youths; they will "live as children do," for God "will renew [their] youth like the eagle's."[2098] Likewise, in

---

2093 Pg. 69, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

2094 The sole exception mentioned by Anderson was Howard Goss, who converted to Pentecostalism from atheism and then went over to the Oneness Pentecostal movement.

2095 Pgs. 110-112, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. Anderson provides many lines of very convincing evidence. Bruner indicates that "A. J. Gordon, F. B. Meyer, A. B. Simpson, Andrew Murray, and . . . R. A. Torrey . . . formed a kind of theological fund from which the Pentecostal theology of the Spirit has drawn heavily to establish itself" (pg. 45, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970). Pentecostalism developed from the teachings of the "Walter Palmers, the R. Pearsall Smiths (Hannah Whitehall Smith), W. J. Boardman . . . Andrew Murray, F. B. Meyer, A. B. Simpson, A. J. Gordon, and . . . R. A. Torrey" (pg. 62, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970).

2096 "Die Heiligungsbewegung," Chapter 6, *Perfectionism*, B. B. Warfield, vol. 1. Warfield, in context, mentions also that such continuationism was found in the German Higher Life movement that spread through the preaching of Robert P. Smith in that country and which led, as might be expected, to the rise and spread of German Pentecostalism (see Chapters 6-7, *ibid*).

2097 Pg. 367, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

2098 Pg. 338, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

connection with severe misinterpretations of Scripture, Hannah Smith preached at Brighton the parallelism between the Higher Life for the soul and physical healing:

> The secret of our sickly condition is shown to us in the 28th chap. Deuteronomy, verses 58, 59, 60[.] . . . This exhortation is addressed to Christian people[.] . . . It is not to unconverted people. . . . I am afraid this describes a great many Christians present. They have been delivered from Egypt, but they have not kept God's law, and the diseases, which they thought were left behind, still cleave to them. This was my own experience after my conversion; I had two weeks of obedience and soul health, and then the diseases of Egypt came back again. Now, is there a way of deliverance, or must we go on as chronic invalids, and only expect to be healed when we get to heaven? . . . If the Lord heals, it seems to me we may with confidence say, "I shall be healed." Then, in Exodus, xv. Chap., 26th verse, we have the Lord giving Himself such a wonderful name, "I am the Lord that healeth thee." . . . [I]n Luke ix. 6, it says of Jesus, "He healed them that had need of healing." . . . [He] showed His power over both soul and body. . . . Is it not, then, as easy for the Lord to heal the soul as the body? . . . He came to heal both. . . . Do not ask your friend whether you may be healed. Do not ask your traditions or your prejudices, but ask your God, and if He says you may, I entreat of you to believe Him. . . . What we want is to find out whether we can be helped, and whether our disease comes within the reach of His healing power. Now, dear friends, we know that health is essential. . . . Get well, and then you can go and work for others. But *how*, you ask? First of all, I answer, it is utterly out of the question to even think of getting rid of disease ourselves; you cannot get at it . . . it is a thing that only God can do. . . . [P]ut your case now into His hands, and leave it with Him. Say to him, "Lord, here I am, sick and helpless; but I give myself to Thee to be healed. I believe Thou art able, and I trust Thee to do it." And having done this, you must not worry yourselves about it any more, but you must simply obey His directions and trust Him. . . . [I]f the Lord . . . [says,] "I will take your case in hand; I will manage it for you; I will heal all your diseases," [will] you . . . take Him at His word? . . . Why, dear friends, what did Jesus come to do if it was not to heal us? You know that He is willing. . . . [T]rust in Him. . . . [T]his [is the] secret of the Lord's healing power[.][2099]

The Higher Life for the body and soul preached at Keswick led directly onward to Pentecostalism.

The Keswick theology was also influenced not only by the perfectionism but also by the continuationism of Wesley and the Methodist movement.[2100] The Oberlin

---

[2099] Pgs. 28-34, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875. Mrs. Smith's words, in her eyes, are applicable to both physical and "spiritual diseases" (pg. 33), for the Higher Life for the soul and body are exactly parallel. The Apostle Paul would disagree with Mrs. Smith's affirmation that Deuteronomy 28:58-60 is addressed to the saved, as a simple comparison of Galatians 3:10 with Deuteronomy 27:26-28:68 makes abundantly clear. He would also disagree with Mrs. Smith's doctrine of the Higher Life for soul and body. Additionally, Luke 9:6 does not say "of Jesus, 'he healed them that had need of healing.'" The verse, speaking of the Twelve Apostles reads: "And they departed, and went through the towns, preaching the gospel, and healing every where." Mrs. Smith must have meant Luke 9:11, but careful study of Scripture in context was not her strong point.

[2100] The Wesley brothers abandoned the dominant Protestant cessationism to adopt a continuationst doctrine, a view in which they were followed by the Methodist movement, and which explains much of the fanaticism that came to characterize Methodism (e. g., the bride mysticism that Hannah and Robert P. Smith learned from Methodists). Thus, nineteenth-century Methodists, writing to defend Keswick continuationism, noted:

> [W]e dare to maintain that many of the phenomena of the Pentecostal times have been continued, are common, and ought to be expected in every age. . . . [Keswick] censors are exceedingly severe, [unjustly so, upon] the habitual reference made by the new [Keswick] teachers to the direct influence of the Holy Spirit . . . [as] a revealer as well as an interpreter of truth . . . speak[ing] to us not only by the written Word, but also by visions, or feelings, or aspirations, or impressions, independent of the Word; and extending even to what

> is sometimes claimed as a physical consciousness . . . [as by Keswick antecedent] Dr. Upham. (pg. 106, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875)

Indeed, "much in Pentecostal teaching is a legacy from Anglicanism, [including the generally Anglican initial] Keswick Conventions . . . through the mediation of Wesley" (pg. 185, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger).

John Wesley also rejected the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness in justification, writing: "Does 'the righteousness of God' ever mean . . . 'the merits of Christ'? . . . I believe not once in all the Scripture. . . . It often means, and particularly in the Epistle to the Romans, 'God's method of justifying sinners.' . . . [Does] 'the righteousness of God' signif[y] the righteousness which the God-man wrought out[?] No. . . . It signifies 'God's method of justifying sinners.'" (pg. 217, *Aspasio Vindicated, and the Scripture Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness Defended, in Eleven Letters from Mr. Hervey to Mr. Wesley, in Answer to that Gentleman's Remarks on Theron and Aspasio*, W. Hervey. Glasgow: J. & M. Robertson, 1762; & pg. 137, *Eleven Letters from the Late Rev. Mr. Hervey, to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley, Containing an Answer to that Gentleman's Remarks on Thereon and Aspasio*, W. Hervey. 2nd ed. London: J. & F. & C. Rivinot, 1789. cf. pg. 497, *The Doctrine of Justification*, James Buchanan. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1997 [orig. pub. 1867]). "Many Wesleyan Methodists, following the example of their founder, have . . . keenly opposed . . . the doctrine . . . of [Christ's] imputed righteousness" (pg. 500, *The Doctrine of Justification*, Buchanan). Thus, "Wesley could not resist assimilating justification into sanctification—the latter being his preeminent and enduring interest. The . . . notion that the believer is *simul justus et peccator* (at once both righteous and a sinner) Wesley firmly rejected. Many Arminians [including Wesley] further assert that faith is not merely the *instrument* of justification but the *ground* on which justification rests. Thus Wesley wrote that 'any righteousness created by the act of justification is real because of the ethical or moral dimension of faith'" (pg. 353, *The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation*, Bruce Demarest). Thus, Wesley wrote:

> Least of all does justification imply that God is deceived in those whom he justifies; that he thinks them to be what, in fact, they are not; that he accounts them to be otherwise than they are. It does by no means imply that God . . . esteems us better than we really are, or believes us righteous when we are unrighteous. Surely no. . . . Neither can it ever consist with his unerring wisdom to think that I am innocent, to judge that I am righteous or holy, because another is so. He can no more, in this manner, confound me with Christ, than with David or Abraham. . . . [S]uch a notion of justification is neither reconcilable to reason nor Scripture. (pg. 47, *The Works of the Reverend John Wesley*, vol. 1. New York: Emory & Waugh, 1831—note that "reason" is mentioned before "Scripture" as a reason to oppose the Biblical doctrine of justification.)

John Wesley rejected key elements of the core gospel doctrine of justification.

The Wesley brothers and the Methodist denomination retained the Anglican belief in baptismal regeneration when they left the English state church to start their own religion (cf. "John Wesley's View of Baptism," John Chongnahm Cho, *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7 (Spring 1972) 60-73). Commenting on John 3:5, Wesley affirmed, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit—Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it [he cannot enter into the kingdom of God]." Commenting on Acts 22:16, he wrote, "Baptism administered to real penitent[s] is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive Church bestow this on any, unless through this means." On both texts John Wesley clearly affirmed that baptism is the means of the new birth. He also declared, "It is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition" (Wesley, sermon, *The New Birth*). In his *Doctrinal Tracts* (pg. 246, 251) he wrote, "What are the benefits . . . we receive by baptism, is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is the washing away of original sin, by the application of Christ's death. . . . [T]he merits of Christ's life and deat[h] are applied to us in baptism. . . . [I]nfants are . . . proper subjects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless [sin] be washed away in baptism. Infants need to be washed from original sin. Therefore they are proper subjects for baptism" (cited in chapter 9, *The Evils of Infant Baptism,* Robert Boyt C. Howell, accessed in the *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library,* Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, 2003). He wrote elsewhere:

> [T]he first of . . . the *benefits* we receive by baptism is . . . the washing away of the guilt of original sin by the application of the merits of Christ's death. . . . [T]he merits of Christ's life and death . . . are applied to us in baptism . . . baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this, our Church prays in the baptismal office that the person to be baptized may be "washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his

> heavenly washing" [A conflation of two prayers in The Ministration of Publick Baptism . . . *Book of Common Prayer* [BCP] (1662), sec. 375-376.]; and declares in the rubric at the end of the office, "It is certain, by God's Word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved" (BCP, pg. 388). And this is agreeable to the unanimous judgment of all the ancient Fathers. . . . By baptism we enter into . . . the new covenant which [God] promised to make with the spiritual Israel. . . [and our] sins and iniquities . . . [are] remember[ed] no more[.] . . . By baptism we are . . . united to Christ . . . [f]rom which spiritual, vital union with him proceeds the influence of his grace on those that are baptized[.] . . . By baptism, we who were "by nature children of wrath" are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our Church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith. Being "grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace" [BCP, pgs. 398-399]. . . . By *water*, then, as a means (the water of baptism) we are regenerated or born again. Nor does . . . [o]ur Church . . . ascribe . . . [merely] the *outward* washing [to baptism], but the *inward grace* which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused which will not be wholly taken away unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long-continued wickedness. . . . *Baptism doth now save us* . . . as it admits us into the Church here, so into glory hereafter. . . . In the *ordinary* way, there is no other means of entering into the Church or into heaven. . . . [Since] infants are guilty of original sin, then they are the proper subjects of baptism, seing [that], in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism. . . . To sum up the evidence. If outward baptism be generally, in an *ordinary* way, necessary to salvation; and infants may be saved as well as adults . . . [we] ought . . . not to neglect . . . any means of saving them[.] (pgs. 321-328, *On Baptism,* John Wesley, in *John Wesley*, ed. Albert C. Outler. New York, NY: Oxford University Pres, 1964. Italics in original.)

John's brother, the Methodist hymn-writer Charles Wesley, wrote against the Baptists, "Partisans of a narrow sect/ Your cruelty confess/ Nor still inhumanly reject/ Whom Jesus would embrace./ Your little ones preclude them not/ From the baptismal flood brought/ But let them now to Christ be saved/ And join the Church of God." (*Charles Wesley's Journal,* 18 October 1756, 2:128). Only their Arminian theology led the Wesleys to call adults who had been sprinkled in infancy to conversion. Since they rejected the Biblical truth that once one is saved, he is always saved (Romans 8:28-39), they held that one who was regenerated in infant baptism could fall away and become a child of the devil again, at which time he would need a second new birth. Wesley consequently preached as follows to Anglicans who were, as he thought and as he preached, born again through infant baptism but needed to be born again one more time because they had lost their salvation through sinning:

> [That the] privileges . . . [of] being born again . . . being the son or a child of God, [and] having the Spirit of adoption . . . are ordinarily annexed to baptism (which is thence termed by our Lord [as] . . . being "born of water and of the Spirit") we know[.] . . . The question is not, what you was [*sic;* also in the following] made in baptism, but, ['] What are you now?['] . . . I ask not, whether you was born of water and of the Spirit; but are you now the temple of the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in you? I allow you was "circumcised with the circumcision of Christ;" (As St. Paul emphatically terms baptism;) but does the Spirit of Christ and of glory now rest upon you? Else "your circumcision is become uncircumcision." . . . Say not then in your heart, "I was once baptized, therefore I am now a child of God." Alas, that consequence will by no means hold. How many are the baptized gluttons and drunkards, the baptized liars and common swearers, the baptized railers and evil-speakers, the baptized whoremongers, thieves, extortioners? What think you? Are these now the children of God? Verily, I say unto you, unto whom any of the preceding characters belongs, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the works of your father ye do." . . . Unto you I call, in the name of Him whom you crucify afresh[.] . . . Lean no more on the staff of that broken reed, that ye were born again in baptism. Who denies that ye were then made children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven? But notwithstanding this, ye are now children of the devil. Therefore ye must be born again. . . . To say, then, that ye cannot be born again, that there is no new birth but in baptism, is to seal you all under damnation, to consign you to hell, without help, without hope. . . . You will say, "But we are washed;" we were born again "of water and of the Spirit." So were . . . these common harlots, adulterers, murderers. . . . This, therefore, hinders not at all, but that ye may now be even as they. . . . And if ye have been baptized, your only hope is this,—that those who were made the children of God by baptism, but are now the children of the devil, may yet again receive "power to become the sons of God;" that they may receive again what they have lost[.] (Sermon 18, "Marks of the New Birth," John Wesley, Elec. Acc. Wesley Center Online, http://wesley.nnu.edu/john-wesley-the-sermons-of-john-wesley-1872-edition/sermon-18-the-marks-of-the-new-birth/)

Whoever would deny that Anglicans were born again in baptism, John Wesley was not among their number. However, Anglicans who became unsaved by sinning after being sprinkled as infants were again lost and needed to be re-saved as adults.

perfectionism and continuationism of Asa Mahan also was an important influence.[2101] Furthermore, the expectation of the presence of continuing miracles,[2102] whether wrought by graven images, holy relics, transubstantiated wafers, or other abominations present in the theology of medieval Roman Catholicism (cf. Revelation 13:14; 16:14; 19:20)[2103] and in the mysticism of Madame Guyon, Fénelon, and other Romanist mystics,[2104] influenced Keswick continuationism and the Pentecostalism that developed from it[2105] both indirectly through Wesley and Methodism[2106] and directly through the impact of

---

2101 Mahan's "publications were translated, wholly and in part, into various European languages. They were quite influential in the development of Holiness and Pentecostal thought throughout Europe. Mahan was also involved with the Bethshan Healing Centre and helped to awaken interest in divine healing throughout Europe" (pg. 405, "Mahan, Asa," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen), since Mahan was a continuationist who wrote prominently in favor of the Faith Cure (pg. 134, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

2102 It is not surprising that the papacy has endorsed the charismatic movement and that there are now millions of Roman Catholic charismatics (see, e. g., pg. xxiv, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan)—Romanism has always accepted continuationism. Nor is it surprising that Pentecostals promoted Romanist mystics like Madame Guyon (see, e. g., pg. 24, *The Latter Rain Evangel*, September 1922).

2103 "Luther, Calvin, and most of the Reformers rejected miracles, visions, and the like as no longer having any role to play in the life of the Church, [but] Catholic theology and piety have always acknowledged a place for them" (pg. 174, "The Hidden Roots of the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church," Edward O'Connor, pgs. 169-191 in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan). As Pope Pius XII wrote, "[M]embers gifted with miraculous powers will never be lacking in the Church" (paragraph 17 of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943 ed., of the papal encyclical *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 193-248, cited on pg. 182, *ibid*). Expanding on the teaching of Pope Pius XII and other earlier Roman Catholic dogma, Vatican II indicated: "[C]harismatic gifts . . . are to be received with thanksgiving and consolation[,] for they are exceedingly suitable and useful for the needs of the Church" (pg. 185, *ibid*).

2104 Indeed, marvels of healing of the sort manifested in the Faith and Mind Cures, and then in the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements, were "for the greater part of Christian history . . . mainly centered in relics," so that "the great majority of the [alleged] miracles of healing which have been wrought throughout the history of the Roman Church have been wrought through the agency of relics. Not merely the actual graves of the saints, but equally any places where fragments of their bodies, however minute, have been preserved, have become healing shrine[s] to many of which pilgrims have flocked in immense numbers[.] . . . We are here at the very center of the miracle-life of the Church of Rome" (pg. 137, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield).

2105 "The case for an Anglo-Catholic and Roman rootage of Pentecostal theology is perhaps strengthened in that these traditions have also tended to maintain a sense of continuation of the 'miraculous' into the present day, not only within their sacramental systems, but also by affirming certain miracles of healing (often in relation to their understanding of sainthood) and by preserving ancient rites of exorcism and the laying on of hands for the sick" (pgs. 36-37, pgs, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

2106 Roman Catholic mysticism was key to the development of the perfectionism and continuationism of John Wesley. "John Wesley . . . says that he began his teaching on Perfection in 1725 . . . [although he] was not converted [on his own testimony] until 1738 . . . [h]ow did he come to teach it? His father and mother . . . had both been interested in . . . Roman Catholic mystical teaching . . . and had read a great deal of it. . . . John Wesley had read [in addition to other Romanist mystics such as] . . . Tauler . . . Thomas à Kempis . . .[and the] 'Protestant mystic . . . [who] wrote a book on Perfection . . . William Law,' but he was influenced "in particular [by]. . . Madame Guyon . . . [and] the Roman Catholic Archbishop Fénelon,"

Romanist mystical writings on Hannah Whitall Smith[2107] and others.[2108] Thus, "proponents of faith cure . . . [drew] heavily upon the classic works of mystical authors

---

although the Romanist mystic "Marquis or Baron de Renty" was probably Wesley's single "favorite author," eclipsing even Guyon and Fénelon (pgs. 307-308, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, Lloyd-Jones). Thus, Wesley could speak of "that excellent man, the Marquis de Renty" although he knew the Catholic was infected with "many touches of superstition, and some of idolatry, in worshipping saints, the Virgin Mary in particular" (cf. Sermon 72, series 2, Sermon 133, series 4, *Sermons, on Several Occasions*, *and to which reference is made in the trust-deeds of the Methodist Chapels, as constituting, with Mr. Wesley's notes on the New Testament, the standard doctrines of the Methodist connexion*, John Wesley. Orig. pub. 4 vol., 1771. Elec. acc. *Logos Bible Software*).

Wesley was also profoundly influenced by the ascetic, Romanist, and Eastern Orthodox "monastic piety of the fourth-century 'desert fathers'" during his time in the "Holy Club" at Oxford University:

> [T]he consideration of Macarius the Egyptian and Ephraem Syrus and their descriptions of "perfection" (*teleiosis*) as the goal (*skopos*) of the Christian in this life [were influential in] shaping . . . Wesley's . . . doctrine of Christian perfection . . . John Wesley . . . was . . . in touch with Gregory of Nyssa, the greatest of all the Eastern [Catholic] teachers of the quest for perfection. Thus, in his early days, [Wesley] drank deep of this Byzantine tradition of spirituality at its source and assimilated its concept of devotion as the way and perfection as the goal of the Christian life. . . . The devotional works . . . of two Latin [Roman Catholic] traditions of mystical spirituality . . . [and] the traditions of Eastern Orthodoxy—Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Macarius of Egypt, and others . . . introduced [important] factors of . . . [Wesley's] understanding of perfection. . . . Wesley . . . was inclined to go beyond logical subsequence [in justification and sanctification] to experiential subsequence because of the deep influence of the Eastern Fathers on him in terms of the relation of perfection to process and goal. (pgs. 93-97, "'Dialogue' Within a Tradition: John Wesley and Gregory of Nyssa Discuss Christian Perfection," John G. Merritt. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22:2 (Fall, 1987) 92-117)

Thus, Wesley received his idea of Christians' entering into perfection or a second blessing from Catholic mysticism, and transferred his two-stage notions into the Higher Life movement and into Pentecostalism. "John Wesley . . . under the influence of Catholic works of edification, distinguished between the ordinary believer and those who were 'sanctified' or 'baptized with the Spirit.' . . . This view was adopted . . . by the evangelists and theologians of the American Holiness movement . . . such as Asa Mahan and C. G. Finney . . . [and] the early Pentecostal movement" (pgs. 21, 322, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger).

Along with perfectionism, Wesley also adopted the ancient and medieval Catholic continuationism (cf. pgs. 44-45, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton) that had provided key support in the Catholic apologetic for their doctrinal deviations from Scripture. Image worship in the iconoclastic controversy and at other times, as well as worship of the saints themselves, transubstantiation, and other idolatries, were regularly validated by the marvels performed by the graven images of and relics culled from the saints, transubstantiated bread, and so on (cf. pgs. 135ff., *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield).

Interestingly, Dayton references Wesley's statement: "[I]f the Quakers hold the same perceptible inspiration with me, I am glad" ("Letter to 'John Smith,' March 25, 1747; elec. acc. Wesley Center Online: Wesley's Letters, 1747, http://wesley.nnu.edu/john-wesley/the-letters-of-john-wesley/wesleys-letters-1747. Compare pg. 43, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton. Note, however, that Wesley went on to guard this declaration from much of the fanaticism that could be derived from it, and he was discussing the meaning of Romans 8:16 and the question of the immediate testimony of the Spirit in assurance when he made it.).

[2107] Thus, for example, Robert and Hannah Smith could reference and promote Guyon and Fénelon at the Brighton Convention (cf. pgs. 140, 367, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

Partially through openness to Romanism and its miraculous relics, and partially through openness to other heresies and the inability to practice Biblical separation that were almost necessarily inherent in its nature as a State-church in a relatively free country, late eighteenth century Anglicanism, from which Keswick largely drew, was also not strongly cessationist but was open to continuationism (cf. pgs. 29-33, 62, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield; pg. 41, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

such as Madame Guyon and Fenelon[.]"[2109] Indeed, many continuationist marvels, such as speaking in tongues, require the rejection of the activity of the mind[2110] and the self-emptying exalted by the Higher Life theology that has been of the essence of Quietism since its flowering in medieval Romanism, just as in the even earlier openly heathen and polytheistic Quietism. What is more, since "the central persons [in the development of Keswick were] Friends, and still cl[ung] to the 'inward light,'"[2111] the Quaker theology, with its doctrine of the continuation of revelation through inner light in Hannah Whitall and Robert Pearsall Smith's background and preaching, as well as that of Robert Wilson, Jessie Penn-Lewis, and other early Keswick leaders, provided crucial background for the strong Keswick continuationism.

From the time of the earliest conference at Broadlands that led to the Keswick Convention, "[t]he 'Seed,' of which George Fox [the founder of Quakerism] spoke, was rooted in them all."[2112] The Keswick theology thus perpetuated the acceptance of continuing revelation and miracles as affirmed by Quakerism. Robert Barclay, the premier Quaker theologian, wrote:

> Revelations of God by the Spirit, whether by outward voices and appearances, dreams, or inward objective manifestations in the heart, were of old the formal object of [believers'] faith, and remain yet so to be; for the object of the saints' faith is the same in all ages, though set forth under divers administrations. Moreover, these divine inward revelations . . . we make absolutely necessary for the building up of true faith[.] . . . [T]hese divine revelations are . . . not . . . to be

---

2108 For example, A. T. Pierson recognized that the "Mystics . . . deserve a very prominent place . . . [a]mong all the leaders of th[e] holiness movement . . . [it] is inseparable from this great current of thought that is associated with such as Jacob Böhme, St. Theresa, Catherine of Siena, Madame Guyon, Fénélon, Tauler, and William Law" (pgs. 11-12, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Pierson).

2109 Pg. 114, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis.

2110 E. g., when Azuza Street leader Frank Bartleman received his special Pentecostal baptism and its charismatic tongues, he testified to the necessity of quietistic passivity and rejection of mental activity (contrast 2 Timothy 1:7) for the receipt of the ability to babble in gibberish:

> I was . . . ceasing from the works of my own natural mind fully. . . . The Spirit had gradually prepared me for this culmination in my experience . . . I had . . . my spirit greatly subdued. A place of utter abandonment of will had been reached . . . purified from natural self-activity. . . . My mind, the last fortress of man to yield, was taken possession of by the Spirit [or, on a cessationist view, by evil spirits]. . . . I was possessed . . . fully. My mind . . . had caused me most of my trouble in my Christian experience. . . . Nothing hinders faith and the operation of the Spirit so much as . . . the wisdom, strength and self-sufficiency of the human mind. . . . In the experience of "speaking in tongues" I had reached the climax in abandonment. . . . From that time the Spirit began to flow through me in a new way. . . . "[T]ongues" . . . necessarily violat[e] human reason. It means abandonment of this faculty for the time. The human mind is held in abeyance fully in this exercise. (pgs. 73-75, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan)

Bartleman explained further that "[n]othing hinders God more . . . when waiting on Him for the 'baptism' [and receipt of tongues] . . . than . . . [having the] mind always at work" (pg. 126, *ibid*).

2111 Pg. 103, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875.

2112 Pg. 62, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie. The Quaker influence was passed down to subsequent generations of Higher Life advocates; e. g., the Christian and Missionary Alliance can commend George Fox as an example of spiritual life and spiritual victory ("The Four Laws of Victory," C. H. Chrisman. *Alliance Weekly*, June 14, 1919, 179).

> subjected to the examination, either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or of the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain rule or touchstone; for this divine revelation, and inward illumination, is that which is evident and clear of itself; forcing, by its own evidence and clearness, the well-disposed understanding to assent, irresistibly moving the same thereunto[.] . . . [T]he Scriptures . . . are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate primary rule of faith and manners. . . . [T]hey are . . . subordinate to the Spirit . . . for . . . by the inward testimony of the Spirit we alone do truly know them.[2113]

Bushnell explains:

> The sect of Friends, from George Fox downward, have had it as a principle to expect gifts [and] revelations[.] . . . Led on thus by Fox, the Friends have always claimed the continuance of the original gifts of the Spirit in the apostolic age, and have looked for them . . . in the ordinary course of their . . . demonstrations. We are not surprised to find [them] . . . believing as firmly in the prophetic gifts of [their] [Quaker] friend[s] as in those of Isaiah or Paul."[2114]

Hannah Whitall Smith described the practical result of this Quaker Inner Light teaching she received in her youth in pointing sinners away from the objective work of Christ on the cross for salvation to the "light within," and away from *sola Scriptura* to alleged personal revelations. She wrote:

> Our Quaker education had been . . . to refer us under all circumstances to the "light within" for teaching and guidance, and we believed that only when God should reveal Himself there, could we come really to know Him. In an old Quaker tract which I have found among my papers, called "What shall we do to be saved?" there is a passage that sets forth clearly the sort of teaching with which we had grown up. It is as follows:
>
> > I cannot direct the searcher after truth who is pensively enquiring what he shall do to be saved, to the ministry of any man; but would rather recommend him to the immediate teaching of the word nigh in the heart, even the Spirit of God. This is the only infallible teacher, and the primary adequate rule of faith and practice: it will lead those who attend to its dictates into the peaceable paths of safety and truth. . . .
>
> The natural result of this teaching was to turn our minds inward, upon our feelings and our emotions, and to make us judge of our relations with God entirely by what we found within ourselves. What God had said in the Bible seemed to us of not nearly so much authority as what He might say to us in our own hearts, and I have no recollection of ever for a moment going to the Scriptures for instruction. The "inward voice" was to be our sole teacher.[2115]

Keswick maintained the continuationism at the heart of Quaker belief and practice, preparing the way for the arrival of the Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements.[2116] As today there are "Quaker Pentecostals,"[2117] and Quakers were associated with the

---

[2113] Pgs. iv-v, Proposition 2, "Concerning Immediate Revelation," Proposition 3, "Concerning the Scriptures," *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People called Quakers*, Robert Barclay.

[2114] Pg. 325, *Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the One System of God*, Horace Bushnell. London: Richard D. Dickinson, 1880.

[2115] Pgs. 151-152, *The Unselfishness of God*, Hannah W. Smith.

[2116] Word of Faith leaders have, they aver, "inspired thoughts" that "are the Word of God" just as the "New Testament" is "inspired thoughts" (pg. 109, *God's Laws of Success*, Robert Tilton).

[2117] Cf. pg. 418, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; pg. 103, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

Pentecostal movement from its very beginning,[2118] similarly "the early Quakers . . . experienced glossolalia,"[2119] and there were "prominent Quaker Pentecostal[s] . . . in Pentecostal leadership."[2120] "Certainly the impact of Keswick thought had a substantial influence on the shaping of Pentecostal theology, not only in the English-speaking world, but elsewhere, particularly in continental Europe. . . . Keswick theology was accepted . . . readily by Pentecostals. . . . Keswick influence quickly gained currency in the young Pentecostal movement."[2121] Keswick theology permeated the institutions promulgating Pentecostalism.[2122] The "Keswick movement" made "extremely important contributions

---

[2118] Thus, for example, Quakers were students at Charles Parham's Bethel Bible College when the modern tongues movement began (pg. 48, *The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Pentecostal Movement*, Klaude Kendrick).

[2119] Pg. 126, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. "The early Quakers . . . had the Gift of Tongues" (pg. 3, *The Apostolic Faith* I:1 (Los Angeles, September 1906), reprinted on pg. 3, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

[2120] Pg. 101, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*, ed. Edith L. Blumhofer. It is not in the least surprising that Pentecostal founder Charles Parham adopted second blessing theology and its companion the Faith Cure through the influence of a "holiness Quaker" whose daughter he married at a ceremony performed by a Quaker minister (pg. 49, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). Parham also rejected hell for annihilationism and rejected the precept of water baptism through this same Holiness Quaker influence, while proceeding to open a Faith Cure home. "In short, he was a typical Holiness preacher of the Keswick variety" (pg. 50, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; Parham later changed his mind on water baptism and affirmed that one should be immersed "in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" (pg. 255, *ibid*)). Parham's "College of Bethel," which he opened only a few months before tongues broke out, also included students who had been ministers and religious workers in Quaker congregations (pg. 51, *ibid*).

"Quaker Seth Cook Rees, a figure prominent in the founding of both the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene and the Pilgrim Holiness Church," who argued that "signs and miracles have reappeared with every Holy Ghost revival," is an example of a significant Quaker Pentecostal leader (cf. pgs. 91, 93, 174-175, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

[2121] "Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm. The perfectionisms of Wesley, the Oberlin theology, and the Keswick theology together birthed the Pentecostal movement, even as they mutually influenced each other. However, the "Keswick view of sanctification started to dominate the Pentecostal movement in 1908," overtaking the Wesleyan perfectionist influences that were initially stronger at Azuza Street ("Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. http://www.pneumafoundation.org). Althouse explains how the Keswick view of the second blessing came to dominate in the Assemblies of God, the largest Pentecostal denomination in the United States. He likewise relates the manner in which the "Keswick understanding of sanctification had direct historical and theological influences upon the early Pentecostal movement," both among those Pentecostal leaders who believed in two acts of grace (the second blessing) and those who believed in three acts of grace, an "issue [that] would fracture the fledgling movement. Nevertheless, the Keswick notions of sanctification not only influenced the more . . . Keswick [two acts of grace] Pentecostals, but Holiness [three acts of grace] Pentecostals as well" (*ibid*).

[2122] "The Bible school of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, Georgia, one of the earliest Pentecostal denominations, based its curriculum on . . . Keswick works[.] . . . *The Pentecostal Holiness Advocate*, an early Pentecostal periodical, advertised the works of . . . Keswick writers regularly. Furthermore, the Assemblies of God, a Pentecostal denomination with . . . Keswick leanings, was dominated by Christian and Missionary Alliance people such as Elderidge, J.W. Welch and D.W. Kerr. The Assemblies of God

to the development of pentecostalism,"[2123] laying the groundwork that made the rise of the charismatic movement essentially inevitable:

> Keswick leaders . . . concluded that [there] would be a great world-wide revival that would give every living person a last chance to accept the gospel. They expected that the Holiness movement would culminate in a Second Pentecost in which the Holy Spirit would endow believers with extraordinary powers[.] . . . The twin themes of a coming Pentecostal revival, sometimes called "the latter rain," and of a Spirit baptism of power, run through . . . Keswick . . . literature. References to the gift of healing as a characteristic of both the revival and "the Baptism" are abundant; [references also appear] to speaking in tongues[.] . . . The Keswick movement . . . was absolutely crucial to the development of Pentecostalism. . . . The doctrinal basis for [Pentecostal] Christianity was laid by the Keswick wing of the Holiness movement, while an atmosphere heavy with hopes of a new Pentecost and inspired by the Welsh revival provided a favorable milieu. . . . Keswick-oriented people . . . in the Holiness movement . . . found the Pentecostal movement attractive . . . because its message fit so well into the general outlook already held by them.[2124]

"It is thus no accident that Pentecostalism emerged when it did. All that was needed was the spark that would ignite this volatile tinder."[2125] The Keswick and Higher Life movement provided the theological fuel for Pentecostalism—all that was needed was a spark to set the whole continuationist mass ablaze.[2126]

With Keswick continuationism came a practical undermining of *sola Scriptura* in favor of an experiential or allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, a phenomenon

---

course for ministers also included works by . . . Simpson, Murray and Pierson" ("Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. http://www.pneumafoundation.org; cf. pgs. 110-112, 267, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

2123 Pg. 81, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

2124 Pgs. 40-43, 46, 81, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. It was the "fundamental and nearly universal notion during the first few years of the [Pentecostal] movement" that the coming of the Second Pentecost with the restoration of tongues was so that missionaries could go to the ends of the earth to preach without learning native languages in preparation for the end of the world: "[T]he primary purpose of speaking in tongues was to make possible the fulfillment of the last sign of the end—the miraculous propagation of the gospel in the languages of all the peoples of the world[.]" To that end many Pentecostal missionaries went to foreign fields expecting natives to understand their gibber-jabber, although they were not successful in even a single instance (pgs. 90-92, 139, *ibid*), leading later Pentecostals to revise their earlier almost universally held belief and leading Pentecostal apologists to downplay the evidence of history on their earlier view.

See also *The Apostolic Faith* I:1 (Los Angeles, September 1906) & I:2 (October 1906) reprinted on pgs. 1, 5, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove.

2125 Pg. 108, 143, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton. Dayton explains:

> [T]he rise of faith healing . . . may be seen largely as a radicalization of the Holiness doctrine of instantaneous sanctification in which the consequences of sin (i. e., disease) as well as sin itself are overcome in the Atonement and vanquished during this life. . . . [T]he whole network of popular "higher Christian life" institutions and movements constituted at the turn of the century a sort of pre-Pentecostal tinderbox awaiting the spark that would set it off. . . . [W]hen Pentecostalism emerged . . . leaders of the Holiness movement recognized that it was only the gift of tongues that set it apart from their own teachings. . . . [They were] at the time but a hairs-breadth from Pentecostalism. (pgs. 174-176, *ibid*)

2126 There is no such tie between dispensationalism and Pentecostalism as there is between the Higher Life theology and Pentecostal continuationism. While Pentecostals may be dispensationalists, a consistent dispensationalism actually leads to cessationism, not continuationism (cf. pgs. 145-147, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

also passed on to the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements, and one that distinguished the Keswick and Pentecostal movements from fundamentalism.[2127] Donald Dayton explains:

> [There is a] distinct hermeneutic, a distinctively Pentecostal manner of appropriating the Scriptures. In contrast to magisterial Protestantism [and Baptist orthodoxy] . . . Pentecostalism reads the rest of the New Testament through Lukan eyes . . . [placing] [n]arrative material [over] . . . didactic . . .Pauline texts. . . . In making this claim, Pentecostalism stands in a long tradition of a "subjectivizing hermeneutic." . . . The "higher life" antecedents to Pentecostalism in the nineteenth century used a similar approach to Scripture in appropriating elements of the Old Testament *Heilsgeschichte* devotionally. The exodus from Egypt, the wilderness wanderings, and crossing Jordan River into the Promised Land all became stages in the normative pattern of the spiritual pilgrimage from conversion into the "second blessing" ("Beulah Land").[2128]

Consequently, it is unsurprising that Keswick taught: "There are times in our Christian life in which we have . . . to . . . accept as children from God things which often seem to be, and are, in contradiction with what appears to us the teaching of Scripture."[2129] Adopting this Keswick idea and accepting what was contrary to what one thought was the teaching of Scripture was very important if one was to embrace charismatic fanaticism. Thus, in the infancy of Pentecostalism at Azuza Street in Los Angeles, "[T]he operative hermeneutical principle [was that] . . . 'the literal Word could be temporarily overruled by the living Spirit.' . . . [I]n order to continue the [Pentecostal] revival, it was necessary for God to act independently of the regulating structure provided in the written Word."[2130] The rules regulating the gift of tongues specified by Paul in 1 Corinthians

---

2127 "The strong concern for the exact meaning of the printed word . . . is one of the principal things that distinguish fundamentalism from other less intellectual forms of American revivalism or from the more experientially oriented holiness tradition or . . . pentecostalism" (pg. 61, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, George Marsden).

2128 Pgs. 22-24, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

2129 Pg. 183, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson. The quotation is from the famous and influential sermon "The Sufficiency of Grace" (pgs. 183-188, *ibid*) by the renowned Keswick leader and Faith Cure continuationist Otto Stockmayer and was preached at Keswick in 1896 (pg. 140, *ibid*). Stevenson's compilation of Keswick messages in his *Keswick's Authentic Voice* was, as validated and endorsed by many Keswick leaders, from the General Director of the China Inland Mission, J. Oswald Sanders, to the Chairman of the Keswick Convention Council, A. T. Houghton. The book, and Otto Stockmeyer's sermon, does present "indeed 'Keswick's Authentic Voice'" through the "outstanding addresses" selected (pgs. 9, 11, *ibid*), including Stockmeyer's.

2130 Pgs. 90-92, "Glossolalia at Azuza Street: A Hidden Presupposition?" Charles S. Gaede. *Westminster Theological Journal* 51:1 (Spring 1989) 77-92. Gaede, a professor at the Southwestern Assemblies of God College in Waxahachie, Texas, explains, in more detail:

> [T]he operative hermeneutical principle [was that] . . . "the literal Word could be temporarily overruled by the living Spirit." . . . (1) there was an awareness of the scriptural regulations governing public glossolalia, and (2) [Azuza street leaders] were unwilling to apply the provisions of the written Word consistently. Why were they willing to let the inconsistency continue? . . . ["We] have seen over and over again during the past fifteen months, that where Christian workers have suppressed these manifestations [because of Scriptural teaching], the Holy Spirit has been grieved, the work has stopped. . . . Who are we to dictate to an all-wise God as to how He shall work in anyone?["] . . . [I]n order to continue the revival, it was necessary for God to act independently of the regulating structure provided in the written Word . . . pragmatism was the method used to solve this problem[.] The existence of the third presupposition would explain the practice of the selective application of biblical authority. On certain issues biblical authority was asserted vehemently; on

were "ignored . . . in all the early Pentecostal meetings."[2131] Pentecostal historians recognize that their movement arose and is propagated by events and experiences, not by careful preaching of the Word, interpreted grammatically and historically.[2132] For the charismatic, the "*exegetical* difficulties which may arise [in Pentecostal doctrine] are, in the final analysis, more than balanced for Pentecostals by the *experiential* proofs."[2133] The mind must not be used to interpret Scripture.[2134] Experience[2135] is superior to Biblical theology and logical study of Biblical teaching.[2136] Thus, both through continuationism and through the rejection of a literal interpretation of Scripture for an exaltation of experience, the Higher Life theology of Robert P. and Hannah W. Smith "gave birth to the Keswick Convention . . . and Pentecostal movements."[2137]

In addition to Quaker theology, William Boardman's healing doctrine, developed out of antinomian, Oberlin, and Wesleyan continuationism and perfectionism, was passed on to the Higher Life movement and is prominent in the writings of Andrew Murray, A. B. Simpson, and many other Keswick leaders. That is, the continuationism of the Faith

---

> other issues it was viewed as antagonistic to the acts of God by his Spirit. That is particularly true with respect to their beliefs and practices of glossolalia. The three presuppositions would be implemented by the hermeneutical principle of pragmatism. . . . The desire and attempts to perpetuate the revival developed an unacknowledged presupposition that the imposition of any structure, including that set forth in the written Word, nullified the experiential activity of God. An implementing hermeneutical principle of pragmatism flowed from that presupposition. (pgs. 90-92, "Glossolalia at Azuza Street: A Hidden Presupposition?" Charles S. Gaede. *Westminster Theological Journal* 51:1 (Spring 1989) 77-92)

2131 Pg. 146, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. "Pentecostals . . . were not overly concerned with the problem of reconciling their experience with 1 Corinthians, chapter 12" (pg. 163, *ibid*).

2132 Synan writes:

> Pentecostal Christianity tends to find its rise in events . . . [and recognizes the] priority of "event." . . . These events . . . giv[e] a distinct focus to one's reading of Scripture. The focus is upon the realistic, even the empirical, results . . . a dramatic breakthrough of supernatural power, a display of charismatic phenomena. It is not the case of a teaching that gains a hearing, but events that attract a following. . . . [F]undamentalists have consistently criticized pentecostals for departing from a theological accent on God's "propositional revelation" in the Scripture. (pgs. 25-27, 209, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan)

2133 Pg. 62, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner, citing pg. 26, *The Heavenly Gift: Studies in the Work of the Holy Spirit*, Pearlman (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1935) and pg. 39, *Systematic Theology,* Williams, vol. 1.

2134 "Under rational inquiry pentecostalism falters" (pg. 206, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan), as does its Higher Life precursors.

2135 Bruner notes:

> The modern family-book of Pentecostalism has . . . the following main chapters: Wesley—revivalism—Finney—the holiness movement. In each chapter personal experience is given special stress . . . [and] in the Methodist and holiness movements, the personal experience most stressed was that which was subsequent to . . . conversion . . . the experience which came in the Pentecostal movement to be called the baptism in the Holy Spirit. (pg. 47, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970)

2136 Compare pg. 6, "A Plea for Experience," *The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God*, 448-449, June 10, 1922.

2137 July 27-28, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

and Mind Cure movement, which grew out of Methodist and other pre-Keswick perfectionist theologies, was very influential on Keswick. McConnell explains:

> [H]ealing . . . w[as] very much alive in the nineteenth-century Faith-Cure movement led by Charles Cullis and spread by William Boardman, Andrew Murray, Adoniram Gordon, Carrie Judd Montgomery, and A. B. Simpson. . . . [T]he Faith-Cure disciples of Charles Cullis . . . [provided] the divine healing movement with the production of a permanent literature . . . transcended denominational distinctions and drew supporters and practitioners from every background . . . [and had] lasting significance . . . [as seen in] the explosion of the Pentecostal movement in the first decade of the twentieth century. The Pentecostal movement was built upon the theological foundation of the Faith-Cure movement.[2138]

The Quaker and Faith Cure continuationism, adopted and strongly promulgated by so many of the leaders of the Keswick theology—and strongly opposed by, or separated from, by none of them—is profoundly connected to the modern Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements.[2139] Charles Parham, the "theological father of the . . . Azusa Street revival . . . which ushered into being the worldwide twentieth-century pentecostal renewal," adopted the key doctrinal distinctive of Pentecostalism—tongues-speech as the necessary evidence of present-day post-conversion Spirit baptism—at the Faith Cure home he had founded as a Higher Life minister, where he taught "the standard teachings of the holiness movement that were current in his day . . . sanctification as a second work of grace [and] divine healing[.]"[2140] William Seymour, the central figure of Azuza Street, learned the Pentecostal theology at the Bible school associated with Parham's Faith Cure home.[2141] Keswick—the Higher Life of the spirit and of the body—laid essential groundwork for the rise of charismatic fanaticism. Indeed, the

---

[2138] Pgs. 204-205, *Another Gospel*, D. R. McConnell. McConnell leaves out especially unsavory but prominent advocates of Faith Cure such as John H. Noyes, who joined the doctrine to extreme perfectionism, communism, and rampant sexual immorality or "free love" among the men and women who adhered to his principles, known by those whom he deluded as "complex marriage" (cf. "Socialism," *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, Strong & McClintock). Compare pgs. 10, 20, 81-87, 107, 119, 159-160, 200 & 239, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis, for Carrie Judd Montgomery's healing by an Adventist, cultist, and woman preacher, Sarah Mix. Curtis also documents Montgomery's transition from preaching the Faith Cure and preaching against the Christian use of medicine with Cullis, Boardman, and Simpson into the Pentecostal movement.

[2139] As healing was the sign of the earlier Higher Life outpouring, so tongues were the sign of the later Pentecostal outpouring (pg. 161, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan).

[2140] Pg. ix, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Justification by faith and premillennialism were also said to be standard holiness teachings, to which could be added other items such as the inspiration of Scripture, monotheism, the resurrection of Christ, and so on. However, post-conversion crisis-sanctification and the Mind or Faith Cure were doubtless the two special doctrinal distinctives—the Higher Life of the spirit and the Higher Life of the body.

[2141] Pgs. ix-xi, xix, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. "Seymour . . . invited Parham, his 'father in the gospel,' to preach at Azusa Street[.] . . . Seymour and his Azusa Street leaders began publication of their own paper, entitled *The Apostolic Faith* . . . [a] name . . . taken from Charles Parham's Apostolic Faith movement" (pg. xix, *ibid.*).

leadership for the early Pentecostal movement had direct, personal contact with Keswick leaders and drew countless adherents of Keswick into their ranks. "Many of the early Pentecostal leaders in Britain attended Keswick meetings."[2142] For example, prominent English Pentecostal "Alexander Boddy . . . was a Keswick evangelical," while "George Jeffreys . . . the . . . founder of another Pentecostal denomination, the Elim Church, had attended Conventions where he was taught to receive [t]he Baptism of the Holy Spirit . . . the Keswick message."[2143] It is very clear that "Keswick . . . played an important role as a precursor to the Pentecostal and charismatic movements"[2144]—indeed, the "[t]he Keswick movement . . . was absolutely crucial to the development of Pentecostalism."[2145] Not surprisingly, "the early Pentecostal understanding of sanctification was . . . a view emanating from the Keswick understanding of consecration and surrender to the Holy Spirit."[2146] When tongues broke out in Los Angeles, "great holiness denominations, already in existence by the time of the Azusa street revival, were swept almost overnight into the pentecostal fold."[2147] The "workers at 'Azuza' . . . were largely called and prepared . . . from the Holiness ranks."[2148] History demonstrates:

> [O]ne can find in late nineteenth century holiness thought and life every significant feature of pentecostalism . . . the ground had been well prepared. . . . the emergence of pentecostalism . . . may be seen as a natural development . . . connections are very apparent. . . . [T]he holiness revival of the late nineteenth century . . . was the cradle in which the pentecostal revival was rocked.[2149]

[2142] Pgs. 178-179, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[2143] Pgs. 178-179, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Even up to "1929 . . . [t]he hope was expressed by the Elim movement . . . that Keswick leaders would . . . be compelled to admit that Pentecostal teaching was correct" (pg. 179, *ibid*).

[2144] Pg. 253, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[2145] Pg. 43, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Mapes Anderson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1979/1992.

[2146] "Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. http://www.pneumafoundation.org. "Of all the writers in the Assemblies of God who have written clearly on the doctrine of sanctification, none is more significant than William I. Evans. . . . Evans outlines a position on sanctification in the classic Keswickian language which reaches through the [Christian and Missionary] Alliance, through A. B. Simpson, all the way to A. J. Gordon, Robert Pearsall Smith, F. B. Meyer, and others who traveled the Keswick circuit" (pgs. 89-90, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan).

[2147] Pg. 93, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. For example, the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church entered the Pentecostal movement wholesale (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:8 (Los Angeles, May 1907), reprinted on pg. 34, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

[2148] Pg. 81, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2149] Pgs. 51-52, 97, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. In more detail:

> [C]entral to the whole [rise of] . . . the pentecostal movement . . . was the change in the evangelical mood created in large measure by the American holiness revival. . . . [T]he American holiness movement of the nineteenth century mediated Wesleyan theology and experience through American revivalism to almost the

Pentecostalism was simply a further development of the evil fruit of unscriptural doctrine and practice found in the holiness and Higher Life movements.[2150]

II. William Boardman

William Boardman, a grocer from Illinois[2151] and a New School Presbyterian who was strongly influenced by Charles Finney, Asa Mahan, and Phoebe Palmer,[2152] worked

---

whole of evangelicalism around the world. It won broad acceptance of a "second blessing" . . . the common point [for] the holiness, Keswick, pentecostal, and charismatic movements . . . expectations of a new age of pentecostal power were aroused . . . and finally, in the nineteenth century holiness revival, the pentecostal movement found a large number of its founding leaders and organizations. . . . Out of the world-wide Holiness movements the Pentecostal movement was born. (pgs. 58-59, *ibid*)

2150 Harry Ironside, having been delivered in the mercy of God from second-blessing perfectionism, wrote in 1912 of the connection between the Higher Life, false professions and pseudo-conversion, a lowering of the level of true holiness, Faith Cure, and Pentecostalism:

> And now I began to see what a string of derelicts this holiness teaching left in its train. I could count scores of persons who had gone into utter infidelity because of it. They always gave the same reason: "I tried it all. I found it a failure. So I concluded the Bible teaching was all a delusion, and religion was a mere matter of the emotions." Many more (and I knew several such intimately) lapsed into insanity after floundering in the morass of this emotional religion for years—and people said that studying the Bible had driven them crazy. How little they knew that it was lack of Bible knowledge that was accountable for their wretched mental state—an absolutely unscriptural use of isolated passages of Scripture! . . . I observed that the general state of "sanctified" people was as low, if not often lower, than that of those whom they contemptuously described as "only justified." . . . Very few of our "converts" stood. "Backsliders" often outnumbered by far our "soldiers." . . . One great reason for this . . . . [was] that the holiness doctrine had a most baneful influence upon the movement. People who professed conversion . . . struggled for months, even years, to reach a state of sinlessness which never was reached; and at last they gave up in despair and sank back in many instances to the dead level of the world around them.
>
> I saw that it was the same with all the holiness denominations, and the various "bands," "Missions," and other movements that were continually breaking off from them. The standard set was the unattainable. The result was, sooner or later, utter discouragement, cunningly concealed hypocrisy, or an unconscious lowering of the standard to suit the experience reached. . . . I went to the Home of Rest[.] . . . Closely allied to the Home were other institutions where holiness and faith-healing were largely dwelt upon. . . . [T]he manifestly carnal gloried in their experience of perfect love! Sick people testified to being healed by faith, and sinning people declared they had the blessing of holiness! . . .
>
> Since turning aside from the perfectionist societies, I have often been asked if I find as high a standard maintained among Christians generally who do not profess to have the "second blessing" as I have seen among those who do. My answer is that after carefully, and I trust without prejudice, considering both, I have found a far higher standard maintained by believers who reject [the second blessing] than among those who accept it . . . a far lower standard of Christian living is found among the so-called holiness people.
>
> The reasons are not far to seek . . . the profession of holiness induces a subtle spiritual pride . . . and frequently leads to the most manifest self-confidence . . . tends to harden the conscience and to cause the one who professes it to lower the standard to his own poor experience. . . .
>
> Superstition and fanaticism of the grossest character find a hotbed among holiness advocates. Witness the present disgusting "Tongues Movement," with all its attendant delusions and insanities. An unhealthy craving for new and thrilling religious sensations, and emotional meetings of a most exciting character, readily account for these things. Because . . . people get to depend so much upon "blessings," and "new baptisms of the Spirit," as they call these experiences[,] . . . they readily fall a prey to the most absurd delusions. In the last few years hundreds of holiness meetings all over the world have been literally turned into pandemoniums where exhibitions worthy of a madhouse or of a collection of howling dervishes are held night after night. No wonder a heavy toll of lunacy and infidelity is the frequent result. . . . Holiness . . . doctrines . . . are the direct cause of the disgusting fruits I have been enumerating. Let a full Christ be preached, a finished work be proclaimed, the truth of the indwelling Spirit be scripturally taught, and all these excrescences disappear. (pgs. 24-40, *Holiness: the False and the True*, Harry Ironside)

very closely with Robert Pearsall Smith in the time from 1873-1875 that led to the beginning of the meetings at Keswick to promote the Higher Life theology, joining the Smiths in the spiritualist-sponsored gathering at Broadlands and its successor, the Oxford Convention,[2153] as well as preaching at the Keswick Convention itself.[2154] Indeed, one could say that "Boardman helped to found the Keswick movement . . . with [Robert] Pearsall and Hannah Whitall Smith."[2155] Through Mr. Boardman, "the despised doctrine of the early Methodists"—perfectionism and continuationism—"has become the glorious heritage of all denominations,"[2156] for he "was the first standard-bearer on the subject of the Higher Life."[2157] *The Higher Christian Life*, which he wrote in three months[2158] and published in 1859, was the book through which "interest in the subject really became widespread . . . and [which] led multitudes" to adopt the Higher Life doctrine of sanctification.[2159] In *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman claimed that for the first time, after "eighteen centuries . . . have . . . been allowed to roll away," the truth of sanctification had been "brought distinctly and prominently before the mind of the church[.] . . . [U]ntil now, the time has never come for it. Now is the time."[2160] While

---

2151 "Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. http://www.pneumafoundation.org.

2152 Pg. 100, *Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology*, A. Naselli.

2153 cf. pgs. 155ff., *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman; pg. 20, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

2154 E. g., pg. 52, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

2155 Pg. 48, *Only Believe*, Paul L. King. The "re-discovery" of the Higher Life theology by "W. E. Boardman . . . was eagerly welcomed and widely disseminated—at meetings convened for the purpose, and through books; and among its most gifted exponents were Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pearsall Smith, a Quaker couple who had 'come into the blessing'" (pg. 14, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson). Compare Robert P. Smith's hagiographical commendation of Boardman at the Brighton Convention, coupled with an affirmation that the Brighton teaching was that of Mr. Boardman (pgs. 46-47, pg. 12, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; at Brighton testimony was also given to how Boardman's teaching brought people into the Higher Life; cf. pgs. 217, 462-463, *ibid*.).

2156 Pgs. v-vi, Pg. 48, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2157 Pg. 254, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2158 Pg. 104, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. Boardman's focus in his book on experience, rather than Scripture, enabled him to write quickly. He did not need to spend large amounts of time studying the Bible.

2159 Pg. 16, *So Great Salvation,* Barabas.

2160 Pg. 215, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman. If the Higher Life only came "distinctly and prominently before the mind of the church" in Boardman's day, how could he write a book of testimonials about people from Luther to Baxter to Edwards who supposedly experienced the Higher Life in in earlier eras? Perhaps Boardman justified the historical revisionism in his testimonials on the presupposition that godly men from earlier eras experienced his Higher Life doctrine without knowing about it. Consequently, historical records that did not actually affirm his doctrine could be revised so that those who secretly held his system could have the hidden Higher Life teaching not present in their conscious thought brought out.

"[t]rained theologians could tear its arguments to shreds" and "detractors" thought it "poison," its influence was, nonetheless, vast.[2161] "Wherever the English language is spoken, his books have gone."[2162] Thus, "[h]is book on *The Higher Christian Life* was perhaps the first popular treatise on this subject that won its way amongst all denominations; and its vast circulation, both in America and England, not only melted the prejudices of hosts against this subject, but made it possible for other writers to follow in the paths which he had opened, and led multitudes of timid souls out of the misty dawn into the clear shining of the sun"[2163] of second-blessing perfectionism and views on the power and promises of the gospel that deviated from orthodoxy. In *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman did not "plac[e] before his readers theological views on holiness" by exegeting what the Bible taught on the subject, but without "entire clearness of doctrinal statement . . . began with facts of Christian experience, and reasoned from those facts,"[2164] as human experience could with much more facility be brought to coincide with his doctrine of the Higher Life than could the Scripture. For example, Boardman recounted the story of someone who, after suffering a serious injury, was allegedly born again because of a dream, and then found out the truth of the Higher Life doctrine because of another dream where Jesus supposedly appeared, hugged him, gave him assurance of salvation, and thus brought him into the Higher Life.[2165] While Boardman did not employ the literal interpretation of Scripture to propagate his Higher Life theology, at least the Higher Life was supported in men's dreams. For one who insists on following the teaching of Scripture alone, however, Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life* is essentially worthless,[2166] since "Boardman's primary authority is experience rather than Scripture, which receives little exegetical attention throughout the 330-page work. To persuade his readers, however, he recounts in detail the experiences of over twenty-five people."[2167] Since God indicates that His Word, not experience, is the sole authority

---

On the other hand, perhaps Boardman simply handled history in whatever way was most convenient for the support of his system without any conscious need to justify his mythmaking. A third and related possibility, and what appears to be the most probable, is that Boardman simply did not know how or care to take the time to learn what is involved in making historically accurate affirmations, especially since the truth of the Higher Life was already certain in his own mind because of his experiences and drawing pro-Higher Life conclusions from history was very desirable.

2161 Pg. 13, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

2162 Pg. 248, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2163 Pg. vii, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2164 Pg. 249, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2165 Pgs. 270-274, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

2166 One who, nevertheless, wishes to read a balanced analysis and critique of Boardman's work can examine "The 'Higher Life' Movement," Chapter 4 in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield.

2167 Pg. 101, *Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology*, A. Naselli.

for the believer (2 Timothy 3:16-17), and since Mormons, Muslims, Buddhists, followers of Mary Baker Eddy, spiritualists, outright Satan worshippers, and followers of all sorts of other abominable false religions can with ease also put together a catena of testimonials about how wonderful their religious systems are, testimonials will not be convincing to one who recognizes the truth of *sola Scriptura*.

While the lack of authority in testimonial is the fundamental failure of Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, his testimonials are themselves inaccurate. They are either inexcusably historically sloppy or deliberately deceptive distortions of historical data. Inaccurately recorded or recounted testimony is of even less value than testimony that actually represents a person's perception of reality. Harry Ironside noted, concerning the Higher Life and perfectionist movements generally: "Exaggerations, amounting to downright dishonesty, are unconsciously encouraged by and often indulged in in their 'testimony' meetings,"[2168] and what Ironside noted of the movement's testimony meetings in general perfectly describes the testimonials of Boardman's book in particular. As one reviewer noted:

> [T]he proofs . . . [in *The Higher Christian Life* by which his] theory is supported . . . [are] the most remarkable thing about the whole production. His proofs are drawn primarily from real life. And as far as we have the means of verifying them, there is not one of them that stands upon the ground of historical truth. . . . We confess that when we discovered what was done . . . totally misrepresent[ing] [historical sources] . . . our moral nature felt a shock similar to that we experience when the tidings come to us of the fall, by heinous transgression, of some prominent one in the church that had stood high in our confidence.[2169]

[2168] Pg. 36, *Holiness: The False and the True*, Ironside, 15th printing.

[2169] Pgs. 520-523, Review of William E. Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, Jacob J. Abbott. *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July 1860) 508-535. On pgs. 520-527, Abbott gives seven illustrations of Boardman's shady manner of manufacturing Higher Life testimonies: 1.) Boardman's claim, in his preface, that Jonathan Edwards wrote a book that is the "account of . . . remarkable cases of higher life attained after conversion," although, in fact, the book "says not a single word about 'cases of higher life attained after conversion,' except in [one] sentence, in which [Edwards] speaks incidentally of the refreshing the church had received" from the conversion of many sinners. Boardman even changed the title of Edwards's book. 2.) Boardman's gives, as the first example of entering into the Higher Life, and one that "is entitled to great weight as an example," the life of Martin Luther. Luther's alleged "second conversion" is "the masterpiece of the whole work, developed at length, and often afterwards referred to." Boardman's narrative about the Reformer never directly quotes Luther's writings even once, but is drawn from a secondary source, J. H. Merele D'Aubigné's *History*. One who reads Boardman's statements and then "[t]urn[s] . . . to D'Aubigné himself . . . will be . . . surprise[d] to see that he is totally misrepresented." Simply reading the sentence immediately before Boardman's quote of D'Aubigné, and even a sentence omitted from the middle of the quotation, "spoil[s] the whole" of Boardman's argument. "What shall we say to such an expedient for getting the patronage of great names in support of an ISM, in direct opposition to the general belief of the church! What would Luther say to it, if he could speak for himself? —a doctrine that he never, in his life, thought of, and one most abhorrent to his cherished belief!" 3.) The testimonial Boardman gives after Luther is "the historian of Luther, D'Aubigné himself. The same use and *abuse* is made of him." 4.) Boardman creates another testimony from Dr. Payson, but one who "will take the pains to turn to the Life of Dr. Payson . . . will see that there is no foundation for that representation of his . . . views on the subject of Christian sanctification" made by Boardman. 5.) Boardman, "as a climax of the absurdity and ridiculousness of building up his demonstration out of standard orthodox testimonies . . . crowns the

Since even accurate testimonial has no authority for Christian doctrine, what value for establishing the alleged truth of the Higher Life can there be in hundreds of pages of Boardman's revisionist myth-making?

Boardman was closer to Christian orthodoxy than Thomas Upham, Asa Mahan, and Hannah Whitall Smith; he had a testimony of conversion that was reasonable and, possibly, genuine.[2170] Nonetheless, since he looked for an ecumenical union of Christendom,[2171] he did not separate from those who denied the Christian faith. Instead, he upheld false teachers such as Mrs. Smith and commended the vile heretic Thomas Upham, despite his worship of a Father-Mother duality as deity.[2172] Boardman also seriously confused the gospel in his own writing and preaching. Boardman confused the doctrine of justification taught by Paul, replacing the Biblical doctrine of justification entirely based on the legal imputation of Christ's alien, extrinsic righteousness[2173] with the Roman Catholic heresy of justification by both imputed and imparted righteousness—a view that would also endear his belief to Quakerism and its doctrine of justification by

---

pyramid with the [Westminster] Assembly's Catechism," with a "professed quotation . . . [that] is not found . . . in either the Confession or the Catechism of the assembly of divines." 6.) Boardman then turns to alleged testimonials to the Higher Life in Scripture. "From the way in which the testimonies of men are handled, it can be readily inferred how those of the holy Scriptures would be handled also." The Apostle Peter's life and preaching are manhandled; for example, Acts 2:38 is quoted, but the phrase "for the remission of sins" is removed, without any indication that a phrase has been expunged from the Scripture, to make the verse into a testimony about entering into the Higher Life. 7.) Paul's writings and testimony are also misused. In light of Boardman's abuse of both Scripture and history, Abbott concludes: "Upon the whole, we would say, as a self-evident truth, the more the book is circulated, the less sanctification there will be in the world" (pg. 535).

2170 Indeed, the presence of a reasonable conversion testimony in Mr. Boardman (cf. pgs. 1-24, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1887) is a refreshing contrast to the absence of such a reasonable confession of genuine conversion in Hannah W. Smith and numerous other Keswick leaders.

2171 Boardman longed and anticipated a time when "the church of the future . . . become[s] completely united" as the "grey prejudices of sect" are set aside to "cement all into one" based on the reception of the Higher Life theology (pgs. 226-235ff, *The Higher Christian Life*). The church age will not end in apostasy, as dispensationalism affirms (cf. 2 Timothy 4:1-7), but in a great ecumenical and apparently postmillennial "growing . . . incoming glory" (pgs. 306-307, *ibid*), culminating in a one-world church and an ecumenical union which was now "at hand" and which will "usher in the jubilee of Redemption" (pg. 315).

2172 E. g., note the favorable references to Upham on pgs. 129-131 of *The Higher Christian Life*, where a lady discovers from Upham that, according to her view of the matter, although she had never "made an entire surrender of myself to [Christ], to do his will, but only to receive his salvation," she was nonetheless saved, as surrender comes at some unknown point after forgiveness, and was not needed for justification, but only to enter into the Higher Life. Note the discussion of Upham above in the "Background and History of the Keswick Convention and Keswick Theology" within the section "An Analysis and Critique of Keswick Theology as Set Forth Particularly in *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*, by Stephen Barabas."

2173 See *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of its History in the Church and of its Exposition from Scripture*, James Buchanan (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1997 (orig. pub. 1867)) for a fine exposition of the Biblical doctrine of justification.

inward renewal.[2174] Boardman even managed to affirm, in an astonishing piece of historical revisionism—or ignorance—that Luther actually opposed what was at the heart of his view of the gospel; allegedly Luther rejected the Protestant doctrine to favor the Roman Catholic view[2175] of justification:

> [N]ow, of late, the whole Christian world has come to distinguish . . . justification and sanctification. Luther used the term justification as including both, in the same way that the apostle Paul used the expression righteousness of God. Justification, in the great reformer's sense, was *being made righteous;* that is, being *reckoned* righteous before God, and being *made* righteous in heart and life . . . he must . . . be holy in heart and life, or he cannot be saved.[2176]

2174 In the words of the "Orthodox" Quaker *Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887*, "justification is [the act] . . . through which, upon repentance and faith, [God] pardons our sins, and imparts to us a new life," that is, justification is not simply and only by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, but by the impartation of new life—a false gospel ("Justification and Sanctification," Elec. acc. http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml).

2175 That is, as defined by the Council of Trent, Rome affirms that justification is "[n]ot remission of sins merely, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man, through the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts by which an unrighteous man becomes righteous" (Session 6 Chapter 7). Demarest summarizes the Roman Catholic position:

> The canons and decrees of the Council of Trent represent the authoritative statement of the Counter-Reformation. Session six of the Council (1546–47) stated that justification occurs in three stages. (1) The *preparation* for justification. Blessed by prevenient grace and addressed by the call of God, the individual "is able by his own free will … to move himself to justice in His sight" (chap. 5). In adults this preparation includes faith, repentance, and the intention to accept baptism. (2) The *beginning* of justification. Through the Spirit's regenerating work, God infuses grace, hope, and love into the soul at baptism, thereby remitting past sins and making the person righteous. Thus justification "is not only a remission of sins but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man through the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts whereby an unjust man becomes just" (chap. 7). (3) The *increase* of justification. Because Trent defined justification as the process of becoming righteous, justification must be augmented if the *viator* would attain heavenly glory. Thus, "through the observance of the commandments of God and the church, faith cooperating with good works," believers "increase in that justice received through the grace of Christ and are further justified" (chap. 10). Justification can be forfeited by mortal sin, but also can be recovered by the sacrament of penance (chap. 14). Since justification can be lost, the pilgrim possesses no certainty of present and future pardon. "No one can know with the certitude of faith, which cannot admit of any error, that he has obtained God's grace" (chap. 9). The realistic attitude of the pious person is hope mixed with "fear and apprehension" (chap. 9). Agreeable with tradition, Trent maintained that God regards the good works individuals perform (Matt 10:42; 16:27; Heb 6:10) as meritorious. Such God-enabled human efforts increase righteousness and facilitate the attainment of eternal life (chap. 16).
>
> In the Canons that follow, Trent repudiated the Reformation tenet of justification by faith alone. "If anyone says that the sinner is justified by faith alone, meaning that nothing else is required to cooperate in order to obtain the grace of justification … let him be anathema" (canon 9). The Council, moreover, placed the ban on Protestant Reformers who insisted that justification is not increased by good works. "If anyone says that the justice received is not preserved and also not increased before God through good works, but that those works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not the cause of its increase, let him be anathema" (canon 24). Canon 32 added an anathema against the Reformers who denied that a person's good works merit eternal life. In sum, according to Trent, justification is more a matter of spiritual and moral renewal than the judicial absolution of guilt and the forgiveness of sins. (pgs. 351-352, *The Cross and Salvation: the Doctrine of Salvation*, Bruce A. Demarest. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1997).

Romanism did not oppose justification partially by imputation and by impartation—it rejected the Biblical truth that justification was entirely and solely based on the imputed righteousness of Christ.

2176 Pg. 55, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman. Italics in original. Naturally, Boardman never quotes Luther, as it would have been a great surprise to the Reformer and to Lutheranism to discover that the German Protestant leader denied what was at the core of Lutheran opposition to Rome, according to the actual historical data, so that he could favor Boardman's doctrine of the Higher Life, a system which he never wrote or preached about, and of which there is no evidence that he even conceived. A brief examination of Luther's doctrine of justification, that actually quotes Luther, is found in "A Survey of

Thus, "full justification includ[es] sanctification from sin,"[2177] for Boardman, although "the history of the Reformation . . . demonstrates [that] the criterion employed . . . to determine whether a given doctrine of justification was Protestant or not was whether justifying righteousness was conceived extrinsically. This criterion served to distinguish the [Protestant] doctrines of justification . . . from those of Catholicism[.]"[2178] Thus, Boardman rejected the heart of the Reformation by repudiating the Biblical doctrine of justification. However, Boardman believed that his Roman Catholic and Quaker doctrine of justification was "the first fact to be taken into account in coming to an understanding of the two separate and distinct experiences" of forgiveness and sanctification;[2179] his heresy on justification was the "first fact" that undergirded his doctrine of the Higher Life. Boardman sowed further confusion when he taught: "Literally and strictly the Holy Spirit and not Christ is the justifier,"[2180] which, literally and strictly, is absolutely false and a very dangerous confusion of the doctrine of justification. Boardman also threatened the gospel by unqualified assertions that "distinct recollections of one's conversion, and . . . the knowledge of the time [of this event] is by no means indispensable."[2181] In accordance with a common paedobaptist weakness on conversion, Boardman affirmed that for those whose "life [is] laid on the altar of God, by parental faith in infancy" a little "child" can have "faith" that was "too early in its beginnings, and too steady in its unfoldings to be marked by memory, or recounted in its stages," and so be converted without a conversion experience such as Paul had on the Damascus road or Jacob experienced at Bethel.[2182] Boardman's understanding of what a Christian is, and how one becomes a Christian—and thus enters into the Christian life—is dangerously deficient.

Boardman also taught that without both justification and the usually post-justification second blessing of sanctification, "the Pentecostal endowment [that] follows

---

Luther's Theology, Part II: Luther's Doctrine of the Application of Salvation," John Theodore Mueller. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 113:451 (July 1956) 227-238. For a more extensive discussion, see pgs. 218-247, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed., Alister E. McGrath. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Unlike Boardman, Mueller and McGrath quote Luther and evidence an understanding of what the Reformer taught.

2177 Pgs. 234-235, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

2178 Pgs. 209-210, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, McGrath. 3rd ed.

2179 Pg. 56, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

2180 Pgs. 97-98, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman. Note the discussion of Boardman's dangerous error here and its connection to his erroneous view of sanctification on pgs. 268-269, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280.

2181 Pg. 149, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2182 Pgs. 205-206, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

conversion . . . the higher starting point of power"[2183] that brings entry into the Higher Life, one will be damned: "Sooner or later [one] must be purified . . . [and enter into the second blessing of] full salvation . . . [without which] [m]illions [of Christians] have lived in life-long ignorance . . . trembling often . . . at the thought of death [because] of their own unfitness for heaven."[2184] Consequently, Boardman taught: "It is necessary for all to come to the point of [distinctly] trusting in the Lord for purity of heart to be prepared for heaven . . . [a]nd none but the pure in heart shall see God in peace."[2185] Nonetheless, Boardman also thought that all of those who are true believers will get this second blessing, which he also termed the baptism of the Holy Ghost, before they die, so that they can go to heaven instead of being justified but in hell. In a related error, as Hannah W. Smith denied that all believers have the Holy Spirit,[2186] Boardman thought that the Holy Spirit is "with" those who are "regenerate[d] in the new birth," but "in" those only who have entered the Higher Life—a doctrine passed on to Andrew Murray and others,[2187] through whom its kernel made its way into Pentecostalism.[2188] Boardman, Murray, and many other advocates of the Higher Life would agree entirely with the charismatic position that "[u]ntil the Pentecostal baptism is experienced the Christian is . . . deprived of the lasting residence of the Holy Spirit; . . . the Spirit only operates on, or is with the Christian, he is not yet within him."[2189] Contrary to Ephesians 1:3, for

---

2183 Pgs. 203-4, *The Higher Christian Life*, 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Henry Hoyt, 1871.

2184 Pg. 215, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

2185 Pg. 206, *The Higher Christian Life,* 1859 ed., see pgs. 478-479, Warfield, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2.

2186 E. g., at Broadlands Hannah Smith preached that "God wish[es] us [Christians] to have the Holy Spirit," while some Christians "do . . . not" have Him (pg. 193, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

2187 Pg. 153, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. Mr. Boardman's book *In the Power of the Spirit* expounds on his idea that the Holy Spirit is only "in" some believers, but "with" them all, but believers would do better to read Romans 8:9 and Galatians 4:6, receive the plainly revealed fact that the Holy Spirit is "in" all true Christians, and not waste their time reading Mr. Boardman's book. Boardman was not alone in his affirmation, however; Hannah W. Smith also believed that through "the baptism of the Holy Ghost" one received "the full indwelling of the Spirit, whereby we become, not judicially, but really and actually the temples of the Holy Ghost, filled with the Spirit!" (Journal, April 29, 1868, reproduced in the entry for April 15 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

2188 Compare the dual doctrine of the Baptism of the Spirit in the work of modern Keswick advocate John R. Van Gelderen in Chapter 8 of his book *The Revived Life* and the very similar (although not absolutely identical) Pentecostal dual doctrine exposited on pgs. 60-61, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner.

2189 Pg. 70, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner. Italics in original. Of course, Boardman and Murray would take the minority Pentecostal position that a variety of spiritual gifts, including but not including exclusively tongues, could accompany the post-conversion "Pentecostal baptism," while the majority view in Pentecostalism requires that tongues will in every case be the initial evidence (pgs. 76-77, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner).

Boardman "[c]onversion" does not "introduc[e] the convert into all the fulness of the blessings of the gospel of peace"—rather, the second blessing does.[2190] How does the justified but unsanctified Christian receive the second blessing and enter the Higher Life so that he can enter heaven? Boardman explained, "Faith alone is the means" of both the first conversion for justification and the second conversion[2191] for sanctification.[2192] Consequently, despite hundreds of pages of material, Boardman wrote: "[Q]uestions . . . such as growth in grace, discipline, temptations, self-examination, watching and prayer, reading, study of the Scriptures, methods of doing good, and the like, might well form the conclusion of a work upon experimental religion. However . . . we must leave these topics untouched[.]"[2193] Once one has figured out, from the testimonials Boardman copiously supplies, how to enter into the Higher Life, "exhortations" to matters like Bible study, watching and prayer, growth in grace, and the like "may be dispensed with," for knowing about the Higher Life is enough, and receiving it will leave the reader "secure from the adversary and cheerful as the lark."[2194] The second blessing, the second conversion or the baptism of the Spirit, sanctification by faith alone, is enough. Although exhortations to Christians to study the Bible, pray, be disciplined, grow, and the like, fill the New Testament, but exhortations to experience the Higher Life through sanctification by faith alone are absent from its pages, the key matter, for Boardman, is the latter, and for those who experience it, the exhortations that actually are present in the Bible become "dispensable," for one can be secure from Satan, and happy as a lark, without them. Such teaching will surely lead one to a carefree flight to a Higher Life.

As Robert P. Smith learned the Higher Life from his wife Hannah, so Mr. Boardman came into the knowledge of the second blessing through his wife, who had entered the experience herself through the influence of Wesleyan and Oberlin perfectionism, but had been instructed in the secret chiefly from an old lady who had been excommunicated for dangerous antinomian and perfectionist heresy. Mrs. Boardman was "charged . . . to read [a] book . . . upon the doctrine of Christian perfection . . . by a Methodist minister when on one of his circuit visits" while a "guest" in the Boardman home. She consequently read "the experiences of Professor Finney and Dr.

2190 Pg. 284, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

2191 "In th[e] early days . . . [at] Keswick . . . there were many testimonies of a practical deliverance from the power of besetting sin . . . which formed so new and blessed an experience that many spoke of it as a 'second conversion'" (pg. 76, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck).

2192 Pg. 113, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

2193 Pg. 319, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

2194 Pg. 320, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman.

Mahan," and by means of their testimonies to having discovered "the great secret of the power of God" and obtaining perfection and the Higher Life, entered into the second blessing.[2195] Reading Finney and Mahan was essential to entering into her experience, as the Bible certainly did not teach the doctrines of either the Oberlin perfectionism of Mahan and Finney[2196] or the Methodist perfectionism of Wesley, so simple exegesis of the Word would never suffice to discover the secret of power. She shared her experience with her husband and brought him to a Methodist meeting so that they could learn more.[2197] However, being dissatisfied with certain aspects of Methodist perfectionism, she and her husband turned to a certain old lady to receive further instruction in the Higher Life. Mrs. Boardman explained what they learned from this lady:

> She had been a member of Dr. Kirk's Church, in Albany, and fifteen years before this, she was one of thirty members who had been turned out, as having embraced great error. Half of the thirty had gone into antinomian perfectionism, which led them into many very extravagant ideas, all the while under the impression that they were guided by the Holy Spirit. Because they prayed without ceasing, therefore they followed the suggestion of the adversary, that secret prayer was unnecessary. On the same ground they gave up family worship. So they imagined that the Lord told them they need not observe the Sabbath [the Lord's Day], as they kept a holy Sabbath every day in their souls. Therefore the wives and daughters did the same on Sunday as on weekdays and while professing holiness, were not ashamed to be seen seated at the window, engaged in sewing, on the Lord's day. Thus Satan, as an angel of light, led them into many errors, and brought into great disrepute the cause of Christ. . . . [T]his dear old lady, who had been dismissed from the church with the others . . . was God's special gift to us.[2198] She taught us many things, and strengthened me in the belief [in the Higher Life]. . . . All this was a wonderful help . . . [a]s the days went on, we were continually before the Lord in prayer for my dear husband, and the time came when, in a little prayer meeting, he was brought out [and received the Blessing].[2199]

Thus, an old lady who had been expelled from the Fourth Presbyterian Church of E. N. Kirk[2200] for abominable heresy—the antinomian perfectionism of John Henry Noyes, who joined perfectionism, communism, rampant sexual immorality, "complex marriage" or "free love" that involved spouse-swapping, and Faith Cure—was the instrument in

---

2195 Pg. 48, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. Hannah W. Smith could likewise write: "I delight in Mahan's book" (Letter to Mary, January 8, 1878, reproduced in the entry for August 15 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

2196 Finney and his followers could also, of course, appeal to experience to validate their system; e. g., Finney's doctrine of "praying through" was validated by a miraculous healing the Jesuit missionary Francis Xavier performed by its means (pg. 122, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

2197 Pgs. 50-52, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2198 Mrs. Boardman affirms that the lady was expelled "without sharing in th[e] errors" of the others. Unlike the rest, she was expelled for no reason, since she was doctrinally sound, Mrs. Boardman averred. Perhaps it was not easy for the church in Albany to know who was espousing and spreading antinomian perfectionism, communism, free love, and other abominable errors and who was orthodox, because orthodoxy is very easy to confuse with such vile errors; or, on the other hand, perhaps Mrs. Boardman was a gullible woman and was herself deceived, since differentiating orthodoxy from such heresy is about as easy as differentiating between Christianity and the worship of the devil.

2199 Pgs. 53-54, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2200 See chapter 2, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, Warfield.

confirming Mrs. Boardman in her perfectionism, specifically in what became one of the features that differentiated the later Keswick theology from Methodist perfectionism, namely, that one who is perfect is not in a "*state* of sanctification." The Boardmans learned from this old woman that one does not have "his own holiness" but "Jesus his Sanctification" instead[2201]—while the Methodists taught that perfection involved one actually becoming holy, Mrs. Boardman discovered from one who was disciplined for antinomianism that the perfect are not actually more holy in themselves, but rather allegedly have Christ's holiness in a mystical way. Both ladies together then were used to bring Mr. Boardman into the experience of "the baptism of the Holy Ghost"[2202] and this Higher Life of perfection without personal holiness. Mrs. Boardman explained her second blessing to her husband, although she feared that she would be called a perfectionist. He answered her: "I have never found it of the least profit to dwell on doctrines, and why should you?" Just tell out in a simple way what Jesus has done for you, and what He is to you, and let the rest alone."[2203] Aided by Mr. Boardman's carelessness about Bible doctrine and preference for experiences, both Mrs. Boardman and the old lady under church discipline for Noyes' perfectionism soon were rejoicing that he, too, had entered the Higher Life, after an allegorical interpretation of two passages of Scripture was "revealed to him" as the final key to unlock the spiritual secret the two women had already experienced.[2204] By the secret power of the Higher Life, Mr. Boardman eventually came to the point that to look at his face was to discover the truth of the second blessing. "[S]eeing [his] face" was to "catch a glimpse of heaven," his face manifesting "the glory of this holy of holies" as it "was lighted with beams of sunshine from the Sun of glory"—people came to be "convinced, not only of the existence of God,

---

2201 Pg. 56, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2202 Pg. 44, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2203 Pg. 54, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. Indeed, Boardman not only had no care for doctrine himself, but he also led others to abandon sound doctrine so that they could experience the Higher Life. For example, Boardman narrates: "One of the most singular instances of blessing [on a trip to Sweden to propagate the Higher Life, where he also preached in the Lutheran state churches] is that of Mr. W . . . a Baptist minister[.] . . . I felt constrained one morning to try and set two of the Bible women free about Baptism [that is, to view much of what God has commanded in the ordinance of believer's immersion as a matter of indifference], and took the matter up freely . . . Mr. W came in . . .while I was talking and opening up the Scriptures . . . and overheard my talk about freedom, specially in the matter of baptism; and the Lord used it to set him at liberty and fill his soul. . . . [T]hat was the Lord's way for giving him the fulness of blessing" (pgs. 207-212, *ibid*).

2204 Pgs. 55-56, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. The two passages were the promise of church perpetuity in Matthew 28:20 and Matthew 1:21. Neither passage has anything to do with the doctrine Mr. Boardman adopted and began to promulgate—at least when grammatical-historical interpretation is employed, rather than mystical, experience-based, and allegorical interpretation.

but of a future state of blessedness, by seeing [his] face . . . as he passed" by.[2205] The possession of such a face was surely a great validation of the truth of his doctrine, as it excelled anything possessed by any mortal man in the New Testament; the first Christians only aspired to a holy life, not a shiny face, as evidence of holiness of heart (Luke 6:43), although others in the late nineteenth century, including many at the Broadlands Conferences that originated the Keswick Conventions,[2206] also came to have shiny faces through the receipt of the second blessing, Spirit baptism, and entrance into the Higher Life,[2207] and a happy-looking face brought many into the Higher Life that could not be brought in by Biblical exegesis.[2208]

Mr. Boardman, after some time, settled into a definite work of Higher Life agitation, Mrs. Boardman also addressing mixed audiences at times in conjunction with influence from Quakerism, as many Quakers were delighted to hear and assist both of the Boardmans.[2209] Mr. Boardman and Mr. R. P. Smith worked together in an ecumenical way to reach "the ministers of all denominations" with the message of the Higher Life,[2210] their joint efforts culminating in the spiritist-backed Conference at Broadlands and its successors at Oxford and Brighton, the precursors to Keswick.[2211] At these Conferences "testimony upon testimony" to the Higher Life theology validated the teachings of Boardman and Smith in a way that grammatical-historical exegesis never

---

2205 Pgs. 239-240, 242, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2206 See, e. g., pgs. 128, 132-134, 170, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

2207 E. g., Robert P. Smith came to see his need for Spirit baptism and the sensual thrills associated with it because those who had "this baptism . . . had something that I had not; something that made their faces shine." He taught that those who come to this physical knowledge of the Bridegroom gain "an imparted radiance in the[ir] faces" (pgs. 252, 271, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). What those first century Christians with holy lives would view as the deepest inward darkness—Robert P. Smith's doctrine of an erotic bridal Baptism—gave those who entered into it shiny faces unknown to the believers of the apostolic era.

2208 E. g., the key Keswick leader, Evan Hopkins, testified: "I watched [the] countenance [of one who already had received the Blessing.] . . . I felt that, in spite of the objections of good earnest Christians, which were my greatest difficulty, a faith which gave such inward rest could scarcely be wrong" (pg. 176, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). In other words, Hopkins rejected the Biblical objections to the Higher Life theology because of someone who had a happy face. Surely following the happy face instead of the Biblical text can scarcely be wrong.

2209 Cf. pgs. 146-147, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. The "gentleman with whom we [Mr. & Mrs. Boardman] were staying, who belonged to the 'Friends,' said, 'You brethren must not expect to occupy much time, for there'll be a crowd gathered to hear the ladies.'"

2210 Pg. 158, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*.

2211 Compare pgs. 25-26, 32, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

could.[2212] Hannah W. Smith wrote concerning the Oxford meeting, a paradigm for later Holiness and Keswick meetings:

> [A]t Oxford . . . a great wave of blessing seemed to sweep all before it. . . . . [S]ome of the testimonies . . . are really most beautiful. . . . [A]ll sorts of denominations . . . met and mingled in the most happy and blessed union[.] . . . One German Pastor the last morning said, "I came over with our Pastors to report the meetings, very unwillingly, and with my whole mind full of prejudices against this new heresy. I did not believe it was according to good German theology, and for a day or two I did nothing but criticize and get vexed. But now all is changed. I do not know indeed whether it yet is good doctrine or not, but I do know the experience is true, and I have got it!" Such things were continually occurring.[2213]

Despite the inability to provide a legitimate exegetical basis for the Higher Life doctrine, countless numbers set the Bible aside, entered into the ecumenical spirit, and received the Blessing through powerful testimonies.

Mr. Boardman also employed evangelistic methods that produced large outward results, so that many could testify to their effectiveness, although when judged by Scripture, they were faulty and dangerous. He asked large crowds, "Will you—do you now accept the Lord Jesus as your Saviour?" and when "a large part of them answered, 'I do,'" he assumed that they had at the time of their statement actually been born again.[2214] By such means many were led to profess entrance into the kingdom of God.

In 1875—the year the Keswick convention was founded—Boardman openly adopted a proto-charismatic doctrine and began allegedly freely working cures along with his preaching of the Higher Life. He had already been working since at least 1870 alongside advocates of the Higher Life for the body as well as for the soul, who had been promoting their healing doctrine in his meetings.[2215] His experience of the Higher Life brought him to experience "the office work of our gracious Lord as the Healer." Boardman affirmed that he discovered both sanctification by faith alone and healing by faith alone through the same experience at the same time, but that he allowed his "restoration of faith in Him as the Healer" to leave his consciousness until years later, proclaiming publicly only sanctification by faith alone for a while.[2216] However, he had

---

[2212] Pgs. 160-161, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*. The importance of giving a public testimony to keeping the second blessing, which figured so prominently in the Faith and Mind Cure movements, Keswick, the Welsh holiness revival, and the Pentecostal and charismatic movements, developed from the theology of the woman preacher and perfectionist Phoebe Palmer (cf. pgs. 62-63, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan).

[2213] Letter to Father and Mother, June 9, 1875, reproduced in the entry for July 25 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

[2214] Pg. 164, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*. Truly, "the last day will declare the sum total of the conversions which took place" in this manner (pg. 164, *ibid*)—but one fears that such methods of inducing regeneration may not produce the genuine fruit Mr. Boardman expected in the day of judgment.

[2215] Pg. 51, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

[2216] Pgs. 10-11, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

seen a man enter the Higher Life and receive healing after not just believing in his heart but making a sort of positive confession, similar to those of the later Word of Faith movement, with his mouth.[2217] Boardman taught that one must take Christ for justification, then take Him for sanctification, and then proceed to take Him as healer. Those "who are going on to prove the fulness of God in Christ" will have God manifest Himself "[f]irst, as the sin-bearing and pardoning Saviour; next, in His ever-abiding presence as the Deliverer from present sin in its power . . . and lastly, as the Deliverer from all the consequences of sin, and from the heritage of sinful flesh—disease."[2218] The Higher Life of sanctification leads onward to the Higher Life of healing, for the transferal into the present of the perfect deliverance from sin and its consequences that, in Scripture, awaits the eschaton, logically involves not only the perfection of freedom from sin but the perfection of freedom from the consequence of sin in the body, disease.[2219] Thus, as Boardman preached and did personal work, many took Christ not merely as their Sanctification but also "took Christ as . . . Healer [and] Keeper in health."[2220] Boardman himself, he claimed, lived an exchanged life, so that in his old age his body was as "fresh . . . through exchange with Him" as it was in youth.[2221] His book "on divine healing, *The Lord That Healeth Thee*, . . . had significant impact on many . . . especially [A. B.] Simpson,"[2222] founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Boardman, who had

---

2217 Pgs. 62-63, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. There are a variety of parallels between Boardman's idea of confession and the Word of Faith doctrine. Boardman recounts the same instance on pgs. 11-14 of *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, although he adds that he has "not . . . any decidedly convincing proof that [the man] had the disease he was supposed to have, or that if he had it was actually permanently cured. The facts could be accounted for in more ways than one" (pgs. 13-14, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*). This rather significant notation was not mentioned in Boardman's autobiography, where the man is mentioned as a plain evidence of the truth of Faith Cure and as the recipient of a miracle.

2218 Pg. 11, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2219 Another logical consequence is freedom from physical death, but Boardman was not willing to go that far; some of his successors in Keswick, Pentecostal, and Word of Faith continuationism were, however, willing to do so. Boardman also sought to separate a healing continuationism from a continuationism of at least certain other sign gifts such as tongues (cf. pgs. 56-57, 140, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*), although his final conclusion was that other signs and wonders were very possibly being restored at that time also; "another great special period may . . . even now be opening before us, in which the Lord may have occasion once more for miracles as signs and wonders" (pg. 57, *ibid*). Furthermore, Boardman believed, practiced, and preached about the correct method of performing miracles of exorcism; through the laying on of hands, evil spirits are cast out (pgs. 124-126, 132, *Record of the International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness held at the Agricultural Hall, London, June 1-5, 1885*, ed. William Boardman. London: J. Snow & Co., 1885; cf. pg. 127, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

2220 Pg. 199, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman; cf. pg. 212, 242.

2221 Pg. 243, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2222 Pg. 48, *Only Believe*, Paul King. Boardman's affirmation about the superiority of Faith Cure to medicine on pg. 54 of *The Lord that Healeth Thee* expresses Simpson's position exactly.

written a book entitled *Faith Work under Dr. Cullis in Boston*,[2223] was led to publicly adopt the Faith Cure doctrine through "a meeting with Dr. Cullis[2224] during [Cullis's] visit to America in the summer of 1875."[2225] "Charles Cullis" was "a homeopathic physician and Episcopal layman" who adopted the Faith Cure "as part of his ministry to the sick in 1873. His 'faith cure' meetings quickly became one of the focal points of a

---

[2223] *Faith Work under Dr. Cullis in Boston*, William Boardman. Boston, MA: Willard Tract Repository, 1874. Dr. Cullis believed that "the seal of the Spirit has been set upon the work by the conversion of all save one, who entered the Home unconverted out of the whole eight hundred and seventy-two," and even this "one may have been brought to Jesus at last" (pg. 287, *ibid*). The manner in which people were assumed to be converted is recounted in the book. For example, a girl stated: "I prayed to Jesus to take away my pain and it went all away, and I fell asleep, and I dreamed that I was a little child in the arms of Jesus, and that he loved me and told me I should always be with him." She was counseled that her dream meant "that Jesus does love you and you are his little child" (pg. 40), indicating that having a nice dream was assumed to be evidence of genuine conversion. On another occasion, Cullis, in a gathering in his Faith Home Chapel, "put the question to all present, whether they would like to be . . . filled with the Spirit, and asked them if so to express it by raising the hand. He thought all raised their hands. To make sure he asked all who desired it to rise, and instantly every one in the room rose, Catholics and Protestants side by side, those who had, and those who never before had confessed Christ, and when they were seated, the Doctor proposed prayer in faith, for the fulfillment of this universally expressed desire. They all bowed together. Several short prayers went up, one after another, in the fervor and confidence which asks and receives, and they arose and dispersed. . . . And who would dare, to say that the blessing was not, like the expressed desire, all embracing?" (pgs. 10-11). In this way, both those already professedly converted and those who were not, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, were led by Dr. Cullis to be filled with the Spirit—and nobody, certainly, would dare to say that such a blessing was not received by all—expect one who cleaves to Scripture alone as his authority, and thus recognizes that an unconverted Roman Catholic who worships the bread of the Mass, prays to Mary, and trusts in baptism for salvation could not possibly be filled with the Holy Spirit and that there was not the slightest reason to conclude that a room full of unsaved Catholics came to Jesus Christ in repentant faith alone for salvation simply because prayers were made that such people would be Spirit-filled. By means of such teaching about conversion and Spirit-filling in his chapel, and by means of his Faith Training College for "Christian workers in the higher life," his tracts and articles, and other means, Cullis influenced great numbers of "[m]inisters of all denominations" and large numbers of other "Christian workers" (pg. 249, 294-295) to adopt the doctrines of the Higher Life and the Faith Cure.

[2224] The Episcopalian Cullis had a "Faith [healing] Home for consumptives in Boston" (*The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life: The Unpublished Personal Writings of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. Melvin E. Dieter, entry for June 5), and he believed "all disease is from the devil" (*ibid*, entry for November 12; note, however, pg. 16, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham, but cf. Boardman's doctrine on the superiority of the Faith Cure to medicine). However, as Hannah W. Smith observed, by means of his methods "there are far more failures than successes, and I dread the reaction. For these failures are nearly always with the most devout Christians, and it is an awful strain on their faith" (*ibid*, entry for November 19). Hannah, having heard of "a great many cures by Dr. C[ullis] . . . finally . . . invited thirty invalids whom I knew to meet him at our house for him to pray with them, and, if possible, to heal them. He held a little meeting with them and pointed out that their faith must be added to his faith or nothing could be done, and he induced each one of that thirty to express the faith that they were healed, but I am sorry to say that as far as my knowledge went not a single one found any difference. Against this, I must put the fact that there were remarkable healings of nervous disorders, which, however, one could easily understand would be affected by a change of mind" (pgs. 262-263, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey).

[2225] "The 'Higher Life' Movement," in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield; pg. 17, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

transatlantic and interdenominational divine healing movement."[2226] He became "a major leader of the broader Holiness movement," as well as a central figure in the Faith or Mind Cure,[2227] promoting not just Boardman, but also the Higher Life continuationists Hannah W. Smith, Theodore Monod, Asa Mahan, and Thomas Upham.[2228] The Faith Cure was a physical counterpart to the spiritual Higher life—the Higher Life for soul and for body was really "Arminianism of both the physical and spiritual sorts."[2229] The "nineteenth-century Holiness and health reform movements provide crucial background for excavating the origins and development of divine healing because so many of the movement's seminal figures were influenced by these two powerful cultural currents. . . . If human beings could hope to attain sanctity of heart and freedom from sin this side of heaven, Holiness advocates reasoned, surely they could also expect to experience physical purity and bodily health in this life."[2230] Cullis was "quite full of the matter" of healing when he met Boardman that year, for the Faith Cure doctrine "had opened up to him a glorious relation of Christ to His Church, and a precious, permanent heritage of His Church in Him, which he had not seen before,"[2231] his "espousal of faith healing [being] explain[ed] [by] his background in homeopathic medicine . . . [and] embrace of perfectionist theology[.]"[2232] Soon Cullis was reporting that many Faith Cures had taken place through his instrumentality,[2233] although he failed to report with the like prominence that he himself suffered, for decades, from a severe heart problem that was never healed.[2234] Because of what Boardman had experienced in England during the Higher Life agitation there that led to the formation of the Keswick Convention, he testified, "I was quite prepared, through what I had seen and heard in London, to agree

---

2226 "Faith Healing, Christian Science, and Kindred Phenomena: Women and Healing in Late-Nineteenth-Century Boston," Heather D. Curtis. Elec. acc. http://www.hds.harvard.edu/cswr/resources/print/rhb/first/06.Curtis.pdf. See also pgs. 122ff., *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton; pgs. 59ff., *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

2227 Pgs. 122-124, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton. Dayton effectively demonstrates the close connection between the Higher Life and the continuationist healing movements.

2228 Pg. 63, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

2229 Pg. 62, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

2230 Pgs. 63-64, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

2231 Pg. 223, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2232 Pg. 63, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

2233 Pg. 24, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2234 Pg. 131, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

with [Cullis] in this."[2235] However, the testimony of Dr. Cullis to Mr. Boardman of the "remarkable healing of a broken arm in answer to prayer in Philadelphia" was instrumental in bringing Boardman to a firm stance in favor of the Faith Cure. Cullis recounted to Boardman the great marvel of the son of Dr. Read, the physician, being healed, for it was a "most remarkable case" and "quite unexplainable, if not by the power of God."[2236] Indeed, it was "one of the most celebrated instances of faith-healing ever wrought in America . . . nothing less than the instantaneous knitting of a broken bone in answer to prayer."[2237] Boardman recounted,[2238] at length, this testimony in his *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, as a central weight that pushed him over the edge to his firm stance in favor of the continuation of Apostolic healing:

> While in Philadelphia I called upon the Doctor [Dr. Read, whose son had experienced the marvel]. He was our family physician, and a dear Christian. I thanked him for all his kindness to my wife and myself, which was not a little, and all without money or price; and then said, "Doctor, I heard in Boston wonderful things about your little son." "Ah!" said he, "I do not like to speak of it to people generally, they are so unbelieving; but I can tell you. The children were jumping off from a bench, and my little son fell and broke both bones of his arm below the elbow. My brother, who is a professor of surgery in the college at Chicago, was here on a visit. I asked him to set and dress the arm. He did so, putting it in splints and bandages, and in a sling. The dear child was

---

[2235] Pg. 223, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. Mr. Boardman had heard two testimonies of Faith Cure while in London; see pgs. 16-17, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

[2236] Pg. 19, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. Cullis noted that the marvel with Dr. Read's son was the only one which he knew of through which a broken bone was healed by Faith Cure (pg. 157, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007); for, indeed, Cullis regularly refused to attempt to heal broken bones or restore amputated body parts (pg. 156, *ibid*), unlike Jesus Christ, who healed amputated body parts at will as easily as any other physical malady (Luke 22:50-51). Boardman, based on the testimony of the healing of Dr. Read's son by Faith Cure, disagreed with Cullis and believed that the Cure healed broken bones also (pg. 157, *ibid*)—however, Dr. Read's son was the only evident example that Boardman set forth also.

[2237] Pg. 249, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield.

[2238] Boardman was followed by others, such as A. J. Gordon, who in his *The Ministry of Healing, or Miracles of Cure in All Ages* (2nd. rev. ed, 1883) references the instance reproduced by Boardman as a powerful support for the Faith Cure. "Gordon worked out his teachings on healing . . . in dialogue with the emerging Christian Science of Mary Baker Eddy," was closely associated with Charles Cullis (pgs. 128-129, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton), and was happy to follow and quote the arguments of the father of American liberal theology, Horace Bushnell, in favor of continuationism (pgs. 117-118, *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Ferguson) and the presence today of the gifts of "[h]ealing, prophecy, and gifts of tongues" (pgs. 110-115, *The Ministry of Healing: Miracles of Cure in All Ages*, A. J. Gordon. New York, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1882, citing Chapter 14, "Miracles and Supernatural Gifts are not Discontinued," in *Nature and the Supernatural*, Bushnell). Thus, out of a mix of Mind Cure, Christian Science, theological liberalism, and Oberlin and Keswick perfectionism (pg. 106, *ibid*), "A. J. Gordon" was "identified . . . as a major figure on the way to Pentecostalism" ("Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology," Donald W. Dayton. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1974): 60-69); "A. J. Gordon . . . had been [a] champio[n] of divine and miraculous healings. Gordon had even argued that just as the gift of healing should continue past the Apostolic age, so perhaps should the gift of tongues" (pg. 94, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, George Marsden). Warfield discusses and refutes Gordon's theology of the Faith Cure on pgs. 212ff. of *Counterfeit Miracles*.

> very patient, and went about without a murmur all that day. The next morning he came to me and said, "Dear papa, please take off these things." "Oh no, my son! You will have to wear them five or six weeks before it will be well." "Why, papa, it is well." "Oh no, my dear child; that is impossible!" "Why, papa, you believe in prayer, don't you?" "You know I do, my son." "Well, last night, when I went to bed, it hurt me very bad, and I asked Jesus to make it well; and He did make it well, and it is well." I did not like to say a word to chill his faith. A happy thought came; I said, "My dear child, your uncle put the things on, and if they are taken off, he must do it." Away he went to his uncle, who told him he would have to be very patient; and when the little fellow told him that Jesus had made him well, he said, "Pooh! Pooh! Nonsense!" and sent him away. The next morning the poor boy came again to me, and pleaded with so much sincerity and confidence that I more than half believed he was really healed, and went to my brother and said, "Had you not better undo his arm, and let him see for himself? Then he will be satisfied. If you do not, I fear, though he is very obedient, he may be tempted to undo it himself, and then it may be worse for him." My brother yielded, took off the bandage and the splints, and exclaimed, "It is well! Absolutely well!" and hastened to the door for air to keep from fainting. He had been a real, simple-hearted Christian, but in his student days wandered away; but this brought him back to the Lord." [Boardman comments:] Strange if it had not! To all this I could say nothing, if I had been ever so much disposed, in the way of accounting for it upon any other hypothesis than that of the little fellow himself—that Jesus had made him well. Two competent surgeons had seen the broken arm, felt the bones, and had the evidence of their own senses that it was broken. One of them had set it, dressed it, and after two days, to satisfy the boy and save him from the temptation to take off the dressings, he had taken them off himself, and found, to his amazement, the arm absolutely well. But now I greatly rejoiced in this new proof that Jesus remains today, as in the days when He was here in the body, the Healer of those who trust Him.[2239]

Boardman reported this case to many others, so that it became the "most frequently quoted"[2240] instance of a Faith Cure in the United States, and through this testimony large numbers adopting the Faith Cure and experienced their own marvels of the like kind, and thus added to Boardman's ever-growing arsenal of testimonies. For example, a boy who had a "curved spine" after doing some hard work one day was healed, Boardman recounted, or at least after the Cure a "surgeon . . . examined the lad, and said, 'There is nothing the matter with his spine, and there never was,'"[2241] so either he never really had a curved spine, as the surgeon affirmed, or he was healed by a Faith Cure. Other equally convincing marvels were wrought through the inspiring influence of the Faith Cure of the broken arm of the son of Dr. Read, and these marvels, wrought by Boardman and others influenced to adopt the Faith Cure by his testimony, built up an ever more marvelous monument to the restoration of Apostolic healing power, based on the foundation of testimonials. Finally, passionately committed to the Faith Cure by such testimonies, and encouraged to write by Dr. Cullis, Boardman determined to write *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, a work filled with the testimonies of those healed, so that the doctrine might be propagated. At first, however, he hesitated. Mr. Boardman believed the cures Dr. Cullis

---

2239 Pgs. 18-20, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2240 pgs. 54-55, *Faith-Healing, Christian Science, and Kindred Phenomena*, J. M. Buckley. New York, NY: The Century Co., 1892.

2241 Pgs. 22-23, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

and he worked were certainly "real." However, Boardman averred, "I had not such a mastery of the subject" of healing as taught in the Bible as "would justify me in saying anything about it." Nevertheless, pressed by the evident facts of marvels being freely worked and convinced of the truth of the Faith Cure system through such testimonies, he said, "finally I determined to do what I could, first in mastering the matter as revealed in the Bible, and then as it is exemplified in the reported instances of healing," so that he could "haste[n] the return of [Christ's] beloved Church to the . . . grand heritage in Him as the Healer."[2242] That is, after practicing, preaching, and propagating the Faith Cure for years, although he did not have such an understanding of the Biblical doctrine of healing as would justify him in saying anything about it, he finally decided to examine the Bible from the perspective of his predetermined paradigm in favor of the Faith Cure, so that he could publish a book that would, he hoped, bring all of Christendom into his firmly held conviction in its favor by adding Biblical arguments to the flourishing evidence of testimonial that had convinced him of its validity. As Boardman adopted and propagated his doctrine of sanctification by faith alone in his *The Higher Christian Life* through the instrumentality of testimonial, not Scriptural exegesis, so he adopted and propagated his doctrine of healing by faith alone by the same means, and experienced much success in convincing the masses to adopt both teachings.

However, when the case of Dr. Read's son was investigated by Dr. J. H. Lloyd, Doctor Lloyd published a letter from the very child upon whom the marvel of healing was affirmed to have been accomplished, after the boy had grown up and become a physician himself. The letter reads:

> Dear Sir:
>
> The case you cite, when robbed of all its sensational surroundings, is as follows: The child was a spoiled youngster who would have his own way; and when he had a *green stick* fracture[2243] of the forearm, and, after having had it bandaged for several days, concluded he would much prefer to go without a splint, to please the spoiled child the splint was removed, and the arm carefully adjusted in a sling. As a matter of course, the bone soon united, as is customary in children, and being only partially broken, all the sooner. This is the miracle. Some nurse or crank or religious enthusiast, ignorant of matters physiological and histological, evidently started the story, and unfortunately for my name—for I am the party—is being circulated in circles of faith-curites, and is given the sort of notoriety I do not crave . . . Very respectfully yours, Carl H. Reed.[2244]

[2242] Pgs. 24-25, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. "[T]his book," *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, "is the result" of these efforts, Boardman stated (pg. 25).

[2243] "*Green stick fracture* . . . a bone fracture in a young individual in which the bone is partly broken and partly bent" *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (11th ed., 2003), Mirriam-Webster.

[2244] Pg. 250, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield, citing *The Century Magazine*, XI, 784. See also pgs. 54-55, *Faith-Healing, Christian Science, and Kindred Phenomena*, J. M. Buckley. New York, NY: The Century Co., 1892.

Thus, Boardman, like Cullis and advocates of the Faith Cure in general,[2245] were "not always as careful as they might be in ascertaining the actual facts of the cases of cure which they report."[2246] In this instance, Boardman's foundational testimonial to the Faith Cure, he got practically nothing correct about what had actually happened. However, perhaps it should not be surprising that Boardman would accept the Faith Cure doctrine because of testimony and blaze it forth to the world while failing to carefully investigate its alleged successes. After all, because of human testimony, he had already failed to carefully study the Bible before adopting and setting forth to the world his doctrine of the Higher Life.

Nonetheless, unaware that the healing that in large measure convinced him to adopt the Faith Cure was a delusion, Mr. Boardman proceeded to teach his doctrine of healing as part of the Higher Life from 1875 onward. Not long after the official foundation, based on demonic Mind Cure ideas that had been circulating for some years earlier, of the "Church of Christ, Scientist," by Mary Baker Eddy in Boston in 1879, Boardman's "publication of *The Lord that Healeth Thee*" in 1881 "fairly launched Mr. Boardman as a teacher of divine healing."[2247] He now propagated his theology of healing by faith as zealously as he did his doctrine of sanctification by faith. He zealously proclaimed a view of the gospel contrary to the grammatical-historical interpretation of 1 Corinthians 15:1-4, which taught that the Good News is salvation through the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, instead reaching the position that "the gospel . . . may be summarized in the two words, salvation and healing."[2248] The "full gospel" includes doing what Christ did and "healing every sickness and every disease among the people."[2249] Indeed, healing is very important, for it can "turn the day" when "His gentler

---

2245 Writing of Faith and Mind Cure testimonials in 1891, Votaw noted:

> Current reports of cures are untrustworthy; the strong presumption is, that one has not all the facts in the case, and also that such facts as one has are perverted, either purposely or inadvertently. . . . In the second place, the number of cures published by practitioners cannot be trusted at all; partly because many of the practitioners carry on the business solely for money, and have become unscrupulous in advertising themselves and their cures; and partly because such a list, even when kept in good faith, contains the names of all who have ever acknowledged a cure, and takes no note of those who, again burdened with their disease, find themselves to have been deceived or mistaken. The relapses all pass for complete cures yet we venture the assertion that they are in the large majority. The patients are worked upo[n] and induced to profess themselves cured . . . the cure, honestly enough credited at the time, [is] afterwards seen to have been illusory and unavailing. In the third place, when a *bone fide* case is found, three questions about it are always pertinent: Was there really anything the matter with the patient? If so, was it the disease which the person supposed he had? And, was the cure actually the result of the treatment, or would it have come about anyway, by natural restorative processes? (pgs. 255-256, "Christian Science and Faith Healing," Clyde W. Votaw. *New Englander and Yale Review*. New Haven, CT: Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, 1891)

2246 Pg. 248, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield.

2247 Pg. 224, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2248 Pg. 48, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2249 Pg. 49, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman, citing Matthew 9:35.

forces of grace and truth have failed."[2250] Despite many verses in the Bible that teach that miracles do not produce saving faith, but faith is produced by the Spirit through the Word (e. g., Romans 10:17; Luke 16:31; Matthew 11:20; John 12:37),[2251] Boardman affirmed that healing can do what God's grace and truth cannot in bringing men to Christ. The Spirit working through the preached Word is not the best way for men to be awakened—on the contrary, Boardman affirms, "nothing awakens men like His supernatural power in His physical kingdom."[2252] "Nothing ever has touched men like . . . healing power," for "by means of" it "men . . . are awakened, convinced, conquered, saved. Yes, this, this only, is the faith by which now, as of old, the world is to be turned upside down."[2253] The necessity of the Faith Cure is thus clearly seen, for it can prevail when God's holy Word cannot, despite being sharper than any sword (Hebrews 4:12) and being empowered by the Omnipotent Holy Ghost. The world cannot be turned upside down by Spirit-empowered preaching of the Word—no—Faith Cures are better.

Letters that testified to healings were read by Mrs. Boardman in holiness meetings, and there soon followed a "visit of Dr. Cullis to England" which "increased and deepened this interest" in the continuation of the sign gifts, "many being blessed and healed at that time."[2254] Testimonials evidenced that "here and there the gift of healing has been bestowed. . . . Gifts of healing have been manifested in a number of places,"[2255] including a powerful manifestation of many Faith Cures at Dr. Cullis' Faith Cure home in Boston,[2256] that place of origin, hotbed and center of work for the Christian Science cult

---

2250 Pg. 58, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2251 Wilhelmus à Brakel properly noted:

> [T]he means whereby man is regenerated . . . is the Word of God alone, be it read or heard—or whatever the way may be whereby one comes to the knowledge of the truths which are revealed only in the Word. "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth" (James 1:18); "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Pet 1:23).
>
> God does indeed use external means which cause man to be disturbed and to come to himself—such as poverty, extraordinary judgments upon the nation, the home, or oneself; fear for and being in danger of death; dreams and unrealistic imaginations as if they saw visions; extraordinary deliverances and temporal prosperity; the observation of the godliness of others and their mutual love, as well as other incidents. These, however, are not means unto conversion, but only means to bring them to the Word, to subdue them, and to make them pliable. The Word of God, however, is the only means. The conversion of those who do not attain to the knowledge of the way of salvation is not true conversion. (pgs. 237-238, *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, vol. 2, Wilhelmus á Brakel)

2252 Pg. 82, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2253 Pgs. 83-84, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2254 Pg. 224, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2255 Pgs. 117-118, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2256 Pg. 118, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. Cures had been taking place at Boston since at least 1871, notes Boardman (pgs. 135-138, *ibid*); after all, Mary Baker Eddy had been cured in 1866.

and Mind Cure of Mary Baker Eddy.[2257] As testimonials were key to Boardman's adoption of the Higher Life theology of sanctification by faith alone, so his eyes were "opened" to the doctrine of healing by faith alone, not by a close scrutiny of Scripture, but by a "close scrutiny of perhaps a hundred different testimonies written out by those who have been healed through faith."[2258] Soon the "Faith-house called 'Bethshan' was opened by Mrs. Baxter[2259] and Miss Murray in 1882," as well as Mrs. Boardman,[2260] "to accommodate the patients who resorted to"[2261] Mr. Boardman, and "at Bethshan dear Mr. Boardman was both the father and the pastor of the work."[2262] He "presided at the . . . weekly meeting for healing on Wednesday afternoons at Bethshan," which was followed by a service that anointed people to heal them.[2263] Bethshan was the flagship of the late nineteenth century "'Faith-Homes' established in America [which espoused] the treatment of disease by prayer alone,"[2264] as "little groups of Christians here and there accepted the teaching of Bethshan and . . . other 'Healing Homes' were established[.]"[2265] At such Faith Homes "treatments . . . did not involve medicinal therapies of any sort . . . the means prescribed [were] prayer, laying on of hands, and anointing."[2266] Bethshan was "in closest fellowship with the [Faith Cure] movement in America, and the teaching of Bethshan was identical with that of the Christian [and Missionary] Alliance."[2267] Boardman, and the Christian and Missionary Alliance that adopted his position, followed

---

2257 It is noteworthy that Mary Baker Eddy, who was herself greatly "influenced by Spiritualism, participated in séances, and shared some basic assumptions with Spiritualism" (pg. 61, *New Age and Neopagan Religions in America*, Sarah M. Pike. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2004), published *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*, her main work, in 1875 in Boston. The Faith and Mind Cure were a united idea in the second half of the nineteenth century, with common origins. Modern Pentecostal attempts to separate Faith Cure from Mind Cure are historical revisionism.

2258 Pg. 111, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2259 Mrs. Baxter was a preacher of the Higher Life and the Faith Cure from the late 1870's; cf. pgs. 98, 105-106, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2260 Pgs. 234ff., *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2261 "The 'Higher Life' Movement," in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield.

2262 Pg. 237, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. Cf. pgs. 124-125, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton; pgs. 144-145, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis.

2263 Pg. 234, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman.

2264 Pg. 212, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield.

2265 Pg. 23, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham. See pgs. 142ff., *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis, for the rise and development of the Faith Home movement. As soon as 1885, A. B. Simpson reported, there were already approximately thirty Faith Homes in the United States and numerous similar resorts abroad.

2266 Pg. 154, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis.

2267 Pg. 23, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.

Charles Cullis[2268] and believed that it was best to reject medicine to follow the example of Christ, who "never use[d] remedies or call[ed] in physicians, but always use[d] His own power" to heal miraculously.[2269] Thus, based on Galatians 2:20, Boardman taught:

> [Christ] is *the Life*, the *All* of life for *body* as well as *soul, complete*. In Him *dwelleth* all fulness; we are filled full in Him. . . . Fulness, absolute fulness of life dwells in Him alone; and in us only as He dwells in us by faith. Fulness of life is fulness of health. Disease is incompatible with fulness of life. His presence in us, welcomed by faith as our fulness of life, and so of health, is really the expulsive power that rebukes and dispels disease. The same is true of strength. . . . Our completeness in Him cannot be actualized until our faith welcomes Him in whom dwells the All-fulness, as our Fulness of life and health in the body, as well as in the soul. . . . He took our infirmities as truly as our sicknesses, and both as truly as our sins . . . And the prominent work of the Spirit is just this—to uplift us into Christ, and unfold Him in all His fulness, the Fulness of God in us."[2270]

One who has received such fulness of life, then, can no longer be sick, weak, or sinful in the least degree, for Christ is entirely free from sickness, weakness, and sin. Christ purchased physical health on the cross, so perfect health must be for today. After all, in the Higher Life theology "Jesus saves me now,"[2271] so all the benefits of Christ's work on

---

[2268] Thus, at Cullis' facility, those with the faith of the Higher Life were "to abstain from medicine, having faith that [their] healing had been accomplished, whether or not [their] body actually bore witness to the miracle. In other words, any lingering physical pain or signs of disease should be interpreted as 'trials of faith' to be prayed about rather than treated. [T]here would be no more visits to physicians, who used their senses and instruments to probe and observe and attempt to classify . . . symptoms. Instead, [one] was to think of h[is] flesh as a field upon which the contest between faith and doubt would be played out" ("Faith Healing, Christian Science, and Kindred Phenomena: Women and Healing in Late-Nineteenth-Century Boston," Heather D. Curtis. Elec. acc. http://www.hds.harvard.edu/cswr/resources/print/rhb/first/06.Curtis.pdf). Thus, Cullis anticipated the later Word of Faith doctrine that one who is "healed" is to ignore the symptoms of disease: "You may have the symptoms of your disease, but count the work as done and . . . take this stand—*I am healed*" (pg. 90, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis, citing *Other Faith Cures*, Cullis, pgs. 4 & 9 **verify this**).

[2269] Pg. 73, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman. However, medicine could be used for those who lacked faith (cf. pg. 74), although Christ healed everyone who came to Him regardless of faith and thus never needed to send anyone, believer or unbeliever, to a doctor for help. Any medical remedies used, Boardman taught, required specific Divine direction (pg. 103), so simply following what medical science had determined was the most likely method of obtaining restoration to health would not acceptable nor be living by faith. One needed specific Divine direction to know whether or not to employ a medicine that was 95% likely to work or one that was 5% likely to work; such a requirement of specific direction was not tempting God or sinfully putting one's life at risk—although, in fact, employing medicine at all was truly a lack of faith.

[2270] Pgs. 231-233, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1887. Italics in original.

[2271] "Jesus saves me now" was the famous catchphrase that Robert P. Smith adopted and proclaimed in the years during and after his preaching with Boardman in the meetings that led to the establishment of the Keswick convention. As Hannah W. Smith wrote, describing the Brighton Convention:

> The watchword of the whole meeting was "Jesus saves me now." And finally we got a chorus all to sing together, in our different tongues[:]
>
> Jesus saves me now,
> Jesus saves me now,
> Yes, Jesus saves me all the time,
> Jesus saves me now.

the cross must be, in all their fulness, for this very moment. Jesus Christ lives the spiritual and the physical life for the believer, so the Christian who knows the spiritual secret is free from sin and from sickness. Sanctification by faith alone entirely without human effort, and healing by faith alone, entirely without human means such as medicine, stand together in Boardman's Higher Life allegorization of Galatians 2:20. However, although Christ is also free from the end point of disease, death, and His human body is glorified, Boardman was not willing to affirm that one who receives Christ's fulness of life will not die, nor that such people already have glorified bodies—such affirmations were too much for him, and, besides, it was very difficult to fill books with the testimonies of those who had lived hundreds of years and already had glorified bodies as they lived on the earth. Consequently, Boardman introduced an inconsistency in his doctrine and admitted that those who believed in the Higher Life still died like their less privileged brethren. Nevertheless, one who is receiving sanctification and healing moment-by-moment[2272] from Christ will never get sick. "[A]biding faith in our Lord as the healer of all our diseases" guarantees that "we shall . . . be healed, not once, and in great extremity only, but always whenever we have need."[2273] Those living the Higher Life will "fill up the measure of [their] days" and then, in an affirmation easier to make in the 1880s before much of the progress of modern medicine, the Higher Life possessor will "die of age alone without disease . . . without abatement of strength or dimness of vision"; he will "di[e] . . . though not of disease,"[2274] although Boardman himself died of a disease, and nobody actually dies of age apart from disease. At Bethshan, Boardman taught "it is God's will to heal" in the same manner that Christ did when he was "here in bodily presence amongst us . . . do[ing] His Father's will in healing the sick."[2275] It is the "will of God to heal all our diseases," with no exceptions;[2276] "it is the Lord's will to

---

> You cannot think how lovely it was to sing it all together in our own languages. The words were on everybody's lips. The Earl of Center made me write my name in his Bible and underneath it this sentence, "Jesus saves me now." (Letter to Father and Mother, June 9, 1875, reproduced in the entry for July 26 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter)

The phrase came from a hymn by E. Gebhardt of Zurich which was entitled "Jesus saves me now" when translated into English from German (pgs. 18, 368, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.).

2272 Boardman taught that men must have their health "preserved through faith just as they have been healed through faith" (pg. 110, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman). A cessation of moment-by-moment faith can make one's health also go away in a moment, just as one's sanctification instantly departs.

2273 Pg. 111, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2274 Pg. 55, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2275 Pgs. 235-236, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1887.

2276 Pg. 77, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

heal all who put their trust in Him for healing, as it is to save all who believe in Him for salvation."[2277] While medical means were not forbidden for those who lacked faith, nonetheless just as supernatural sanctification was by faith alone, without human works or effort, so Divine healing comes by faith alone, without human works of effort such as the employment of medical means, as Christ's own life within the Christian through the believer's cessation of effort was the basis for both sanctification and healing. Christ is "for ever a Healer for those who put their trust in Him alone,"[2278] and "from first to last healing of the body [is] side by side with salvation of the soul."[2279] Indeed, "we fail to have the fulness of our need met" by Christ if we do not "take Him as . . . our Healer"—"oh, how far short shall we fall" in our spiritual life "if we fall short of being made whole in body!"[2280] Testimonials of people who were healed prove the truth of this view indubitably.[2281] Thus, by means of the evidences of the "work of healing" in many lives, the "sophism that healing . . . . is simply the seal and sign of plenary inspiration and official authority peculiar to the times of giving the law and testimony of God in the Scriptures . . . this delusion of the devil" is being "practically destroyed," that is, destroyed by the practical evidences of the testimonies of many people who received Faith Cures, rather than by careful exegesis of the Bible.[2282]

2277 Pg. 78, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2278 Pg. 25, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. A. B. Simpson, who adopted the continuationist doctrine of healing from Boardman, held either an almost or an entirely identical position on the question of medical means. Cf. also pgs. 69-71.

2279 Pg. 26, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2280 Pg. 82, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2281 In addition to those in his own experience and those of Dr. Cullis, Boardman refers, first, to Dorothea Trüdel and the Lutheran Blumhardt (pgs. 85-89, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman; cf. the testimonials on pgs. 90-138). Trudel was a leading testimony for the Faith Cure, although her health remained "very feeble" her whole life, she died at age forty-eight of typhus fever, and there was no evidence that organic disease was ever cured at her Faith Cure home (pg. 243, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield). Boardman indicated that "Pastor Blumhardt" is "a highly-esteemed Lutheran minister" (pg. 86, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*), and healer, refraining from mentioning or ignorant of the fact that Blumhardt was an advocate of "radical Christian socialism" (pg. 77, *New Dictionary of Theology*, S. B. Ferguson & J. I. Packer. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000) who "influenced . . . [an] important group of pastors and theologians" who were also apostates and heretics, "including Barth, Thurneysen, Brunner, Bonhoeffer, Ellul and Moltmann" (pg. 76, *The Dictionary of Historical Theology*, T. A. Hart. Carlisle, United Kingdom: Paternoster, 2000; cf. Blumhardt, Johann Christoph & Blumhardt, Christoph Frederick, *New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, J. D. Douglas, gen. ed.). In addition to influencing heretics, he also practiced exorcisms (pg. 76, *The Dictionary of Historical* Theology, Hart), his works on demonic activity being cited favorably by Jessie Penn-Lewis (cf. "Symptoms of Demon Possession" in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis). He could not, however, get the devil out of Barth, Brunner, and the rest (see also pgs. 120-121, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

Of course, the reason people needed to live in a Faith Cure home, such as that of Trudel, was that they actually were not miraculously and instantly healed—the very existence of such homes evidences that healing like that of Christ and the Apostles was not taking place.

2282 Pg. 84, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

While testimonials were key to Boardman's adoption and propagation of the Faith Cure, he affirmed that Biblical narratives supported it also. The fact that Moses had a rod that could turn into a snake, and that he could put his hand into his bosom and make it become leprous and then cure it by returning it to his bosom again, certainly was proof for the Faith Cure (Exodus 4:1-8). Moses' "rod . . . [was] the symbol of all power in heaven and on earth," and Moses could cure all diseases at will since he could put his hand in his bosom and take it out again healthy, proving that there are "two permanent, grand, and comprehensive powers—power over all the power of that old serpent the devil, and power over all diseases of the body" that all Christians possess just as Moses did, because of Matthew 28:20.[2283] "The whole church" has been given the authority to "carry on . . . the same work of preaching the gospel and healing the sick . . . exercised by Christ, and given to the twelve and the seventy—power over all the power of the devil to master it, and over all disease to heal it."[2284] Furthermore, because Moses cast a tree into bitter water at Marah and the waters became sweet, and the Lord promised not to send special plagues on Israel as He did on Egypt if they were obedient (Exodus 15:22-26), all who are "shown . . . the tree of Calvary" will have "healing of the body." This is the "law of health . . . continual freedom from bodily maladies."[2285] Indeed, as in its twin, the Mind Cure of New Thought and Mark Baker Eddy, healing is a "law of His kingdom of grace, as inevitable as any law of His kingdom of nature."[2286] In fact, Boardman's allegorizing of Exodus 15 is so convincing to him that he named his book after the phrase *The LORD that healeth thee* found in Exodus 15:26. Many other passages of the Bible, after they are allegorized, give equally clear support to Boardman's doctrine, from the sending of quail in the wilderness, to the striking of Miriam with leprosy, to the writings of David in the Psalter, to king Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple in Jerusalem—each of these prove that all Christians should be healed.[2287] Indeed, even the fact that Elisha cured Naaman's leprosy shows that all the people of God can heal themselves and others of all diseases by the law of healing—Faith Cure was Israel's "national faith," the "faith of the Church [of Israel] in the land . . . from the children up to

---

2283 Pg. 28, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman; see also pg. 49. Note that Jessie Penn-Lewis, John A. MacMillan, and others followed Boardman in his allegorical interpretation of Moses and his staff; the allegorization of Moses' "uplifted hands" as "not the hands of prayer, but the hands of authority and power" was proclaimed at the Brighton Convention also (pg. 155, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

2284 Pgs. 50, 53, 78, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2285 Pgs. 29-32, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2286 Pg. 64, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2287 Pgs. 32ff, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

the king[,] the whole people,"[2288] despite the fact that Naaman needed to go to Elisha because nobody else could or did perform such healings, and despite the testimony of Christ that "many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian" (Luke 4:27). Boardman finds the narratives of Scripture filled with the doctrine of Faith Cure, and his arguments are all just as convincing as his conclusion from the pericope of Naaman and Elisha. There is no need to recount any more of them—essentially, a person who has seen one of his arguments has seen them all. Someone with an *a priori* commitment to the Faith Cure doctrine because of testimonial from experience and extrabiblical sources will be happy to have Boardman's many allegorizations of sacred history as further evidence; someone who is committed to grammatical-historical exegesis and *sola Scriptura* will view all of Boardman's argumentation as a wretched allegorization and awful misuse of the holy Word of God.

Boardman does not, however, confine his argument entirely to allegorized narrative, although such allegorizations are the largest part of his appeal to the Bible. Thus, while he does not spend much time on passages that have a better chance at actually supporting his position when interpreted literally, choosing rather to spend many pages of his book on testimonials and allegorized narrative, he also makes a few other arguments in favor of his Faith Cure theology. Boardman affirms that a "comparison of Isaiah liii with Matthew viii plainly shows us that our Lord Jesus Christ bore our sins, sorrows, sicknesses, and all in His own body on the cross on purpose to [*sic*] take them all away from us in spirit, soul, and body," so "healing through faith" in this age is guaranteed in the atonement.[2289] While the passages in question indicate that perfect spiritual sinlessness and perfect restoration of the body are certainly purchased by Christ on the cross, these benefits are only actually partaken of to their fullest extent in glorification. Indeed, all good things that the saints possess are purchased for them by the cross—every good they receive comes from their heavenly Father (James 1:17), who has adopted them only because of Christ's propitiatory work on the cross. Boardman, in accordance with his Higher Life theology that moves the spiritual benefits of perfect deliverance from sin from the eternal state into the present, while weakening their truly perfect spiritual nature, also moves the perfect bodily health of the glorified and resurrected body from the future into the present, while likewise weakening the perfect nature of the full bodily deliverance promised the saints. Neither Isaiah 53 nor Matthew

---

2288 Pgs. 39-41, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2289 Pg. 139, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

8 indicates that every believer who follows Faith Cure doctrine is guaranteed physical health in this life. Warfield correctly notes concerning Matthew 8:17 and the Faith Cure:

> The passage has, of course, no direct bearing on the assertion that miraculous cures continue to be performed in the church. It speaks only of Christ's own miraculous cures, and does not in the remotest way suggest that his followers were to work similar ones. . . . [As for the idea that Christ bore our sicknesses so that Christians might not get sick in this life, and that healing in this life is guaranteed in the atonement, the] error does not lie in the supposition that redemption is for the body as well as the soul, and that the saved man shall be renewed in the one as well as in the other. This is true. Nor does it lie in the supposition that provision is made in the atonement for the relief of men from disease and suffering, which are fruits of sin. This too is true. It lies in confusing redemption itself, which is objective and takes place outside of us, with its subjective effects, which take place in us; and in failing to recognize that these subjective effects of redemption are wrought in us gradually and in a definite order. . . .
>
> A very little consideration will suffice to show that . . . attempts so to state the doctrine of the atonement as to obtain from it a basis on which a doctrine of faith-healing can be erected betray us into a long series of serious errors. They imply, for example, that, Christ having borne our sicknesses as our substitute, Christians are not to bear them, and accordingly all sickness should be banished from the Christian world; Christians are not to be cured of sickness, but ought not to get sick. They imply further, that, this being so, the presence of sickness is not only a proof of sin, but argues the absence of the faith which unites us to Christ, our Substitute, that is saving faith; so that no sick person can be a saved man. They imply still further that, as sickness and inward corruption are alike effects of sin, and we must contend that sickness, because it is an effect of sin, is removed completely and immediately by the atoning act of Christ, taking away sin, so must also inward corruption be wholly and at once removed; no Christian can be a sinner. Thus we have full-blown "Perfectionism." . . . Perfectionism and faith-healing, on this ground, stand or fall together. We wonder why, in [this line of] reasoning . . . believers [are still] subject to death. The reasoning which proves so much—too much—proves, of course, nothing at all.[2290]

Dr. Warfield's arguments are conclusive against any argument for the Faith Cure from Matthew 8:17 for those who recognize the sole authority of Scripture and seek to obey the Divine imperative to use logic and the mind (Isaiah 1:18). Unfortunately, the Faith Cure and the charismatic and Word of Faith fanaticisms that developed from it contained at their most fundamental level either a denial or weakening of both *sola Scriptura* and the Biblical use of logic and the mind.

Boardman also appeals to Psalm 103:3b, "who healeth all thy diseases," to prove that the Faith Cure is taught in the Bible. However, nothing in Psalm 103 indicates that the healing mentioned is miraculous, any more than the Lord's crowning His children with lovingkindnesses is miraculous or His giving them good things to eat (Psalm 103:4-5) is miraculous, or whenever the Lord compassionately heals the broken hearts of His sad children a miracle has taken place (Psalm 147:3). Rather, Psalm 103 emphasizes Jehovah's providential care of His children in all areas of life. Whenever a believer recovers from a disease, it is because the Lord healed him, just as whenever he eats, it is because the Lord provided food for him, for God providentially works all things after the

---

[2290] Pgs. 234-235, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield.

counsel of His own will.[2291] The point of Psalm 103:3b is that the Lord, who ordains all that comes to pass, works all things together for good for His children (Romans 8:28-39), not that some believers who have entered the Higher Life can receive miracles of healing when they employ the techniques of the Faith Cure.

Boardman also appeals to James 5:14-15 to prove that the ability to heal like Christ and the apostles continues throughout the church age for all Christians. However, without allegorization and experience-driven hermeneutics, the passage proves no such thing. In fact, Scripture records that the disciples needed to send for Peter or another apostle to perform miracles (Acts 9:38), since the body of the Christian community did not possess miraculous healing gifts themselves. Only the apostles and a few others on whom the apostles laid their hands were able to miraculously heal.[2292] James 5:14-18 reads:

> 14 Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: 15 And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. 16 Confess *your* faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. 17 Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain: and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. 18 And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.[2293]

James[2294] instructs a very ill person, who must summon the elders to come to him (v. 14) since he is unable to go to them,[2295] to call for church leadership[2296] to come and pray for

---

[2291] Ephesians 1:11; Isaiah 14:27; 45:7; Amos 3:6; Genesis 50:20.

[2292] Pgs. 50-51, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman. James 5:14-15 was the favorite Faith Cure text of Dr. Cullis, while Boardman's favorite was Psalm 103:3b (pg. 17, *ibid*).

[2293] 14 ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, ἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν ἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου· 15 καὶ ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κάμνοντα, καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος· κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ. 16 ἐξομολογεῖσθε ἀλλήλοις τὰ παραπτώματα, καὶ εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, ὅπως ἰαθῆτε. πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη. 17 Ἠλίας ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν, καὶ προσευχῇ προσηύξατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι· καὶ οὐκ ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐνιαυτοὺς τρεῖς καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, 18 καὶ πάλιν προσηύξατο, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ὑετὸν ἔδωκε, καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐβλάστησε τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς.

[2294] Merrill Unger comments:

> Is the practice of the early Hebrew Christian church reflected in James 5:14–16 identical with divine healing as it should be practiced in the church today or does the rest of the New Testament warrant, and does human experience necessitate, making a careful differentiation? . . . The following reasons are offered to show why this of necessity is so, and why modern "faith healers" who ignore the historical context and time setting of the passage fall into fanaticism or the unwitting practice of magic.
>
> *First, James 5:14–16 was never addressed to the Gentile Church*. It was written to "the twelve tribes" in the dispersion (James 1:1), that is, to the very earliest Jewish converts to Christ during the transition period (Acts 1:1—9:43), before the gospel had been released to the Gentiles and the first Gentiles were added to the church and before God's purpose for the new age to visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people had been announced at the first church council A.D. 48 or 49 (Acts 15:14–15). Internal evidence places this epistle as one of the earliest of all New Testament books to be dated, possibly as early as A.D. 45. . . . Believers still assembled in the "synagogue" (James 2:2).
>
> The Epistle is also shown to be very early by the exceedingly elementary character of its doctrinal content. There is a silence with regard to the relation of the church to the non-Jewish world. No evidence

appears of the church as the Body of Christ, nor of the distinctive teachings of grace revealed in Paul's letters. Indeed the question of the incorporation of Gentile believers does not appear to have been broached, indicating a date of authorship before the Jerusalem council in A.D. 48 or 49. There is no more Jewish book in the New Testament. Indeed, if the several passages referring to Christ were eliminated, the whole Epistle would be as proper in the canon of the Old Testament, as in the New Testament. The Epistle could be described as an interpretation of the Mosaic law and the Sermon on the Mount in the light of the gospel of Christ.

Second, James 5:14–16 is based on the healing covenant made with Israel. . . . This healing covenant concerned Israel only, the people of the covenants (Rom 9:5). . . . As a healing covenant it was operative upon Israel from its constitution as God's chosen nation at the Exodus to the nation's setting aside in unbelief (Acts 28:23–29), the Epistle of James being written before this climactic event.

When the nation Israel will be saved and restored to national blessings at the second advent (Isa 53:1–12) the healing covenant will be reinstated, accompanied by the restoration of miracles of healing and other supernatural powers (Isa 35:5–6; Heb 6:5). . . . *[T]he healing covenant with Israel guaranteed early Hebrew Christians instantaneous and complete healing in response to faith in Christ*. Healing "in the name" and "through faith in the name" brought such miraculous deliverance as was manifested in the cripple at the Gate Beautiful (Acts 3:6, 16). Such healings among Hebrew Christians were the order of the day until the setting aside of Israel in unbelief and with this event, the abrogation of the healing covenant with the nation (Acts 4:30; 5:12–16; 6:8; 8:7–8).

The use of oil also connects with the Jewish setting of James 5:14–16. Such anointing with oil was a general Jewish practice, as shown by the Talmud. The Lord and His disciples adopted this custom (Mark 6:13). . . . [E]fficacious faith for healing was divinely imparted to the Apostolic Jewish Christian elders as they claimed the promises of Israel's healing covenant (Exod 15:26). But the all-important point for the correctly instructed Christian minister to see, now that the nation Israel and her healing covenant have been set aside while the great "Gentile" church is being called out, is that such "prayer of faith" is divinely given and divinely operative in the established Gentile church only when it is God's will to heal. The great Epistles addressed to the church clearly teach that it is not always God's will to heal, nor is it always for the believer's highest good to be healed. Chastening, testing, molding into Christlikeness and other factors condition the Lord's healing of a Christian's sicknesses (1 Cor 5:1–5; 11:30–32; 2 Cor 12:7–9; 1 Tim 5:23; 2 Tim 4:20).

This is the reason why nowhere in any of the church Epistles is anything said about anointing the sick with oil (cf. 2 Cor 5:7) and the prayer of faith saving (healing) them. "The prayer of faith," however, does save (heal) them, but it is only given when God's purpose is determined in each case, and such prayer is offered in God's will. For so-called "faith healing" to teach that it is always God's will to heal believers and to command "God in Jesus' name" is a Satanic snare, into which so many modern faith healers have fallen. It is an open door to "white magic," where despite the use of God's name and religious pretentions, the creature dares to make the Creator his lackey. By so doing he captures the very essence of "magic," which is Satanic opposition to God's will and desire to be like God and use His power independent of Him (Isa 14:12–14; 2 Tim 2:26). To accomplish such a misguided purpose, however, innocent or sincere as it may be, is an open invitation for demonic deception and operation, and it is high time for all who seek physical healing to realize this peril. ("Divine Healing," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 128:511 (July 1971) 234-244. Note, contrary to Unger, that Acts 15 is not a church council in the later sense of the term.)

Unger's comments are worthy of consideration, especially in connection with the Jewish practice of using oil for healing. The view that the promise of James 5:14-15 "applied only those miraculous days [of the first century], and is no longer to be claimed . . . seems to have never been without advocates among leading Protestants" (pg. 229, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield). Nonetheless, even if James 5:14-15 is valid for the entirety of the dispensation of grace, it does not even come close to proving the Faith Cure theology, as demonstrated in the text below.

2295 The passage speaks of pastors engaging in hospital visits, as it were, not going to help those who have the sniffles.

2296 Only true churches really have church leaders such as elders. Thus, those not associated with true churches—historic Baptist churches—do not really follow the practice of James 5:13-18, for the leaders of their religious organizations are not truly church elders any more than the leaders of any secular corporation, such as leaders in a restaurant chain or a department store, are church elders. However, God in His great mercy can grant answers to prayer for healing to those not members of true churches, especially since in James 5:13-18 the emphasis is not upon the office of elder, but the elders are simply representatives of the congregation; thus, in 5:16, all the congregation is commanded to pray, so that healing may come.

him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.[2297] The elders, who are characteristically men of prayer (cf. Acts 6:4), are able to give spiritual and godly counsel and to comfort one who is suffering; thus, they are summoned. Nevertheless, the entire congregation has just as much access to the Father in prayer, including prayer for healing (James 5:16). Since some sickness, but not all, is caused by sin (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:30-32; 3 John 2) or, under Divine permission, by Satan (Luke 13:16),[2298] the elders can examine the ill person to see if he is sick as a Divine judgment upon him for his sin (cf. Hebrews 12:6-11). James specifically indicates, in agreement with the rest of the canon, that some sickness, but not all, is the result of personal transgression (James 5:15).[2299] If the sick one is not right with God, but is backsliding and sinning, he can confess his sins to God and have them forgiven (1 John 1:9); if he has committed faults against his brethren, he can both confess them to God and also confess them to those he has offended. Such confession will lead to the removal of the Lord's chastening hand and restoration to health, even as staying right with God and quickly confessing one's faults against another to the offended party will prevent those illnesses that are Divine chastisement from coming upon believers in the first place (James 5:15-16).[2300] On the

---

[2297] James' emphasis upon prayer, rather than upon the anointing with oil, is seen in both the fact that the imperative in v. 14 is to *pray*, while *anointing* is a dependent participle (προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, ἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν ἐλαίῳ), and in the fact that v. 15 mentions ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως, "the prayer of faith," without any mention of anointing. That the main subject of James 5:13-18 is prayer appears from the occurrence of the word *prayer* in each verse of 5:13-18; indeed, only in this section of James' epistle is prayer mentioned at all. The shift from the present tense verbs *afflicted, pray, merry, sing psalms* (Κακοπαθεῖ . . . προσευχέσθω . . . εὐθυμεῖ . . . ψαλλέτω) of 5:13 and *sick* (ἀσθενεῖ) of 5:14 to the aorists *call*, *pray, anointing* (προσκαλεσάσθω . . . προσευξάσθωσαν . . . ἀλείψαντες) in 5:14 and then back to the present imperatives *confess* and *pray* (ἐξομολογεῖσθε . . . εὔχεσθε) in 5:16 indicates that the call for the elders and the anointing with oil is to take place only on irregular seasons or infrequently, while the confession and prayer of 5:16 is to be the normal and continuing practice of events.

[2298] It should be noted that just as Satan, to advance his overall plan, can allow unconverted false teachers who are under his control to cast out demons (Luke 11:19), so he can allow false teachers to supernaturally heal diseases that were Satanically caused in the first place, so that, by means of these supernatural exorcisms and healings, people come to follow the false teachers as if they are proclaiming the truth (cf. Revelation 16:14) and come into a worse place of deception than before the "good" of the demonic healing wonders took place.

[2299] κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ. κἂν is καί + ἐάν, and so the statement presents a third class condition, not a first class condition. Sin causing the sickness is only a possibility, not a presumed reality. Similarly the subjunctive mood in the perfect periphrastic ᾖ πεποιηκώς indicates the possibility, but only the possibility, not the certainty, that the sick person committed sin in the past with results that continued into the present (that is, the sin was not confessed and repented of), so that sin was the cause of the sickness.

[2300] In 5:16, "healed" is from ἰάομαι and is clearly used for physical healing, in accordance with the large majority, but not the totality, of its uses in the New Testament (Matthew 8:8, 13; 13:15; 15:28; Mark 5:29; Luke 4:18; 5:17; 6:17, 19; 7:7; 8:47; 9:2, 11, 42; 14:4; 17:15; 22:51; John 4:47; 5:13; 12:40; Acts 3:11; 9:34; 10:38; 28:8, 27; Hebrews 12:13; James 5:16; 1 Peter 2:24). The verb always refers to physical healing in the New Testament when it is not in a quotation. James moves from the specific case of sickness

other hand, a refusal to repent under sicknesses that are the Father's chastisement can lead to untimely death.[2301] The sinning believer cannot pray and receive answers from God (James 4:3); thus, he cannot offer "the prayer of faith" for his own healing (James 5:15) nor will the elders be able to offer the prayer of faith for him.

"The prayer of faith"[2302] is a specific,[2303] Divinely enabled and energized[2304] petition for healing, for the person to be healed and raised up from his bed of sickness.[2305]

---

in 5:14-15 into the general principle, enunciated in 5:16, that being right with God will keep believers free from sickness as Divine chastisement.

[2301] The truth that a believer's backsliding can bring him to an early death is clearly the teaching of Scripture in general (2 Chronicles 16:12-13; Hebrews 12:5-10; 1 Corinthians 11:30). One could argue that it is also the teaching of James 5:19-20. On this view, James considers the one who errs from the truth a backslidden but born-again believer, and he uses the verb *convert* (ἐπιστρέφω) in the same sense as Luke 22:32 for the restoration of a backslider. The sins of the backslider will be forgiven, and he will not suffer physical death as chastisement for continued impenitence (James 5:20), including physical death as a result of sickness decreed by the Father as chastening (5:14-20).

On the other hand, in favor of the view that James 5:19-20 refers to the conversion of a lost person, only the lost are clearly designated by God as "sinners" using the Greek word in James 5:20 (ἁμαρτωλός; Matthew 9:10–11, 13; 11:19; 26:45; Mark 2:15–17; 8:38; 14:41; Luke 5:8 (Peter's self-designation in a moment of great emotion, not Christ's designation of Peter), 30, 32; 6:32–34; 7:34, 37, 39; 13:2; 15:1–2, 7, 10; 18:13; 19:7; 24:7; John 9:16, 24–25, 31; Romans 3:7; 5:8, 19; 7:13; Galatians 2:15, 17; 1 Timothy 1:9, 15; Hebrews 7:26; 12:3; James 4:8; 5:20; 1 Peter 4:18; Jude 15). The use of "brethren" (Ἀδελφοί) in 5:19 is not conclusive; James is not necessarily referring to fellow true believers, but could be speaking of fellow Jews (James 1:2, 9, 16, 19; 2:1, 5, 14–15; 3:1, 10, 12; 4:11; 5:7, 9–10, 12, 19; cf. Acts 15:13), and, in any case, the one who needs to be converted is not necessarily specified as a brother but only as one who is among the brethren (τις ἐν ὑμῖν). The phrases to "err from the truth" (πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας), "convert him" (ἐπιστρέψῃ . . . αὐτόν) and "he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death" (ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου) are more easily interpreted of the conversion of a lost man, and the salvation of his soul from eternal death, than of the backsliding of a believer and his consequent premature physical death. Thus, it appears that James 5:19-20 refers to the conversion of a lost sinner, and his being saved from spiritual and eternal death, rather than the restoration of a backsliding true believer and his deliverance from premature physical death.

[2302] ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως. Note the use of the article.

[2303] The use of the words εὐχή and εὔχομαι for prayer in 5:15-16 supports the character of the prayer in question as a specific petition, here for healing (cf. the use of the words for a specific vow). Other words for *prayer* are much more common. The noun εὐχή appears in the New Testament only in Acts 18:18; 21:23 & James 5:15. It appears in the LXX in Genesis 28:20; 31:13; Leviticus 7:16; 22:21, 23, 29; 23:38; 27:2; Numbers 6:2, 4–9, 12–13, 18–19, 21; 15:3, 8; 21:2; 29:39; 30:3–15; Deuteronomy 12:6, 17, 26; 23:19, 22; Judges 11:30, 39; 1 Samuel 1:11, 21; 2:9; 2 Samuel 15:7–8; Job 11:17; 16:17; 22:27; Psalm 21:26; 49:14; 55:13; 60:6, 9; 64:2; 65:13; 115:9; Proverbs 7:14; 15:8, 29; 19:13; 31:2; Ecclesiastes 5:3; Isaiah 19:21; Jeremiah 11:15; Daniel 6:6, 8, 13; Jonah 1:16; Nahum 2:1; Malachi 1:14; 1 Esdras 2:4, 6; 4:43, 46; 5:52; 8:57; Judith 4:14; 2 Maccabees 3:35; 15:26; Ode 3:9; Sirach 18:22; Baruch 6:34. The verb εὔχομαι appears in the New Testament in Acts 26:29; 27:29; Romans 9:3; 2 Corinthians 13:7, 9; James 5:16 & 3 John 1:2, and in the LXX in Genesis 28:20; 31:13; Exodus 8:4–5, 24–26; 9:28; 10:18; Leviticus 27:2, 8; Numbers 6:2, 5, 13, 18–21; 11:2; 21:2, 7; 30:3–4, 10; Deuteronomy 9:20, 26; 12:11, 17; 23:22–24; Judges 11:30, 39; 1 Samuel 1:11; 2:9; 2 Samuel 15:7–8; 2 Kings 20:2; Job 22:27; 33:26; 42:8, 10; Psalm 75:12; 131:2; Proverbs 20:25; Ecclesiastes 5:3–4; Isaiah 19:21; Jeremiah 7:16; 22:27; Daniel 6:6, 8, 12–14; Jonah 1:16; 2:10; 1 Esdras 4:43–46; 5:43, 52; 8:13, 49; 2 Maccabees 3:35; 9:13; 12:44; 15:27; 4 Maccabees 4:13; Ode 3:9; 6:10; Wisdom 7:7; Sirach 18:23; 34:24; 38:9 Baruch 1:5; 6:34. The usage in the New Testament, the canonical Greek Old Testament, and the Apocrypha supports the sense of a specific petition in James 5:15-16.

As faith is a gift from God (Philippians 1:29; James 1:17-18), so when a particular healing is in the will of God, the Lord can enable the sick person, the elders, or the church to present the prayer of faith to Him, giving them belief that this specific healing is His will (cf. Matthew 21:22; Mark 11:24), and then answering their Divinely-produced faith. Only when healing is God's will, giving Him greater glory and bringing a greater benefit to the sick believer than the spiritual strengthening that comes through trial (James 1:2-3, 12), does the Holy Spirit enable any group or individual among the saints to offer the prayer of faith, one free from any doubt (cf. James 1:6), for healing. The prayer of faith cannot be offered by Christians simply convincing themselves that a particular healing is going to take place—supernaturally produced faith must undergird the prayer, and such faith is only at times, not all the time, produced by God in accordance with His will.

Furthermore, James 5:14-15 does not specify that the healing is miraculous. Whenever a person recovers from illness, whenever he is enabled to arise from a sickness that had left him bedridden, it is truly affirmed that the healing comes from the Lord and that it was the Lord who raised the sick one up (James 5:15). Nothing in James 5 requires that the healing be miraculous any more than the promise that the Lord gives wisdom to those who ask Him for it requires the performance of a miracle (James 1:5). Indeed, James does not speak of healing through the sign gift of miraculous healing that was limited to certain Christians (1 Corinthians 12:9, 28, 30), but of healing in answer to prayer that could be offered by any Christian (James 5:16) without any regard for miraculous gifts. When Epaphroditus was sick, and was not miraculously healed, but recovered through the less dramatic means that God uses to cure the overwhelming majority of non-fatal illnesses, Paul could still affirm that Epaphroditus' recovery was because "God had mercy on him" (Philippians 2:27). James 5:14-15 does not limit God to the exertion of miraculous power in His work in delivering the sick—James recognizes that every good and perfect gift, including recovery from sickness through non-miraculous means, whether plenty of rest or prescribed medicine, comes from the Father

---

Furthermore, ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως is characterized at the end of James 5:16 as a δέησις, an "urgent request to meet a need, exclusively addressed to God, *prayer*," used "to denote a more specific supplication" than "προσευχή, the more general term" (BDAG). "προσευχή [is] . . . prayer in general, δέησις [is] . . . prayer for particular benefits" (pg. 188, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Trench).

[2304] That is, in 5:16 ἐνεργουμένη is passive, referring to a prayer the believer is enabled to pray by the Holy Spirit, a δέησις . . . ἐνεργουμένη, v. 16. Compare ἐνεργέω in Philippians 2:13; Colossians 1:29.

[2305] ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κάμνοντα, καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος. σώσει is here used for physical salvation or deliverance of the sick one (τὸν κάμνοντα), and ἐγερεῖ refers to being "raised up" from the sickbed (cf. Mark 1:31; Luke 5:24-25; Proverbs 6:9, LXX).

(James 1:17). When God answers prayer and a sick believer recovers, whether because of a special supernatural intervention or through the mechanisms the Creator has placed within the human body, which can be assisted by medicine He has graciously enabled men to discover, and which are sustained by the strength of Him in whom we live and move and have our being (Acts 17:28; Colossians 1:17) because of His gracious Divine decree for the restoration of physical health (Ephesians 1:11), it is true that the Lord was the One who healed and raised up the sick. God heals, not only when He works without means, but also when in accordance with His loving will and in answer to the Divinely-enabled prayer of His obedient people, He uses medicine to cure maladies. James 5:14 and 15 never specifies that the healings in question were miraculous, instantaneous, or in other ways identical in character to the miraculous healings Christ and the apostles performed—both on those with faith and on those without faith—as signs to validate their Divine authority.

In fact, the "anointing . . . with oil" of James 5:14 actually requires[2306] the use of medicine, rather than prayer alone, for the healing of the sick. The use of oil for healing was accepted medical procedure at the time,[2307] and James commends the use of medical means with his reference to anointing with oil.[2308] The verb *to anoint* in James 5:14 is

---

[2306] That is, since "anointing" (ἀλείψαντες) is a participle dependent upon the imperative "let them pray" (προσευξάσθωσαν), the use of medicine, as the oil is here used as a medical instrument, is required. Faith Cure advocates and Pentecostals who contend that one must follow the procedure of James 5:14-15 in healing, but who either reject the use of medicine or affirm that its use is only optional, disobey James 5. Nobody has been led by the Holy Spirit to reject the use of the best medical means available for healing because of James 5:14-15, since the Spirit required the use of medicine in the passage. Nonetheless, while both prayer and medicine are enjoined, the emphasis of James is on prayer rather than upon the medical anointing with oil, since "let them pray" is the specific command and "anointing" is a subordinate participle. Sometimes good medical means are not available, but the believer always can and should pray.

[2307] Such medicinal oil as is commended in James chapter five had been in use in Israel for centuries, made by men such as the godly apothecaries who helped rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 3:8).

[2308] "The word *aleipsantes* ('anoint') is not the usual word for sacramental or ritualistic anointing. James could have used the verb *chrio* if that had been what he had in mind. The distinction is still observed in modern Greek, with *aleipho* meaning 'to daub,' 'to smear,' and *chrio* meaning 'to anoint.' Furthermore, it is a well-documented fact that oil was one of the most common medicines of biblical times. See Isaiah 1:6 and Luke 10:34. Josephus (Antiq. XVII, 172 [vi. 5]) reports that during his last illness Herod the Great was given a bath in oil in hopes of effecting a cure. The papyri, Philo, Pliny, and the physician Galen all refer to the medicinal use of oil. Galen described it as 'the best of all remedies for paralysis' (*De Simplicium Medicamentorum Temperamentis* 2.10ff). It is evident, then, that James is prescribing prayer and medicine. . . . In answer to 'the prayer offered in faith,' God uses the medicine to cure the malady" (*Expositor's Bible Commentary*, gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, on James 5:14-15).

"The oil specified was olive oil (*elaion*) which was freely available . . . [and] was used for dietetic, toilet and medical purposes. There is no indication that the oil needed to be specially consecrated for its use in anointing the sick. Two different words are used for the application of oil in the New Testament. *Aleipho* is the humbler one and usually means to apply oil for toilet purposes (Matt. 6.17, Luke 7.46). *Chrio* is the ritual and official word for anointing and is used only in the figurative sense of anointing by God. Here in James the humbler word is used. . . . [A]n analysis of the usage of the verb *aleipho* in the

not the verb expected for ceremonial anointing,[2309] but a general anointing that would include the use of oil for physical and psychological well-being.[2310] The oil is to refresh, strengthen, and heal the body through the natural means God has created in the physical realm. The good Samaritan, to assist physically the wounded man in Christ's parable, "went to *him*, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him" (Luke 10:34).[2311] "[W]ounds,

---

New Testament appears to support the medical view [of James 5:14] rather than the religious one. . . . It is never used in the gospels of anointing for a religious purpose, but only for toilet or medical purposes. . . . Anointing with oil . . . was used only for the healing of physical disease in the New Testament. . . . James was saying that normal medical methods should be used in the name of the Lord and based on prayer . . . we may translate [the relevant] clause in verse 14 as 'Giving him his medicine in the name of the Lord.' . . . James held that healing should be a combination of medical and non-medical methods, and in illustration referred to a contemporary medical method of anointing with oil which he said should be used in the name of the Lord and with prayer. . . . [In] James' reference to anointing with oil . . . he is here recommending the employment of both physical and non-physical methods of healing. . . . [Methods of] medical healing . . . are God's gifts to suffering humanity and are to be used in healing the sick" (pgs. 338-339, 343, "Healing in the Epistle of James," John Wilkinson. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 24 (1971) 326–45).

[2309] Thus, when Faith Cure advocates generally, from Boardman to Charles Cullis to A. B. Simpson, argued that the anointing in James 5 is ceremonial, and that ceremonial anointing "is the divine prescription for disease; and no obedient Christian can safely dispense with it" (pgs. 118-125, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis), they were clearly in error.

[2310] ἀλείφω. The verb appears in Matt 6:17; Mark 6:13; 16:1; Luke 7:38, 46; John 11:2; 12:3; James 5:14. In all of these texts, the anointing is not ceremonial, with the sole possible exception of Mark 6:13; but note even on that verse: "Oil was used medicinally in OT times (Is. 1:6; Jer. 8:22; 51:8) as in other ancient societies, and the action of the Samaritan in pouring oil and wine on the wounds of the traveller in Jesus' parable (Lk. 10:34) was probably common practice. It may be, therefore, that the disciples' use of oil was purely a pragmatic, medical measure" (*The Gospel of Mark : A Commentary on the Greek* Text, R. T. France, on Mark 6:13). Note also in the LXX Ruth 3:3; 2 Samuel 12:20; 14:2; 2 Kings 4:2; 2 Chronicles 28:15; Esther 2:12; Daniel 10:3; Micah 6:15; Judith 16:8 (however, note also Genesis 31:13; Exodus 40:15 (yet also note χρῖσμα later in the verse); Numbers 3:3). Contrast the ceremonial emphasis in the New Testament uses of χρίω: Luke 4:18; Acts 4:27; 10:38; 2 Corinthians 1:21; Hebrews 1:9, an emphasis which is the strongly dominant use in the LXX (Exodus 28:41; 29:2, 7, 29, 36; 30:26, 30, 32; 40:9–10, 13; Leviticus 4:3; 6:13; 7:36; 8:11–12; 16:32; Numbers 6:15; 7:1, 10, 84, 88; 35:25; Deuteronomy 28:40; Judges 9:8, 15; 1 Samuel 9:16; 10:1; 11:15; 15:1, 17; 16:3, 12–13; 2 Samuel 1:21; 2:4, 7; 5:3, 17; 12:7; 19:11; 1 Kings 1:34, 39, 45; 5:15; 19:15–16; 2 Kings 9:3, 6, 12; 11:12; 23:30; 1 Chronicles 11:3; 14:8; 29:22; 2 Chronicles 23:11; 36:1 Psalm 26:1; 44:8; 88:21; 151:4; Hosea 8:10; Amos 6:6; Isaiah 25:6; 61:1; Jeremiah 22:14; Ezekiel 16:9; 43:3; Sirach 45:15; 46:13; 48:8), although there are a few exceptions, and possible exceptions, or alternative uses (such as painting a house, Jeremiah 22:14; cf. also Deuteronomy 28:40; Isaiah 25:6; Jeremiah 22:14; Ezekiel 16:9; 44:3; Judith 10:3). Thus, while it is true that anointing with oil at times is used to represent the Holy Spirit, one would expect χρίω rather than ἀλείφω in James 5:14 if pneumatic typology was the intended emphasis.

[2311] "The good Samaritan used oil and wine to treat the wounds of the injured man (Lk 10:34). Because of its alcoholic content, the wine would have an antiseptic action, but at the same time would tend to coagulate the surface of the raw wound and permit bacteria to thrive under the coagulum. The oil, by its emollient effect, would tend to nullify this latter undesirable side effect of wine and would also be soothing due to its coating action. A dressing was then applied, and the patient was taken to a resting place" (pg. 1430, *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, W. A. Elwell & B. J. Beitzel. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1988). "[O]live oil and wine . . . were the provender that the Samaritan had with him on his journey. A mixture of them for medicinal purposes is known from Theophrastus, *Hist. plant.* 9.11, and from the later rabbinic tradition (*m. Šabb.* 19:2). In the OT olive oil is said to be a softener of wounds (Isa 1:6); elsewhere

and bruises, and putrifying sores" are to be "closed . . . bound up . . . [and] mollified with ointment [oil][2312]" (Isaiah 1:6). The "balm in Gilead" was for use by the "physician" so that "health" might be "recovered" (Jeremiah 8:22). Extrabiblical literature contains abundant references of a similar nature to the medicinal use of oil.[2313] Indeed, when

---

in the NT it is used to anoint the sick (Mark 6:13; Jas 5:14). The acidic nature of wine would serve as an antiseptic" (pgs. 887-888, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, J. A. Fitzmyer, on Luke 10:24).

2312 שֶׁמֶן.

2313 For example, Josephus wrote concerning the death of Herod:

> After this, the distemper seized upon his whole body, and greatly disordered all its parts with various symptoms; for there was a gentle fever upon him, and an intolerable itching over all the surface of his body, and continual pains in his colon, and dropsical tumors about his feet and an inflammation of the abdomen,—and a putrefication of his privy member, that produced worms. Besides which he had a difficulty of breathing upon him, and could not breathe but when he sat upright, and had a convulsion of all his members; insomuch that the diviners said those diseases were a punishment upon him for what he had done to the rabbis. Yet did he struggle with his numerous disorders, and still had a desire to live, and hoped for recovery, and considered of several methods of cure. Accordingly, he went over Jordan, and made use of those hot baths at Callirrhoe, which run into the lake Asphaltitis, but are themselves sweet enough to be drank. And here the physicians thought proper to bathe his whole body in warm oil, by letting it down into a large vessel full of oil; whereupon his eyes failed him, and he came and went as if he were dying, and as a tumult was then made by his servants, at their voice he revived again. Yet did he after this despair of recovery, and gave orders that each soldier should have fifty drachmae apiece, and that his commanders and friends should have great sums of money given them.
>
> 656 Ἔνθεν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἡ νόσος διαλαβοῦσα ποικίλοις πάθεσιν ἐμερίζετο πυρετὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦν οὐ λάβρος κνησμὸς δὲ ἀφόρητος τῆς ἐπιφανείας ὅλης καὶ κόλου συνεχεῖς ἀλγηδόνες περί τε τοὺς πόδας ὥσπερ ὑδρωπιῶντος οἰδήματα τοῦ τε ἤτρου φλεγμονὴ καὶ δὴ αἰδοίου σηπεδὼν σκώληκας γεννῶσα πρὸς τούτοις ὀρθόπνοια καὶ δύσπνοια καὶ σπασμοὶ πάντων τῶν μελῶν ὥστε τοὺς ἐπιθειάζοντας ποινὴν εἶναι τῶν σοφιστῶν τὰ νοσήματα λέγειν 657 ὁ δὲ παλαίων τοσούτοις πάθεσιν ὅμως τοῦ ζῆν ἀντείχετο σωτηρίαν τε ἤλπιζεν καὶ θεραπείας ἐπενόει διαβὰς γοῦν τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῖς κατὰ Καλλιρρόην ἐχρῆτο θερμοῖς ταῦτα δ᾽ ἔξεισι μὲν εἰς τὴν Ἀσφαλτῖτιν λίμνην ὑπὸ γλυκύτητος δ᾽ ἐστὶ καὶ πότιμα δόξαν δὲ ἐνταῦθα τοῖς ἰατροῖς ἐλαίῳ θερμῷ πᾶν ἀναθάλψαι τὸ σῶμα χαλασθὲν εἰς πλήρη πύελον ἐκλύει καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὡς τεθνεὼς ἀνέστρεψεν 658 θορύβου δὲ τῶν θεραπευόντων γενομένου πρὸς μὲν τὴν φωνὴν ἀνήνεγκεν εἰς δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀπογνοὺς τὴν σωτηρίαν τοῖς τε στρατιώταις ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα δραχμὰς ἐκέλευσεν διανεῖμαι καὶ πολλὰ χρήματα τοῖς ἡγεμόσι καὶ τοῖς φίλοις. (*War* 1:656-658; cf. *Antiquities* 17:168-173)

Philo wrote:

> Again: why need we seek for more in the way of ointment than the juice pressed out of the fruit of the olive? For that softens the limbs, and relieves the labour of the body, and produces a good condition of the flesh; and if anything has got relaxed or flabby, it binds it again, and makes it firm and solid, and it fills us with vigour and strength of muscle, no less than any other unguent.
>
> τί δὲ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλαίας ἐκθλιβομένου καρποῦ πλέον ἔδει ζητεῖν πρὸς ἀλείμματα; καὶ γὰρ λεαίνει καὶ κάματον σώματος λύει καὶ εὐσαρκίαν ἐμποιεῖ, κἂν εἴ τι κεχαλασμένον εἴη, σφίγγει πυκνότητι καὶ οὐδενὸς ἧττον ἑτέρου Ῥώμην καὶ εὐτονίαν ἐντίθησιν. (*Dreams* 2:58)

Pliny, in his *Natural History* 23:39-53 discusses in detail the "medicinal properties of the various kinds of oil," commenting on olive oil, green oil, castor oil, almond oil, laurel oil, myrtle oil, cypress oil, citrus oil, walnut oil, oil of balsamum, radish oil, sesame oil, palm oil, and many other types of oil, whether fresh or aged. His discussion underscores the very significant medicinal use of oil in ancient times—sometimes in accordance with what God has enabled science to verify experimentally today, and sometimes not.

Patristic references to the medicinal use of oil include: "Antony, the great monk . . . rejected the practice of anointing with oil, and the use of baths and of similar luxuries likely to relax the tension of the body by moisture." (*Ecclesiastical History*, Sozomen, Book 1:13); "Or what castle or house is beautiful and serviceable when it has not been anointed? And what man, when he enters into this life or into the gymnasium, is not anointed with oil? And what work has either ornament or beauty unless it be anointed and burnished?" (Theophilus of Antioch, *Theophilus to Autolychus* Book 1:12). Compare also the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Kittel, on ἀλείφω.

James 5 teaches that the sick believer is to consider his spiritual needs and fellowship with the Lord, to pray and get godly counsel and fellowship, and to use medicine, he affirms a view of the relationship between God as healer and physicians dominant in inter-testamental Judaism as seen in the Apocrypha in the *Wisdom of Ben Sira*:

> [1] Make friends with the physician, for he is essential to you; him also God has established in his profession. [2] From God the doctor has his wisdom, and from the king he receives his sustenance. [3] Knowledge makes the doctor distinguished, and gives him access to those in authority. [4] God makes the earth yield healing herbs, which the prudent should not neglect. [5] Was not the water sweetened by a twig that people might learn his power?[2314] [6] He endows humans with the

---

Lightfoot records the following material concerning medical anointing with oil from Jewish sources:

> R. Simeon, the son of Eleazar, permitted R. Meir to mingle wine and oil, and to anoint the sick on the sabbath. And he was once sick, and we sought to do so to him, but he suffered us not." [Talm. Jerus. In Berachoth, fol. 3, col. 1]
>
> "A tradition. Anointing on the sabbath is permitted. If his head ache, or if a scall come upon it, he anoints with oil." [Id. In Maazar Sheni, fol. 53, col. 3
>
> "If he be sick, or a scall be upon his head, he anoints according to the manner." [Talm. Bab. In Joma, fol. 77, 2.]

Lightfoot then comments:

> [A]nointing with oil was an ordinary medical application to the sick. . . . Now if we take the apostle's counsel, as referring to this medical practice, we may construe it, that he would have this physical administration to be improved to the best advantage; namely, that whereas "anointing with oil" was ordinarily used to the sick, by way of physic—he adviseth that they should send for the elders of the church to do it; not that the anointing was any more in their hand, than in another's, as to the thing itself, for it was still but a physical application—but that they, with the applying of this corporal phsyic, might also pray with and for the patient, and apply the spiritual physic of good admonition and comforts to him. Which is much the same, as if . . . . a sick person should send for the minister at taking of any physic, that he might pray with him, and counsel and comfort him. . . . [The] [A]postle, seeing anointing was an ordinary and good physic . . . directs them . . . to get the elders, or ministers of the church, to come to the sick, and to add, to the medical anointing of him, their godly and fervent prayers for him[.] (Pg. 316, *The Whole Works of John Lightfoot*, vol. 3, John Lightfoot, ed. John Rodgers Pitman. London: J. F. Dove, 1832)

A search of the Talmuds of Jerusalem and Babylon will provide further evidence of the sort set forth by Lightfoot.

It is also noteworthy that the recorded and commended uses of oil for medicinal purposes in the Bible are those for which there is a rational scientific purpose (Luke 10:34; Isaiah 1:6, etc.). The medically questionable or harmful uses that are mixed into discussions such as that of Pliny are not commended in God's Word.

2314 Ben Sira refers to Exodus 15:25, following the Jewish tradition that "supposedly, the water passed through the porous wood, which filtered out enough of the impurities to make it potable" (pg. 84, *Exodus: The JPS Torah Commentary*, N. M. Sarna, on Exodus 15:25). Indeed, the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Exodus 15:25 specifies that Moses used the "bitter oleander tree" (אילן מריר דארדפני), since "Palestinian tradition accords the power of sweetening brackish water . . . [to] bitter oleander" (pg. 577, *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, W. H. Propp, on Exodus 15:25). Likewise, Philo wrote:

> 181 And when they had departed from the sea they went on for some time travelling, and no longer feeling any apprehension of their enemies. But when water failed them, so that for three days they had nothing to drink, they were again reduced to despondency by thirst, and again began to blame their fate as if they had not enjoyed any good fortune previously; for it always happens that the presence of an existing and present evil takes away the recollection of the pleasure which was caused by former good. 182 At last, when they beheld some fountains, they ran up full of joy with the idea that they were going to drink, being deceived by ignorance of the truth; for the springs were bitter. Then when they had tasted them they were bowed down by the unexpected disappointment, and fainted, and yielded both in body and soul, lamenting not so much for themselves as for their helpless children, whom they could not endure without tears to behold imploring drink; 183 and some of those who were of more careless dispositions, and of no settled notions of piety,

knowledge to glory in his mighty works, [7] Through which the doctor eases pain [8] and the druggist prepares his medicines; thus God's creative work continues without cease in its efficacy on the surface of the earth. [9] My son, when you are ill, delay not, but pray to God, for it is he who heals. [10] Flee wickedness; purify your hands, cleanse your heart of every sin.[2315] [11] Offer your sweet-

---

blamed all that had gone before, as if it had turned out not so as to do them any good, but rather so as to lead them to a suffering of more grievous calamities than ever; saying that it was better for them to die, not only once but three times over, by the hands of their enemies, than to perish with thirst; for they affirmed that a quick and painless departure from life did in no respect differ from freedom from death in the opinion of wise men, but that that was real death which was slow and accompanied by pain; that what was fearful was not to be dead but only to be dying. 184 When they were lamenting and bewailing themselves in this manner, Moses again besought God, who knew the weakness of all creatures, and especially of men, and the necessary wants of the body which depends for its existence on food, and which is enslaved by those severe task-mistresses, eating and drinking, to pardon his desponding people, and to relieve their want of everything, and that too not after a long interval of time, but by a prompt and undeferred liberality, since by reason of the natural impotency of their mortal nature, they required a very speedy measure of assistance and deliverance. 185 But he, by his bountiful and merciful power, anticipated their wishes, sending forth and opening the watchful, anxious eye of the soul of his suppliant, and showed him a piece of wood which he bade him take up and throw into the water, which indeed had been made by nature with such a power for that purpose, and which perhaps had a quality which was previously unknown, or perhaps was then first endowed with it, for the purpose of effecting the service which it was then about to perform: 186 and when he had done that which he was commanded to do, the fountains became changed and sweet and drinkable, so that no one was able to recognize the fact of their having been bitter previously, because there was not the slightest trace or spark of their ancient bitterness left to excite the recollection. 181 ἄραντες δ᾽ ἀπὸ θαλάττης μέχρι μέν τινος ὡδοιπόρουν μηκέτι τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὀρρωδοῦντες φόβον. ἐπιλιπόντος δὲ τοῦ ποτοῦ τρισὶν ἡμέραις, αὖθις ἐν ἀθυμίαις ἦσαν ὑπὸ δίψους καὶ πάλιν ἤρξαντο μεμψιμοιρεῖν ὡς μηδὲν εὖ προπεπονθότες· ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ παρόντος προσβολὴ δεινοῦ τὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς προτέροις ἀγαθοῖς ἡδονὰς ἀφαιρεῖται. 182 θεασάμενοι δὲ πηγὰς ἐπιτρέχουσιν ὡς ἀρυσόμενοι χαρᾶς ὑπόπλεῳ, δι᾽ ἄγνοιαν τἀληθοῦς ἀπατηθέντες· πικραὶ γὰρ ἦσαν· εἶτα γευσάμενοι γναμφθέντες τῷ παρ᾽ ἐλπίδα τά τε σώματα παρεῖντο καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀναπεπτώκεσαν οὐχ οὕτως ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτοῖς ὡς ἐπὶ τοῖς νηπίοις παισὶ στένοντες, οὓς ἀδακρυτὶ ποτὸν αἰτοῦντας ὁρᾶν οὐχ ὑπέμενον. 183 ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν ὀλιγωροτέρων καὶ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν ἀβεβαίων καὶ τὰ προγεγονότα ἠτιῶντο ὡς οὐκ ἐπ᾽ εὐεργεσίᾳ συμβάντα μᾶλλον ἢ διὰ μετουσίαν ἀργαλεωτέρων συμφορῶν, ἄμεινον εἶναι λέγοντες τρίς, οὐχ ἅπαξ, ὑπ᾽ ἐχθρῶν ἀποθανεῖν ἢ δίψει παραπολέσθαι· τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἄπονον καὶ ταχεῖαν τοῦ βίου μετάστασιν οὐδὲν ἀθανασίας διαφέρειν τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσι, θάνατον δ᾽ ὡς ἀληθῶς εἶναι τὸν βραδὺν καὶ μετ᾽ ἀλγηδόνων, οὐκ ἐν τῷ τεθνάναι τὸ φοβερὸν ἀλλ᾽ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ ἀποθνῄσκειν ἐπιδεικνύμενον 184 τοιαύταις χρωμένων ὀλοφύρσεσι, πάλιν ἱκετεύει τὸν θεὸν Μωυσῆς ἐπιστάμενον τὴν ζῴων καὶ μάλιστα τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθένειαν καὶ τὰς τοῦ σώματος ἀνάγκας ἐκ τροφῆς ἠρτημένου καὶ δεσποίναις χαλεπαῖς συνεζευγμένου, βρώσει καὶ πόσει, συγγνῶναι μὲν τοῖς ἀθυμοῦσι, τὴν δὲ πάντων ἔνδειαν ἐκπλῆσαι, μὴ χρόνου μήκει, δωρεᾷ δ᾽ ἀνυπερθέτῳ καὶ ταχείᾳ, διὰ τὴν τοῦ θνητοῦ φυσικὴν ὀλιγωρίαν ὀξὺν καιρὸν τῆς βοηθείας ἐπιποθοῦντος. 185 ὁ δὲ τὴν ἴλεων αὐτοῦ δύναμιν φθάνει προεκπέμψας καὶ διοίξας τὸ τοῦ ἱκέτου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀκοίμητον ὄμμα ξύλον δείκνυσιν, ὃ προσέταξεν ἀράμενον εἰς τὰς πηγὰς καθεῖναι, τάχα μὲν κατεσκευασμένον ἐκ φύσεως ποιοῦν δύναμιν, ἣ τάχα ἠγνόητο, τάχα δὲ καὶ τότε πρῶτον ποιηθὲν εἰς ἣν ἔμελλεν ὑπηρετεῖν χρείαν. 186 γενομένου δὲ τοῦ κελευσθέντος, αἱ μὲν πηγαὶ γλυκαίνονται μεταβαλοῦσαι πρὸς τὸ πότιμον, ὡς μηδ᾽ εἰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγένοντό ποτε πικραὶ δύνασθαι διαγνῶναι, διὰ τὸ μηδὲ ἴχνος ἢ ζώπυρον τῆς ἀρχαίας κακίας εἰς μνήμην ὑπολελεῖφθαι. (*Moses* 1:181-186)

While Exodus 15:24-27 likely records an actual miracle, so that Jewish tradition to the contrary is erroneous—although the statement in Exodus 15:25 that the Lord "taught" Moses a tree (וַיּוֹרֵהוּ יְהוָה עֵץ) to use for the healing in response to prayer is suggestive—the Jewish tradition that the passage records an event where the Lord healed Israel, not by direct miracle, but through natural means, the purification of the bitter water by Divinely and providentially ordered properties in the tree that Moses employed, illustrates the Jewish view that healing through the employment of medicine and properties the Creator placed within His creation was by no means despised or looked down upon, as in Boardman's Faith Cure doctrine. The Jews believed that the power of God was declared and His glory manifested through the use of medicine in healing. Boardman's allegorical doctrinal extrapolations from Exodus 15:24-27, and his wild claim that Israel's "national faith" was his own doctrine of the Faith Cure (pgs. 29-32, 39-41, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*) are not a little different from what Israel's national faith about the use of medicine actually was.

[2315] Compare Sirach 38:10 with James 4:8, "Cleanse *your* hands, *ye* sinners; and purify *your* hearts, *ye* double minded" καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, ἁμαρτωλοί, καὶ ἁγνίσατε καρδίας, δίψυχοι.

> smelling oblation and memorial, a generous offering according to your means. [12] Then give the doctor his place lest he leave; for you need him too. [13] There are times that give him an advantage, [14] and he too beseeches God that his diagnosis may be correct and his treatment bring about a cure. [15] Whoever is a sinner toward his Maker will be defiant toward the doctor. (38:1-15)[2316]

Intertestamental Judaism taught: "Pray to God, for it is He who heals. Flee wickedness; purify your hands, cleanse your heart of every sin . . . then give the doctor his place." James likewise taught that God heals, but one must use medicine. Rejecting medicine is not Biblical faith—it is disobedience to James 5 and ungodly fanaticism.

James 5:14-15 provides no support whatsoever for Boardman's doctrine of the Faith Cure, nor for the Keswick, Pentecostal, and Word of Faith misinterpretations of James 5 that developed from the Higher Life Faith and Mind Cure doctrine. Boardman is either ignorant of or ignores the historical background to James 5:14-15 and its support for the use of medicine in healing. Without dealing with arguments to the contrary, Boardman assumes that James 5:14-15 is a binding prescription for believers in the entire church age. Boardman's faulty, non-Baptist view of the church allows him to believe that the statements of James 5:14-15 are valid for those not part of true Baptist churches, although only such churches truly have church leadership such as elders. Boardman makes all disease the result of sin and failure to ascend to the Higher Life, while James specifically indicates that not all disease is the result of personal sin, and Boardman's Higher Life and Faith Cure theology was unknown in the first century and for the first 90% of church history. Boardman neglects the fact that the faith of "the prayer of faith" is a gift from God, exercised in accordance with His sovereign will, rather than the spontaneous production of every man at his own will.[2317] James, unlike Boardman, teaches that only when it is God's will to heal can the prayer of faith be proffered to God.

[2316] Sirach 38:1 τίμα ἰατρὸν πρὸς τὰς χρείας αὐτοῦ τιμαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔκτισεν κύριος 2 παρὰ γὰρ ὑψίστου ἐστὶν ἴασις καὶ παρὰ βασιλέως λήμψεται δόμα 3 ἐπιστήμη ἰατροῦ ἀνυψώσει κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔναντι μεγιστάνων θαυμασθήσεται 4 κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς φάρμακα καὶ ἀνὴρ φρόνιμος οὐ προσοχθιεῖ αὐτοῖς 5 οὐκ ἀπὸ ξύλου ἐγλυκάνθη ὕδωρ εἰς τὸ γνωσθῆναι τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ 6 καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν ἀνθρώποις ἐπιστήμην ἐνδοξάζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ 7 ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐθεράπευσεν καὶ ἦρεν τὸν πόνον αὐτοῦ μυρεψὸς ἐν τούτοις ποιήσει μεῖγμα 8 καὶ οὐ μὴ συντελεσθῇ ἔργα αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰρήνη παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς 9 τέκνον ἐν ἀρρωστήματί σου μὴ παράβλεπε ἀλλ᾽ εὖξαι κυρίῳ καὶ αὐτὸς ἰάσεταί σε 10 ἀπόστησον πλημμέλειαν καὶ εὔθυνον χεῖρας καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθάρισον καρδίαν. 11 δὸς εὐωδίαν καὶ μνημόσυνον σεμιδάλεως καὶ λίπανον προσφορὰν ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχων 12 καὶ ἰατρῷ δὸς τόπον καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔκτισεν κύριος καὶ μὴ ἀποστήτω σου καὶ γὰρ αὐτοῦ χρεία 13 ἔστιν καιρὸς ὅτε καὶ ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῶν εὐοδία 14 καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ κυρίου δεηθήσονται ἵνα εὐοδώσῃ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ ἴασιν χάριν ἐμβιώσεως 15 ὁ ἁμαρτάνων ἔναντι τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτὸν ἐμπέσοι εἰς χεῖρας ἰατροῦ. Translation from pgs. 438-439, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary,* P. W. Skehan, & A. A. Di Lella (2008). New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008. Note also their commentary on the passage.

[2317] Indeed, the Higher Life theology in general neglects the fact that faith is a gift from God, rather than an autonomously generated product of man.

Nor does James 5:14-15 specify that the healing is miraculous. Indeed, James enjoins the sick to use medicine to be healed, while Boardman discourages the use of medicine. James 5:14-15, when interpreted in a literal, grammatical-historical way, provides no support whatsoever for Boardman's Faith Cure. James 5:14-15 is only a witness for the Higher Life healing theology if one possesses an *a priori* commitment to the Faith Cure, based on supposedly authoritative testimonials to its efficacy outside of Scripture, combined with a hermeneutic of either empty proof-texting or allegorical eisegesis.

In gathering all the arguments—discussed above—from Scripture he can to prove his Faith Cure position, Boardman makes no attempt in his book to carefully study the passages in their contexts, but simplistically proof-texts passages, and then both acts himself and teaches others to act as if what he assumes is in the passages in question is really present. He had no need to carefully exegete the texts, however; he knew his doctrine was true, for it worked—the multitude of testimonials to it was surely a sufficient replacement for the study of God's Word. Testimony could be compared with testimony to validate the Faith Cure, even if Scripture could not be compared with Scripture to do so.

Indeed, Scripture could also simply be ignored when it was convenient. For instance, the fact that God warned Israel, "thou hast no healing medicines" (Jeremiah 30:13) is ignored by Boardman. That a lack of medicine is a Divine judgment, not a commendable aspect of an alleged Israelite doctrine of Faith Cure, does not fit well within Boardman's paradigm, so surely it can simply be passed by. That God, by the mouth of Jeremiah, would assume that "balm in Gilead" and the "physician" is the normal means through which "the health of the daughter of my people [is] recovered" (Jeremiah 8:22) is very difficult for Boardman's Faith Cure doctrine to explain. That, when extraordinary Divine judgment for sin is not in view, it is appropriate to receive a command to "take balm . . . for pain" and to "use many medicines" (Jeremiah 46:11; 51:8)[2318] is very difficult if God's view is truly that one should abandon medicine for the Faith Cure since the use of medicine is really a lack of trust in the Lord. Jeremiah, and

[2318] Jeremiah certainly also makes it clear that when disease is caused by personal sin, and one is unwilling to repent of that sin, or when a nation is rebellious and unwilling to repent, personal or national sickness can come as a Divine judgment, and the use of doctors and medicine to eliminate disease in such instances can then fail. Furthermore, Jeremiah certainly recognizes that God, not medicine, is the ultimate cause of healing; physicians and treatments are merely a subordinate cause. Such facts are recognized by Baptist and Protestant cessationists and are entirely consistent with their position, while Jeremiah's assumption that the use of medicine is normal and proper is highly problematic for one who advocates abandoning medicine for a Higher Life of the body.

the rest of the Bible,[2319] when interpreted literally, provide not a shred of evidence for the Faith Cure, but clearly and repeatedly contradict it. However, in light of the many testimonials validating Boardman's doctrine, Scripture's teaching that medicine is good, while a lack of healing medicine is Divine judgment, could surely be passed by.

Nevertheless, Boardman had an answer for those who appealed to Scripture to prove that it was not always God's will to heal—at least for the parts of the Bible that he did not ignore. 1 Timothy 5:23, Boardman explains, was just about Timothy having "frequent weaknesses," not frequent sicknesses,[2320] although the word is used of disease every time it appears in the gospels, is also translated "sicknesses" (Matthew 8:17) and "diseases" (Acts 28:9), and is never used for any kind of "weakness" that would have existed in an unfallen world or existed in the incarnate Christ whose life allegedly is the sanctification and healing of the Higher Life advocate,[2321] and, furthermore, the related verb[2322] is used in the pastoral epistles only of Trophimus' sickness (2 Timothy 4:20), which Boardman admits is actual sickness.[2323] Despite the exegetical facts, Boardman knew that 1 Timothy 5:23 could not refer to Timothy getting sick or weak from sickness and needing to be in better health by changing his dietary habits; rather, Timothy was just "weak" in some sense that Christ, it seems, can be weak at the right hand of God, living Timothy's physical life for him; Timothy was not really sick, and, in fact, not really weak either, for Timothy was surely an advocate of the Higher Life of healing, and so he was like Moses and lived his entire life "without disease . . . without abatement of strength or dimness of vision,"[2324] regardless of what grammatical-historical interpretation of 1 Timothy 5:23 might indicate to the contrary.

Furthermore, 2 Timothy 4:20 does not prove that the Lord sometimes allows His servants to be sick and unhealed, nor does Philippians 2:25-27, for both Trophimus and

---

[2319] E. g., the positive reference to physicians that were Joseph's servants in Genesis 50:2—another text ignored by Boardman.

[2320] Pg. 75, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

[2321] The complete list of New Testament texts employing ἀσθένεια is: Matthew 8:17; Luke 5:15; 8:2; 13:11–12; John 5:5; 11:4; Acts 28:9; Romans 6:19; 8:26; 1 Corinthians 2:3; 15:43; 2 Corinthians 11:30; 12:5, 9–10; 13:4; Galatians 4:13; 1 Timothy 5:23; Hebrews 4:15; 5:2; 7:28; 11:34.

[2322] ἀσθενέω. The complete list of New Testament texts with the verb is: Matthew 10:8; 25:36; Mark 6:56; Luke 4:40; 7:10; 9:2; John 4:46; 5:3, 7; 6:2; 11:1–3, 6; Acts 9:37; 19:12; 20:35; Romans 4:19; 8:3; 14:1–2, 21; 1 Corinthians 8:9, 11–12; 2 Corinthians 11:21, 29; 12:10; 13:3–4, 9; Philippians 2:26–27; 2 Timothy 4:20; James 5:14.

[2323] Pg. 75, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman. Boardman does not give any indication that he is even aware that the Greek noun *astheneia* and verb *astheneo* are employed in 1 Timothy 5:23 and 2 Timothy 4:20, texts which he seeks to deal with so differently; nor is there any evidence that he was aware that James 5:13 employs the verb *astheneo* also.

[2324] Pg. 55, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

Epaphroditus were healed, for sure—the healing was just "delayed," so that Trophimus was "attacked and prostrated by disease."[2325] Although Scripture does not record the healing of Trophimus at all, while Epaphroditus was "nigh unto death"[2326] for some time from sickness, the fact that the Higher Life advocate is to live his entire life "without disease . . . [and] without abatement of strength"[2327] is still, somehow, not obliterated. It is certain that many of Boardman's Faith Cures were very much "delayed" and left people prostrated from disease and nigh unto death, until they actually suffered death, as Christ's supposed living their physical life and the Faith Cure could not keep them alive. When Christ cured leprosy, reattached limbs, raised the dead, gave the blind from birth sight, and perfectly cured every single other disease, no such "delay" took place—the Lord never had to explain to lepers that they were still leprous, that men with withered hands still had withered hands, that the dead were still lifeless, that missing body parts were still missing, that the blind still could not see, and so on, because healing was "delayed." This radical discontinuity between the Faith Cure and Biblical miraculous healing, however, was not truly extant, according to Boardman. Indeed, even 2 Corinthians 12:5-10, although specifically indicating that the Lord did not heal Paul of his thorn in the flesh, his disease,[2328] and specifically stating that Paul submitted to the Lord's will that he not be healed, actually does not prove that God does not will to heal some disease during the earthly pilgrimage of His saints—rather, Boardman knows, the truth is that Paul was "purified to the Lord alone in his faith," and once having stepped into the Higher Life, he was cured and "made strong," and therefore in 2 Corinthians 12:5-10 there is "nothing to shake, but everything to confirm, our confidence that it is the will of the Lord to heal all our diseases according to our faith, even as it is to save all who rest in Him for salvation."[2329] In light of the many testimonials from Boardman's experience, and the confirmation of what he already knew to be true from an allegorical reading of various Biblical narratives, 1 Timothy 5:23; 2 Timothy 4:20; Philippians 2:25-27; and 2 Corinthians 12:5-10 must all—whatever the cost—be explained as signifying something other than their obvious and natural sense. The Faith Cure, Boardman affirmed, still stood as valid, despite these passages.

2325 Pg. 76, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2326 Pgs. 73-75, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2327 Pg. 55, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2328 Note the explanation of this "thorn in the flesh" including both ἀσθένεια and ἀσθενέω in the passage, as well as κολαφίζω, meaning "to cause physical impairment, *torment* . . . of painful attacks of an illness" (BDAG).

2329 Pg. 80, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

Furthermore, Boardman required faith in connection with his cures, although nowhere does the New Testament say that healing requires faith by the recipient. There is no record in the Gospels where anyone who came to Christ for healing was turned away unhealed, whether a believer or an unbeliever.[2330] If someone is not healed, the problem is with the one seeking to do the miracle, not with the one seeking to be healed, even if that person is "faithless and perverse" (Matthew 17:14-21). Christ sometimes healed immediately after condemning those who came to him for their unbelief (Matthew 17:17-18; Luke 9:41-42).[2331] In no instance did the Lord Jesus Christ refuse to heal

---

[2330] The fact that faith was not required when Christ or the Apostles healed men does not mean that, at times, those with faith were blessed with the receipt of miracles of healing over others (cf. Matthew 8:13; 9:29; 15:28; Acts 14:9), and that at times, as the just Judge who must punish sin, Christ refused to remain in an area or to heal those there who refused to believe in Him and come to Him for healing (Matthew 13:58; Mark 6:5-6). In such situations, Christ "could there do no mighty work" (Mark 6:5) not because He lacked ability, or because He was dependent upon men rather than being the Sovereign King of Kings, but because to do so was not in accordance with His wisdom, goodness, and His holy justice. He was unable to deny His attributes and fail to punish unbelief and transgression, just as Jeremiah recorded, "the LORD could no longer bear, because of the evil of your doings" (Jeremiah 44:22). Christ cannot deny His justice and leave sin unpunished, for He cannot deny Himself (2 Timothy 2:13), just as He cannot lie (Titus 1:2; Hebrews 6:18). Christ's omnipotent power was regulated by His Divine wisdom, which recognized that healing unbelieving and rebellious people who would not even come to Him for healing would have no positive spiritual effect on them. He would not deny His goodness by healing these people who refused to come to Him and receive Him and the gospel, for being physically healed and seeing miracles while refusing spiritual salvation would have greatly aggravated their judgment (Matthew 11:23-24). There is no record in Mark 6:5 that people actually came to the Lord and asked for healing—rather, because they did not believe, they did not come to Him for healing at all. If, when Christ did a miracle in a particular area, the people who lived there did not bring their sick to Him, but came to Him and told Him to leave, He did not perform further miracles, but left (Mark 5:15-17), just as He avoided areas where the people came to hate Him and sought to kill Him (John 7:1; Luke 4:16-30).

Comparably, immediately after the rejection of Mark 6:5 (see v. 7-11), Christ commanded the Apostles to go into Jewish villages and "[h]eal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give" (Matthew 10:8). However, if those in a particular house or village refused to receive them (Matthew 10:14), they were to depart and shake off the dust on their feet, and nobody would then be healed in that house or village. The fact that Christ limited the miracles He performed in specific situations and left people unhealed in regions where they did not come to Him for healing but tried to kill him instead does not change the fact that, over and over again throughout the whole of His earthly ministry, Christ healed absolutely everyone who came to Him (Matthew 4:23-25; Luke 4:40) from every disease (Matthew 9:35), just like the Apostle Peter healed everyone that came to him of every disease (Acts 5:15-16). The fact that Christ did not heal people who refused to ask Him for healing but told Him to leave or who tried to kill Him does not help the purveyors of the Faith Cure or of Pentecostalism explain away their abysmal failure to duplicate Biblical miracle healing. Pentecostal marvel-peddlers do not run away from people who try to kill them but heal everybody who asks them for healing. Rather, they fail to heal those who come to them for healing and kill those who trust in them by encouraging them to forsake life-saving medicine.

[2331] When the King James Bible records Christ telling people, "Thy faith hath made thee whole" (ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε, Mattthew 9:22; Mark 5:34; 10:52; Luke 8:48, 50; 17:19), He addressed people who were spiritually saved from their sin; the same Greek phrase is translated "thy faith hath saved thee" (Luke 7:50; 18:42), for "whole" is the Greek word usually translated "saved," σῴζω, signifying "salvation from sin" (compare the use of ἰάομαι for solely physical healing in Matthew 15:28, and the σῴζω/ἰάομαι contrast in Mark 5:34). Christ equally healed ten lepers, but only to the one who was spiritually saved did He say, "thy faith hath made thee whole" (Luke 17:12-19). The other nine were just as physically healed,

someone who came to him for healing because of a lack of faith. He healed without discrimination as to person or affliction. The vast majority in Galilee did not believe in Christ, but He healed all that came to Him (Matthew 4:23-25).

The Lord had no limitations as to place or time for healing. He healed throughout "Syria" (Matthew 4:24), at the bottom of a mountain (Matthew 8:8), in a desert place outside the cities (Matthew 14:14), on a mountain by the Sea of Galilee (Matthew 15:30), and in the coasts of Judaea beyond Jordan (Matthew 19:1). Luke 9:6 explicitly says that He healed "everywhere." There were no "healing meetings" in the Bible, nor did anyone have to come to a Faith Cure home to receive healing, or have a "delayed" healing that required one to be hospitalized for a while in a Faith Cure home or any other such institution.[2332]

The Lord Jesus had no relapses or failed healings, nor did anyone have to wait for Jesus' healing to take effect. He had the power to take care of every sickness or injury immediately.[2333] He immediately cleansed lepers (Matthew 8:3; Luke 17:14). He immediately restored the hand of a withered man (Matthew 12:10-13).

---

but they were not spiritually made whole or saved by faith. Those who believed in Christ were both physically and spiritually made whole (Matthew 9:22), and could consequently "be of good comfort" and "go in peace" as the children of God (Luke 8:48), while those who did not believe in Him were physically healed if they came to the Lord to get well, but they were not truly made whole or saved in the deepest and most necessary way.

[2332] Indeed, the very existence of a Faith Cure home or hospital where people who were still sick were left to recover is proof positive that the Faith Cure does not heal like Christ and the Apostles healed. The Lord Jesus did not need to send anyone to a hospital because He healed everyone of everything by simple and immediate acts of Divine power.

[2333] One could affirm that Mark 7:33-35 constitutes an exception to Christ's pattern of instant healing, but such an affirmation would be false. The Lord did what is recorded in v. 33 to help the man to understand that his hearing and speech were to be restored, and then Christ healed him immediately by simply speaking (v. 34-35).

The New Testament does, however, record one exception to Christ's pattern of instant healing in Mark 8:23-26. However, in this episode Christ healed the man in two stages because, as validated by the context of Mark 8:14-22, His healing paralleled His illumination of the spiritual sight of His disciples. The Lord healed by two distinct and deliberate acts of miraculous power to illustrate a spiritual point, while those who affirm that they have the gift of healing like Christ fail to either heal instantly, as the Lord chose to do the overwhelming majority of the time, or to heal with two distinct acts of miraculous power, as Christ chose to do in this solitary instance for a specific spiritual purpose—rather, moderns who claim Apostolic healing abilities "heal" in a manner that is consistent with natural causes the overwhelming majority of the time, and neither heal instantly in one supernatural act of power nor in two distinct and deliberate acts of miraculous power.

> In Mark's account of the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida not only the climax of the story but the entire narrative is constructed on the motif of "seeing." In English translations several of the words used for sight are the same, but in the original Greek there are eight different words used for nine instances of seeing in 8:23–25! The redundancy of references to sight and seeing provides a counterbalance to the redundancy of accusations of blindness and misunderstanding in the previous story. Yet another link between this miracle and the previous story occurs in the speech of Jesus to the blind man. At a miracle Jesus normally speaks an authoritative word or makes a pronouncement. Here, however, he asks a question, "Do you see anything?" (v. 23). That unusual question looks like an echo of Jesus' pleading questions of the disciples in the previous story, the first of which was "Do you still not see?" (8:17). The blind man's response that he can see people

Christ also healed every disease, including organic ones. Christ reattached the ear of Malchus after it had been completely cut off by Peter (Luke 22:51, 52). Matthew 9:35 indicates that He healed "every sickness and every disease" in Galilee (cf. Matthew 4:23). In John 9 He healed a man born blind.[2334] Matthew 15:30-31 reads: "And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet; and he healed them: insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see: and they glorified the God of Israel." Someone who truly has the gift of healing will be able to immediately make visibly incurable and irreparably damaged body parts perfectly healthy and also reattach the body parts of people who have lost them.

Christ also raised people from the dead (Matthew 9:18, 24; Luke 7:12-15). He exercised His power to raise those who had been dead for days and were already decomposing (John 11). Christ's Apostles also raised people from the dead (Matthew 10:8; Acts 9:40; 20:10-12). Someone who does miracles like Christ and the Apostles will also raise the dead.

While Boardman affirmed that the type of healing practiced by Christ and the Apostles was also found in his Faith Cure, in fact the type of healing practiced by Boardman was radically different and vastly inferior to that of Scripture. When the Lord Jesus and the Apostles healed people, the miraculous character of their healing was self-evident (John 11:47-48; Acts 4:16), but sometimes nobody knew—including Boardman himself—that the miracles he worked were actually miraculous, rather than the product of natural causes.[2335] Indeed, "in many of the meetings for healing there would be nothing for the eye to see."[2336] Nobody was marveling because of evident miraculous power, as they did when Christ healed in Matthew 15:30-31. When Boardman and other

---

who "look like trees walking around" (v. 24) is a clue that the disciples themselves will be enabled by Jesus to begin the process of moving from blindness to sight.

The healing of the blind man of Bethsaida is the only miracle in the Gospels that proceeds in stages rather than being instantly effected. . . . The . . . repeated touches cannot imply for Mark insufficiency on Jesus' part . . . since elsewhere Jesus performs more difficult miracles (from a human perspective) without fail, such as healing the Gerasene demoniac (5:1–20) or raising a dead girl (5:35–43). The two-stage cure in the present miracle thus suggests a *process* of revelation — as much for the disciples . . . as for the blind man at Bethsaida. (*The Gospel according to Mark. The Pillar New Testament Commentary*, J. R. Edwards, on Mark 8:23-25)

[2334] See also Matthew 9:27-30; Mark 8:22-25.

[2335] Cf. pgs. 62-63, 222-223, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1887. On pg. 62, *The Lord that Health Thee*, W. Boardman indicates that skeptics could mock at and deny the reality of the Faith Cures—something that the enemies of the gospel could not do when Christ and the Apostles healed.

[2336] Pg. 236, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1887.

Higher Life advocates practiced the Faith Cure, "healing was not instantaneous"[2337] the great majority of the time; rather, people were "not healed perfectly at once," but simply "felt comfortable."[2338] In the "faith-cures of our time . . . many . . . are not instantaneously entire, but by stages, and some of them quite lingering . . . healing remains incomplete."[2339] Many of those "healed" never recovered at all; they remained sick. Testimonials of healing that were supposed to be convincing enough to be included as evidence in Boardman's book, but fell incredibly short of the miracles of healing found in the Bible, were very numerous—testimonials that were comparable to miracles such as the dead being raised (Luke 7:22), or Christ's instant healing of a man born blind (John 9), or Christ's instantly reattaching missing or amputated body parts (Matthew 15:30-31; Luke 22:51-52), were entirely absent. Boardman mentioned, as choice evidences for his Faith Cure, a "poor woman" who "probably" had "cancer," although she might have had some other disease, and was, in any case, "not quite well" after being Faith Cured, although she felt "strengthened and relieved."[2340] A "child" with "a foot put out of joint" was healed, so that "she look[ed] quite bright and happy," although she had "not tried yet to walk."[2341] A woman claimed a cure, stopped using all medical means, and then was "healed slowly," indeed, over the course of at least a year, and never became normal.[2342] Another lady, a missionary, was healed, although her "disease continued with UNABATED force" for some time.[2343] Another woman was healed, although it took "a few months" for her disease to be gone.[2344] A man had a lung disease, decided to take the path of the Faith Cure and so "took no medicine," and was consequently healed, although he testified, "I have not the full use of my hepatized lung." Nonetheless, he doggedly affirmed, "it will recover entirely," using the future tense, for it still had not done so, despite his testimony of healing.[2345] A child was healed, although

---

2337 Pg. 17, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2338 Pg. 21, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2339 Pg. 62, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2340 Pg. 93, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2341 Pg. 94, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2342 Pg. 94, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2343 Pg. 113, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. Capitalization in the original. Nonetheless, she found that her "faith to grasp" the Faith Cure "was greatly strengthened by the relinquishment of outward means . . . the use of means . . . hindered" her from "looking off unto the Lord." Happily, she did not relinquish means and then die from her unabated disease, but ended up getting better, so Boardman put her testimony in his book, as he did various others who "abandoned physicians and remedies, laid aside all their appliances, and [began] trusting simply and solely in the Lord to heal . . . by His power in answer to the prayer of faith" (pg. 130, *ibid*).

2344 Pg. 123, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2345 Pg. 134, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

"for nearly three months" the "child seemed to grow steadily worse" after medical means were abandoned and only prayer was employed for healing, and, indeed, "after nearly three years" the child's mother testified, "I am still waiting upon God to have this wonderful cure completed."[2346] Had Christ practiced this sort of "healing," a "healing" that involved years of delay without a cure, those "healed" at the start of His ministry would first get even more sick, and then still be diseased as His earthly ministry drew toward its close. For the sake of the truth of the gospel and the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus, the Christian greatly rejoices that the miracles of Scripture were of an entirely different class than the marvels of the Faith Cure, marvels that have been replicated in pagan religions and pseudo-Christianity. While Boardman insisted that his healing powers, and those of other practitioners of the Faith Cure, were of the same nature as those of the Lord Jesus and His Apostles, he nevertheless admitted that they were not in reality what they claimed: "[N]ot a few of those healed in our time have not been instantaneously made whole, as most of those were who were healed in the time of our Lord and His apostles,"[2347] he conceded, although the accurate statement, that nobody was being healed of all diseases in the manner that Christ and the Apostles healed, and the Lord Jesus and the Apostles always—not merely "most" of the time—immediately healed everyone at their will, is left unsaid.

Indeed, the Faith Cure was an abysmal failure in actually healing everyone like Christ and the Apostles did (Matthew 9:35)—most of the time the healing did not heal. Boardman explained this failure by asserting that full healing came only to full faith, and partial healing came to partial faith.[2348] In so doing, he contradicted his alleged parallel with justification, for full faith in Christ alone does indeed result in justification, but partial faith in Christ brings, not partial salvation, but nothing but a curse and damnation.[2349] Those who are "fully brought into union with Him" are without fail "made whole in body,"[2350] Boardman avers, leaving himself a way of escape for those

---

2346 Pgs. 130-131, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2347 Pgs. 141-142, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. Boardman attempts a justification of the discontinuity between Biblical healing and the Faith Cure on pgs. 142-143, one which is more notable in its admission of discontinuity than in the success of its explanation. Despite vociferous claims of continuity throughout Boardman's book, he ends with an admission of very notable discontinuity.

2348 Pgs. 105-107, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2349 Compare the contradiction in Stephen Barabas' *So Great Salvation* on partial faith bringing a partial sanctification, despite the alleged parallel between justification and sanctification being by faith alone, in the section above, "An Analysis and Critique of Keswick Theology as Set Forth Particularly in *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention* by Stephen Barabas," and also pgs. 263-264, "Means and Measure of Holiness," Thomas Smith. *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280.

2350 Pg. 63, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

who fail to be healed—their faith, supposedly, must have been deficient. The "responsibility for failure, partial or entire," of the Faith Cure "rightfully" is placed "upon those who should have full and firm faith"—they are not healed immediately because they do not have enough faith.[2351] While Boardman could not prove his position from the Bible, "experience" taught that "want of faith in the patient" led to "restoration" to health "not [being] immediate."[2352] Faith Cure did not fail because it was not Biblical, but because the person who needed to be healed did not have enough faith.

Further justification of the failure of the Faith Cure can come by assaulting the power of the Son of God and degrading His miracles during His earthly ministry; Boardman taught that Christ only healed "as the faith of the people would afford Him opportunity,"[2353] and only healed "to the full measure of faith"[2354] of those who came to Him, reducing His real, miraculous, perfect cures of everyone to the level of the marvels Boardman sought to affect with his Faith Cures. Boardman attempts to claim that those who were not healed by the Faith Cure missed out on their miracle because of a lack of faith, as, supposedly, took place in the Gospels and in Acts, although the accounts of Christ's life teem with stories of people who did not believe but were healed. One wonders if the people Christ raised from the dead believed in their state of death as a prerequisite to healing. However, neither Boardman nor Cullis actually were able to see, as their doctrine required, the most holy receive cures and the less holy turned away; rather, as Hannah W. Smith observed, by means of the Faith Cure of Cullis and Boardman "there are far more failures than successes, and I dread the reaction. For these failures are nearly always with the most devout Christians, and it is an awful strain on their faith."[2355] However, the Faith Cure practitioner could always reply that the most devout Christians were not really the most devout; after all, even Job, although the Lord

---

2351 Pg. 142, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2352 Pg. 127, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman.

2353 Pg. 53, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. As explained earlier in more detail, Matthew 13:58 and Mark 6:5-6 by no means prove that the Lord Jesus did not have the power to heal people who did not believe. Rather, the verses speak of Christ's righteous withholding of miracles of healing as judgment upon the unbelieving people in the particular context under consideration; furthermore, the people did not bring their sick to Christ for healing, so He did not heal them. These two passages do not contradict in the least the strong testimony of many other texts that Christ healed all who came to Him for healing, even though the great majority of the population did not believe.

Compare Hannah W. Smith's related misuse of Matthew 13:58 & Mark 6:6 at the 1874 Broadlands Conference (pg. 127, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

2354 Pg. 73, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2355 Letter of Hannah W. Smith to Priscilla, Monterey, California, August 14, 1882, reproduced in *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life: The unpublished personal writings of Hannah Whitall Smith*, M. E. Dieter, entry for November 19.

Himself directly testified that there was "none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil" (Job 1:8; 2:3), suffered from disease, Boardman affirms, because of Job's "trust in himself . . . in . . . his own unselfish righteousness of life."[2356] God permitted Job to suffer disease so that he would not "remai[n] in his false trust in his own righteousness"[2357] but enter into the Higher Life and because Job was not willing to listen to God's warnings,[2358] an insight into that holy man's life which one needed Mr. Boardman to reveal, as one could never find it in the book of Job. Mr. Boardman's argument sounds dangerously like that of Job's three friends, which kindled Jehovah's wrath (Job 42:7); Boardman perhaps should have paused over Job's question, "Will ye speak wickedly for God?" (Job 13:7), but such wicked speech is not Mr. Boardman's sin, for, of course, the Higher Life is true and Job was wrong for not having entered into it. However, when at the end of the book Job came to recognize that "in his own heart he had trusted in himself," then "the Lord gave Himself . . . to His beloved servant, in place of his own wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption," and Job, freed from "the evil of trusting in his own righteousness of heart," was "in that moment" freed from both "Satan" and his bodily "malady," being instantly transferred into the Higher Life and "therefore delivered from the evil trio—the evil one, the evil of trusting in his own heart, and the evil disease of his body."[2359] Mr. Boardman, and all others who had entered into the Higher Life, had thus reached a pinnacle of spirituality far above that of Job, one from which they were enabled to be free from all bodily disease of the kind Job suffered for his sin. If Boardman's view of Job—which was passed on to the Keswick and Higher Life movement generally,[2360]

2356 Pg. 66, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2357 Pg. 67, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2358 Pg. 65, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2359 Pgs. 68-69, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman.

2360 E. g., at the Brighton Convention the question was faced: "We are sometimes asked [if the Higher Life is true], what we are going to do with such portions of Scripture as the book of Job?" The answer was given:

> Job had so much conflict when otherwise he might have known rest. . . . He did not clearly perceive the life of the child of God. He . . . kn[ew] Jesus Christ as the Saviour, but [he did] not know Him as the life. . . . [He was] a man full of himself[.] . . . Job . . . was righteous in his own eye—self-righteous—and that is what every man is who is not depending entirely on the Lord Jesus Christ. (pgs. 205-208, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875)

However, finally Job found the Higher Life, and then the Lord gave him seven more sons and three daughters, whose beauty allegorically interpreted signified "resurrection fairness" (pg. 208). In such a manner, through the gross abuse and misreading of the book of Job, the Higher Life of ease and rest could be maintained against the evident and literal teaching of God's Word, and Hannah W. Smith could be justified above one who God Himself testified was the holiest man on the earth in his day.

for without it the Higher Life theology is obliterated[2361]—is false, such an affirmation would smack of immense pride, an astonishing lack of insight into the point of the book of Job,[2362] and consequently a very low level of spirituality—even apart from the devastating pastoral consequences of telling the Lord's beloved children, who were walking in uprightness of heart, that, when sick, they were ill because of some sin in their lives. However, Boardman's affirmations about Job cannot be false, although there is not a shred of evidence in the Bible for them, because his theory of Faith Cure is destroyed if Job was indeed the most righteous man on the earth and his sickness was not a result of personal sin in his life and a failure to discover the Higher Life—and Boardman has such an abundance of testimonies to his doctrine of sanctification and healing by faith alone, that they must necessarily be the truth, despite the torture of the text required to manufacture evidence for his theology in Scripture.

Warfield summarizes the problems with the Faith Cure:

> First of all, as regards the *status quaestionis* let it be remembered that the question is not:
> (1) Whether God is an answerer of prayer; nor
> (2) Whether, in answer to prayer, he heals the sick; nor
> (3) Whether his action in healing the sick is a supernatural act; nor
> (4) Whether the supernaturalness of the act may be so apparent as to demonstrate God's activity in it to all right-thinking minds conversant with the facts.
> All this we all believe. The question at issue is distinctly whether God has pledged himself to heal the sick miraculously, and does heal them miraculously, on the call of his children—that is to say without means—any means—and apart from means, and above means; and this so ordinarily that Christian people may be encouraged, if not required, to discard all means as either unnecessary or even a mark of lack of faith and sinful distrust, and to depend on God alone for the healing of all their sicknesses. This is the issue, even conservatively stated. For many[2363] will say that faith gives us as clear a title to the healing of our bodies as to the salvation of our souls; and this is often interpreted to mean that it is the heritage of every Christian, if a true Christian, to be free from all disease and bodily weakness, and it is a proof of special sin in a Christian if he is a special sufferer from disease.

2361 E. g., Robert P. Smith taught at the Oxford Convention:

> Do not permit the Devil to suggest difficulties, as that a life of full consecration to God will make you miserable. Banish instantly a thought so unworthy of God! *He is your Father*—your *Heavenly* Father. Does an earthly parent make the thoroughly obedient child miserable? Shame on the thought! Let it never be allowed entrance to any heart here! (pg. 223, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874. Italics in original.)

For Smith to maintain this Higher Life teaching, abandonment of the obvious teaching of the book of Job was clearly necessary, as what that inspired book of wisdom plainly teaches is ascribed by Mr. Smith to the devil. Smith supported his belief that the Christian life is perpetual "rest" and "ease" by twisting Psalm 25:12, overlooking the fact that only a handful of verses later in the same psalm David affirmed: "I am desolate and afflicted" and, "[t]he troubles of my heart are enlarged," although he could also affirm: "Mine eyes are ever toward the LORD" (Psalm 25:15-17), so the man after God's own heart was looking to the Lord in faith although undergoing affliction.

2362 Indeed, Mr. Boardman appears to justify Job's three counselors in their attributing Job's illness to personal sin, despite the fact that "the LORD said to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me *the thing that is* right, as my servant Job *hath*" (Job 42:7).

2363 Such as Boardman, Simpson, the Word of Faith movement, etc.

With reference to this question it is to be said at least:

(1) No promise of such miraculous action on God's part exists in Scripture.

(2) No facts have been adduced which will compel the assumption that such miraculous healing takes place.

(3) Such a miraculous method on God's part would be wholly unnecessary for the production of the effect desired; God can heal the bodily hurt of his people without miracle.

(4) The employment of such a method of working would be contrary to the analogy of God's mode of working in other spheres of his activity.

(5) It would be contrary to the very purpose of miracle, which would be defeated by it. If miracles are to be common, everyday occurrences, normal and not extraordinary, they cease to attract attention, and lose their very reason of existence. What is normal is according to law. If miracles are the law of the Christian life they cease to serve their chief end.[2364]

[2364] Warfield speaks of what might be called "sign miracles." An act like regeneration, or the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification, would be denominated by Warfield as "supernatural," but not as a "miracle." Warfield's definition is supported by the use of the English word *miracle* in the Authorized Version (Exodus 7:9; Numbers 14:22; Deuteronomy 11:3; 29:3; Judges 6:13; Mark 6:52; 9:39; Luke 23:8; John 2:11, 23; 3:2; 4:54; 6:2, 14, 26; 7:31; 9:16; 10:41; 11:47; 12:18, 37; Acts 2:22; 4:16, 22; 6:8; 8:6, 13; 15:12; 19:11; 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28–29; Galatians 3:5; Hebrews 2:4; Revelation 13:14; 16:14; 19:20). Warfield's definition of miracles also receives support from the Hebrew and Greek words rendered *miracle*, although other words indicate that, in a different sense, it is legitimate to call an act such as regeneration a *miracle*, not simply something *supernatural*.

Three words are translated *miracle* in the Old Testament; מוֹפֵת, אוֹת, and פֶּלֶא. מוֹפֵת appears 36 times (Exodus 4:21; 7:3, 9; 11:9–10; Deuteronomy 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 13:1-2; 26:8; 28:46; 29:2; 34:11; 1 Kings 13:3, 5; 1 Chronicles 16:12; 2 Chronicles 32:24, 31; Nehemiah 9:10; Psalm 71:7; 78:43; 105:5, 27; 135:9; Isaiah 8:18; 20:3; Jeremiah 32:20–21; Ezekiel 12:6, 11; 24:24, 27; Joel 3:3; Zechariah 3:8), is predominantly translated *wonder* (25x), then *sign* (8x). It is rendered *miracle* twice (Exodus 7:9; Deuteronomy 29:3). The word is used of miracles such as the ten plagues the Lord brought on Egypt (Exodus 7:3; 11:9) or the miraculous rending of the altar at Bethel (1 Kings 13:3, 5) or the wonders God will perform in the Tribulation period (Joel 2:30) or God's miraculously making Hezekiah's sundial go backward ten degrees (2 Chronicles 32:24, 31). It is also used of supernatural wonders done by false prophets (Deuteronomy 13:1-2). The word is also used of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and others who, by their actions or in other ways, visibly typed or manifested the supernaturally given prophecies of the prophets (Isaiah 8:18; 20:3; Ezekiel 12:6, 11; 24:24, 27; Zechariah 3:8). The miraculous, as מוֹפֵת, functions in character as a sign by its unique character, causing men to wonder. In all these instances—the large majority of uses, which include both texts where the English word *miracle* appears—is employed of events that unquestionably pass beyond providence to match the limited definition Warfield gives *miracle*. Indeed, the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* affirms that מוֹפֵת is "always connected with a miraculous occurrence" (vol. 7, pg. 209, art. on σημεῖον). Deuteronomy 28:46 & Psalm 71:7 constitute the only possible exceptions, where the word could apparently be used of what are evident signs of God's working, but which do not necessarily surpass the level of providence. However, Psalm 71:7 affirms not that the Psalmist "is" a "wonder" or מוֹפֵת, but that he is "as a wonder," כְּמוֹפֵת, simply making a comparison. Furthermore, the language of "sign . . . and . . . wonder" in Deuteronomy 28:46 recalls the judgments Jehovah put upon Egypt (Deuteronomy 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 26:8; 29:3; 34:11), which were clearly miraculous. While the Deuteronomic curses predicted by Moses in 28:46 certainly including awful providential judgments upon Israel, they will ultimately be fulfilled in the miraculous judgments upon unconverted Israel in the Tribulation period (which include the descent of the unconverted into hell), described in the book of Revelation with significant allusion to the Egyptian plagues in Exodus. Consequently, there are no clear or certain exceptions to the pattern that a מוֹפֵת points to a sign, wonder, or "miracle" in the narrow sense defined by Warfield.

אוֹת appears 79 times (Genesis 1:14; 4:15; 9:12–13, 17; 17:11; Exodus 3:12; 4:8–9, 17, 28, 30; 7:3; 8:19; 10:1–2; 12:13; 13:9, 16; 31:13, 17; Numbers 2:2; 14:11, 22; 17:3, 25; Deuteronomy 4:34; 6:8, 22; 7:19; 11:3, 18; 13:2–3; 26:8; 28:46; 29:2; 34:11; Joshua 2:12; 4:6; 24:17; Judges 6:17; 1 Samuel 2:34; 10:7, 9; 14:10; 2 Kings 19:29; 20:8–9; Isaiah 7:11, 14; 8:18; 19:20; 20:3; 37:30; 38:7, 22; 44:25; 55:13; 66:19; Jeremiah 10:2; 32:20–21; 44:29; Ezekiel 4:3; 14:8; 20:12, 20; Psalm 65:9; 74:4, 9; 78:43; 86:17; 105:27;

135:9; Job 21:29; Nehemiah 9:10). The word is translated *sign* sixty times, *token* 14 times, and *miracle* twice (Numbers 14:22; Deuteronomy 11:3). אוֹת usually describes unquestionable miracles, such as the plagues in Egypt wrought through Moses (Exodus 7:3; 8:23), or the miracles wrought in the wilderness journey from Egypt to Canaan (Numbers 14:11, 22), or the miraculous fire brought out of a rock by the Angel of the LORD (Judges 6:17), or the miracle of making Hezekiah's sundial go back ten degrees (2 Kings 20:8-9; Isaiah 38:7), or the virgin birth of the Messiah (Isaiah 7:14). The word is employed alongside of מוֹפֵת of the supernatural works or prophecies of false prophets—their prophecies sometimes come to pass (Deuteronomy 13:1-2) but sometimes do not (Isaiah 44:25). אוֹת is employed like מוֹפֵת, although not as frequently, of people that type or manifest supernaturally given prophecy (Isaiah 8:18; 20:3), as well as of actions that type or manifest prophecy (Ezekiel 4:3). However, אוֹת is also employed of what is obviously less than strictly miraculous, such as the sign of circumcision (Genesis 17:11) or the celebration of the feast of Unleavened Bread (Exodus 13:9) or the Sabbath (Exodus 31:17). It is used of the sign or token Rahab requested from the spies (Joshua 2:12) and of the twelve stones taken from the Jordan river and made a monument (Joshua 4:6), as well as other monuments (Isaiah 19:20). It is used of the providentially guided answer of the Philistines to Jonathan and his armorbearer (1 Samuel 14:10), of the "signs of heaven" that the heathen feared in their pagan astrology but the people of God were to not be dismayed at (Jeremiah 10:2), and of the ensigns of war of the ungodly (Psalm 74:4). Thus, while אוֹת is very often a reference to what Warfield would designate a strict *miracle*, broader uses are also present.

When a specific event is designated a "sign and wonder," employing אוֹת and מוֹפֵת together, reference is always made to the work of Jehovah, and the strictly miraculous is always in view: Exodus 7:3; Deuteronomy 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 26:8; 28:46; 29:2; 34:11; Nehemiah 9:10; Psalm 78:43; 105:27; 135:9; Isaiah 8:18; 20:3; Jeremiah 32:20–21. Note that Deuteronomy 13:1-2 does not fit in this category, because it refers to a sign "or" wonder (אוֹת אוֹ מוֹפֵת). Isaiah 8:18; 20:3 refer to the confirmation of miraculously given prophecy.

The verb פָּלָא, which is usually rendered with a form of *wondrous* or *marvelous*, is also frequently used of the strictly miraculous (thus, the Niphals in Exodus 3:20; 34:20; Joshua 3:5; Judges 6:13 (the sole text where the word is translated *miracle*); Jeremiah 21:2; etc.)—indeed, the verb is employed when the Lord distinguishes His wondrous and miraculous power, manifest in the Exodus, as superior to anything performed at any previous time in any nation before that period, indicating that Divine miracles of Exodus character were not performed constantly, nor replicated by fallen angels: "And he said, Behold, I make a covenant: before all thy people I will do marvels [אֶעֱשֶׂה נִפְלָאֹת], such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation: and all the people among which thou *art* shall see the work of the LORD: for it *is* a terrible thing that I will do with thee" (Exodus 34:10; in the Tribulation period, miracles will be in a class comparable to those of the Exodus, Micah 7:15). The Niphal of פָּלָא is also frequently used for "wondrous works" that include both the miraculous and non-miraculous acts of God (cf. Job 5:9; 9:10; Psalm 9:2; 26:7; 71:17; 72:18; 75:1; 78:4, 11, 32; 86:10, etc.), for the fundamental idea of the word is not what Warfield would define as miracle, but an act that produces wonder in those who learn of it. The Niphal is consequently employed of what is clearly not miraculous but is wonderful (Deuteronomy 17:8; 30:11; 2 Samuel 1:26; 13:2; Job 42:3; Proverbs 30:18; Daniel 11:36; etc.) The miracle idea is not at all strong outside of the Niphal (Piel, Leviticus 22:21; Numbers 15:3, 8; Hiphil, Leviticus 27:2; Numbers 6:2; Deuteronomy 28:59; Judges 13:19 (an instance of the miraculous outside of the Niphal); 2 Chronicles 2:9; 26:15; Psalm 17:7; 31:21; Isaiah 28:29; Joel 2:26; Hithpael, Job 10:16). The complete list of texts with the verb is Genesis 18:14; Exodus 3:20; 34:10; Leviticus 22:21; 27:2; Numbers 6:2; 15:3, 8; Deuteronomy 17:8; 28:59; 30:11; Joshua 3:5; Judges 6:13; 13:19; 2 Samuel 1:26; 13:2; 1 Chronicles 16:9, 12, 24; 2 Chronicles 2:9; 26:15; Nehemiah 9:17; Psalm 9:1; 17:7; 26:7; 31:21; 40:5; 71:17; 72:18; 75:1; 78:4, 11, 32; 86:10; 96:3; 98:1; 105:2, 5; 106:7, 22; 107:8, 15, 21, 24, 31; 111:4; 118:23; 119:18, 27; 131:1; 136:4; 139:14; 145:5; Job 5:9; 9:10; 10:16; 37:5, 14; 42:3; Proverbs 30:18; Isaiah 28:29; Jeremiah 21:2; 32:17, 27; Daniel 8:24; 11:36; Joel 2:26; Micah 7:15; Zechariah 8:6).

In summary, the Old Testament employs the terms מוֹפֵת, אוֹת, and פָּלָא to speak of miracles. פָּלָא and אוֹת are used of both for what Warfield would designate as the strictly miraculous and of wonders and signs that are broader than Warfield's definition of miracle. מוֹפֵת, on the other hand, is always associated with what Warfield would designate as the strictly miraculous; it constitutes a sign and wonder that is an evident breaking of the supernatural into the natural order.

The New Testament translates both δύναμις and σημεῖον as *miracle*. The words τέρας, μεγαλεῖον, ἔνδοξον, παράδοξον & θαυμάσιον are also related (cf. § xci, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Trench).

The noun δύναμις is usually translated *power* (77x out of 120 uses); *mighty work* (11x) is the second most common rendering. The word is translated *miracle* in Mark 9:39; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11; 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28-29; Galatians 3:5; Hebrews 2:4. When δύναμις is used of miracles, it emphasizes the *power* or *capability* involved. While the word is employed in senses where the performance of a miracle is not in view, in every such case a particular act is not under consideration (Matthew 6:13; 22:29; 24:29–30; 25:15; 26:64; Mark 9:1; 12:24; 13:25–26; 14:62; Luke 21:26–27; 22:69; Romans 1:20; 8:38; 1 Corinthians 14:11; 15:24; 15:56; 2 Corinthians 1:8; 4:7; 6:7; 8:3; 12:9; Ephesians 1:21; 2 Thessalonians 1:7; Hebrews 6:5; 7:16; 11:34; 1 Peter 3:22; 2 Peter 2:11; Rev 1:16; 3:8; 4:11; 5:12; 7:12; 11:17; 12:10; 15:8; 17:13; 18:3; 19:1). When a particular act is specified with δύναμις, the act in question is always miraculous—non-miraculous works are never clearly identified with δύναμις. Thus, the word is regularly used of the performance of miraculous acts (Matthew 7:22; 11:20, 21, 23; 13:54, 58; 14:2; Mark 6:2, 5, 14; 9:39; Luke 10:13; 19:37; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11; 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28-29; 2 Corinthians 12:12; Galatians 3:5; 2 Thessalonians 2:9; Hebrews 2:4), and in other uses the word is clearly associated and related to the performance of miracles (Mark 5:30; Luke 1:17 (a legitimate instance, despite John 10:41, where σημεῖον, not δύναμις, is employed; John led many to miraculous regeneration—he led many to turn from disobedience to wisdom so that Israel could be prepared for the Lord, as Elijah also had done; cf. 1 Kings 18:39. John's work of bringing many to regeneration through his preaching as a prophet was a miracle as δύναμις, but not as σημεῖον.); 1:35; 4:14; 4:36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; 9:1; 10:13, 19; 24:49; Acts 1:8; 3:12; 4:7, 33; 6:8; 8:10; 10:38; Romans 1:4, 16; 9:17; 15:13; 15:19; 1 Corinthians 1:18; 24; 2:4–5; 4:19–20; 5:4; 6:14; 12:10; 15:43; 2 Corinthians 13:4; Ephesians 1:19; 3:7; 3:16, 20; Philippians 3:10; Colossians 1:11, 29; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 2 Thessalonians 1:11; 2 Timothy 1:7–8; 3:5; Hebrews 1:3; 11:11; 1 Peter 1:5; 2 Peter 1:3, 16; Revelation 13:2). The *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (ed. Kittel, pg. 230, vol. 7) notes that "in the plural δύναμεις even became a technical term for 'miracles' in the NT," an affirmation supported by the evidence (Matthew 7:22; 11:20–21, 23; 13:54, 58; 14:2; Mark 6:2, 14; Luke 10:13; 19:37; 21:26; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11; 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28–29; 2 Corinthians 12:12; Galatians 3:5; Hebrews 2:4; 6:5—the sole exceptions are instances where does not refer to acts at all, Matthew 24:29; Mark 13:25; Luke 21:26; Romans 8:38; 1 Peter 3:22). The best argument against δύναμις referring specifically to the miraculous would be the class of texts where the word is employed in association with Christian salvation, a category which is inclusive of sanctification and of the bestowal of spiritual gifts (Romans 1:16; 15:13; 1 Corinthians 1:18; Ephesians 1:19; 3:7, 16, 20; Philippians 3:10; Colossians 1:11, 29; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 2 Thessalonians 1:11; 2 Timothy 1:7, 8; 3:5; 1 Peter 1:5; 2 Peter 1:3). However, it is better to conclude from the existence of this category that regeneration is a miraculous work of Divine power, and the Spirit's power in progressively eradicating indwelling sin in Christians, producing spiritual fruit, and performing other works associated with salvation is a similar work of Divine power, rather than *a priori* concluding that Christian salvation is non-miraculous, and from this *a priori* establishing a category, otherwise not clearly attested in the New Testament, where δύναμις refers to non-miraculous actions. The identification of salvation with the miraculous is clearly supported elsewhere in Scripture with texts that indicate that personal *regeneration* is in the same category as a work of Divine power with the transformation, the cosmic regeneration, involved in establishing the Millennial earth (Matthew 19:28; Titus 3:5; παλιγγενεσία) or the fact that both bringing into being a universe and bringing into being a clean heart are works of *creation* (Genesis 1:1; Psalm 51:10; בָּרָא). Furthermore, the identification of δύναμις with the miraculous establishes that a Biblical *miracle*, as a work of God's power, is not necessarily a rare event, for the exercise of Almighty power in sustaining the universe employs δύναμις (Hebrews 1:3). While God constantly sustains the universe, Scripture indicates that this is a miracle in the sense of the word δύναμις. Furthermore, while they are not able to replicate everything done by the Almighty, the powers of darkness can perform miracles (2 Thessalonians 2:9).

The word σημεῖον appears 77 times in the New Testament (Matthew 12:38–39; 16:1, 3–4; 24:3, 24, 30; 26:48; Mark 8:11–12; 13:4, 22; 16:17, 20; Luke 2:12, 34; 11:16, 29–30; 21:7, 11, 25; 23:8; John 2:11, 18, 23; 3:2; 4:48, 54; 6:2, 14, 26, 30; 7:31; 9:16; 10:41; 11:47; 12:18, 37; 20:30; Acts 2:19, 22, 43; 4:16, 22, 30; 5:12; 6:8; 7:36; 8:6, 13; 14:3; 15:12; Romans 4:11; 15:19; 1 Corinthians 1:22; 14:22; 2 Corinthians 12:12; 2 Thessalonians 2:9; 3:17; Hebrews 2:4; Revelation 12:1, 3; 13:13–14; 15:1; 16:14;

(6) The contention of the faith-healers overlooks numerous important Biblical facts. Primarily the fact [is overlooked] that the miraculous gifts in the New Testament were the credentials of the apostles, and were confirmed to those to whom the apostles had conveyed them—whence a presumption arises against their continuance after the apostolic age. Then, again, [it is overlooked] that there are instances of sickness in the New Testament which were not removed by the prayer of faith. There is, for example, Paul's leaving of Trophimus at Miletum sick, and his recommending to Timothy, when sick, not the seeking of healing by the miraculous act of God, but the use of medicinal means—the drinking no longer of water but of a little wine for his stomach's sake and his often infirmities. It seems quite clear that Paul did not share the views of our modern faith-healers.

(7) The faith-healing arguments presuppose or lead to many false doctrines. A desultory allusion to some of them may not be without its uses: (A) Sickness and sin are often connected in an utterly un-Scriptural manner. That all the sicknesses which afflict our race are a result of sin is true. But that special sicknesses infer special sin our Saviour himself explicitly denies [John 9:3]. (B) These arguments would be equally valid to commend Perfectionism.[2365] If sinfulness is not to be removed in this life, neither is sickness. Both are the fruits of guilt, and both are removed on the basis of the work of the guilt-bearer; and both are removed only when the subjective salvation is completed [in the eschaton]. (C) They are founded on a completely un-Scriptural view of the functions of suffering, and the uses of sickness and pain. All sickness and suffering are spoken of as if they were from the Evil One alone; as if they were sheerly the mark of the displeasure of God; and as if they were a fruit of particular sin. Scripture says, "Behold whom the Lord loves he chastens, and scourges every son whom he receives" [Hebrews 12:6]. Sickness is often the proof

---

19:20), and is translated by a form of *sign* 50 times, by *miracle* 23 times, by *wonder* three times, and as *token* once. The word is translated "miracle" in Luke 23:8; John 2:11, 23; 3:2; 4:54; 6:2, 14, 26; 7:31; 9:16; 10:41; 11:47; 12:18, 37; Acts 4:16, 22; 6:8; 8:6; 15:12; Revelation 13:14; 16:14; 19:20. With the exception of a handful of texts where the word signifies "a visible mark by which someone or something is recognized" (Matthew 26:48; Luke 2:12; Romans 4:11; 2 Thessalonians 3:17), the word refers to miraculous signs: Matthew 12:38-39; 16:1, 3, 4, 24:3, 24, 30; Mark 8:11, 12; 13:4, 22; 16:17, 20; Luke 2:34 (Christ Himself is a σημεῖον because of the miracle of the incarnation; cf. Luke 11:30; Isaiah 11:10-12); 11:16, 29, 30; 21:7, 11, 25; 23:8; John 2:11, 18, 23; 3:2; 4:48, 54; 6:2, 14, 26, 30; 7:31; 9:16; 10:41; 11:47; 12:18, 37; 20:30; Acts 2:19, 22, 43; 4:16, 22, 30, 5:12; 6:8; 7:36, 8:6, 13; 14:3; 15:12; Romans 15:19; 1 Corinthians 1:22; 14:22; 2 Corinthians 12:12 (Apostles have miracle-working power to validate their office); 2 Thessalonians 2:9; Hebrews 2:4; Revelation 12:1, 3, 13:13, 14; 15:1; 16:14; 19:20. The powers of darkness can perform false signs or miracles (σημεῖον); Matthew 24:24; Mark 13:22; 2 Thessalonians 2:9; Revelation 13:13-14; 16:14; 19:20. "In the religious sphere, *sēmeion* has always meant a prodigy that is recognizable and provides proof for everyone. In the NT, it is a category of miracle, together with mighty works (*dynameis*) and wonders (*terata*, Acts 2:22; 2 Thess 2:9; 2 Cor 12:12; Heb 2:4); but it retains its value as a sign or demonstration" (pg. 252, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* vol. 3, Spicq). The σημεῖον, unlike the δύναμις, always refers to something specific and unique: "If in face of the varied nature of NT usage a basic meaning can be laid down . . . this seems to reside in the fact that in a specific situation which cannot be repeated σημεῖον states or indicates a possibility or intention or the indispensability of a definite human reference" (pg. 231, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* vol. 7, Kittel). Consequently, σημεῖον is not used for works such as human regeneration and sanctification, as δύναμις is.

Consequently, while a *miracle*, as an act of God's power, as a δύναμις, is broader in scope than Warfield's definition, a *miracle* as a sign, as σημεῖον, supports Warfield. The glorious and stupendous acts of God's power in both the parting of the Red Sea and in raising a dead sinner to new life are *miracles* in the sense of δύναμις; only the former is a sign-miracle, a σημεῖον.

In conclusion, while there are words that designate *miracles* in the Old and New Testament that encompass ideas broader than that Warfield designates "miracle," his definition nonetheless has clear Biblical support, not just as a definite idea present within the semantic range of all the words translated *miracle* in the Authorized Version, but also in the sign-miracles specified by מוֹפֵת and σημεῖον.

[2365] So, indeed, the Higher Life theology and the Faith Cure are very closely bound together.

> of special favor from God; it always comes to his children from his Fatherly hand, and always in his loving pleasure works, together with all other things which befall God's children, for good.
>
> (8) The faith-healing contention leads to contempt for God's appointed means, and this leads to the fanatical attitude of demanding from God apart from all means that for the attaining of which he has ordained appropriate means. We are not to refuse to cultivate the soil and then demand to be fed by miracle.
>
> (9) The faith-healing practice leads to the production of "professionals," standing between the soul and God. There is grave danger in a soul permitting an unauthorized intermediary to take up a position between it and the gracious activities of God toward it. From this germ the whole sacerdotal evil has grown. And, on the other hand, to the practitioner himself there comes inevitable temptation to spiritual pride and autocracy, which is most disastrous to his spiritual life; and sometimes even something worse. . . . [T]he faith-healing delusion has [brought about] the production of a series of these practitioners, whose activities have not always been wholesome.[2366]

The price for retaining Boardman's Faith Cure doctrine might indeed seem high—the rejection of literal interpretation for allegory, Scripture-twisting, turning Job into someone who was sick because of a sinful failure to discover the Higher Life, a reduction of the miracles of Christ and the Apostles to the mockeries of real miraculous healing in the Faith Cure that are not evidently miraculous, but often delayed, partial, or non-existent, the spiritual confusion of telling those who are sick that some sin and failure to practice the Higher Life is the cause of their illness, countless medically unnecessary early deaths, lamenting widows and widowers, children without fathers and mothers, and the dishonor to God that arises from all these evils.[2367] Nonetheless, Boardman continued preaching his faith-healing and Higher Life message until, being struck at Bethshan with paralysis that paralyzed his entire right side, and failing to be healed, although he held on in his paralyzed state for a week,[2368] he died in 1886, following the pattern of very many others who had visited Bethshan, failed to be healed, and died. Despite Boardman's false teachings and practical failures, he was very influential. Andrew Murray, who also preached for and fellowshipped with A. B. Simpson, imbibed Keswick theology and adopted the Faith Cure after a healing experience at Bethshan in 1882 and reading the writings of "Boardman and Cullis."[2369] The "broad holiness principles" of Boardman "summarize distinctive holiness theology as they later undergirded distinctive Pentecostal theology."[2370] Indeed, Boardman not only influenced the rise of worldwide Pentecostalism indirectly by spreading the Faith Cure in Higher Life meetings, but he

---

2366 Pgs. 252-255, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield.

2367 Pg. 23, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham. Boardman believed: "[I]f after all [the teaching of *The Lord that Healeth Thee*] should be found not of God, the effect would be disastrous" (pg. 5, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman. London: Morgan and Scott, 1881).

2368 Pg. 242, 246, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1887.

2369 Pg. 461, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*.

2370 Pg. 43, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.

influenced and worked directly with various Pentecostal pioneers.[2371] The healing doctrine of Boardman, Murray, and other Higher Life and Keswick leaders was influential in the development of the Pentecostal and charismatic movements and the Prosperity Gospel or Word-Faith movement,[2372] as "a whole host of . . . participants in the divine healing movement . . . [spread by] Charles Cullis" and channeled through the Higher Life movement "became Pentecostals."[2373]

Applications from the Life and Teachings of William Boardman

The faithful Christian and historic Baptist church member can consider and learn much, both positive and negative, from William Boardman's life and his errors. However, there is no need to read his writings to learn positive truth. Rather, Mr. Boardman should be recognized as a pernicious false teacher whose writings and false teachings should be rejected wholesale. Believers should beware of his corrupting influence upon later Higher Life teachers—one can imbibe the false doctrines of Mr. Boardman by reading later Keswick writers without ever even being aware of his

---

2371 For example, Boardman invited John Dowie to "an international conference on divine healing and sanctification . . . in 1885" (pgs. 116-122, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; cf. the discussion of this conference and the contributions to it of Andrew Murray and Otto Stockmayer on pg. 353). Dowie was a heretic, an advocate of Keswick-holiness views, an ardent Faith Cure wonder-worker (cf. pgs. 86-87, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan; pg. 5, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee), the founder of Zion City, Illinois, a utopia filled with allegedly Pentecostal signs and wonders (at least until it went bankrupt and famine set in) where hospitals were unnecessary, and a mentor for Pentecostal healing evangelists in the USA, South Africa, Switzerland, and Holland. Dowie, who developed his healing doctrine in the standard Higher Life background (pgs. 136-137, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton), founded "subsidiaries" of Zion City "in Zürich, Amsterdam, and South Africa," and his "sermons and healings . . . exercised a considerable influence on the early Pentecostal movement. The American healing evangelists appealed directly to him, and many leaders of the Assemblies of God, as well as the funds for the Swiss, Dutch, and South African Pentecostal movements, came from Dowie's Zion Church" (pg. 354, *ibid*). "Key early Pentecostal leaders came from Dowie's organization. They included Fred Vogler, Harry Bowley, F. F. Bosworth, F. A. Graves, and Marie Burgess (later better known as the wife of Robert Brown, pastor of Glad Tidings Tabernacle, New York City)" ("Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm). Indeed, "In 1900," the Pentecostal founder Charles "Parham visited Zion, probably because he was interested in Dowie's healing ministry" ("Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. http://www.pneumafoundation.org; cf. pgs. 50, 76, 128-131, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. See also pgs. 118, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan; pg. 5, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee). Agnes Ozman, who first spoke in tongues under the guidance of Parham, also had visited Dowie's Zion City (pg. 51, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). Dowie was finally ejected from Zion City on charges of misappropriation of funds and polygamy (pgs. 72-73, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

2372 Compare the biographical material below. See also pgs. 465-494, *Perfectionism*, Warfield, vol. 2.

2373 Pgs. 23-24, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

existence. Indeed, his influence places the Higher Life and Keswick movements with which he was intimately associated, and which certainly never exposed his errors or sought to root out his influence, under grave suspicion of doctrinal and practical corruption, a suspicion that is sadly confirmed by the false teachings of those who followed Boardman in proclaiming the Higher Life. With an all-sufficient Scripture and many far better volumes of Christian literature, there is no need to read anything Mr. Boardman wrote. Put him away—the sooner the better.

Glory in the doctrine of justification solely by Christ's imputed righteousness. Echo the words of Isaiah 61:10: "I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh *himself* with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth *herself* with her jewels." How precious it is to know that you have Christ's very righteousness as my legal standing before God! What glory does God receive in saving sinners through Christ's sufficient merits, so that His love and justice, His grace and holiness, are all infinitely exalted by this precious, precious salvation through the cross! What abasement of self, destruction of self-righteousness, sweet comfort in the wounds of Christ, and love for your Redeemer is engendered by thoughts of this blessed truth of justification! How terrible it would be were I to have to meet the legal requirement of perfect holiness by means of my terribly imperfect sanctification! Indeed, such would be nothing less than certain spiritual death, everlasting wrath and damnation, and an eternity shut out from the face of God. Reject, then, with horror and disgust the least corruption of the blessed Biblical truth on justification, including the assault upon this truth by Mr. Boardman. Be willing to lay down your life rather than compromise the doctrine of justification in any way whatsoever.

When you are sick, you need to pray, confess your sins, examine yourself and be sure you are right with God and are trusting in Him, and use the best medicine medical science can provide. Failure to use the best medicine available is a violation of James five and of the sixth commandment.[2374] Rejecting medicine for the Faith or Mind Cure, or for anti-medical Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith concepts that developed from the earlier Higher Life and Christian Science cult pseudo-Cures, is a great sin, as is

---

[2374] Compare the fine statement of what is required by the sixth commandment in questions 134-136 of the *Westminster Larger Catechism*: "The duties required in the sixth commandment are all careful studies, and lawful endeavors, to preserve the life of ourselves [Eph 5:28-29] and others [1 Kings 18:4] by . . . a sober use of . . . physic[.] [Isa 38:21] . . . The sins forbidden in the sixth commandment are . . . the neglecting or withdrawing the lawful and necessary means of preservation of life; [Matt 25:42-43; James 2:15-16; Eccles 6:1-2] . . . and whatsoever else tends to the destruction of the life of any [Exod 21:18]."

the employment of untested and unproven New Age and quack medical methods.[2375] Christians are never led by God to disobey the teaching of Scripture on the proper use of medicine and the use of means for the preservation of life. Anti-medical notions are forbidden by Scripture in the same manner that a failure to pray, confess sin, and trust in God are contrary to Scripture.

Do not seek to advance the kingdom of God with half-"truths" or lies, such as Mr. Boardman does with his shoddily documented and often flatly false testimonies to the Faith Cure that are such an insult to the Biblical standard for the miraculous. Be able to say with Paul that you and the believers with whom you fellowship "have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth [are] commending [y]ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God" (2 Corinthians 4:2). Indeed, you must by no means allow any one's testimony to anything to alter one jot or tittle what Scripture, literally interpreted, teaches. God's Word is infallible truth, while testimonies can be lies—as is attested not only by Mr. Boardman's delusion and false witness to the world concerning Dr. Read's son, but by the lying prophet who led astray a faithful servant and prophet of God in the Scripture (1 Kings 13). The formerly faithful prophet's allowing testimonial to change his interpretation of the Word of God led to his early death—in 1 Kings at the hand of a lion—and the replacement of repentance and revival in the northern Kingdom (1 Kings 13:33) with spiritual declension, apostasy, and the eternal damnation of many. So Boardman's testimonial-based Faith Cure delusion has also led many who could have been healed by medicine to an early death, and his corruption of truth has contributed both to the destruction of true spirituality for the errors of the Higher Life and to the rise of vast realms of modern continuationist apostasy, which have likewise led to the eternal damnation of very many. You are neither responsible to know, nor think upon any person's testimony to any allegedly extra-Biblical marvel. You are not responsible to explain anyone's testimony to miracles he claims to have experienced. But you are responsible to know, think upon, obey, and live by every Word of God, and must have that Word alone as your sole authority for your faith and practice. By rejecting all false authorities—including the alleged authority of testimonials to this or

---

[2375] Compare the article "New Age Medicine: An Examination of Reiki, Ayurveda, Homeopathy, Reflexology, Iridology, Acupuncture, Chiropractic, Macrobiotics, Naturopathy, Rolfing, Applied Kinesiology, Neuro-Emotional Techniques, Touch for Health, and Behavioral Kinesiology," by David Cloud, accessible at http://faithsaves.net/unconventional-and-new-age-medicine/, as well as the other resources exposing New Age and quack medicine on that site. See also *Can You Trust Your Doctor? The Complete Guide to New Age Medicine and Its Threat to Your Family,* John Ankerberg & John Weldon. Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1991.

that—and cleaving only to the Bible, you will be a fit instrument for the Lord to mightily advance His kingdom through you.

Precious Christian ladies should recognize that they need to trust Biblical leadership and see their need for the guidance of the male authorities God has placed in their life. Women need the protection of their father, their husband, and their pastor, for they are more easily deceived (1 Timothy 2:11-15), and their men, consequently, need to live up to the role with which God has entrusted them. Many heresies have arisen as a consequence of Satan's ability to deceive women more easily, as the Fall itself came through Adam's failure to protect and lead his wife to obey God's Word and Eve's consequent deception by the Serpent. The story of the Boardmans, and of the Pearsall Smiths, illustrates this Biblical fact. Mrs. Boardman was led into Higher Life perfectionism first, having herself discovered the Second Blessing from an old woman under church discipline for antinomian heresy. This old woman and Mrs. Boardman than brought Mr. Boardman over to their position. The Keswick doctrine that the believer does not become the least bit more personally holy throughout the course of his Christian pilgrimage is the teaching that this antinomian lady conveyed originally to Mrs. Boardman. Similarly, Mrs. Smith first found the Higher Life, bringing into the doctrine her hesitant husband. She also encouraged her husband to learn from Dr. Foster, that great proponent of the erotic baptism of power, the receipt of which led Mr. Smith into the work of Higher Life agitation and then to his public disgrace, downfall, and apostasy from Christianity. Women from the Old Testament to the New Testament Jezebel (1 Kings 16ff.; Revelation 2:20), to Ellen G. White, to Mary Baker Eddy, to countless other women preachers and prophets have led, taught, and misled men. The Second Blessing would have been shorn of very much without Phoebe Palmer, the Keswick theology without Jessie Penn-Lewis, and Pentecostalism without vast numbers of women, going back to Agnes Ozman, the first to receive the restored gift of speaking in gibberish in connection with Charles Parham. Men should not be sitting at the feet of women preachers such as Hannah W. Smith or Jessie Penn-Lewis and learning doctrine from them. Furthermore, women must not allow their more emotional and less rational nature to preserve in them an attachment to Higher Life books, authors, and theology, nor in the least discourage or dissuade their husbands from rejecting the Higher Life because of its unscriptural character. They must not allow their God-given tendency toward nurture and softness—which is, in its proper place, a wonderful blessing—to lead them to encourage their husbands, pastors, or other spiritual leaders to soften their stand against perfectionism. Furthermore, men must take spiritual leadership and protect their wives, daughters, and church members from exposure to false teaching, including the Higher

Life, and if they have failed to do so in the past, must repent and then lead their women out of error, even if their initial resumption of obedience to the leadership role God has given them incurs opposition.

Literal interpretation of Scripture does not ignore context, nor does it wrest promises that have their complete fulfillment in the future so that they are allegedly completely fulfilled at this present time. Such an abuse of God's revelation of Himself is not faith, but sin; not confidence in Divine promises, but rebellion and unbelief. Consequently, Boardman's doctrine of the Higher Life, both for the body and for the soul, is rebellion and unbelief, for taking promises that pertain to the future and twisting them into false and watered-down present fulfillments is at the heart of the Higher Life. Rather than hearkening to Mr. Boardman's doctrine of faith, hear the word of God's prophet, Isaiah: "he that believeth shall not make haste" (Isaiah 28:16).[2376]

Congregations and pastors that allow Higher Life doctrine and its advocates to influence them and those they have spiritual responsibility for because of the truths retained in their system from the older orthodox model of sanctification—such as the importance of faith in the Christian life and the repudiation of self-dependence—will not be able to limit the Higher Life influence to the Scriptural elements. The errors and heresies will creep in also. The leaven of false doctrine will enter, spread, and cause more and more corruption. The Higher Life doctrine of sanctification is intimately connected with the Faith Cure continuationism; the same hermeneutical errors produce both ideas. Why accept the torture of texts of Scripture, the *de facto* rejection of *sola Scriptura* for the authority of experience, the spiritual confusion, and the other extreme dangers associated with the Higher Life simply because some Scriptural elements are retained? Why drink polluted water when the pure is available in the Word of God, and vastly better devotional writers are also available?

Indeed, non-charismatic and cessationist advocates of the Higher Life will find that consistency with their perfectionist hermeneutic will lead them where they do not want to go. Their divided house will not stand. Either they should go all the way and become charismatic fanatics, embracing their strange fire from the spirit world, or they should turn their backs on the Higher Life and return to cessationism and the vibrant spirituality that is a fruit of a serious study of and commitment to the regulative authority of Scripture alone and the Lordship of God the Father, mediated by Christ and applied by

---

2376 הַמַּאֲמִין לֹא יָחִישׁ. "*shall not make haste*; or be impatient for the fulfillment of this prophecy, but patiently wait for it, knowing that it is for an appointed time, and will not tarry; and that God will hasten it in his own time; or will not make haste to lay any other foundation, being satisfied with this that is laid" (*Commentary on Isaiah*, John Gill, note on Isaiah 28:16).

the Holy Spirit. By all means, let the people of God be filled with true heavenly fire—but let them not seek for the true fire by bringing the false near to them, for so they will reap a terrible devastation.

III. Andrew Murray

The South African minister Andrew Murray (1828-1917), whose "influence has been, probably, greater than that of any other contemporary devotional writer,"[2377] is a very notable advocate of the continuationistic Keswick theology and a charismatic precursor. His works, translated into many foreign languages, have received a wide recognition in Europe and America," so that "[t]o estimate the spiritual influence which Andrew Murray exercised upon his day and generation is not only a difficult but an impossible task."[2378] He wrote approximately 240 books and tracts[2379] in English and Dutch, translated into a large number of languages, including, among a number of others, French, German, Spanish, Danish, Swedish, Chinese,[2380] Japanese, Russian, Arabic, Yiddish, and Urdu.[2381] He could write quickly, as his writings,[2382] while containing a variety of warm devotional thoughts, were generally "unpremeditated," rather than being the product of careful and painstaking exegesis of Scripture. He could, for example, write eighteen chapters of a book in a single day.[2383] As Keswick exercised a profound influence upon Murray, in turn, "'[p]henomenal' is not too strong a word to describe the influence of Dr. Andrew Murray upon Keswick . . . as powerful as that of any man upon the movement," for "he became renowned as an exceptionally gifted exponent of the

---

2377 Pg. 441, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Murray wanted DuPlessis to write his biography (pg. v, *ibid*), and DuPlessis has obliged by composing an extremely favorable presentation of Murray's life.

2378 Pgs. 411, 435, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2379 It is noteworthy that "[a]ll the teachings of his later lifetime are present . . . [in] his earliest volumes" (pg. 469, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2380 The influence of his writings in China is described on pgs. 472-473, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Their influence on Watchman Nee is notable.

2381 Pgs. 472-474, 526-535, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2382 It is noteworthy that he also regularly preached "without the use of manuscript or notes" (pg. 446, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2383 Pgs. 464-468, 499, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. His book *De Blijdschap* (Joy) was the particular work that DuPlessis recorded he wrote eighteen chapters of in a day. Murray would regularly write a number chapters of his books in a day. Such work was made more easy since, for example, "[o]ut of the contemplation of [a] . . . shapeless brown stump grew *The Mystery of the True Vine*," rather than, say, a deep and careful exegesis of the vine pericopes in Scripture. DuPlessis also noted: "A word or two is necessary on Andrew Murray's style, which, it must be confessed, is a poor one, both in English and in Dutch. . . . Mr. Murray was perfectly aware of his linguistic shortcomings. One of his earliest letters . . . contains a lament over 'my miserable deficiency in composition' . . . and to his daughter and amanuensis he would say, in later years: 'My child, I have no style, or only a very bad style.'"

same teaching as at Keswick . . . through his books,"[2384] which spread the Keswick theology around the globe. He was both associated with "Keswick" and with "Mr. Moody,"[2385] and, his Faith Cure theology being well known,[2386] he spoke at the Keswick Convention in 1895[2387] at the invitation of its Quaker co-founder Robert Wilson,[2388] where he was "one of the principal speakers," indeed, "[t]he main feature of . . . [the] Convention" that year, telling the assembled crowds at Keswick: "Do not be afraid if people say, Do you want to make Quakers of us?"[2389] Murray also preached at a variety of other Higher Life venues,[2390] where, he testified, many "have heard how I have pressed upon [them] the two stages of the Christian life," justification and sanctification, "and the step from the one to the other," the special act of faith for sanctification.[2391] The two-faith position of Murray and Boardman passed directly from the Higher Life theology into Pentecostalism.[2392] Murray also adopted from William Boardman, in connection with other Higher Life and Faith Cure influences,[2393] the theories of

---

2384 Pg. 249, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson.

2385 Pg. 185, *Divine Healing*, Andrew Murray. Murray was invited to and influenced many at Moody's Northfield Conference after preaching at Keswick in 1895 (pgs. 444-445, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2386 E. g., Murray's *The Lord thy Healer* was freshly printed and promulgated in London only the year before (pg. 528, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2387 The text of his addresses, "The Pathway To The Higher Life" and "That God May Be All In All," appears on pgs. 292-300, 425-435 of *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson. Murray's "address . . . on 'The Way to the Higher Life' . . . stands out beyond all others," Evan Hopkins testified in *The Keswick Week* of that year, while Figgis and Sloan consider only his other address competitive in its Higher Life power—his two messages stood above those of all other speakers that year (pg. 250, *ibid*). See also pg. 109-110, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

2388 Pg. 47, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary N. Garrard. Murray was already under the spell of the quietist and mystic William Law at the time, publishing a book of extracts from Law in that very year and another volume of extracts the next year (pgs. 528-529, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2389 Pg. 435, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson, printing the text of Murray's message "That God May Be All In All" (pgs. 425-435). Murray explains that one should not be afraid of people asking if Keswick wants to turn men into Quakers because "every portion of Christ's body"—the universal, invisible church, in which the Quakers were included, despite denying justification by the imputation of Christ's righteousness alone and other core doctrines of the gospel—"has a lesson for us" (pg. 435, *ibid*). Murray was in particular commending the Quaker practice of "keeping silence before God" (pg. 435, *ibid*) and expecting Him to give one a special revelation; indeed, this Quaker practice is the "chief thing," more important than commands to "give yourselves up to the will of God, prove the power of God, and seek the glory of God throughout the earth" (pg. 434, *ibid*).

2390 Pgs. 442-444, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis; pg. 113, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2391 Pg. 447, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2392 Pgs. 104ff. of *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner, explores the two-faith Pentecostal error and its antecedents in the writings of Murray, F. B. Meyer, A. J. Gordon, A. B. Simpson, and others.

2393 While secondary to Boardman, Johannes Blumardt was another influence on Murray in favor of the Higher Life and healing theology; Murray even traveled on foot from Holland to visit Blumhardt (cf. pg. 111, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger).

sanctification and healing by faith alone.[2394] He adopted the doctrine of Boardman and Hannah W. Smith that the Holy Spirit does not indwell the believer at the moment of regeneration, but only indwells those who have received the second blessing and entered into the Higher Life, affirming, in a manner that prepared the way for Pentecostalism,[2395] that adoption of this false pneumatological doctrine was key for entry into the Higher Life, revival, and a restoration of the sign gifts.[2396] Indeed, whenever the Spirit is truly

---

[2394] Happily, Murray had a reasonable testimony of personal conversion, unlike so many other early Keswick leaders, although the fact that he was already in seminary studying for the ministry at the time of his professed conversion is evidence of the character of Murray's Dutch Reformed church as a mixed multitude at best (cf. pgs. 32, 64-66, 74, 78, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, J. DuPlessis. London: Marshall Brothers, 1919). His counseling people who were seeking salvation that "we have but to accept, to believe 'He is mine,' and we are saved" (pg. 137, *ibid*) also certainly lacks important clarity, as the lost sinner is not to believe that Christ is already his, but that Christ will save him if he comes to the Redeemer in repentant faith.

Despite being a conservative Dutch Reformed minister, Murray did not hold to classical Reformed doctrine in all its aspects; for example, he believed in an unlimited atonement, and his eldest daughter served for many years in the strongly Arminian Salvation Army (pgs. 249, 487, *ibid*).

[2395] Note the similarity to Murray's position on, e. g., pgs. 42-46 of *Systematic Theology*, Earnest S. Williams, vol. 3, an Assemblies of God and Pentecostal classic. Williams employs Acts 19:1-7 as Murray does, and also affirmed, as Boardman and Murray would, that "[i]n the new birth the temple [of the Christian's body] is fitted for the infilling of the Holy Spirit," which does not take place, Williams teaches, at regeneration, but only at the time of the Second Blessing. The second blessing doctrine of post-conversion Spirit-baptism taught by "Gordon, Meyer, Simpson, and Murray, and all those influenced by them, [brought] Pentecostalism . . . a large and influential body of . . . opinion which taught and supported the later distinctively Pentecostal experience of a subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit" (pg. 46, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970). Compare also pgs. 313-325 of Murray's *The Spirit of Christ* with the Pentecostal writers cited by Bruner on pg. 63, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner, and pgs. 95-96 for parallelism between A. J. Gordon and Pentecostalism's doctrine.

[2396] Murray argued that the Holy Spirit does not indwell all believers, and that recognition of this alleged fact is essential for a restoration of the miraculous sign gifts, by misinterpreting Acts 19:1-7, overlooking both the fact that the people who did not have the Spirit were unconverted individuals who did not believe in the Trinity and the transitional character of the passage, as well as the many plain texts that indicate that for the course of the dispensation of grace all believers are indwelt, such as Romans 8:9; Galatians 4:6; and 1 John 3:24:

> [T]he message [is] that the Christian life is two-fold. The first is that we experience something of the operation of the Holy Spirit but do not yet receive Him as the Spirit of Pentecost, as the personal indwelling Guest who comes to abide permanently in the heart. The second is that there is a more abundant life in which the indwelling is known and the full joy and power of redemption are a fact of personal experience. It is essential that believers come to fully understand the distinction between these two conditions . . . only then can we dare hope that the Christian community will once more be restored to its Pentecostal power. . . . Had it been otherwise, Paul would never have asked the question, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" (Some versions render this "Have you received the Spirit since you believed?") These disciples were recognized as those who believed in Jesus Christ as the Messiah. This belief, however, was not enough. . . . [T]here are two ways in which the Holy Spirit works in us. The first is preparatory, in which He acts on us but is not yet dwelling in us. The second is the higher phase of His working, when we receive Him as an abiding gift, an indwelling Person; we know that He has assumed responsibility for our whole inner being, working in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure. This is the ideal of the full Christian life. . . . It is of utmost importance to comprehend this. . . . [T]o receive the Holy Spirit . . . was quite different from the working of the Spirit that led them [those in Acts 19:1-7] to conversion . . . [i]t was something higher: for now the Holy Spirit was imparted in power with His abiding indwelling to consecrate and fill their hearts. . . .

working with power, according to Murray, miracles of healing will always be found—anyone who claimed that the Spirit is working powerfully, but does not see miraculous physical healings take place, is deceiving himself:

> Let us seek then to obtain divine healing. Wherever the Spirit acts with power, there He works divine healings. . . . [I]t is precisely because the Spirit acted powerfully [in the book of Acts] that His working must needs be visible in the body. If divine healing is seen but rarely in our day, we can attribute it to no other cause than that the Spirit does not act with power. . . . Let us pray earnestly for the Holy Spirit . . . for the work of healing.[2397]

Murray also wrote an entire book to "help some to see that the second blessing is just what they need."[2398] After all, "the impotence of the regenerate man . . . proves the need of something new, a second blessing. . . . the second blessing and the higher life, or the spiritual life."[2399] Murray's adoption of a distinction between the Spirit being "with" all believers but only "in" those who knew of the Higher Life in the dispensation of grace was clear evidence of his dependence on Boardman, for such a distinction can with much more ease be discovered in Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life* than it can be found in the Bible. Murray taught that in "regeneration . . . [t]he believer [becomes] a . . . temple ready for the Spirit to dwell in," but only "where faith claims it" and the Higher Life is entered into does "the second blessing" come, namely, "the Spirit of the Father and the Son [coming] to dwell within [the Christian]," even as, misinterpreting Acts 2:38,[2400] the

---

> As long as believers think that the only thing lacking in their life is more commitment or zeal or strength, and that if they only attain to these they will become all they ought to be, the preaching of a full salvation will be of little use. It is only when they discover that they are not standing in a full relationship with the Holy Spirit—they may have His initial working but do not yet know Him as an indwelling presence—that the way to something higher will ever be seen as a possibility. For this discovery, it is indispensable that the question be put to every believer as clearly as possible: "Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed?" When the answer is a straightforward no, the time of revival is not far off. . . .
>
> In the Acts of the Apostles we often read of the laying on of hands and prayer. Even a man like Paul—whose conversion was the result of a direct revelation of Christ—had to receive the Spirit through the laying on of hands and prayer. This implies that there is to be among ministers of the Gospel and believers in general a power of the Spirit that makes them a channel of faith and courage to others. . . . On the Day of Pentecost, speaking with other tongues and prophesying were the result of being filled with the Spirit. Here at Ephesus, twenty years later, the very same miracle is again witnessed as the visible token and pledge of the glorious gift of the Spirit. We should expect that, where the reception of the Holy Spirit and the possibility of being filled with Him are proclaimed and received, the life of the believing community will be restored to Pentecostal power. . . . Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed? Let every believer submit himself to this heart-searching question. . . . Do not hold back, even if you do not yet fully understand what the blessing is or how it comes. . . . [Y]ou may rest assured that the marvel of Jerusalem and of Samaria, of Caesarea and Ephesus, will once again be repeated. (pgs. 13-21, Andrew Murray, *The Fullness of the Spirit.* Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 2004 ed. Originally titled *The Believer's Full Blessing of Pentecost*.)

[2397] Pgs. 29-30, *Divine Healing: A Series of Addresses*, Andrew Murray. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing Co., 1900.

[2398] Pg. 173, *The Two Covenants and the Second Blessing*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Chicago; Toronto: Fleming H. Revell, 1899.

[2399] Pgs. 181, 189, *The Spiritual Life*, Andrew Murray. Chicago, IL: Tupper & Robertson, 1896.

[2400] See the discussion of the verse in *Heaven Only for the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ vs. Baptismal Regeneration*, Thomas Ross.

"three thousand" were regenerated at the moment of their "repentance and faith" but then subsequently, "when they had been baptized," received "the Indwelling Spirit . . . as God's seal."[2401] Baptism is very important for the Higher Life, since "baptism is . . . the sacrament of the beginning of the Christian life . . . [and] in Romans 6 baptism is represented as the secret of the whole of sanctification, the entrance into a life in union with Jesus."[2402] Murray connected his error on the indwelling of the Spirit with the idea that in regeneration the believer gains only a "renewed regenerate spirit,"[2403] rather than a renewal that affects the whole man; his restriction of regeneration to the human spirit was developed by Jessie Penn-Lewis and Watchman Nee in accordance with the initiator impetus from the spiritualist Lord Mount Temple's doctrine of deification as propagated at the Broadlands Conferences.[2404] Murray's belief that only the spirit was regenerated was important in his rejection of Biblical activity in Christian sanctification for Keswick Quietism.[2405] Since only the spirit is regenerated, "[t]he greatest danger the religion of the Church or the individual has to dread is the inordinate activity of the soul, with its power of mind and will,"[2406] for the Christian conflict is not, as Scripture represents it, between the flesh and the spirit, but between the soul and the Spirit[2407]—it is not the evil of indwelling sin versus the renewed person strengthened by the Holy Spirit, but the evil of the person himself and his activity against the Divine seed of the indwelling Spirit in

---

2401 Pgs. 14-16, *The Spirit of Christ*, Andrew Murray.

2402 Pg. 202, *The New Life: Words of God for Young Disciples of Christ*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Hurst & Company, 1891.

2403 Pgs. 14-16, *The Spirit of Christ*, Andrew Murray. Murray wrote: "In regeneration it is this spirit of man which is quickened again and renewed. . . . In that inner shrine of our wondrous nature, the spirit, deeper than the soul, with all its life of feeling, and thought, and will, which God made for Himself, in the spirit quickened by His power, there dwells the Holy Spirit" (pgs. 334, 338, *The Spirit of Christ: Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church*, Andrew Murray. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1888).

2404 Mr. Mount-Temple prayed: "My Lord Jesus, as Thou didst take my humanity, I pray Thee impart to me Thy Divinity," and he stated that, as with the confession of Christ as one Person with a true Divine and a true human nature at Chalcedon: "I have to record my thanks . . . for deep Churchism at our Conferences . . . [and] for the knowledge that we are all two in one—two natures in one person . . . the Divine and the human" (pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

2405 Bruner points out the connection between the Pentecostal imperative that one "must become as passive as possible" to receive the baptism of the Spirit and the teaching of Andrew Murray and the mystical writers on the subject (pg. 99, 339, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner; cf. the need for "deep passivity," according to Murray, on, e. g., pg. 200, *The Spirit of Christ*).

2406 Pg. 335, *The Spirit of Christ: Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1888.

2407 "In the believer there is ever going on a secret struggle between the soul and the Spirit" (pg. 337, *The Spirit of Christ: Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church*, Andrew Murray).

the human spirit. Adopting many of the doctrinal aberrations of the Keswick continuationist leaders "Boardman, Smith, [and] Stockmayer," who "decisively influenced . . . his doctrine of holiness and . . . his practical Christianity" as "[h]e remained in constant contact with the Holiness movement," Murray testified: "I constantly followed what was happening in Oxford and Brighton, and [it] all helped me."[2408] He contributed greatly to the spread of Higher Life conferences throughout South Africa "under the stimulus of the Oxford Holiness Movement which is connected with the name of Pearsall Smith,"[2409] despite dissent from the Higher Life theology by other Christian leaders.[2410] Having adopted the Higher Life for both the soul and the body in the Faith Cure, he promulgated the companion teachings as the founder of "the South African Keswick" and lifelong leader in the "South Africa General Mission" through many other "Holiness Conventions" that were organized in South Africa to promote the Higher Life for soul and body.[2411]

Murray was influenced by a large variety of men, from rationalists to mystical quietists and perfectionists to other Keswick leaders. He "acknowledged his indebtedness for valuable pedagogic principles . . . [to] Herbert Spencer," studying Spencer "with a view to . . . writing . . . on the education of our children."[2412] Murray's *The Children for Christ* was written strongly under Spencer's influence, although the "High Priest of materialism"[2413] and evolutionist "Spencer was the chief exponent of agnosticism in 19th-century England."[2414] Murray "delighted also in the writings of" men such as the theological liberals and idolaters P. T. Forsyth[2415] and Adolf Harnack.[2416]

2408 Pg. 113, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; cf. pg. 448, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis; pgs. 52-53, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2409 Pg. 313, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2410 Pgs. 315, 517, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2411 "No estimate of Mr. Murray's influence as a leader . . . would be complete that did not take account of his intimate and lifelong connexion with the South Africa General Mission" (pg. 381, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis; cf. pgs. 381-386. Murray worked closely with Spencer Walton). Through Murray, not just Keswick continuationism, but also Keswick ecumenicalism was brought to South Africa, as men "of every denomination" (pg. 382) came together to imbibe and spread the Higher Life within the allegedly universal and invisible "Church Catholic" (cf. pg. 418, *ibid*).

2412 Pg. 410, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Of course, Spencer was not the sole influence on Murray's view of the education of youth; cf. pg. 479, *ibid*, for others.

2413 *Calvary Contender*, 07/15/1999, cited in the *Fundamental Baptist Digital Library*, ed. David Cloud.

2414 Pg. 1538, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, F. L. Cross.

2415 Despite a rejection of some of his earlier influence from Ritschl, Forsyth "retained the tools of liberal higher criticism" (pg. 260, *New dictionary of theology*, Ferguson & Packer). Many compare his views to those of Karl Barth, but, rejecting part of the orthodoxy that even the neo-orthodox heretic Barth had retained, Forsyth rejected classical Christology: "[M]any . . . think of . . . Forsyth . . . as a 'Barthian before Barth'. Forsyth, like Barth, understands divine revelation in terms of the gracious and reconciling

He also found much value in the writings of Stockmaier and other Keswick writers, and found the Quietist mystic "Tersteegen . . . beautiful and profitable," so that he could "read Tersteegen over and over again."[2417] Murray averred, concerning the Oberlin Perfectionist leader and Keswick speaker Asa Mahan's *Baptism of the Spirit*, with its second blessing perfectionist doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Ghost: "I have read [Mahan] with profit . . . the book does one good."[2418] The biography of George Fox was a favorite.[2419] Murray also stated: "I approve of [the] books [of] . . . [Thomas] Upham and . . . and recommend them."[2420]

Shortly before preaching at Keswick, Murray "had fallen under the potent spell of William Law . . . the chief of the English mystics . . . [and] a quietist, who daily 'prostrated himself body and soul, in abysmal silence, before the interior central throne of divine revelation' . . . and it is the mystical element in his teaching which . . . proved to be such an irresistible influence to . . . Murray."[2421] Murray recognized that "[i]n Law . . . the deep truth . . . on which so much stress is laid in what is called Keswick teaching, stand[s] prominently out."[2422] Law's teaching of the spiritual life, in Murray's view, was that of Keswick. Law's writings "occup[ied] a place of pre-eminence" for Murray after

---

activity of God in Jesus Christ. But for Barth, the Chalcedonian definition is essential to the task of understanding and speaking faithfully of the full divine and human identity of the person Jesus. Forsyth, however, adjudges this ancient Christology to be far too Hellenic (i.e. ontological) and therefore of no contemporary significance or authority. In its place, he proposes a 'metaphysic' of conscience. . . . Forsyth's ready dismissal of the Chalcedonian motif of a 'unit-in-difference' sharply distinguishes his Christology and doctrine of the triune God from those of Barth; many would regard them as less adequate" (pg. 235, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen). Indeed, rejecting classical Christology is not just "less adequate." It is idolatry.

"At the breakfast-table [Murray also] discoursed on German theology, and on the attitude of the school of Ritschl[.] . . . Dogma or doctrine is of no account" (pg. 482, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

[2416] Pg. 481, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

[2417] Pgs. 332, 437, cf. 439, 482, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. On Tersteegen's Quietism see pg. 466, *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol. 4, Fahlsbusch & Bromiley. Although a Protestant, Tersteegen "adopted some of the ideas of Catholic quietist mysticism" (pg. 680, *Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol. 3) and fell under the "influence of ascetic and Quietist ideas," so that he, unsurprisingly, translated many of the works of medieval Roman Catholic Quietism, such as the writings of Guyon (pg. 1062, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, F. L. Cross).

[2418] Pg. 337, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Murray also expressed dissent from Mahan's exegesis of Ephesians 1:13.

[2419] Pg. 479, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Murray also enjoyed biographies of non-Quakers with far more orthodox theology, such as David Brainerd.

[2420] Pg. 238, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Happily, Murray also said: "I cannot say that I agree in everything with Upham[,]" since Mr. Murray was a Christian and Protestant minister, not a an exponent of a god that is a Father-Mother duality, like Upham.

[2421] Pgs. 449-450, 456, 470, 518, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

[2422] Pgs. 173-174, *The Two Covenants and the Second Blessing*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1899.

reading them. Murray wrote: "The more I read [Law's] writings . . . the more I am impressed by his insight, range, and power . . . For fine observation of the human heart there is surely no one like him among English writers. . . . [Law] is one of the most powerful and suggesting writers on the Christian life[.]"[2423] Works such as Law's *A Serious Call* and *Christian Perfection* "were read, re-read, and underscored, in token of his appreciation of the inestimable worth of their teachings. This deep appreciation was even more strikingly proved by the fact that he edited no less than six volumes of selections from Law's writings,"[2424] despite the fact that Law was an opponent of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer, received for justification by faith alone, and other essential doctrines,[2425] and therefore was an enemy of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Through Law, Murray was also influenced by the German mystic, heretic, pantheist, and dualist Jacob Böhme.[2426] The "mysticism [of] Böhme and Law . . . depreciates the value of Scripture, denies the imputation theory of the atonement, minimizes the worth of the Church as a visible divine institution . . . and reveals a marked pantheistic tendency," among other abominable errors.[2427] The influence of such authors

---

2423 Pgs. 470, 480, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2424 The books in question were *Wholly for God*, *The Power of the Spirit*, *The Divine Indwelling, Dying to Self, The Secret of Inspiration,* and *God in ons* (Dutch). See pgs. 455, 498, 480, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Murray did at least warn about some of the errors espoused by Law—which was commendable—in a preface to his republication of Law's works, although not republishing them at all would have been far better.

2425 Law was not just the author of *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1728) but also the author of such undevout and unholy affirmations as: "What becomes now of the Philosophy of Debtor and Creditor, of a Satisfaction made by Christ to a Wrath in God? Is it not the grossest of all Fictions, and in full Contrariety to the plain written Word of God?" (*Spirit of Love, Part 2; The Second Dialogue Between Theogenes, Eusebius, and Theophilus,* William Law). Nonetheless, Andrew Murray affirmed: "The points on which so much stress is laid in what is called Keswick teaching, stand prominently out in . . . William Law['s] . . . whole argument" (Note A, Chapter II, "The Second Blessing," in *The Two Covenants and the Second Blessing*, Andrew Murray, elec. acc. *Blue Letter Bible*). John Wesley, after his professed evangelical breakthrough, wrote to Law, his contemporary and correspondent, "a severe letter . . . reproaching him for never having set before him the way of salvation in all its simplicity. 'Under the heavy yoke of the law,' he says, "I might have groaned till death, had not a holy man, to whom God lately directed me, upon my complaining thereof, answered at once, Believe, and thou shalt be saved. Now, sir, suffer me to ask, How will you answer it to our common Lord that you never gave me this advice? Why did I scarce ever hear you name the Name of Christ? Never so as to ground anything in faith in His blood? Who is this who is laying another foundation?'" (pg. 457, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. DuPlessis, nevertheless, commented: "Had Andrew Murray lived in the first half of the eighteenth century instead of the second half of the nineteenth, he might have reconciled Wesley and Law.")

Contrary to Murray, however, to try to learn how to be holy by reading the works of unregenerate heretics like William Law is amazing folly.

2426 Pgs. 449ff., *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Böhme also "imbibed . . . astrological and theosophical speculations" (pg. 453, *ibid*).

2427 Pgs. 453-5, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

shows up in Murray's writings in a variety of ways, and contributed to his "books [being a] source of consolation and comfort to many . . . of many creeds."[2428]

Medieval Roman Catholic mysticism and quietism had a very influential and lifelong influence on Murray. The devout Mary worshipper, receiver of inspired oracles,[2429] and Roman Catholic monk "Bernard of Clairvaux," who taught that "it is necessary for the seeker to lose himself in God and merge his own individuality in that of the Eternal One," and who also gave "a mighty stimulus to asceticism," was "a favourite historical character with Andrew Murray, who called his home at Wellington after the famous abbey which Bernard founded."[2430] Throughout his life Murray was also greatly influenced by Madame Guyon. Murray stated: "I approve of [the] books [of] . . . Madame Guyon . . . and recommend them," so that it was a great compliment for one in his family to recognize a fellow minister as "an exemplification of the doctrines of Quietism in action[.] . . . All those expressions of being dead to self and lost in God which one finds in Madame Guyon seem to be exemplified in his experience and life."[2431] Murray rated "Madame Guyon" and the Catholic monk "Rysbroeck" as "among his chief friends," while also admiring the Roman Catholics "Catherine of Siena and Santa Teresa," with their false gospel, idolatrous worship, whether of images, allegedly transubstantiated bread, or Mary, and demonic visions, mysticism, and continuationism.[2432] It is perhaps not surprising that Murray's "books of devotion . . . met with the highest commendation at the hands of the most High Church Anglican Bishops[.]"[2433]

Murray was amenable to the Keswick continuationist theology because of "his inadequate theological training . . . [he was] a minister by the time he was twenty"[2434] (cf. 1 Timothy 3:6), and the limited training he did receive was within a hotbed of rationalism

---

2428 Pg. 511, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2429 E. g., his false prophecy of the success of the Second Crusade; cf. pg. 315, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, McClintock & Strong.

2430 Pg. 451, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. For Bernard, "conversion [was] enter[ing] the monastery," and "uncoerced humility justifies and . . . merits the grace of God[.] . . . Bernard does not represent a purely forensic form of justification" (pgs. 41, 48, 58, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation*, Arie de Reuver, trans. James De Jong). "Bernard was not . . . a forerunner of the Reformation. He was a devout child of the twelfth century, completely involved in the contemporary developments of the Roman papal establishment" (pg. 57, *ibid*).

2431 Pgs. 237-239, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Murray did also affirm: "I cannot say that I agree in everything with . . . Madame Guyon," since Mr. Murray was not a medieval Roman Catholic like Guyon. Murray would nonetheless have done well to warn against Guyon instead of commending her very dangerous writings with a few words of warning.

2432 Pgs. 480-481, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2433 Pg. 511, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2434 Pg. 113, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

and theological liberalism,[2435] under professors with strong antipathy to evangelical piety and among unconverted denominational fellow-students with "scandalous morals." Even the "orthodox and respectable" ones "profaned . . . the name of God," and many were "intoxicated" on various occasions.[2436] "Conversion was an antiquated word."[2437] It is perhaps not surprising that Murray's view of conversion and advice to the unconverted contain serious confusion. Denying total depravity for the doctrine that the lost can truly love Jesus Christ, Murray wrote to the unconverted: "I write to you as those of whom I hope that it is in truth their earnest desire to find the Saviour, and of whom I really trust that they have truly declared before the Lord: Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee."[2438] Those unconverted persons who truly love Christ are not to consciously and instantly repent, and believe the gospel, and be justified by repentant faith alone, but are to confess that they accept Christian doctrine, worship Christ, and so insensibly and gradually become believers.[2439] It is most unfortunate that Murray's

---

2435 Nevertheless, Murray did not become a theological modernist, but retained many elements of the conservative Dutch Reformed paedobaptist tradition in which he had been raised. For example, his teaching about what the children of believers possess by virtue of their parentage evidences clear dependence upon the Reformed paedobaptist covenantalism:

> The word *holy* is the promise of a divine life-power. Let us beware of emptying the word *holy* of its divine truth and power. If God calls our children *holy*, it is because they are born from a believing parent who is holy in Christ; therefore, they are holy, too. The child of true believers inherits from his parents, not only the sinful nature, but habits and tendencies which the child of the unbeliever does not share. These are the true seeds of holiness, the working of the Holy Spirit from the mother's womb. Even where it cannot be seen, there is a secret heritage of the seed of holiness implanted in the child of the believer. There is secured to him the Holy Spirit in whom the holiness of God has reached its full manifestation. . . .
>
> In promising the Holy Spirit to His disciples, our Lord said He would be a river of living water flowing from them to others. The believer has power to influence those with whom he comes in contact. The child born of him inherits a blessing in the very life he receives from the parent who is sanctified by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. In the mother's womb the child can receive the Holy Spirit. Oh, let us be sure of it, when God gives our child the name *holy*, that is the beginning of the work of His own Holy Spirit. Let nothing less than this be what our heart reads in God's words: your children are holy. (pgs. 267-268, *Raising Your Children for Christ*, Andrew Murray. New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 1984)

Murray's affirmations might find support in the Reformed paedobaptist tradition, but they certainly are not found in the Bible; at the church of Ephesus, all who had been regenerated—and the book clearly states that Christian families with children were to be found in the congregation at Ephesus (Ephesians 6:1)—had been spiritually dead and were unholy children of wrath and of the devil without any inherent goodness in them until they came to a point when, after some time living, having a walk, and fulfilling the lusts of the flesh and of the mind, they were consciously converted at the moment of saving faith (Ephesians 2:1-10). The church of Ephesus, including the converted children of Christian parents in the congregation, would not have recognized Murray's statements as Christian doctrine had Murray's teaching, or the covenantal paedobaptism it is based upon, existed at the time.

2436 Pgs. 60-63, 68-69, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2437 Pg. 58, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2438 Pg. 10, *Why Do You Not Believe?: Words of Instruction and Encouragement for All Who Are Seeking the Lord,* Andrew Murray. Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1894.

2439 Murray wrote:

> This at least you know that, although you cannot yet say, He is my Saviour, your whole soul believes that He was sent by God to be a Saviour, and that He has proved Himself to be a Saviour for others. Well, then, go

theologically liberal seminary education left him with such a confused view of evangelical conversion.

Indeed, Murray confessed that his seminary education was essentially useless,[2440] although his interaction with religious apostasy likely contributed to Murray's ecumenicalism, his "broad . . . charity" and "generous welcome" to men such as the Keswick leader, international Keswick spokesman, and annihilationist George Grubb, and the Higher Life and ecumenical leader John R. Mott, who became "one of the principal architects of the World Council of Churches," was that body's "honorary president," and who received "the Nobel Peace Prize for his contributions to the ecumenical movement."[2441] Murray was "among the first to bid them welcome, and to lend the weight of his influence and authority to their undertaking[s] . . . there can be no doubt that the sympathy [and] constant interest . . . of Mr. Murray formed . . . a large element in any success which may have attended their mission."[2442]

Despite his lack of a genuinely Christian theological education, Murray went on to influence many other important Keswick continuationist leaders, such as Jessie Penn-Lewis and Watchman Nee. He corresponded with Mrs. Penn-Lewis, contributed to her *Overcomer* magazine, and commended her writings. He even wrote an introduction to one of her works, which he was glad to have translated into Dutch and arranged to have distributed to all the ministers and elders of his denomination in South Africa for free.[2443] "For twenty years he was president of the Holiness movement in South Africa,"[2444] the

---

> with this confession to Jesus, utter it before Him in prayer, look to Him and adore Him as the Saviour of the world. Speak out what you do believe, and by this means will faith in your heart be confirmed and increased. Say: "Lord Jesus, how unbelieving I am; this, however, I do believe that Thou art the Saviour, full of love and grace, and mighty to redeem." Forget yourselves and worship Jesus, although you dare not as yet say, that He is yours. In the midst of those exercises your faith will increase, and by and by you will insensibly come to the confidence that He is also yours. (pgs. 36-37, *Why Do You Not Believe? Words of Instruction and Encouragement for All Who Are Seeking the Lord*)

2440 Murray stated: "[T]he lectures here [in seminary] are such that it is almost impossible to get any good from them." A fellow student averred: "One learnt nothing from [the professors'] lectures" (pgs. 62, 67, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis); the sole exception was the lectures of "Opzoomer," whose lectures bred "an enthusiasm which was wholly lacking in his older colleagues," but this enthusiasm was for apostasy from Christianity, as he was "a rationalist . . . an empiricist . . . [and] one of the fathers of . . . Liberalism or Modernism . . . in Holland" (pg. 63, *ibid*). Because the seminary education he had received was useless, Murray wanted to go to Germany to get a real education, but his father told him to return to South Africa and begin his service as a minister instead, and he did so (pgs. 67ff., *ibid*).

2441 Pgs. 451-453, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen. The *Dictionary* notes: "Mott's appeal seemed to be 'entirely to the moral nature and there is no theology in it' (Hopkins, *Mott*, p. 385). His relative indifference to theology and broad ecumenical sympathies were characteristic of the holiness evangelicalism of the late nineteenth century."

2442 Pg. 440, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Murray also welcomed more orthodox men; he did not confine his welcome to the heterodox.

2443 Pg. 2, *The Overcomer*, January 1910.

2444 Pg. 113, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

country where he ministered. Among other theological errors,[2445] Murray taught the classic Keswick form of Quietism, affirming that the Christian "soul becomes utterly passive, looking and resting on what Christ is to do,"[2446] yielding to be "a passive instrument possessed by God,"[2447] for "Scripture . . . speaks of our being still and doing nothing . . . [the Christian] yields himself a truly passive instrument in the hand of God . . . [to] perfect passivity."[2448] The believer is to be passive, rather than actively use his mind or will, since these are functions of his allegedly unregenerate soul, rather than his regenerate spirit, and "[t]he greatest danger the religion of the Church or the individual has to dread is the inordinate activity of the soul, with its power of mind and will."[2449] The "intellect . . . is . . . impotent and even dangerous" without a quietistic extra-Biblical and extra-mental revelation from God, a "wait[ing] for His teaching" within, "deeper than the soul, with all its life of feeling, and thought, and will."[2450] Murray also altered the previous practice of his church to permit women to lead the congregation, including the men, in prayer.[2451] He further averred: "Perfection . . . is a Bible truth . . . and Perfectionism . . . may . . . be . . . truth."[2452] He "frequently deplored the fact that . . . Christians in general were 'terribly afraid of perfectionism.'"[2453]

2445 For example, in addition to paedobaptism and the confusion on conversion so closely associated with it, Murray believed that alcoholic "[w]ine is a good gift of God, to be received with gratitude and to be used to His glory," so that he could not agree with those who argued that "the Bible not merely permits but enjoins abstinence from the use of wine," although he was himself, commendably, a practitioner of total abstinence (cf. pgs. 361-365, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis; for a good presentation of the Biblical requirement, not option, of total abstinence, see *The Use of Wine in the Old Testament*, Robert Teachout).

2446 Pg. 30, *Abide in Christ: Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God*, Andrew Murray. Philadelphia, PA: Henry Altemus, 1895. Out of this utter passivity, Murray goes on to explain, activity flows—in the Keswick theology, quietism is not an end to itself, but leads to a sort of activity.

2447 Pg. 7, *Waiting on God! Daily Messages for a Month*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1896. Murray is quoting a poem by Freda Hanbury.

2448 Pgs. 136-137, *Abide in Christ: Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God*, Murray. Here again, Murray goes on to explain that by means of "perfect passivity" one becomes the "active instrument" of God.

2449 Pg. 335, *The Spirit of Christ: Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1888.

2450 Pg. 338, *The Spirit of Christ: Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church*, Andrew Murray.

2451 Pgs. 194-199, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2452 Pg. 311, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Murray also stated that some forms of perfectionism are "a human perversion of that truth" of "Perfection" and of true "Perfectionism."

2453 Pg. 313, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

In 1882—the year Murray's first book, *Abide in Christ*,[2454] appeared in English[2455]—through the influence of Boardman and Stockmeyer,[2456] and while "visiting England in search of health" and visiting "Keswick,"[2457] Murray added the doctrine of the Higher Life for the body to his doctrine of the Higher Life for the soul, recognizing, as Boardman had before him, the one as the natural concomitant of the other.[2458] The initial impetus to his adoption of the Faith Cure was reading Boardman's *The Lord thy Healer*,[2459] and study, not of the Bible, but of "the work of Dorothea Trüdel and Dr. Cullis . . . removed from [his] mind all doubts,"[2460] while personal interaction with Stockmeyer and Boardman led him to open avowal and bold advocacy of the Faith Cure aspect of the Higher Life. Writing to his congregation in South Africa about his trip to Europe and his new public advocacy of the Faith Cure, Murray explained his recognition of healing by faith alone as an adjunct to sanctification by faith alone:

> Let me now relate to you a few of my experiences in Europe. . . . I desired particularly to see Pastor Stockmaier . . . a truly spiritual man, of strong faith, and who now stood at the head of an institute for faith healing. . . . At . . . the Mildmay Conference[2461] . . . Mr. Stockmaier was also present. I called on him . . . Mr. Stockmaier [taught me that the] body has been redeemed . . . and, for the believer who can accept it, the Lord is ready to reveal even in the case of the body His mighty power to deliver from the dominion of sin.
>
> Mr. Stockmaier invited me to attend, in the course of the following week, the meetings of Dr. Boardman, writer of *The Higher Christian Life*, on the subject of faith healing. Shortly before my departure from [South Africa] I had perused Dr. Boardman's other work *The Lord thy Healer* . . . I now learnt that only a few months before an institute for faith healing had been opened in London under his supervision. This institute I visited in the following week, when everything became

---

2454 The first Dutch edition had been published in 1860. Murray, speaking about his *Abide in Christ*, testified at the 1895 Keswick convention: "I had not then . . . . [when] my book *Abide in Christ* was written . . . experienced all that I wrote of; I cannot say that I experience it all perfectly even now" (pg. 448, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2455 Pgs. 442, 463, 521, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. *Abide in Christ*, which was published after Murray's stay at Bethshan, sold very rapidly, being recommended by men such as F. B. Meyer (pg. 56, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*, W. Y. Fullerton).

2456 Pg. 115, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2457 Pg. 381, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis; pgs. 61-62, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

2458 As the connection was entirely natural, it is not surprising that many others followed Murray and Boardman in preaching both the Higher Life of the body and the soul, so that "the rise of the healing doctrines was largely a radicalization of the perfectionist push of the Holiness teachings. . . . the connection is present in every major manifestation of the Healing movement in the late nineteenth century" (pgs. 130, 136, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton). It is noteworthy that Murray also frequented hydropathic establishments, despite the love that advocates of spiritism and other advocates of the equivalents in that day of modern New Age energy medicine had for the hydropathic system (cf. pg. 162, Andrew Murray at Water Cure, in *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2459 Pg. 338, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2460 Pg. 339, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2461 The "the Mildmay Conference" was a "precursor of the Keswick Convention" (pg. 658, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, Larsen).

clearer to me and I decided to ask if I could not be received as an inmate. The reply was that . . . I would be welcome.

I entered the institute . . . and remained in it for . . . three weeks. It would be difficult to describe how much instruction and blessing I obtained during those weeks. . . . But why was it necessary to enter a Home, and to remain there for so long a time? Is not the prayer of faith the matter of a moment, just like the imposition of hands or the anointing with oil of which James speaks? Quite true. . . . Yet in most cases time is needful . . . [t]he stay in such a Home . . . helps to . . . strengthen faith.[2462] . . . Disease is a chastisement . . . [w]e ask the Lord truly to impart to the body the eternal youth of His heavenly life,[2463] and . . . [acknowledge] our readiness to receive the Holy Spirit in order to infuse health into the body which He inhabits, and our readiness to live every day in complete dependence upon the Lord for our bodily welfare. We learn to understand . . . giving and preserving health by faith . . . a more complete union of the body with Him[.][2464] . . .

One of the first things that struck me as being in conflict with my expectations was that in most cases slow progress is made with the healing process. I thought, and others have expressed the same opinion, that if healing is an act of God's almighty power, there can be no reason why it should not be perfected at once.[2465] This point I discussed with Dr. Boardman and others, whose reply was somewhat as follows—

"First of all, experience has taught that at the present time most cases of healing are subject to this rule; so that, even though we cannot understand why it should be so, we have merely to observe what God actually does.["][2466] . . . I subsequently discussed the subject with Mr. Stockmaier, who stands at the head of a faith healing establishment at Hauptwal in Switzerland. He told me how at one time he was wholly incapacitated . . . and that even after he had accepted the truth of healing by the exercise of faith, the trouble in no wise disappeared immediately. For more than two years the [problem] continued . . . [h]e counted it a great privilege that God . . . preserve[d] him . . . [in] the body [by] the daily bestowal upon it of supernatural power . . . [instead of] immediate cure[.] . . .

At first I could not entirely assent to this view of the matter. I asked Dr. Boardman if it would not be a much more powerful proof . . . if the cure of disease were instantaneous and complete. . . . Would it not also be for the greater glory of God if I desired of Him this instantaneous restoration? His answer was, . . . "Your duty is to hold fast to Him as your Healer, in whom you already have the healing of your malady [even if your body still has all the symptoms of sickness."][2467] . . . In this point of view I was able, ultimately, wholly to acquiesce.

So we see that in faith healing there is the same contrast as in the spiritual life[.] . . . In the well-known fifty-third of Isaiah sins and sicknesses are placed alongside of each other in a very remarkable way, and are borne together by Him in the suffering of which the chapter speaks. . . . We have severed the one from the other, and have accepted the redemption of the soul from sin as the fruit of Christ's sufferings, but without regarding the deliverance of the body from disease as

---

2462 However, in the Gospels and Acts, those who had the gift of healing did not require faith in those whom they healed.

2463 Were this prayer actually in accordance with Scripture and actually answered, not merely a gradual healing from some types of non-organic disease, but instantaneous perfect health, and eternal freedom from physical death, would result.

2464 Note the parallel to the Keswick doctrine of sanctification—the Higher Spiritual Life is maintained only moment by moment, and any failure to continue it brings an instantaneous and total relapse to a state of utter domination by sin, and the Higher Physical Life is also only maintained moment by moment, and any failure to live the Higher Spiritual Life brings instantaneous relapse into sickness. Neither Higher Life concept is taught in Scripture.

2465 Indeed, the reason such a thought is so prevalent is that immediate healing is what is found in the truly miraculous healings in the Bible.

2466 Note that "experience" is the answer to, and justification for, the radical discontinuity of the Faith Cure with the miracles of Scripture.

2467 The Faith Cure doctrine that people can be healed but still be just as sick as before is here set forth. It has led many to an early grave.

> in like manner the fruit of His sufferings.[2468] The faith which says, "He has borne my sins to free me from them," must also learn to say, "He has carried my sicknesses in order to deliver me from them also." . . . [F]rom the disease of the body there can be deliverance through the Spirit who dwells in the body as His temple. . . . Only yesterday I heard from a brother who has just arrived from Switzerland of a . . . girl who was . . . weak with consumption[.] . . . She heard from Mr. Stockmaier of the possibility of being cured by faith. One night she seemed to see very clearly how the Lord had given His body for her body, just as for her soul He had poured out His soul unto death. It seemed to her that she actually beheld the Lord[2469] giving His body for her health and cure. Next morning . . . she got up out of bed[.] . . .
>
> [F]aith healing . . . points the road of holiness and full consecration[.] . . . The question has arisen in my mind whether I may not perhaps possess the gift, and have the vocation, to devote myself, for a time at least, to this work. I notice in those who are engaged in this labour that they must give almost all their time and strength to it.[2470] . . . I spent last Sunday week at Männedorf, where Dorothea Trüdel labored with so much blessing. . . . I found the opportunity of discussing [these matters with] . . . Samuel Zeller . . . [h]er successor[.] . . . [H]e expressed the opinion that, if the Church were to flourish as in the earliest ages, and the leaders in the congregation were again to be characterized by true spirituality, the gift of healing would be found very much more frequently[.] . . . May the Lord in His own good time grant this![2471]

"The subject of faith healing continued to engross Mr. Murray's attention for several years after his return to South Africa"[2472] from Boardman's Bethshan Institute of Healing.[2473] By 1884 he had published a book "in which he developed his teachings concerning healing by faith . . . he described [it] as 'a personal testimony of my faith[.]'"[2474] He published his book despite the fact that he "acknowledges in his preface

---

2468 Murray's parallel only holds if the deliverance from sin God gives in sanctification is that of the instantaneous entrance into the Higher Life by means of the second blessing; this instantaneous deliverance can be paralleled with the Faith Cure which claims to give instantaneous miraculous healing, although in both cases neither the Higher Spiritual nor Physical Life is quite as high as its proponents affirm; but if the historic Baptist doctrine that progressive sanctification is a process of growth in holiness that is completed only in glorification is true, and perfect freedom from sin's effects on body and soul awaits the eschaton, then the fact that one trusts in Christ for both a glorified and genuinely perfect and sickness-free body and a genuinely perfect and sin-free person at the time of the future resurrection does not involve any kind of unbiblical severance of anything.

2469 Note how the restoration of other miraculous powers, such as visions, goes hand in hand with the Faith Cure. The alleged restoration of the gift of healing will bring with it the alleged restoration of the other miraculous gifts, and both the healings and the visions, tongues, and so on, will bear the same sort of discontinuity with Scripture.

2470 Neither Christ nor the Apostles had to devote almost all their time and strength to healing instead of preaching because they had the real ability to miraculously heal. Only when allegedly miraculous healings are gradual, and take weeks, months, and years to supposedly work, does one need to devote all one's time to such "healing." The Lord Jesus would have emptied out all Faith Cure establishments by curing all their occupants in a few minutes.

2471 Murray's two letters to his Congregation at Wellington, reproduced on pgs. 339-345 of *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Note how easily Murray's wish for the restoration of miraculous healing slides into a desire for a restoration of all the miraculous gifts of the "earliest ages [of] the Church."

2472 Pg. 345, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2473 Pg. 352, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2474 Pg. 345, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

that many objections can be leveled at the doctrine of faith healing to which no satisfactory answer can at present be found."[2475] Nevertheless, Murray argued:

> Are not these glad tidings that reach us from different quarters, that the Lord is again making Himself known to His people, as of old, by the name *The Lord thy Healer?* The number of witnesses daily increases who can affirm [so] from their own experience[.][2476] . . . The Church has grown so unaccustomed to this action of the Spirit in curing the body, she has for so long ascribed the loss of this gift to the counsel of God[2477] rather than to her own unfaith . . . that the truth has remained hidden even from the eyes of many pious expositors and theologians. . . . The Grounds for [the] Faith [Cure include] . . . Mark xvi. 18 . . . [that] the Lord Jesus, our Surety, has borne our sicknesses as well as our sins in His body . . . [that] Jesus commanded and empowered His disciples[2478] both to preach the Gospel and to heal the sick. . . . [that] this is part of the work for which the Holy Spirit was given and has come down from heaven . . . 1 Cor xii. 4, 9[2479] . . . [that] the healing of the body and the hallowing of the soul are very closely connected, and because in union with each other they enable us fully to know and glorify Jesus . . . Exod. xv. 26 . . . [that] the Church must expect great outpourings of the Spirit in these days, and may reckon upon this gift likewise . . . Isa xliv. 3 . . . Pentecost was but a commencement . . . [n]ow that the Lord is beginning to bestow His Spirit, we may certainly expect a new manifestation of His wondrous power.[2480] The rules for faith healing [include] . . . understand that sickness is a chastisement on account of sin . . . be assured . . . that it is the will of God to heal you . . . [since] the new life of the Holy Spirit . . . affect[s] the body not less than the soul . . . the healing power of Jesus will restore health to your body . . . claim healing for yourself . . . as . . . [a] sinner . . . claims by faith the forgiveness of sins . . . the sick one says . . . I have the healing . . . [although I] fee[l] no change and fin[d] no light . . . [and] feel no better[.] . . . Do not be astonished if the disease does not immediately take a turn for the better. And if after some improvement the disease grows worse, do not imagine that it is all a mistake . . . act as one who realizes that health is beginning to return . . . [t]hese trials are . . . a proof that God is willing to strengthen you to be healed wholly and solely by faith in Jesus . . . testify, as a witness to the faith who knows what he says.[2481] . . .
>
> This new life is none other than the Holy Spirit in the body. . . . Healing and sanctification are closely united. . . . These are the main outlines of the doctrine of faith healing[.][2482]

Murray with "fervency . . . [and] intensity of conviction . . . both preached and practiced the doctrines of healing by faith,"[2483] so that many learned from Murray to "take no

---

[2475] Pg. 345, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

[2476] Note the appeal to experience and testimonial and the evident influence of William Boardman's book on the Faith Cure.

[2477] That is, for Murray, cessationism is a faithless error that must be overthrown and replaced with continuationism.

[2478] That is, according to Murray, if not the New Testament, not the Apostles only and those on whom they laid hands, but every disciple of Christ in all ages is commanded and empowered to miraculously heal people.

[2479] Note that 1 Corinthians 12:4-9, if the gifts found in the passage are a proof-text for the Faith Cure in modern times, are equally a proof-text for all the other sign gifts, such as tongues.

[2480] Note the assumption, based on the Isaiah text that is actually about Millennial blessing on Israel, that Spirit baptism is a post-conversion event for the dispensation of grace, and the fact that if all that was involved in Pentecost in Acts two is for the current day, not the gift of healing only, but all the sign gifts, should be restored, as affirmed in Pentecostalism.

[2481] Of course, the notion that one has been "healed" but is still sick and is getting worse is in radical discontinuity with Biblical miraculous healing, is contrary to all sense, and is very dangerous advice to give sick people, as acting as if one is getting well when one is getting sicker means that one will cling with a death-grip to delusion and view taking medicine as sin, instead of abstaining from so doing as sin.

[2482] Pgs. 345-348, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. Minor changes in capitalization have been introduced, and italics eliminated.

medicines for any disease."[2484] He "never receded from the position which he took up towards faith healing in . . . [his] book[,] [which] was circulated in America . . . in French . . . [and] Dutch," although there were "cases in which all the conditions of healing seemed to be completely fulfilled, where yet the disease refused to yield to prayer, and the death of the sick one ensued."[2485] Nevertheless, "Murray continued for many years to follow the principles of faith healing," teaching that "suffering, even in the believer, is due to some special sin," avoiding doctors for decades, and suffering from various maladies, none of which was healed in the way that Christ healed in the Gospel records. Murray suffered, for example, from:

> [T]hroat trouble . . . severe injuries to his arm and his back [so that] at first he had to be assisted into the pulpit . . . [and which left him] suffering from a weak back . . . [for] years [and] . . . permanen[t] injur[y] [to] his spine . . . later years [in which he became] exceedingly deaf . . . lameness and deafness [for] years . . . decreased . . . strength . . such feeble[ness] . . . increasing bodily infirmity . . . severe illness . . . serious [infirmity such that he] had to be conveyed to a hospital . . . positive ill-health [that left him unable to] fulfil preaching engagements . . . serious influenza and bronchitis [severe enough that] [h]e never really regained strength again[.][2486]

He finally suffered from a "heavy cold with concomitant bronchitis, from which he never recovered[,] [but lingered in sickness for] . . .months," until he finally died in delirium.[2487] Despite believing in and promulgating widely the Higher Life of the body, he suffered sickness like other men. However, his doctrine did not, at least, lead to his own personal early death, as Murray lived a long life, although fellow ministers who believed in it saw it fail and died,[2488] and even a minister in Murray's own family died because of the Faith Cure:

[2483] Pg. 352, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

[2484] Pg. 475, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. The individual who testified to having learned this lesson from Mr. Murray also testified that Murray taught him "to forsake all commentaries on the Bible and look only to the teaching of the Holy Ghost."

[2485] Pg. 349, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. DuPlessis speculates, however, that Murray "felt with increasing force the difficulties urged against the doctrine" (see pgs. 349-352, *ibid*). Whatever he may or may not have felt, no repentance for teaching such error or renunciation of it ever followed.

[2486] Pgs. 351-352, 381, 430, 466, 477, 491, 494, 500-501, 506-512, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis. The list is not comprehensive.

[2487] Pgs. 506-512, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

[2488] For example: "An exceedingly earnest and capable young missionary . . . was seized with an internal malady . . . [a] general request was issued for intercession. Mr. Murray himself, accompanied by his colleague . . . J. R. Albertyn, proceeded to . . . where the sick man lay, in order to lay his hands on him and pray for him. A few days later the following message was . . . made public: . . . ['']We . . . expect a complete recovery. With marvelous calmness, rest and peace, and in childlike faith Brother Stofberg [the sick missionary] rests assured that the Lord is healing him. May God's great name be at this time more and more glorified by His children!' Yet notwithstanding . . . Mr. Stofberg died within three weeks, and the faith of many who were awaiting news of his restoration was grievously staggered. Mr. Murray ascribed this failure of faith and prayer to effect the recovery of the sick man to the low state of the Church, which had neither truly apprehended the truth nor exercised the faith that is able to save and to heal" (pg. 350, *The*

> Pieter F. Hugo, who was married to a niece of Mr. Murray, and was therefore the object of especial sympathy and prayer . . . developed symptoms of consumption, which compelled him to suspend his pastoral labours and threatened to terminate fatally. Leaving his congregation in the Eastern Province he proceeded to Paarl, where he could enjoy the rest and comfort of his mother's home and also be within easy reach of Mr. Murray's influence. . . . Mr. Murray's bulletins on the state of the patient's health show how carefully he was watching the case. . . . Mr. Hugo, who was a truly pious and devoted man, was firm in the faith that he would recover. Acting in accordance with the principle of considering himself as already healed, he undertook a long journey to Middleburg in the Central Karroo, in order to attend a ministerial conference, at which Mr. Murray was also to be present. . . . Mr. Hugo accomplished the return journey . . . and then began rapidly to weaken. One evening he complained of a feeling of utter weariness, retired to his room, and shortly afterwards breathed his last. His death occurred within a month of his visit to Middleburg . . . [h]is decease was a great blow to Mr. Murray, who had cherished the most confident expectation of his nephew's recovery.[2489]

Thus, a minister and member of Murray's own family, foolishly pretending that he was already well when he was actually sick because of his adoption of the Faith Cure, died young in an unnecessary and tragic waste and a violation of the principles involved in the sixth commandment. Such were the closest relatives among the unnecessary and continual production of youthful corpses, widows, widowers, and orphans among the people of God that resulted from Mr. Murray's espousal and fervent promulgation of the Higher Life for the body. Mr. Murray was also unable to heal his wife or prevent her from enduring great and continual suffering from disease for years, much less from dying,[2490] although she "was like himself strongly convinced of the truth of faith healing."[2491] Nor could he prevent his eldest son from being so sickly that he had to abandon his further education, nor from dying at only twenty-three.[2492] Believing that a believer's suffering is a product of special sin is a very hard message to hold to through such suffering, grief and loss—thankfully, it is not one taught in Scripture.

Nevertheless, despite the failures of the Faith Cure, Murray believed that the gift of healing was not limited to the first century but was for the entire church age, influenced in his doctrine of healing by what he had himself "witnessed . . . [in] a Sunday evening service for the sick . . . [led by] the late Mr. W. E. Boardman."[2493] Murray wrote: "The Bible does not authorize us, either by the words of the Lord or of His apostles, to believe that the gifts of healing were granted only to the early times of the

---

Life of Andrew Murray, DuPlessis). That is, this minister died, not because the Higher Life Faith Cure was a delusion, but because not enough people were committed enough to its truth to make it work.

2489 Pgs. 349-350, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2490 Pgs. 486-487, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2491 Pg. 351, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2492 Pg. 487, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

2493 Pgs. 113-114, *Divine Healing*, by Andrew Murray. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1900. Elec. acc. http://ia341314.us.archive.org/2/items/DivineHealingByAndrewMurrayBroughtByPeter-johnParisisfounderOfThe/DivineHealingByAndrewMurray.pdf.

Church[.] . . . [I]t is the Church's unbelief which has lost the gift of healing . . . salvation offers to us even now, healing and holiness[.] . . . The more we give ourselves to experience personally sanctification by faith, the more we shall also experience healing by faith. These two doctrines walk abreast. . . . [D]ivine healing is part of the life of faith. . . . Wherever the Spirit acts with power, there He works divine healings."[2494] Murray taught, as did John MacMillan,[2495] A. B. Simpson,[2496] and the Pentecostal movement, that physical healing in this life was part of Christ's atonement: "Jesus Christ has obtained for us the healing of our diseases, because He has borne our sicknesses. According to this promise, we have right to healing, because it is part of the salvation which we have in Christ."[2497] Job was sick, Murray affirmed, following Boardman, because the patriarch had not properly employed the Higher Life technique of surrender and faith to deal with "his hidden sins."[2498] It was best for believers to cease using medicine[2499] and simply to employ Higher Life techniques when they were sick, for "setting aside all remedies [is better than] using remedies as believers do for the most part[.] . . . Renouncing remedies, [*sic*] strengthens faith in an extraordinary manner; healing becomes then, far more than sickness, a source of numberless spiritual blessings; . . . we commit ourselves to Him as our sovereign healer, counting solely on His invisible presence."[2500] Unfortunately, as with the spurious "healings" of modern charismatics, the generality of the "healings" Murray spoke of were radically different from those of the Lord Jesus and the Apostles. Biblical healings were all perfect and without any relapses,

---

2494 Pgs. 15, 17-19, 24, 29, *Divine Healing*, Murray.

2495 "MacMillan believed that healing is a privilege for the Christian as a provision of the atonement, and needs to be affirmed actively and strenuously," so that the believer can "refuse the sicknesses that seek to fasten upon [his] physical fram[e]" (pg. 227, *A Believer with Authority*, Paul L. King). See pg. 25, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, November 22, 1942 & pg. 26, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, January 23, 1938, MacMillan.

2496 One notes that Murray's *Divine Healing* was published in 1900 in Nyack, NY, home of the CMA Training Institute, by the Christian and Missionary Alliance (cf. pg. 529, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis).

2497 Pg. 72 (cf. pg. 12), *Divine Healing*, Andrew Murray. London: Victory Press, 1934. Cf. http://www.jesus.org.uk/vault/library/murray_divine_healing.pdf.

2498 Pg. 172, cf. 168-173, *Divine Healing*, Murray. Since Job was the most righteous man on the earth (Job 1:8), it appears that Higher Life principles must not have been practiced much on the earth in Job's day, since even the best man on earth was made horribly sick for not properly employing them—or, perhaps, Murray's reading of Job, in which he follows William Boardman, is radically inaccurate.

2499 The Word of Faith movement likewise teaches that "all disease comes from the spiritual realm of Satan. . . . a true believer should never be sick. . . . [Word of] Faith teachers insist that believers can, and should, grow in their faith to the point where they no longer need medical science. Only those in the Faith movement who are immature in their faith guiltily seek medical care" (pgs. 149-150, 186, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell; pgs. 153-165 demonstrate the almost exact similarity between Murray's doctrine and that of the Word of Faith theology, and provide a fine critique of the Word of Faith healing doctrine.).

2500 Pgs. 174-179, *Divine Healing*, Murray.

while such was not the case with the alleged healings Murray spoke of: "Sometimes also the first symptoms of healing are immediately manifest; but afterwards the progress is slow, and interrupted at times . . . [or entirely] arrested or . . . the evil returns."[2501] The tremendous difference between Murray's Higher Life theology of healing and the healings of the Lord and His Apostles was connected to his Higher Life doctrine of sanctification. As the Keswick theology teaches that sanctification is only maintained by a moment-by-moment faith decision without any change or actual renewal of the inward nature, so physical healing is only maintained by a moment-by-moment faith decision, and any relapse in the faith decision leads to a loss of the healing: "[T]he return to health . . . is the fruit of giving up sin, of consecration to God. . . . [I]t is by healing that God confirms the reality of . . . sanctification[.] . . . When Jesus . . . cures . . . our body . . . miraculously . . . it follows that the health received must be maintained from day to day by an uninterrupted communion with Him."[2502] As the Higher Life theology generally takes elements of the perfection of spiritual sanctification that the historic Baptist and traditional Protestant theories of sanctification affirm belong to the future state of glory and affirms that they can be obtained here on earth at the present time, so Boardman and Murray, consistent with their Higher Life principles, took the perfect healing of the body that properly pertains to the future state of glory and affirmed it was to be obtained on earth now, in the same fashion as sanctification was to be obtained, namely, by a moment-by-moment faith decision. Certainly God is able to heal people today, and it is right for believers to pray for physical healing, but the Higher Life theology of healing espoused by Boardman and Murray is unscriptural, and the Biblical gift of healing—which involved no relapses and did not require any faith on the part of the recipient—was temporary and for the first century alone.

Indeed, according to Murray, none of the spiritual gifts were temporary, and they will appear to those who have discovered "the higher life"[2503]: "Wherever the life more abundant of the Spirit is to be found, we may expect Him to manifest all His gifts . . . Divine healing accompanies the sanctification by the Spirit . . . the body . . . ought to be healed as soon as the sick believer receives by faith the working of the Holy Spirit, the very life of Jesus in him."[2504] Murray believed that not healing only, but "all [the Spirit's] gifts," including tongues, prophecy, and the rest of the phenomena claimed by the modern charismatic movement, should be expected for the entirety of the church age

---

2501 Pg. 92, *Divine Healing*, Murray.

2502 Pg. 154, *Divine Healing*, Murray.

2503 Pgs. 201, 209, *Divine Healing*, Murray.

2504 Pgs. 85-86, 124, *Divine Healing*, Murray.

for those who have entered into the Higher Life[2505]—indeed, Murray taught believers to "live in a holy expectation" for a restoration of the other gifts that accompanied the pouring out of the Spirit in Acts.[2506] Keswick theology was the key to having all the sign gifts restored: "[M]en and women who live the life of faith and of the Holy Spirit, entirely consecrated to their God . . . would see again the manifestation of the same gifts as in former times."[2507] He affirmed that God may lead believers today through "heavenly voices."[2508] Tongues, in particular, will be restored as Keswick theology spreads:

> On the day of Pentecost the speaking "with other tongues" and the prophesying was the result of being filled with the Spirit. . . . We may reckon upon it that where the reception of the Holy Spirit and the possibility of being filled with Him are proclaimed and appropriated, the blessed life of the Pentecostal community will be restored in all its pristine power.[2509]

Murray's strong continuationism, associated with his teaching that "the intellect must follow," not lead, "the heart and the life . . . [i]n all the experience of the blessings of the Gospel,"[2510] were important in theological trajectory from Keswick to Pentecostalism.[2511]

In light of Murray's Higher Life continuationism, it is not surprising that he was a central figure in the rise of South African Pentecostalism. Certain of Murray's books are "sold nowadays only by the Pentecostals."[2512] Murray requested that his own biography be written by J. DuPlessis, whose continuationism led him to became the General Secretary of the charismatic Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.[2513] Furthermore, Murray "acted as mentor for Pieter Le Roux, who was to be a key figure in the

---

[2505] Nor is it surprising that charismatic writers can refer to "Andrew Murray" as a "prominent Pentecostal figur[e]" alongside of charismatics like "Aimee Semple McPherson" (cf. pg. 67, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell), although such a designation for Murray is somewhat proleptic.

[2506] Pgs. 87-88, *Divine Healing*, Murray.

[2507] Pg. 15, *Divine Healing: A Series of Addresses*, Murray. See also pg. 100.

[2508] Pg. 161, *The Spirit of Christ*, Andrew Murray. Springdale, PA: Whitaker House, 1984. While Murray writes, "There are souls to whom such leading . . . [by] heavenly voices . . . undoubtedly is given," at least he also affirms that such voices are not the "ordinary" means of leading—an affirmation, however, that a Quaker or practically any modern Pentecostal could also make.

[2509] Pg. 17, *The Full Blessing of Pentecost: The One Thing Needful*, trans. J. P. Lilley. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1908.

[2510] Pg. 204, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

[2511] Antecedents of the Word of Faith theology have also been seen in Murray. For example, the doctrine of the authority of the believer, as developed by the Word of Faith movement out of the writings of John MacMillan, appears to have been anticipated by Murray: "The Head truly calls the members of His Body to share His power with Him. Our Father places His power at the disposal of the child who completely trusts Him" (pg. 83, *With Christ in the School of Prayer*, Andrew Murray. Springdale, PA: Whitaker House, 1981).

[2512] Pg. 114, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

[2513] Pg. v. *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis & pg. 172, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee. DuPlessis was a continuationist like Murray but not yet the General Secretary of the Pentecostal Mission at the time Murray asked him to write the biography.

establishment of Pentecostalism in South Africa,"[2514] as LeRoux was "one of the first propagandists" of the Keswick continuationist and essentially Pentecostal "Christian Catholic Church" of John Dowie. LeRoux went on to become, "for 29 years, President" of the "Pentecostal Apostolic Faith Mission"[2515] which largely developed out of the Christian Catholic denomination.[2516] The Christian Catholic Church and the Pentecostal Apostolic Faith Mission "provided the example that has been followed by the South African Pentecostal movement"[2517] to this day, including the South African Pentecostal doctrine that "[m]edicine is rejected and . . . absolute reliance on the healing of the sick through prayer" is practiced instead.[2518] In addition to the major Pentecostal denominations, numberless South African "independent Pentecostal churches . . . go back to men like Le Roux" as "offshoots of the Apostolic Faith Mission."[2519] Andrew Murray's Keswick continuationism was key to the explosion of the apostasy, which is South African Pentecostalism.

Unlike many other central figures in the Keswick theology, Andrew Murray had a reasonable testimony of personal conversion and a confession that was consistent with the fundamentals of the Christian gospel. He was a sincere and pious man, and various Christian truths found in his writings have been a spiritual blessing to many. A sincere Pentecostal pastor may similarly make statements that could be of benefit to separatist Baptists. Nevertheless, the errors of Keswick continuationism and the influence of many unconverted religious figures in Christendom are bound inextricably into the fabric of Murray's works. The spiritual truths that have blessed the people of God in his writings are also found in the works of many authors free from Murray's errors, writers of unquestionable orthodoxy and fervent spirituality who pay far more attention to the careful and accurate exegesis of that instrument of the Spirit for the sanctification of the saint, the holy Scripture (John 17:17), than Murray does.

Applications from the Life and Teachings of Andrew Murray

2514 pg. 462, "Murray, Andrew," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen; pgs. 72-73, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

2515 Pg. 115, 120, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2516 Pg. 120, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2517 Pg. 120-121, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2518 Pg. 121, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2519 Pgs. 171-172, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

Many of Andrew Murray's writings should be avoided altogether by all Christians. Compositions such as his writings on the Faith Cure are certainly worthless settings forth of dangerous error. The remainder of his works, at the most, should only be read by those who, within the protection of a strong Bible-practicing Baptist church, have a comprehensive knowledge of his Keswick and continuationist errors and the spiritual wisdom to reject them, as well a firm grounding in the truth of Scripture on the doctrines and practices concerning which Murray has been led astray. Since such knowledge is absent in the vast majority of those who read Mr. Murray, the great majority of his readers should abstain from reading him. Countless Christians have been hindered in their sanctification and been spiritually confused by the Keswick errors in Murray's writings, and many have been influenced toward charismatic apostasy by him. Even for the small minority that possesses the comprehensive knowledge and equipment to diagnose and handle his errors, one would expect greater spiritual refreshing from spending time in the Word itself, instead of Murray's works, and from the reading of better devotional writers who handle the Scripture with more study and carefulness. A spirituality developed from the study of Andrew Murray will be withered and weak compared to a spirituality sustained by a deep study of God's Word.

Learn from Andrew Murray's life the dangers of corrupt religious denominations. While Christian charity has a reasonable ground for hope that Murray himself was truly regenerate, the fact that he could already have determined to enter the ministry before his conversion illustrates the fact that vast numbers of spiritual leaders in the South African Dutch Reformed denomination of Murray's day were unconverted—while God in His mercy appears to have saved Murray in seminary, many others who were studying for the ministry had never come to Christ, and never did come to Christ, but became spiritual wolves destroying the flock of God. It was imperative for any true believers among the Dutch Reformed in South Africa in Murray's day to come out from among that corrupt denomination and unite themselves with truly Biblical and separatist assemblies. Unconverted members are an awful curse to any church—what disaster, then, is an unconverted minister?

Learn also from Andrew Murray's life the danger of a corrupt seminary education. A Christian should be as likely to attend an apostate seminary as the Apostle Paul would have been to send one of his converts to the Judaizers for an education, or as Elijah would have been to send one in the school of the prophets to learn in the school of Baal. By the great mercy of God, a young and impressionable Murray was himself preserved from utter spiritual shipwreck while funding and attending an educational institution of the Antichrist to prepare for Christian ministry. Many others were not so

preserved. Furthermore, Murray's seminary education was both a waste of years of his life and a seed-bed for filling his mind and heart with errors that were never entirely extirpated—had he instead attended a school run by a true church, one that was whole-heartedly consecrated to God and whole-heartedly opposed to every form of error, the likelihood that Murray would have adopted an ecumenicalism that contributed to the destruction of whatever true Christianity remained in his denomination is small. Furthermore, God blessed Murray's sincere desire to walk with Him despite all his errors—but how much the more could he have flourished spiritually had he not been pumped full of error for years in his youth? Who knows what blessings were available to Murray had he followed the preceptive will of God, and were lost because of a failure to practice separation (cf. 2 Chronicles 16:7; Psalm 81:16)? Such terrible evils as apostate institutions for the training of Christians should not be attended, but be abolished from the face of the earth, thrust down into that hell which belched them forth.

Learn also from Murray's life the great spiritual danger in hearing and reading of corrupt false teachers. Although he had already been hopefully converted, and even in the ministry, for years, Murray fell under the spell of William Law, that enemy of the gospel of Christ, and allowed that false teacher to profoundly influence him. What is more, not only did Law influence Murray personally, but countless believers have been drawn towards error by the teachings of Law that they received mediated through Murray. It would have been better for Murray to have feared error more, and mistrusted his ability to discern error more, and avoided William Law altogether. "Be not deceived"—whether considering your denominational affiliation, or your educational choices, or your reading material—"evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Corinthians 15:33). The Scripture gives no exceptions. Whether you are in seminary, or in the ministry already, unscriptural associations will corrupt you.

Murray's ecumenicalism and continuationism illustrate the experience-centered spiritual confusion engendered by the Keswick theology. His Faith Cure delusion, which was nothing but the physical concomitant of his Higher Life doctrine of sanctification, has led both to many an unnecessary physical death and to the rise of Pentecostalism, which has overwhelmed South Africa and brought many not only to physical death by a rejection of medicine, but to spiritual death also, as the saving gospel is confused with mystical experience. Reject experience-based hermeneutics, and cleave with all your heart and soul to the literal interpretation of Scripture, recognizing the Bible as your sole authority. In so doing, you will be preserved from much spiritual danger.

Rejoice that God promises you perfect physical healing in the future glory. Ponder His blessed promise: "Behold, the tabernacle of God *is* with men, and he will

dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, *and be* their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Revelation 21:3-4). Yes, healing is in the atonement—perfect bodily healing, freedom from all pain and suffering, crying, and the last enemy, death, is certain to come for you. Since God is your own God, and He has given you His Son, with Him you will certainly also be given all things. You will not need to worry that you will "lose your healing." You will not need to pretend that you are healed when you are not. Your body will be perfectly whole in truth, and so forever and ever, for you will have a body like Christ's glorious body. How wonderful is God's real work of healing—how it infinitely exceeds the meager dregs promised by the Faith and Mind Cure! Fix your eye of faith on your God and His glorious promises to you, and, knowing that even in this life He works all things together for your good, you can traverse your earthly pilgrimage, with its trials and sorrows, with a joyful confidence in the ineffably blessed eternity that is your certain future, to the everlasting glory of your blessed Savior, Jesus Christ.

Andrew Murray sought for genuine spirituality—such a desire was highly commendable, and one that you must share—indeed, your very desire for a closer walk with God must undergird your rejection of the errors of Murray's Keswick continuationism. Rejoice that a genuinely vibrant and Christ-centered spiritual life can truly be lived by the power of the Spirit through the Word in the context of a historic Baptist church. You are not left to a dichotomy of following Andrew Murray, adopting his errors, and having a heart-felt spiritual life, or rejecting Keswick's errors for a cold and lifeless orthodoxy. No, you can have a glorious and living orthodoxy that undergirds and greatly contributes to a sweet and growing spiritual life in Christ. In fact, this is what you must have—nothing else can suffice but the passionate spiritual embrace of the orthodox Christ revealed fully and truly today only in the pages of the Holy Scripture. Reader, how is it with you?

IV. F. B. Meyer

F. B. Meyer, who had "attended and enjoyed the Broadlands Conference, Oxford Convention, and Brighton Convention,"[2520] was a key figure in the spread of Keswick theology in Baptist churches. Meyer was a pastor who was "once, President of the Baptist Union," at a time after C. H. Spurgeon had already pulled out of the Union

[2520] Pg. 126, *Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology*, Naselli.

because of the heresies that were filling it. Meyer was also "a prolific author . . . [although] [h]is books are not of a very scholarly nature."[2521] Nonetheless, he was a definitive Keswick writer.[2522] "[R]aised by a Quaker grandmother, [he] was also much influenced by . . . Hannah Pearsall Smith."[2523] It "is doubtful whether any other Keswick leader ever did more than Dr. Meyer to make the distinctive Keswick message known throughout the world,"[2524] as he "spoke at twenty-six Keswick conventions as well as at important regional conventions, and encouraged Keswick teaching within the Baptist denomination through a Prayer Union, which attracted wide ministerial support . . . [and] became Keswick's leading international representative," making nearly twenty visits to the United States and Canada, addressing meetings in South Africa, and engaging in tours in the Middle and Far East,[2525] where he preached Keswick theology to the heathen. "F. B. Meyer . . . was Keswick's best known international representative . . . h[e] travel[led] on behalf of the holiness movement . . . [in] South Africa, Bulgaria, Constantinople, Ceylon, China, Nigeria, and the United States" just between 1907-1910, being away "from Britain for several months at a time"[2526] and traveling over twenty-five thousand miles spreading the Keswick teaching.[2527] "He introduced Keswick teaching into the Baptist denomination," so that, largely through him, "Keswick's influence . . . sprea[d]"[2528] beyond its largely Anglican and Quaker roots. Thus, Meyer, having followed the Keswick theology from the time of its origin at the Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions,[2529] contributed greatly to the spread of Keswick theology through his preaching tours, writing, ministry at specifically Keswick venues, and preaching at well-attended convocations from A. B. Simpson's deeper life conferences to Moody's

---

2521 Pg. 182, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

2522 Pg. 47, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall

2523 Pg. 152, *Changed by Grace: V. C. Kitchen, the Oxford Group, and A.A.*, Glenn Chesnut. New York, NY: iUniverse, 2006.

2524 Pg. 186, *So Great Salvation*, Barabas.

2525 Pgs. 429-430, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen. Meyer "emphasized strongly in his own teaching the steps which led into 'the blessed life'" (pg. 43, *Transforming Keswick*, Price & Randall).

2526 Pg. 62, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall

2527 Pg. 111, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2528 Pg. 43, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. By 1920, not Meyer alone, but other Baptists, including those corrupted by rationalism and theological modernism, were speaking at Keswick (pg. 140, *ibid*).

2529 Pg. 65, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*, Fullerton; pgs. 42-43, *Transforming Keswick*, Price & Randall; pg. 103, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

Northfield conferences.[2530] Meyer was key to the spread of the Keswick theology in Baptist churches and in many other places as he worked as an ecumenical conference speaker and Higher Life holiness evangelist.

Meyer held for years that "the saints alive on earth toward the end of the [first] century were rapt to heaven[,]" a view he mixed "with the historical interpretation of the Book of Revelation." Concerning this view of a first century catching away, "Mr. Meyer said, 'In the main I thoroughly accept [this] conclusion. It must be true.'" After all, "the theory is not so fantastic as it seems . . . the miracle it involved . . . account[ed] in great measure . . . for the rapid spread of Christianity in the next [the second] century. That there is no record of the event is . . . justified by the fact that there was nobody left to record it." On "the first day of 1905 Mr. Meyer preached a sermon advocating this view, which attracted considerable attention, one of the London daily newspapers giving an extended report of it," as a prominent minister affirming that all Christians were snatched away near the end of the first century as the explanation for the rapid spread of Christianity in the second century would surely sell quite a few newspapers.[2531] Furthermore, in "1917 Meyer launched, with the support of several Keswick leaders, the Advent Testimony and Preparation Movement, which became a significant body,"[2532] and of which Meyer "became [a] very pronounced" advocate. By this time, Meyer was suggesting that the world was going to end because of the First World War: "the Great War was . . . the Midnight Cry . . . he and some others suggested,"[2533] an affirmation somewhat comparable to the prophetic proclamation of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis of the Translation and the end of the world about that time.

Although Meyer did believe in baptism by immersion for believers, he was very far from being a strong defender of historic Baptist doctrine and practice. He was "less theological and didactic" than even the other speakers at the already extremely undogmatic Keswick convention[2534]—indeed, his "relatively undogmatic approach was

---

2530 "Keswick . . . was imported back into the United States by Moody, who brought into his Northfield Conventions in the early 1890s such figures as F. B. Meyer . . . who returned five times within the decade; Andrew Murray . . . [and] H. W. Webb-Peploe" (pgs. 105-106, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

2531 Pg. 157, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*, Fullerton.

2532 Pg. 430, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

2533 Pg. 159, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton. The war was "the precursor of the return of Christ to reign on earth for a thousand years" (pg. 133, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Other Keswick supporters of the Advent Testimony movement from its inception were H. W. Webb-Peploe, John Steward Holden, and E. L. Langston; Meyer was the chairman of the Movement (pg. 133, *ibid*).

2534 Pg. 67, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*. W. Y. Fullerton.

of crucial importance"[2535] for his spread of Keswick doctrine worldwide—although he did defend a view of Spirit baptism as a post-conversion second blessing similar to the view of William Boardman instead of endorsing the historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism, as it was important to Meyer to put away denominational distinctions and seek post-conversion Spirit baptism.[2536] Meyer denied that by means of believer's baptism one was added to the Baptist church that authorized the ordinance (cf. Acts 2:41-47; 1 Corinthians 12:13). Rather, he taught not only that one could receive believer's baptism and not be added to a Baptist church, but also that one could be immersed and remain a member of a paedobaptist religious organization, with no desire whatsoever to separate from it and join a Baptist congregation. Rather than a church ordinance in the Biblical sense, baptism was simply a personal matter: "[R]emember . . . that you may be baptized, as a believer, without becoming a member of the Baptist denomination. You may be baptized, and still continue in communion with that Christian body with which you have been accustomed to worship. This rite is a personal matter between the Lord and the individual believer."[2537] Since baptism did not add one to a Baptist church, in Meyer's view, "[p]robably no man has baptized more members of other churches"—who remained in these other churches—"than he."[2538] Indeed, Meyer pastored a paedobaptist religious assembly, Christ's Church, for twenty-one years—a longer period than he spent as the pastor of any Baptist church, and this paedobaptist assembly was both his last pastorate and the place where his funeral was held. Explaining why he was leaving a Baptist church for a paedobaptist religious organization, Meyer wrote: "I am less of a denominationalist than ever . . . I can best serve my generation from an undenominational standpoint," although the Baptists he had previously pastored expressed "regret and dismay" once they found out Meyer's plan, at the last minute—for he had neither "consulted the [Baptist] Church or even consulted with its officers" but "arrangements were carried through . . . [with] secrecy" and as he was "at the bottom a little ashamed of his desertion of Regent's Park [Baptist Church] . . . he practically accepted the new church before he informed the old one."[2539] Not only did the fact that the members of Christ's Church had no Biblical baptism, and so could not Biblically be church members

---

[2535] Pg. 111, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall

[2536] Pgs. 41-42, 45, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton; cf. "Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism." **Ref. appendix with this work.**

[2537] Pg. 84, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*. W. Y. Fullerton, citing Meyer's "Seven Reasons for Believer's Baptism."

[2538] Pg. 84, , *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*. W. Y. Fullerton.

[2539] Pgs. 73-77, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*, Fullerton.

or be a true church of Christ at all, stop Meyer from assuming its pastorate, the fact that his newly adopted religious organization had a "liturgy" did not stop him either.[2540] He was happy to have Christ's Church "mainly suppor[t] the L. M. S.,"[2541] the paedobaptist London Missionary Society, founded as an ecumenical mix of Anglicans, Congregationalists, Wesleyans, and Presbyterians, Calvinists and Arminians, and numerous other forms of doctrinal divergence, such as acceptance of the idea that the heathen could be saved without knowing the name of Jesus Christ—thus, Meyer's book advocating this heresy of a Christ-less salvation, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, was in substance delivered as the Annual Sermon of the L. M. S.[2542] The previous pastor at Christ's Church, Christopher Newman Hall, a divorced adulterer, annihilationist, and opponent of verbal inspiration, "was delighted to secure as his successor at Christ Church F. B. Meyer . . . a worthy heir."[2543] Meyer was willing to immerse the Anglican minister, Keswick leader, and annihilationist heretic George Grubb.[2544] Indeed, faithful to Keswick ecumenicalism, Meyer refused to "declar[e] it impossible to receive those who accept a formula which implies baptismal regeneration," thinking that this "would have been far from the unity in Christ . . . at the beginning and the end he rejoiced that we," whether believing in baptismal regeneration or not, "are 'all one in Christ Jesus,'" in the words of the Keswick motto.[2545] Meyer presided over the Keswick Open Communion service where those who believed in the true gospel and false gospels united to celebrate, as they thought, the Lord's Supper.[2546] The Galatian false teachers that the Apostle Paul anathematized (Galatians 1:8-9) would have been welcomed as Christian brethren by Meyer, for he stated that he "hoped one day 'to kneel before the Throne of God with a High Churchman on one side and a Quaker on the other,'"[2547] despite the baptismal regeneration and sacramental false gospel of High Church Anglicanism and the rejection of justification by Christ's imputed righteousness and other damnable heresies of Quakerism. He happily preached the Higher Life to those who went beyond even High Church Anglicanism in sacramentalist heresy, such as the Eastern Orthodox.[2548] Meyer's

---

2540 Pg. 76, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*, Fullerton.

2541 Pg. 143, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*, Fullerton.

2542 Preface, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1906.

2543 Cf. pgs. 282-284, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

2544 Pg. 85, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

2545 Pg. 194, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

2546 Pg. 195, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

2547 Pg. 208, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

2548 Pg. 111, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Meyer even preached to the Armenian Patriarch in the Gregorian Church in Constantinople,

personal grounds for an eternal hope were most questionable in light of the lack of even a sentence or a single phrase about a personal conversion experience in Meyer's authorized[2549] biography of several hundred pages and his deep confusion about the nature of the gospel. Indeed, "Meyer didn't know anything about conversion, or about the gathering of sinners around Christ" even during his first pastorate—he only picked up, in 1873, certain evangelistic practices, or perhaps certain promotion and marketing techniques, from D. L. Moody, who himself was sadly ecumenical—but even at that point there is no record of Meyer experiencing a personal conversion.[2550] Since Meyer believed good Quakers were Christians, not people in a false religion in need of true salvation—a position that made it much easier to accept the doctrines of Quakers such as Hannah W. Smith—it is not surprising that he would invite "missionaries of . . . the Society of Friends to a yearly Conference."[2551] Furthermore, Meyer was "one of the very few outsiders who has been allowed, in the course of its 260 years' history, to address the . . . executive committee . . . of the Society of Friends."[2552] Meyer's understanding and proclamation of the Christian gospel was terribly deficient and grossly heretical.

In light of Meyer's strong identification with Keswick, it is natural that he also encouraged Pentecostalism. "In the 1890s, F. B. Meyer was to be found assuring his Keswick audience that they could receive 'a mighty baptism of the Holy Ghost' like 'another Pentecost.' It was an outlook which helped to create the emphasis on Spirit-baptism found in twentieth-century Pentecostalism. . . . Meyer embodied a spiritual power that was 'literally Pentecostal.'"[2553] He was a clear "Pentecostal predecessor," who taught that even Jesus Christ "needed" a post-conversion "anoint[ing]" or second blessing before He could do the work of God.[2554] In his international travels, Meyer was part of the "explicit . . . link between . . . holiness revivalism and Pentecostalism," as he led people to "claim the promise and power of Pentecost" and reported that "Baptists . . .

---

exhorting him to embrace Keswick theology, rather than exhorting him to repent and turn from the worship of idols, from sacramental salvation, and from other abominable heresies to Jesus Christ and be born again.

[2549] Pgs. 7, 222, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

[2550] Pg. 102-103, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

[2551] Pg. 143, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

[2552] Pg. 188, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton; note also the Quaker influence in ancestors of his family, pg. 11.

[2553] Pg. 43, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Meyer proved his doctrine of post-conversion Spirit baptism by "outspoken personal testimonies about a sense of failure giving way to new power, a power seen in practice," rather than by a careful exegesis of Scripture; Meyer also "often gave away copies of Murray's *Abide in Christ*" (pg. 53, *ibid*).

[2554] Pg. 221, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner, citing pg. 87, *A Castaway and Other Addresses*, F. B. Meyer. Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1897.

were speaking in tongues and casting out demons."[2555] Meyer contributed to the founding of the Welsh Keswick Convention at Llandrindod Wells in 1903, an important precursor to the work of the 1904-5 holiness revival associated with Evan Roberts and a place where the doctrines of Jessie Penn-Lewis were propagated.[2556] Meyer taught that the Welsh holiness revival involved a restoration of the miraculous gifts of 1 Corinthians 12[2557]—a chapter where tongues are included. It is not surprising that, "[f]ollowing the Welsh Revival of 1904–1905, Meyer reported in Los Angeles on what he had observed in Wales. His report encouraged future leaders of the Pentecostal movement, which was to spread from 1906."[2558] Meyer's encouragement of Pentecostalism was perhaps furthered by the fact that he himself received revelations that added to Scripture. For example, he claimed to have a vision in which he engaged in conversation with Jesus Christ[2559] and also received, apparently by revelation, information that in heaven angels were making "a new road, along the River Bank" since there had "been so many arrivals lately," and that Meyer and his physician would have their "mansions . . . together"[2560] along this new road overlooking this heavenly river.

F. B. Meyer's Keswick ecumenicalism, however, did not extend only to sacramentalists, Quakers, and Pentecostals within the broad pale of Christendom. In keeping with the teaching of the teaching of the Broadlands Conference, Meyer taught that pagans, idolaters who knew nothing of Jesus Christ and who—if one accepts the authority of Scripture alone (John 14:6; Acts 4:12; Romans 1)—are worshippers of the devil without hope or God in the world, could also be saved without ever hearing about or knowing the Lord Jesus, the Son of God and only Savior of the world. In India, following his practice in other countries, Meyer preached the Keswick theology to idolaters trapped in the darkness of Hinduism because he believed that God had already given Hindus "revelations" of himself, and that their "tears and prayers come up as a memorial before God," although not offered to the Triune Jehovah, but to their abominable idols, so that they were in need only of "further revelations" through Christ. Meyer affirmed: "I [am] . . . deeply convinced that the prime work of our missionary

---

2555 Pg. 178, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall

2556 Pgs. 168-169, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2557 Pg. 172, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2558 Pgs. 429-430, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

2559 Pg. 212, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

2560 Pg. 213, *F. B. Meyer*, Fullerton.

societies is to discover the souls . . . the non-Christian natives . . . with whom the Divine Spirit has already been at work, ascertaining the stage which they have reached in the divine life, and endeavoring to lead them forward."[2561] The Keswick theology was important to pagan Hindus and other non-Christians, for many of them already possessed "the divine life" and just needed to move forward, and, of course, nothing could move idolatrous polytheistic Hindus forward to a deeper spiritual life than Keswick theology. Preaching Keswick doctrine to such people was, indeed, the prime work of missionary societies, and Keswick doctrine would strike a better cord with such Hindus than preaching the objective and finished work of Jesus Christ and justification by repentant faith alone in Him, since Hindu mysticism and quietism were like Keswick doctrine. Meyer testified:

> At the close of an afternoon service in one of the public halls of Bombay, a number of intelligent and thoughtful men . . . non-Christian natives of India . . . gathered round me, who said that my teaching of the inner life, and especially of the negation of self, was not what they were generally accustomed to hear from the lips of a Christian teacher, though it was exactly in line with much that was taught in their own religious books. They told me that one objection which they had towards the religion of Jesus Christ was that, so far as it had been presented to them, it seemed so exclusively objective in its testimony, and gave so little room for those deeper teachings of the subjective discipline of the spirit which appeared to them so all-important. . . . It is interesting to recall the eagerness with which the non-Christian natives of India heard from my lips teaching as to those higher or deeper truths [of the Keswick theology] concerning the crucifixion of the self-life in order to the indwelling of the Son of God.[2562]

Hindu idolaters were not the only ones who could be saved without knowing Jesus Christ, of course; pagan religious leaders "from all races" could lead one to heaven, since nature revealed all that was necessary for salvation. Meyer's belief in "a kind of nature mysticism," found very prominently and notably in his own oft-repeated testimony to his entrance into the Keswick experience, led Meyer to believe that "Wordsworth and all his followers were . . . students in the school of Jesus Christ. . . . Nature was being given greater emphasis at Keswick than had previously been the case in evangelicalism."[2563] Such nature mysticism led Meyer to "often" leave the "Keswick tent

---

[2561] Pgs. 25-29, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, F. B. Meyer. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1906. Meyer even met Mahatma Gandhi and commended his sincerity. Indeed, Meyer was even "formative in . . . Ghandi['s] own 'passive resistance' movement," although, sadly, Ghandi did not receive the gospel of Jesus Christ through his interaction with his mentor Meyer (pg. 113, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

[2562] Pgs. 26-27, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

[2563] Pgs. 46-47, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Part of this emphasis on nature was the strong cultural influence on Keswick in favor of Romanticism; at Keswick, "sentiments which embodied some Romantic traits and which could at times seem to be less firmly anchored in older scriptural orthodoxy . . . [were] voice[d]," and not by F. B. Meyer alone, but also by Evan Hopkins, Webb-Peploe, and others. Indeed, "Keswick was . . . a symptom of the Romantic inclinations of the period . . . what was distinctive about it did derive primarily from the spirit of the age, and can be understood only in that light." Both philosophical "romanticism" and "relativism"

to breathe in both the Keswick air and the Holy Spirit,"[2564] for Meyer would pray: "Father, as I breathe in this breath of the evening air, so I breathe in Thy gift of the Holy Spirit."[2565] After all, the initial impulse for the Broadlands Conference arose out of a discussion by the Pearsall Smiths with the Mount-Temples about the value of the "habit [of] go[ing] out into the woods for a week or ten days, and seek together in long breaths to draw in the influx of the Spirit,"[2566] so breathing in the Spirit was a solid Keswick and Broadlands teaching from the very beginning, even if that Holy Ghost who dictated the Scriptures said nothing whatever about going into nature to breathe Him in. However, as Broadlands testified, with the Catholic mystic Bernard of Clairvaux as its support, "experience" demonstrated that there was "something greater in woods than in books," so one could "tur[n] from the Bible to nature."[2567] Perhaps for F. B. Meyer, as for his Higher Life predecessors, it was not necessary to find support for his nature mysticism in Scripture, since the woods were better than the Book. In any case, Meyer had entered into the Higher Life himself originally by breathing God in after a meeting led by George Grubb at Keswick.[2568] Thus, through nature mysticism, the heathen could be saved, breathing in the Holy Spirit with the evening air like Meyer did. Indeed, the heathen did not even need to live up the light that they had to be saved, since none of them do so (as is true, and which justifies their universal condemnation, according to the Apostle Paul in Romans 1-2, though not according to Mr. Meyer); some kind of vague faith in their pagan gods was enough for the heathen to be saved, just as in Christendom one does not need "accurate views of that redemption" wrought by Christ to be saved, but simply a faith that is the same in kind with that of the allegedly saved pagans: "[M]yriads of souls, who lived and died with no other teaching than that of natural reason, have entered into the Kingdom . . . and they have been admitted on precisely the same terms as those on

---

contributed to the growth, popularity, and teaching of Keswick (pgs. 45-47, 254, *ibid*). It is noteworthy that Wordsworth was born in the Lake District, where the Keswick Conventions were held.

[2564] Pg. 76, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[2565] Pg. 47, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Compare the words of A. B. Simpson: ""I had to learn . . . every second, to breathe Himself in as I breathed, and breathe myself out. So, moment by moment for the spirit, and moment by moment for the body" ("Himself," A. B. Simpson. Elec. acc. http://www.biblebelievers.com/simpson-ab_himself.html).

[2566] Pg. 117, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

[2567] Pgs. 88-89, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910; cf. pgs. 90ff. One was also to turn from "nature to the Bible" as both nature and Scripture supposedly contributed to the understanding of the other, but nature is still given first priority, the woods being above the books. The Scriptural position that grammatical-historical exegesis is what drives Biblical interpretation, not nature in any degree whatsoever, is indubitably rejected.

[2568] Pgs. 103-104, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

which we [Christians] hope to be accepted."[2569] Accurate views of redemption were the more certainly unnecessary, since Meyer himself did not hold to them—for example, he rejected the doctrine that Christ's cross-work was a propitiation (Romans 3:25; 1 John 2:2; 4:10): "We must never think that our Lord stepped in to appease the otherwise implacable wrath of the Father."[2570] For a Keswick revival to come, the universal church must reject the work of Christ as a propitiation of the wrath of God for a doctrine of atonement by her own blood and self sacrifice: "[T]he Church . . . accounts that her blood is not too great a price to pay for an atonement through love and self-sacrifice—it is only under such circumstances that a work of lasting revival can be inaugurated."[2571] In light of these affirmations, clearly the old orthodox doctrine of Christ's blood atonement was not necessary for salvation. Meyer received further support, as he supposed, for his doctrine that a vague faith in a deity was all that was necessary for salvation from his gross misunderstanding of Old Testament theology, seen in the alleged fact that throughout the Old Testament Israel believed the lie that the Lord was "God of the hills alone," but not "of the valleys also"—the truth that God was the Omnipresent and Omnipotent One over the whole world, including the valleys and the hills, was allegedly only revealed in the New Testament. Furthermore, in keeping with weakness on the Trinity at the Broadlands Conferences,[2572] Meyer thought that from the creation of the world until the day of Pentecost the Triune God was unknown, and the saints of Scripture accepted the blasphemy that the Holy Ghost of God was "an atmosphere," not "a Person."[2573] If people who knew nothing of the Trinity, who thought God was only a local deity who controlled hills but was powerless in valleys, and who rejected the orthodox doctrine of Christ's blood atonement, could have faith and be saved in the past, they could be saved in the same manner today also; people within Christendom who simply have the vague faith in a deity that one can have from natural revelation are saved, Meyer taught. After all, if accurate views of the atonement of Christ, the Trinity, and other fundamental Christian doctrines, are necessarily part of saving faith, the ecumenicalism of Keswick must fall to the ground, and the heretics that founded the Keswick theology and filled so many of the seats of Keswick conventions would be

---

2569 Pgs. 23-25, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2570 Pg. 101, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2571 Pg. 109, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2572 E. g., "Jesus Christ is . . . the Holy Spirit, Who will dwell in us" (pg. 170, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910), the heresy of modalism. Elsewhere (pg. 195, *ibid*), even the Spirit's dual procession from the Father and the Son is given a strange Higher Life interpretation.

2573 Pg. 80, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

unconverted—a clearly unacceptable conclusion. Those "earnest brethren . . . [who] denounced [Meyer] as a heretic"[2574] were certainly mistaken, and just were not ecumenical enough; neither was Naaman when he confessed to Elijah, "now I know that *there is* no God in all the earth, but in Israel" (2 Kings 10:15), nor Paul when he affirmed that pagans were without hope and without God (Ephesians 2:12). Meyer was not nearly as narrow as the Scripture and its Author:

> Not from the Hebrew race alone, but from all races, God has called forth great souls . . . the great Prophets and Teachers of the Race . . . who have received His messages for their contemporaries and all after time. We utter their names with reverence, and acknowledge the important contributions that have been made to the religious history of the race by Confucius, Buddha, Zoroaster, Plato, and other prophetic souls, who have reared themselves like soaring Alps above their fellows, catching and reflecting the light of the Eternal.[2575]

Zoroaster, Buddha, Plato, and other pagan devil-worshippers were actually prophets who received messages from God, just like those received by the Prophets of the Bible; their teachings, writings, and religious systems were not the proclamations of idolatry to be detested, but "sources of religious knowledge and inspiration,"[2576] as the Bible is an inspired source of religious knowledge. Alongside of the Bible one may recognize the inspiration of the "Vedas . . . Krishna . . . Seneca" and other pagan writings and writers; "the founder of the Moslem faith" also gave a "noble witness," and "Marcus Aurelius," that "loftiest of pagan moralists," was a righteous heathen although he "cruelly persecuted the Christians of the [Roman] empire," so not only those ignorant of Christ, but those who put His people to death, can be saved and be vehicles of Divine revelation. From the message of pagan writings, the heathen receive "revelation of the truth" and "righteousness is imputed to them," although they "know nothing of our Lord's work on their behalf."[2577] Unsurprisingly, while uplifting the documents of pagan religion to the level of inspiration, Meyer downgraded the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Bible, accepting modernistic ideas such as a documentary hypothesis about the composition of the gospels comparable to the modern "Q" theory[2578]—"Meyer was a late nineteenth/early twentieth-century Protestant liberal who took modern biblical criticism for granted, and was not a fundamentalist. . . . Fundamentalism . . . was a divisive force which . . . placed an overemphasis on doctrine and dogmas."[2579] He proclaimed that theologically liberal views of Scripture were by no means to be opposed—on the

---

2574 Pg. 204-205, *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*. W. Y. Fullerton.

2575 Pgs. 18-19, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2576 Pg. 20, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2577 Pg. 104, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2578 Pg. 72, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2579 Pg. 152, *Changed by Grace: V. C. Kitchen, the Oxford Group, and A.A.*, Glenn Chesnut. New York, NY: iUniverse, 2006.

contrary, "the great need of the present hour is that leaders of religious thought should cease to concern themselves with the questions of Higher Criticism" and retreat to an alleged "essentially spiritual plane," abandoning "the intellectual plane" to unbelief.[2580] What is more, pagans, and their writings, Meyer affirmed, "are a striking comment on those great words of Malachi, 'From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, God's name is great among the nations, and in *every* place incense has been offered unto His name, and a pure offering; for His name is great among the Gentiles,'"[2581] although Malachi actually was not affirming that pagans were worshipping the true God and making pure offerings as they served their idols through human sacrifice, temple prostitutes, and the like, but predicting the future Messianic kingdom when the Gentiles would reject all idolatry and purely worship Jehovah alone through Jesus Christ, as validated in the translation in the Authorized Version, which correctly has future tense verbs where Meyer employed the present tense: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name *shall be* great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense *shall be* offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name *shall be* great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts."[2582] Phoenician Baal-worshippers in Tyre and Sidon, and even the sodomites who sought to gang-rape other men in the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah and who were destroyed by fire and brimstone from heaven (Genesis 19), could be saved—for God knew the faith that they had, and their real, fundamentally positive attitude toward Him: "God, who searches the heart, and knows what would have happened in Tyre and Sidon and the cities of the Plain, if they had heard of the mighty works of Christ, deals with them on the basis of the faith they have, anticipating the hour when that faith, which is an attitude towards God, and the embryo capacity for receiving God, shall no longer be an unfurled bud, but shall open to its full radiance and glory in the tropical atmosphere of heaven."[2583] Since Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, animists, and even idolatrous sodomites who practice gang-rape, could be saved without ever hearing the name of Jesus Christ, and certainly without a conscious conversion to Him, their problem was not that they were certain of hell in their religions—rather, it was that they lacked the power for service to God provided by the Keswick theology, just like the Jews did in the Old Testament dispensation. Meyer

---

[2580] Pg. 209, "The Indestructibility of the spirit," F. B. Meyer, in, *Spiritualism: Its Present-Day Meaning; A Symposium*, ed. Huntly Carter. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott, 1920.

[2581] Pgs. 21-23, 35, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer; italics in original.

[2582] Cf. *Haggai, Malachi. The New American Commentary*, R. A. Taylor & E. R. Clendenen on Malachi 1:11 for a defense of the future tenses of the verbs in translation and a Millennial interpretation of the verse.

[2583] Pgs. 26-27, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

was Keswick's great international ambassador because of his belief that heathen people could get eternal life through faith in their gods, but they needed the Higher Life only found in the Keswick doctrine to discover the secret of a happy life on earth. As in the Quakerism of Hannah W. Smith, Meyer believed men are not totally depraved, and religion ignorant of Jesus Christ can bring people to heaven, but Meyer thought non-Christian religions could not supply power for service—only Keswick could. "It is a mistake to suppose that the state of the world, as it is today, is due to the determined choice of man to be evil," for men are not determined to evil, and it certainly is not the case that "there is none that seeketh after God" (Romans 3:11) or that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart [is] only evil continually" (Genesis 6:5)—rather, all men have a "better self," so that even in "Heathenism . . . [m]en have seen and approved the better," and "the heart of man never ceased to feel after God . . . the soul of man has ever cried out for God, for the Living God . . .[and] sighed with unutterable and insatiable desire for light and life and love." Just like the world developed through long evolutionary ages, getting better and better over time, so the heathen are getting better and better over time. While heathens are not totally depraved, and many will be in heaven, nonetheless they do not have the power supplied by Keswick: "the state of the world . . . is due to inability to be and do the things which reason and conscience alike demand. . . . Natural Religion cannot supply power."[2584] Romans 7:14-25 is a description of both the righteous heathen who are headed to heaven without knowing of Christ, and of Jews in the Old Testament[2585]—the heathen will be saved, just like many Jews before Christ were saved, but power for service was lacking to both—hence the need to preach to the heathen, not so much justification by the objective substitutionary work of Christ, but the Higher Life of Keswick theology. Keswick, not the gospel, was the need of the idolater.

In light of Meyer's belief that pagan devil-worshippers were really worshippers of the true God, and the spiritualism associated with the foundations of Keswick at the Broadlands Conference, it is not surprising that he was weak in his condemnation of spiritualism. "Not all Christians regarded paranormal manifestations as necessarily evil. The Baptist theologian F. B. Meyer . . . believed telepathy and clairvoyance to be natural capacities of the mind, endowed by God, analogous to wireless telegraphy."[2586] Furthermore, Meyer believed that those on earth received visitations from the dead; for example, while preaching the funeral of one Mr. Buckley, Meyer stated that while

---

2584 Pgs. 39-41, 116ff., *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2585 Pgs. 39-40, 65-67, *The Wideness of God's Mercy*, Meyer.

2586 Pg. 70, *Photography and Spirit*, John Harvey. London: Reaktion Books, 2007.

Buckley was dying he "saw his spirit relations, and even called them by name."[2587] Direct communication with the dead was possible, Meyer affirmed.[2588] Meyer did not endorse spiritualism *per se*—it came in for general condemnation in his pamphlet *The Modern Craze of Spiritualism*. However, as a reviewer of his pamphlet noted, "[H]e deals too tenderly with clairvoyance, which . . . [is] an easy stepping-stone to the séance; and . . . he astonishes by saying that 'in passing over, the soul may sometimes manifest itself to the beloved ere it is definitely withdrawn into the presence of God,' . . . [a teaching which is] erroneous and dangerous."[2589] Thus, Meyer condemned what he recognized as spiritualism, but certain spiritualistic phenomena were not considered to truly be spiritualism. For F. B. Meyer, if not for Scripture, the dead did communicate with the living, and clairvoyance was an ability endowed by God—forms of what truly was spiritualism were acceptable.

F. B. Meyer did believe in the bare fact that believers should be immersed, and he performed a variety of ministries in and with Baptist churches, contributing to their being infected with his heresies, as well as serving as the leader of the Baptist Union during a period when it was capitulating to theological modernism and liberalism. While he contributed greatly to the infiltration of Keswick theology in Baptist churches, and contributed to the spread of continuationism and thus the rise of Pentecostalism, he was very far from an advocate of historic Baptist doctrine—he was a far better representative of the easy heterodoxy and ecumenical practice of Keswick.

Applications from the Life and Teachings of F. B. Meyer

F. B. Meyer would be better classified as a wolf in sheep's clothing than a Bible-believing, historic Baptist minister. His writings should be rejected, and he should be warned against. Why should God's people read the writings of one who propagated the standard errors of the Keswick theology, and who also gave no evidence of personal conversion, who accepted absurd eschatological fictions, who refused to contend for Baptist distinctives, who found liturgy and baptismal regeneration acceptable but rejected

---

2587 Pg. 28, "Spiritualism at the Leicester Cemetery," in *The Medium and Daybreak: A Weekly Journal Devoted to the History, Phenomena, Philosophy, and Teachings of Spiritualism*, 15:718 (January 11, 1884) 1-32.

2588 Pg. 208, "The Indestructibility of the spirit," F. B. Meyer, in, *Spiritualism: Its Present-Day Meaning; A Symposium*, ed. Huntly Carter. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott, 1920. Meyer affirmed that "what are thought to be direct communications with the spirits of the departed" are "largely," but not totally, "accounted for in other ways" than direct fellowship with the dead. That is, most spiritualistic phenomena are not actual encounters with the spirits of dead people, but some are.

2589 Pg. 577, "Book Notices," in *The Christian Worker's Magazine*, 20:7, March, 1920.

the Regulative Principle of worship, who was grossly ecumenical, who radically watered down the demands of the gospel and taught that heathen did not need to hear about and consciously believe in Jesus Christ to be saved, who rejected the truth that Christ propitiated God's wrath on the cross, who blasphemed Jehovah by claiming that Old Testament Israel thought He was only the God of the hills, not of the valleys, who blasphemed the Holy Spirit by claiming that He was thought of as an atmosphere, not a Person, for most of the history of the world, who rejected the verbal, plenary inspiration of Scripture for modernistic apostasy, and who spread continuationism, contributed to the rise of Pentecostalism, and was open to forms of spiritualism? Do not the writings of such a man have a better place in a fire than in the minds and hearts of the Triune Jehovah's people? Are they not laced with the sulfurous stench of the fires of hell? F. B. Meyer was a heretic, and the Lord's precious faithful ones should beware of both his pernicious personal influence and his baneful and continuing influence on the doctrines and practices of others. That such a man as he is hailed by the adherents of the Higher Life as Keswick's leading international representative provides yet another reason why Keswick theology must be rejected by true churches and faithful Christians.

While F. B. Meyer did not, you must treasure the power of the blessed gospel of Jesus Christ. Natural theology will only condemn, never save (Romans 1:18-32), but "the gospel of Christ . . . is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Romans 1:16). There is no other name than that of Jesus Christ by which men must be saved (John 14:6; Acts 4:12), and no other way of salvation than by repentant faith in Him and His substitutionary death, as validated by His resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:1-4). All who do not receive this gospel must necessarily perish eternally, but the Holy Spirit, through the Word, produces faith in countless of those who hear it (Romans 10:17; James 1:18), so that they are washed in Christ's blood, adopted into the family of their infinitely loving, gracious, and tender heavenly Father, and are enabled to join the eternal song in grateful worship of their God and Lord, Jesus Christ: "Thou art worthy . . . for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. . . . Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing" (Revelation 5:9-12)! Is not this gospel, this best of all Good News, worth proclaiming in all its purity to the ends of the earth, worth living in light of, and worth dying for? Where is the Christian who will not cry out, with his heart and soul, "Yes, it is so—Amen, Amen!" Then, dear reader, act upon this truth. Be part of reconciling the world to Christ by proclaiming His sweet name to all men unto the

very ends of the earth. Furthermore, do not allow the truth of this gospel to be corrupted in the least part. View with horror the wounds F. B. Meyer sought to inflict upon the gospel, and inflicted in truth upon countless precious souls who followed him in his damnable errors. Rather than rejecting, or being the slightest bit ashamed of the precious doctrines of propitiation and of penal substitution, let the penal substitution of Christ on the cross, and His appeasement of the Father's wrath thereon, be your only hope and confidence for a blessed eternity, and your joy and glory on earth even now. Treasure them in your heart. Meditate upon them in your mind. Speak of them everywhere, and be heartily thankful to God for them always. They are at the heart of that only saving gospel that is the undiluted power of God unto salvation.

Hate the abominable error of F. B. Meyer of preaching Keswick theology to unconverted heathen instead of preaching the gospel. Only God knows the numbers who are in hell today because of this fearful error and dereliction of obvious duty by Mr. Meyer and those whom he influenced. Meyer's practice in this regard is a clear example of how God is dishonored and people come to be eternally damned when cultural pressure is surrendered to, rather than resisted by, the Lord's church and people. Telling people in India that their heathen ancestors were saved, not lost, was surely easier and much more culturally acceptable. Surely there was great pressure to lie to them in this manner, as F. B. Meyer did, or at least downplay or equivocate on the truth, as many others did. What was the result? God's truth was not glorified, the gospel was corrupted, apostasy was furthered, and precious souls were deluded and lost. Reader, you must never under any circumstances surrender, be ashamed of, or water down anything taught in God's holy Word because of cultural pressure. "[F]ear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matthew 10:28). "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the LORD shall be safe" (Proverbs 29:25).

Christians must practice the methodology of gospel proclamation taught in Scripture. The book of Acts clearly teaches and models by example aggressive evangelism for every church member; all should go "every where preaching the word" (Acts 8:4), with the goal of preaching to "every creature which is under heaven" (Ephesians 1:23; Mark 16:15), that is, giving clear presentations of the gospel to every single person on the face of the earth. God's Word presents house-to-house evangelism as an explicit pattern of Scripture (Acts 5:42; 20:20-21). If Christians in the New Testament went out preaching "daily," you can certainly go persistently. If they sought to reach large groups at one time by preaching in the temple and other places "publickly," then Christian men should follow their pattern by preaching on the streets, and all

Christians should follow their pattern by distributing literature and proclaiming the gospel wherever sizeable groups of people can be found. If they also went "house to house," seeking to reach "every house," then you also ought to specifically reach every single household in your area and send forth laborers from your church who will seek to do so likewise in communities that are further away, until "all men every where" have heard the gospel (Acts 21:28; 19:10; Mark 16:15). Are you part of a church that is following the Biblical pattern and preaching publicly and house to house? If not, it is time to either start obeying Scripture or time to leave that church for a faithful congregation. If so, are you participating in this blessed and holy work, with zeal and love for Jesus Christ, and love for and holy boldness towards sinners? If not, now is the time to repent—now is the time to beg God for a heart like His for the lost.

Christian pastors and other spiritual leaders must by no means turn aside from the sufficient and God-glorifying Biblical methodology for gospel-proclamation to promotion and marketing techniques that violate Biblical principles. F. B. Meyer learned from D. L. Moody, and others, a variety of how-to methods that could draw large crowds and build a big church—but without a pure gospel, and without pure methods of proclaiming that gospel, the glory goes to man, not to God, and truly beneficial long-term results will not follow. A congregation may grow numerically as "an holy temple in the Lord" (Ephesians 2:21) filled with the blessings of Jehovah, or it may grow numerically utilizing unbiblical techniques and methodologies into a great mixed multitude of converted and unconverted people, filled with spiritual confusion and with the curse of the Lord. The latter sort of "growth" is more easily accomplished—it is within the potency of human might and power, while the former is solely through the power of God's Spirit—but the eternal consequences will be evident when each stands before the Judge of all the earth.

Believers must also exercise careful spiritual discernment about popular public speakers who are popular with the world and with broad Christendom. While God is certainly able to make a congregation large (cf. Acts 2:41), Christ also warned, "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets" (Luke 6:26). The size of a man's congregation, or the worldly success associated with it, is by no means a reliable indicator of the presence of true and vital spirituality or Divine blessing. Popularity does not indicate orthodoxy and orthopraxy. F. B. Meyer had huge congregations and tremendous popularity in his day, although, as his many heresies validate, he did not have the blessing of God. The prophets of Baal in Elijah's day had far larger congregations and far greater popularity than Elijah, and the Antichrist will command a greater following in the Tribulation period than any truly

godly preacher in church history. What is more, the blessing of God and true faithfulness will not always lead to a large congregation—you can have Christ's smile, keeping His Word and not denying His name, while yet having but "a little strength" (Revelation 3:8). Do not allow the desire for numerical growth to lead you to downplay, compromise on, or abandon one tittle of the truth. Far better to preserve the whole of the once-delivered and holy faith uncorrupted, yet be hated and rejected by the world, than to be a popular and accepted speaker but compromise it. For what is the eternal reward of the life to come in comparison to the temporal and fleeting reward of the praise of men of dust?

Beware of allowing error into your church, or into your own mind and heart, in the name of missions. It is a clear Biblical imperative for congregations to send out church-planters worldwide (cf. Acts 13:1-4), and God's people should be very desirous that God would call them, or their children, to such a blessed work. The reading of the biographies of great missionaries of the past to quicken a passion for missions is most commendable. However, false doctrine and practice must not be allowed in the name of missions. Sending an F. B. Meyer out worldwide to blaze abroad Keswick and modernistic heresies, or sending out a George Grubb to assail Christ's teaching on hell, fills the world with pseudo-Christian heresies rather than the pure gospel message and sows terrible worldwide confusion concerning the character of true Christianity and the faith Christ delivered to His churches. Keswick errors, continuationist errors, and many other errors are spread through biographies, testimonials, and other narratives of events on mission fields, the people of God relaxing their guard against false teaching because of the sacrifice or suffering of those in foreign lands. This must not be. Highly esteem Biblical mission work while refusing to bypass God's eternal truth in the name of foreign missions.

You must also reject spiritualism in all its forms—even those that deny that they are spiritualism. The devil is very unlikely to openly admit that he wishes you to reject God and follow him to utter ruin. Rather, he will perpetrate a multiplicity of deceptions to make himself appear like an angel of light. There are far more people who worship the devil while thinking that they are worshipping God than there are who intentionally and knowingly worship the devil. Be careful—more careful than Meyer was—in recognizing all the workings of Satan in spiritism and avoiding them all.

Reject theological modernism in all its forms—for, indeed, it is a form of the working of the devil. Reject rationalism and begin all your thinking with the only truly consistent logical foundation—the Word of God. Reject higher critical nonsense about the alleged evolutionary development of Biblical religion and the Hebrew Scriptures and accept the plain self-testimony of the Almighty to His own works in His Word. Reject

the fictional "Q" document and all higher critical ideas about the origin of the New Testament. Reject evolutionary lower critical ideas that deny the preservation of God's Word in the common Received Text and treat God's Book like some secular document. Indeed, reject evolution entirely and accept the truth of the creation of the world *ex nihilo* in six twenty-four hour days thousands, and not millions, of years ago. Every jot and tittle of the Bible is God's verbally, plenarily inspired Word, dictated by the Holy Ghost through holy men of old. Recognize this fact and oppose every idea and teaching that conflicts with it.

Baptists must by no means accept what someone teaches simply because he claims to be a Baptist. Since all the first century churches were Baptist churches, Judas, along with the other eleven Apostles, was a Baptist. Ananias and Sapphira were Baptists. Diotrephes was a Baptist. F. B. Meyer was, after a sort, a Baptist also—he was even the president of a Baptist Union for a time, albeit one that was rapidly slipping into utter apostasy and theological liberalism. It is not enough that one claims that he is a Baptist—rather, his doctrine and practice must be tried by the Word of God.

Learn also from Meyer the danger of Baptists forming Unions, Conventions, Associations, and other forms of "Baptist" hierarchicalism not found in Scripture. The pernicious influence of Meyer's modernism, and of many modernists like him, was able to corrupt many more churches because of their position in the Baptist Union. The leaven in the Union spread throughout the organization, corrupting church after sound church, until all that did not separate was leavened. Not a scrap of Scripture supports the existence of any denominational hierarchy—all that the Lord Jesus has authorized in the New Testament is the local, visible, independent and autonomous congregation. All Conventions, Unions, and the like are certain to fall into false teaching, for the Lord Jesus has not promised to protect them, nor has He promised His special presence with them—such promises are only given to His church. Nor can hundreds of assemblies with diverse views on all sorts of doctrine and practice unite in a Union, Association, or any other formal structure without setting aside some of what the Bible teaches, violating from the very beginning the requirements of Scripture to contend for all of the faith. Within the church it is possible that "no other doctrine" (1 Timothy 1:3) at all than the truth is advocated—in all forms of Baptist hierarchicalism such purity is impossible. Churches of like precious faith can work together as they see fit, but once they form parachurch or suprachurch organizations the seed of compromise has already been sown. Let the Lord's churches learn from the destruction of the Baptist Union, and countless similar organizations—let them remain independent, unaffiliated, and truly autonomous, that they may be truly holy—as separation, both personal and ecclesiastical, is inherent in true

holiness, so ecumenicalism of any kind is inherently unholy—so that they may be truly pleasing to their sole and sufficient Head and Husband, Jesus Christ.

Learn from F. B. Meyer's example the danger and damage unconverted church members can do—and how much the more danger there is in unconverted ministers. How much evil came to the Baptist churches of England through a failure to guard their baptisteries and membership roles! How many more congregations would be faithfully practicing the truth today had previous generations rigidly allowed none to be baptized into the membership of their churches who could not clearly testify to personal conversion and possessed a life that bore the evident marks of supernatural regeneration? Modernism and rationalism were able to spread like wildfire in late nineteenth century British nonconformity because many church members and ministers were already unconverted and were thus susceptible to the wanton embrace of any alluring heresy that came along. How much better it would have been for F. B. Meyer personally—and for Baptists in his country generally—had he been forbidden to submit to God's holy baptismal ordinance because of his lack of anything like a clear conversion? How much the more evil was it to allow him to enter the Baptist ministry in the same state? Let no one today deceive himself into thinking that results the less pernicious will result from a similar practice. Only churches that carefully guard their membership role, doing all that is in their power to restrict their congregation to true saints both by great care in who they allow into the baptistery and by the consistent practice of church discipline, can expect to be preserved from apostasy in the long term.

Unlike Meyer, you must cleave to and contend for a sound and robust Baptist polity. Love the Lord Jesus Christ, and, like your Master, be dogmatic and defend all the truths of the written Word. Defend, even unto death, believer's immersion as a church ordinance and the door to membership in Christ's congregation. Reject all liturgy and embrace the Regulative Principle of worship. Be jealous over the purity of Biblical worship, even as your God is jealous over it. Reject open communion; protect Christ's precious Supper as Paul commanded in 1 Corinthians 11. Preach the Word—all of it, from the verbal inspiration of Scripture, to the necessity of faith in the Triune God for salvation, to the fire and brimstone in the lake of fire, to the restriction of Spirit baptism to the book of Acts and the cessation of the sign gifts to the first century, to the historic Baptist doctrine of sanctification.

Are you a member of a Bible-believing and practicing historic Baptist church? Marvel, and be filled with humble and aweful amazement, at your glorious privilege—you have not only been chosen to be part of God's spiritual and invisible kingdom through the new birth, but have been added by baptism to Christ's own body, temple, and

bride! What opportunities you have to walk closely with God! You are a living stone in God's holy temple. Oh, how necessary it is for you to live like one!

IV. Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis

Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis were the central minister and the most influential expositor,[2590] respectively, of the Welsh holiness revivalism concentrated from "December 1904 to May 1905,"[2591] co-opting and eclipsing a genuine revival movement in Wales that had already been taking place. Roberts received infant "baptism a few weeks after his birth on June 8, 1878,"[2592] and grew up in the Calvinistic Methodist denomination. His "name appears in the church roll for the first time in 1893-94" after taking a "preparation class,"[2593] but evidence of his own personal conversion is very weak at best.[2594] A minister claimed that he had been the instrument some time after 1898 of Roberts' "conversion or consecration,"[2595] but Roberts himself does not appear to

---

2590 Of course, other men were involved, such as "W. S. Jones," who not long before 1904 "had a vision," after which it "soon became evident that God had chosen him to be the first receiver and transmitter of Holy Spirit baptism. Around him there gathered a group of young pastors such as Keri Evans, W. W. Lewis and D. Saunders who sought the same experience" (pgs. xvi-xvii, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones). Nevertheless, "Evan Roberts . . . must be placed at the center of events" (Pg. xviii, *ibid*.).

2591 Pg. 65, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones. It is worth noting that practically all the resources employed in this study of Roberts, Penn-Lewis, and the Welsh revival are written by men sympathetic or even adulatory of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis and hostile to their critics. For example, one of the least adulatory and most even-handed writers, J. Vyrnwy Morgan, stated that "he would rather burn . . . [his] manuscript . . . than be the cause of adversely affecting the work of God through Mr. Roberts . . . I have . . . profound regard for Mr. Evan Roberts" (pg. 268, *The Welsh Religious Revival, 1904-5: A Retrospect and a Criticism*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1909). Morgan notes: "The title of this volume should not be taken as implying any hostility to revivals. Criticism is the science of discrimination, and it is the science upon which this [book] is based" (pg. xi). Other works cited frequently do not hesitate to attack the character, impugn the motives, and employ other unjustifiable tactics to oppose critics of Roberts, Penn-Lewis, and their ministries. They certainly were by no means out to put Roberts or Penn-Lewis in a bad light.

2592 Pg. 3, *An Instrument of Revival: The Complete Life of Evan Roberts, 1878-1951*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

2593 Pg. 5, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2594 Roberts' very sympathetic biographer B. P. Jones believes that Roberts was converted "[a]t some point" (pg. 5, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones) but gives no specific or certain details or words of Roberts himself about this event which Jones affirms took place. Similarly, S. B. Shaw records Roberts' birth, youth, and entrance into revivalistic work in the Welsh holiness revival with not a jot or tittle of reference to Roberts' experience of personal conversion (pgs. 121-125, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905). Nor does W. T. Stead record a syllable that recounts a reasonable personal conversion testimony in his account of Evan Roberts' life (pgs. 41ff., *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead)—Roberts passes from thinking he is not a Christian to being someone who has visions and encounters with supernatural forces and therefore concluding that he belongs to God.

2595 Pg. 9, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

have affirmed that he was born again at that time—indeed, Roberts testified that he was not a Christian until a number of months before the onset of the holiness revival.[2596] The closest one can come from Roberts' own words to a conversion testimony appears to be a time when he was "taking steps to enter ministerial training" and seeking to be "baptized with the Spirit." Hearing a "voice . . . within his troubled heart" about willingness to receive the Spirit, "he went . . . to the chapel" where he was residing and at that meeting, affirmed:

> What boiled in my bosom was the verse, "For God commendeth his love." I fell on my knees with my arms outstretched on the seat before me. The perspiration poured down my face and my tears streamed quickly until I thought the blood came out. Mrs. Davies of Mona, Newquay, came to wipe my face, and Magdalen Phillips stood on my right and Maud Davies on my left. I cried, "Bend Me, Bend Me, Bend Me. . . . OH! OH! OH! . . . After I was bended, a wave of peace and joy filled my bosom.[2597]

Roberts affirmed that "Living Energy" came and "invaded his soul, burst all his bonds, and overwhelmed him," and he "gave his testimony at the afternoon service" about this experience "as if it were a kind of conversion or new birth"[2598] through seeking and receiving Spirit baptism. Evan Roberts testified that a "living energy or force enter[ed] his bosom till it held his breath and made his legs tremble,"[2599] which he took to be evidence that his sins were forgiven and that the spirit that entered him, hindering his breathing and making his legs wobbly, was the Holy Spirit. Such "bodily agitations . . . [and] convulsions were the natural and legitimate results of the new birth,"[2600] in his view, although his landlady turned him out of the house, having "become afraid of him," fearing "he was possessed or somewhat mad."[2601] Although there are not strong grounds to conclude that Roberts was, at whatever point, genuinely converted, and not just the subject of a variety of powerful religious experiences arising from his flesh or from the devil, at least "ever since he had been filled with the Spirit he had been physically conscious of the Spirit's prohibitions and commands"[2602] in voices and visions; he "began to have visions"[2603] from the time of his Spirit baptism and alleged conversion, so

---

2596 Pg. 41, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. "[A]ccording to his own account . . . he was not a Christian until little more than fifteen months" before Stead wrote his book in 1904 (*ibid*).

2597 Pg. 24, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Note the discussion by the headmaster of the school where Roberts prepared for the ministry for a few weeks on pgs. 110-112, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2598 Pgs. 23-24, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2599 Pg. 19, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones.

2600 Pg. 234, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2601 Pg. 42, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2602 Pg. 108, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2603 Pg. 111, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

that "it is evident that Evan Roberts [was] conscious that he ha[d] received a gift of prophecy through his baptism of the Spirit."[2604] Roberts' experiences were comparable to those of "St. Teresa, Jakob Boehme, George Fox, [and] Ignatius Loyola,"[2605] having the same sources in the spirit world as such Roman Catholic, theosophist, and Quaker luminaries. When "Dr. Williams, the phrenologist[,][2606] . . . measured [his] cranium, deduced certain patterns," and "told . . . the young miner, 'You ought to be a preacher,'" an affirmation also confirmed by a minister who had heard Roberts pray publicly one time, Evan was guided no longer to be a miner but a minister.[2607] However, his education for the ministry was extremely limited, as was his education in general, although he was "deeply influenced" by "C. R. Sheldon's *In His Steps*."[2608] Roberts "left school at age twelve, laboured in coal mines for twelve years, undertook part-time study and a brief pre-college course . . . [and] had no pastoral or evangelistic experience"[2609] when he became the center of the Welsh holiness revival in 1904, although a novice (1 Timothy 3:6), one whose "schooldays were few and irregular,"[2610] and "an unqualified preacher

---

2604 Pg. 178, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2605 Pg. 180, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2606 "Franz Gall (1758–1828) and Johann Spurzheim (1776–1832) developed an early physiological psychology known as phrenology, which held three fundamental positions: the exterior conformation of the skull corresponds to the interior (brain); mind is analyzable into a number of functions (e.g., combativeness, hope, acquisitiveness, cautiousness, and secretiveness); and the functions of mind are differentially localized in the brain, and an excess in any function is correlated with an enlargement of the corresponding place in the brain. . . . [T]he term *phrenology* mean[s] literally the science of the mind. The theory asserted that personality and character traits could be judged by the location and size of bumps on the skull. . . . Some 37 localized areas of the brain were specified to contain independent and inherited regions relating to such character traits as self-esteem, conscientiousness, and spirituality. Three general character types—mental, motive, and vital—facilitated grouping of personalities. Phrenology maps were drawn to indicate the locations of particular faculties and were then used to analyze the corresponding bumps on the skull of a client. . . . Phrenology had a certain popular appeal; people thought personality could be determined by feeling an individual's skull. However, phrenology was never accepted by scientists because its methodology was largely anecdotal. . . . The charlantanlike activities of Gall and Spurzheim and the multiplicity of faculties made phrenology the last faculty psychology" (pgs. 427, 790, 872, *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling* (2nd ed.), D. G. Benner & P. C. Hill. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999). Interestingly, one of Evan Roberts' "heavily involved" helpers was "Annie May Rees, the daughter of a phrenologist" (pg. 52, see 76ff., *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones).

2607 Pg. 10, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Pg. 110 mentions Evan's interaction with another phrenologist later.

2608 Pg. 6, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. "Sheldon, a Congregational minister, followed the liberal teaching of his day that Christ was merely an example," and thus the book "promotes a social gospel rather than the Saving Gospel of Jesus Christ," one of "[w]alking in the steps of Jesus" rather than "trust[ing] in His saving merits and vicarious satisfaction to get to Heaven" (*Calvary Contender*, 10/15/1997; elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, ed. David Cloud).

2609 Pg. xiii, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2610 Pg. 55, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

with only six weeks of adult pre-college education."[2611] Incapable of careful exegesis of the Bible, he taught "experience-based doctrine" and held to "no dogmatic beliefs," since he was "totally untrained" for "systematic theological instruction" or "expository preaching."[2612] "Evan Roberts was not intellectual . . . was moved more by his emotions than by his ideas . . . was more intuitive than inductive or deductive . . . had no fundamental doctrine, no system of theology, no distinctive ideal."[2613] He did not follow the pattern of Christ and the Apostles, as well as of earlier revival preachers such as Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield, or earlier instruments of revival in Wales,[2614] by preaching boldly and specifically on sin, calling men to repentance, and strongly warning about hell and judgment to come (Matthew 5:22-30). Instead, Roberts set forth "no *dies irae* to terrify, but a *dies caritas* to win its way[.] . . . Sin—or at least vice—[was] seldom denounced[.]"[2615] Indeed, Roberts stated: "What need have these people [in the Welsh holiness revival] to be told that they are sinners?"[2616] Furthermore, "Roberts does not call his hearers to repentance . . . but speaks of having been called to fulfill the words of the prophet Joel. 'Your old men shall dream dreams; your young men shall see visions.'" Rather than preaching repentance, Roberts "frequently describe[d] visions that had appeared to him."[2617] Surely describing visions will bring more to salvation than preaching repentance. He also "told his congregations that he had 'not come to terrify them by preaching about the horrors of eternal damnation'" and "told reporters . . . 'I preach nothing but Christ's love,'" after the manner of the preaching of Hannah W. Smith.[2618] Nevertheless, "his message was not so much Christocentric as pneuma-centric, a result of the influence of the Holiness movement, especially the

---

2611 Pg. 96, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; pg. 85, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2612 Pgs. 253, 5, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2613 Pg. 55, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2614 Thus, Vyrnwy Morgan noted "an unmistakable change of character . . . [in] the general record of revivals" in the years that led up to and included the Welsh holiness revival; "the notion of a material hell is gone, never to return[.] . . . There has been a change of emphasis. It used to be on hell; it is now on character; it used to be on wrath; it is now on conduct" (xiv-xvi, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan).

2615 Pg. 154, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. For example, Roberts said, "there's no need to preach against the drink [alcohol]"—rather, a solely positive message was sufficient (pg. 54, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

2616 Pg. 49, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2617 Pg. 47, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Stead quotes the *South Wales Daily News* of November 14, 1904.

2618 E. g., "Mrs. Smith went herself to a man in prison, who was condemned to death for murder. . . . She only told him how God loved him, and grieved over him, stayed with him, and told him again and again, till he was conquered" (pg. 163, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

teaching of Keswick;"[2619] Roberts spoke at the Welsh Keswick Conference at Llandrindod Wells in 1905 at the height of the holiness revival excitement.[2620] While Keswick proper was key for Roberts, Keswick antecedents, such as the "experience . . . called 'perfect love' or Christian perfection' taught by J. Wesley and J. Fletcher . . . [were also] given attention in this revival."[2621] Thus, while earlier revivals had recognized that the Spirit of God did not speak of Himself, but of Christ (John 16:13-14), Evan Roberts stressed (as William Boardman had before him) that there "were thousands of believers in our churches who have received Christ, but had never received the Holy Ghost," a change of emphasis from "[h]eretofore" when "the work of Christ ha[d] been the all-important truth."[2622] However, very often Roberts did not preach at all. Services became closer to the pattern, though not necessarily the volume, of the Quaker meeting, where everything was spontaneously enacted as led, allegedly, by the Holy Spirit.[2623] Roberts' meetings "remin[d] one of the Quakers . . . they would feel themselves thoroughly at home in [them]."[2624] Earlier Welsh revival movements "exalted the preacher," but this "feature . . . was missing in the Revival of 1904-5,"[2625] which contributed to "the decline of the sermon."[2626] Indeed, the "pastor . . . was practically regarded as an alien in the Commonwealth of Israel. The prevailing sentiment was . . . [to] than[k] the Lord that He had shunted the ministers to the *sideline*. [One] never heard a word from the Revivalist in public in recognition of the Welsh ministry, nor saw a single act that showed appreciation of their position."[2627] Rather than emphasizing the study of and

---

2619 Pgs. 520-521, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2620 Pg. 171, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2621 Pg. 137, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2622 Pg. 7, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

2623 In the words of the Quaker Jessie Penn-Lewis: "Pastors allowed the services to take any form that might arise from the movement of the Spirit. Anyone might rise to speak or lead in prayer without fear, and sermons were put aside when the need rose" (pg. 63, *The Awakening in Wales*), following the pattern of the Quaker meeting, and neglecting the fact that certain elements of worship, including preaching, were ordained by the sovereign authority of God the Holy Ghost for worship in the New Testament (cf. 2 Timothy 4:2).

2624 Pgs. 30-31, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Stead gives as an exception the quantity of singing in the holiness revival meetings, a point—the sole significant point—of discontinuity, although at times even this discontinuity was eliminated and "effective reversion to the practice of the Society of Friends" appeared (pgs. 50-51, *ibid*).

2625 Pg. 76, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. This neglect of Evan Roberts "helped to kill what otherwise might have been an impetus to reverence, peace, and vital religion in the land for years to come." Furthermore, even when preaching was not abandoned, it "deteriorated in its quality . . . becoming excessively . . . superficial" as well as not being "doctrinal" (pg. 134, *ibid*.).

2626 Pg. 177, *The Pentecostals*, Walter J. Hollenweger. London: SCM Press, 1972.

2627 Pg. 184, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original. Writing in 1909, Morgan continued: "During the Revival [ministers] were counted as nothing. Not a word of appreciation did they

unquestioned obedience to Scripture, and exalting the preached Word, Roberts placed tremendous stress upon instant, immediate, and unquestioning obedience to the "voice from within," that "voice" that drove him into public ministry and guided him in his work.[2628] During significant portions of the Welsh holiness revival, "clergymen [noted that] [s]ince the revival began [Evan Roberts] has not taken a Bible verse and made comments as preachers do;"[2629] indeed, "there was very little sermonizing of any kind,"[2630] as frequently "sermons [are] put aside for testimony."[2631] "Those who came to hear a great sermon, or even *a* sermon, were disillusioned. [Roberts] was not an expositor or even a fluent speaker," but rather gave forth "broken sentences" at intervals in his chaotic meetings.[2632] People recognized that "[p]reaching is not generally acceptable at these spontaneous meetings."[2633] "Preaching, in the usual acceptation of the word, has . . . been entirely discarded," as instead "services are throughout spontaneous, resembling a Quaker's meeting."[2634] Indeed, "the Welsh revival might be regarded as a

---

receive when emotionalism was at its height. They are still suffering. For ministers as a class Evan Roberts had not a single word of appreciation, though the harvest was the fruit of the seed that they and their predecessors had planted. . . . The same unsympathetic attitude was assumed by Evan Roberts towards aged Christians. . . . [T]aking a general view of the religious life of Wales today, the name 'minister' is not the call-word that it used to be. . . . It has been stripped of its former force, magnitude and richness. It means less in the home, the school, and the community at large. The average minister is now under toleration. . . . [A]t the time of the Revival [this downgrade in ministerial status] took a very acute form. Ministers were not in demand, their services were dispensed with and their claims to leadership denied. We are only beginning to realize its effect" (pgs. 188-189, 202-203, *ibid*). See also pg. 65, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

[2628] Pg. 61, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan; cf. pg. 45, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Compare the reproduction of Roberts' principles, including that of unquestioned obedience to what one identifies as the Spirit, and the adulatory account of his work in the Welsh holiness revival along with an adulatory obituary in the articles "The Great Welsh Revival," Ruth Russell and "Evan Roberts is Dead" (pgs. 11-12, *The Pentecostal Evangel* 1928 (April 1922, 1951).

[2629] Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2630] Pg. 222, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

[2631] Pg. 64, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

[2632] Pg. 55, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original. Also pg. 40, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

[2633] Pg. 49, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Scripture never commands men to sing the gospel to every creature, and never teaches that congregational singing is evangelistic or man-directed rather than being God-directed worship, affirming on the contrary that "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Corinthians 1:21). Nevertheless, under Evan Roberts "the revival . . . has followed the line of song, not of preaching" (pg. 33-34, *The Great Revival in Wales*, Shaw).

[2634] Pgs. 9, 106, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

triumph for Quakerism."[2635] However, preaching the Word was not necessary, since Roberts had "no body of doctrine to present," but instead gave out "prophetic messages and exhortations . . . in place of expository teaching."[2636] Following the pattern of the early Keswick conventions, Roberts declared that he never studied the Bible to prepare a message. "I never prepare what I shall speak, but leave that to Him," he declared. This was possible because Roberts had no substantive doctrine to communicate: "There is no question of creed or of dogma in this movement . . . only the wonder and beauty of Christ's love."[2637] Instead of rightly dividing the Word, Roberts gave inspired "prophetic message[s]"[2638] to others. It was not necessary to preach the inspired Bible when "people called 'inspiration'" Roberts' own words and marvels.[2639] After all, Roberts testified: "We now, like the prophets of old, have . . . . transmitt[ed] . . . 'The Word of the Lord' . . . to the Church."[2640] Thus, "[o]ne of the most striking things about the Revival of 1904-5 was the comparative absence of teaching," for it employed "little theology of a definite and systematic kind," preferring "visionary and ecstatic" experiences.[2641] Observers noted:

> [A meeting would] practically resolv[e] itself into a singing festival[.] . . . At times, while one section is singing a hymn, another section in the chapel starts off a wholly different one. This is interspersed with short, spasmodic addresses by Mr. Roberts, relating to visions he has witnessed. Singing is kept up hour after hour—the same tunes and words being interminably repeated—far into the early hours of the morning . . . young girls and women, fatigued with exertion, are strung up to a pitch of feverish excitement. Their emotions overpower them and they break out into wild cries and gesticulations . . . [which] are put down as a manifestation of the Spirit. Some participants have since been confined to their homes with nervous prostration.[2642]

In the sharpest contrast to the revivals in the book of Acts, in the work of Evan Roberts singing was employed "rather than . . . the Gospel message . . . being . . . preached. . . .

[2635] Pg. 190, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Shaw affirmed that the lack of order in the service is the most obvious similarity.

[2636] Pg. 224, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pg. 99.

[2637] Pg. 34, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2638] Pg. 121, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Jones records part of one particular message Roberts received to give to his former tutor, John Phillips, on pg. 121.

[2639] Pg. 66, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. "According to the teaching of the 'New Theology' . . . Evan Roberts was inspired . . . undoubtedly. But if we fall back upon the old theology for our interpretation of inspiration, Evan Roberts was not inspired" (*ibid*, pgs. 67-68).

[2640] Pg. 180, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

[2641] Pg. 82, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. "[T]here . . . is . . . precious little . . . teaching[.] . . . Do you think that teaching is what people want in a revival?" (pg. 35, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905). Also pgs. 24-25, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

[2642] Pgs. 263-264, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

The sermon is a poor thing compared with the . . . song."[2643] While in the Bible preaching brought supernatural conviction and conversion (Acts 2:37-42), the work of Evan Roberts recognized that the Welsh were "taught to death, preached to insensibility."[2644] "Evan Roberts . . . makes no sermons . . . is . . . no[t] a preacher. . . . [P]reaching is emphatically not the note of this Revival[.] . . . If it has been by the foolishness of preaching men have been saved heretofore, that agency seems as if it were destined to take a back seat in the present movement."[2645] At least this was the case for the preaching of the Bible—but Roberts's "inspired preaching,"[2646] his "inspiration of the exalted and supernatural kind,"[2647] was considered a sufficient replacement for the exposition of the Word. He asked, "Why should I teach [the Bible] when the Spirit is teaching?"[2648] However, in places in Wales where "greater emphasis on preaching and teaching" was made, there were "more lasting and beneficial results" than there were from Roberts' "lack of clear biblical teaching" and emphasis upon "what he claimed to be the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit,"[2649] at least among traditional denominational groups such as the Baptists and Calvinistic Methodists, although Roberts' method of neglecting the Word for other revelations was central to the rise of Pentecostalism.

Evan Roberts "claimed to have received over twenty ecstatic visions during the earlier part of 1904, which left him elated but strangely perplexed." He placed an "emphasis on direct and unmediated divine inspiration," so that his "near clairvoyant tendency . . . bec[ame] such a marked feature of his ministry [and] was given full rein. He would claim regularly . . . that he knew by divine intuition of particular individuals' specific sins and of their need to repent openly in order for his meetings to continue. These claims caused some consternation."[2650] Indeed, Roberts began his own ministry

---

2643 Pg. 31, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Comparison was also made to the liturgy of Eastern Orthodoxy, where preaching is most certainly set to the side (pg. 38, *ibid*). The "Singing Sisters," who included "a professional singer . . . are as conspicuous figures in the movement as Evan Roberts himself"—they are "as indispensable as Mr. Sankey was to Mr. Moody." (pgs. 49, 32, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead) Roberts testified: "[T]he Singing Sisters . . . [are] [m]ost useful. They go with me wherever I go. I never part from them without feeling that something is absent if they are not there" (pg. 49, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

2644 Pg. 26, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2645 Pg. 38, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2646 Pg. 163, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2647 Pg. 73, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2648 Pg. 49, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2649 Pg. 101, *A Light in the Land: Christianity in Wales, 200-2000,* Gwyn Davies.

2650 "Roberts, Evan," *A Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals,* ed. Timothy Larsen.

after he "claimed to have a vision"[2651] authorizing the beginning of his revival work and "hear[ing] a voice bidding him go . . . and speak."[2652] He felt "his whole body shaking and his sight also wavering," after which "he seemed to see the people" of a certain city and "men sitting in rows" in a schoolroom, heard a "voice" telling him to go to them, and then saw the room where he was "filled with light [as] dazzling [as] . . . the glory as of the light of the sun in heaven," and although he wondered if "this was a deceiving vision from Satan," he concluded it was not, and left school to work for holiness revival because of "the vision and the voice calling him" with "his support—the God of visions."[2653] During "the few weeks"[2654] of his training for the ministry he "claim[ed] that he was under the Spirit's command when he missed a class or forgot a study period or failed to finish an essay"[2655] and "he would open a book, only to find it flaming in his hands . . . [t]his experience increased daily until the awe that possessed him made it impossible to battle on . . . [and] Dr. Hughes, an American specialist . . . [affirmed] that Evan was suffering from religious mania,"[2656] so that Evan "came under personal attack as a lunatic at worst and eccentric at best."[2657] Concerning one vision, Evan testified: "For the space of four hours I was privileged to speak face to face with Him as a man speaks face to face with a friend," a privilege Moses alone had among the Old Testament prophets (Exodus 33:11; Numbers 12:8). However, Evan's visions went beyond even what Moses experienced. The Bible states that nobody has seen God the Father at any time, but only the Son of God has been seen (John 1:18), but Roberts claimed to regularly see "God the Father Almighty . . . and the Holy Spirit," rather than only "Jesus Christ" as did the prophets of the Bible;[2658] his experiences were comparable to those of Teresa of Avila, who likewise claimed she conversed with God the Father rather than Jesus Christ.[2659]

2651 Pg. 230, *The Making of the Modern Church: Christianity in England since 1800* (New ed.), B. G. Worrall. London: SPCK, 1993.

2652 Pg. 86, 112, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2653 Pgs. 17-19, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. See also pgs. 21, 25, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones; pg. 45, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead, gives the account in Roberts' own words, including Roberts' asking a confidant if his vision was "of the devil."

2654 Pg. 85, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2655 Pg. 18, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. It is noteworthy that, in his revival meetings, "[a]rriving late [was] usual" for Roberts (pg. 71, *ibid*.).

2656 Pgs. 18-19, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2657 Pg. 28, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2658 Pg. 44, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2659 Pgs. 44-45, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. One recalls Hannah W. Smith's satisfaction with the "bare God" who could be approached apart from Christ.

Indeed, Roberts testified: "I . . . sp[oke] face to face with Him [the Father] as a man speaks face to face with a friend" for "hours" every night "for three or four months," and then "again retur[ned] to earth."[2660] Unless Evan Roberts was a false prophet and under Satanic delusion, a greater than Moses was here, and so the possibility that "Roberts [was] . . . intending to set" a "notebook" with his writings "beside the writings of the New Testament" as a record of inspired revelations is explicable.[2661] At times "a tremor ran through him, and his face and neck were observed to quiver in a remarkable way."[2662] His work in the Welsh holiness revival teemed with "experiences of visions, voices, and ecstasies."[2663] "His bodily agitations were awful to behold. They filled the hearts of children with fear, bewildered and astounded men of mature years, and caused hysterical women to faint."[2664] On at least one occasion he records in his diary: "I was commanded not to read my Bible"[2665] for an entire day by a voice.[2666] It was not necessary, however, for Roberts to get guidance by searching the Scriptures, for he "adopted the practice of writing down a problem, placing the paper on to an open Bible and leaving the room for the Holy Spirit to write down an answer,"[2667] and in this way he could get solutions to his problems.

In 1906, the same year he went to the Keswick Convention and was invited to give a special address,[2668] Roberts moved into the Penn-Lewis household after Jessie Penn-Lewis had visions about him,[2669] leaving behind "the confusion of South Wales where there were disorderly meetings at Carmarthen, dancing and barking at Llannon, a prophesying curate at Llanelly, [and] a persuasive woman healer in Swansea,"[2670] while by 1907 there were "many instances . . . [of] prostrations and trance visions and such

---

2660 Pg. 43, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2661 Pg. 181, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; cf. Henri Bois, *Le Reveil dans le pays de Galles,* pgs. 460-461.

2662 Pg. 86, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2663 Pg. 165, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

2664 Pg. 234, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2665 Pg. 116, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2666 Roberts also taught that it was acceptable to read only one verse of the Bible a day (pg. 52, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead), although reading more of the Bible was commendable.

2667 Pg. 523, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2668 Pg. 129, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

2669 Pgs. 159-160, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

2670 Pg. 160, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

manifestations as *guiding lights* and *angelic helps*."[2671] Indeed, Roberts experienced almost innumerable visitations from the spirit world and made "many statements about special guidance by vision and voices"[2672] both before, during, and after the Welsh holiness revival. "[H]e claims as his guide . . . the inner voice . . . the Spirit tells him when to speak and when to be silent, to whom he may grant an audience and whom he must refuse, what places to visit and the places he must avoid."[2673] Thus, Roberts was directed by visions of Satan and sundry other spiritual beings concerning where he should go to hold meetings.[2674] In one often-mentioned vision[2675] he claimed he "was taken up into a great expanse without time or space—it was communion with God. Before this it was a far-off God that I had. . . . I was frightened that night . . . [s]o great was my shivering that I rocked the bed and my brother awakened [and] took hold of me, thinking I was ill. After that I was awakened every night a little after one" to experience similar communion, although without the same fear, "for about four hours. . . . About five I was allowed to sleep[.]"[2676] Frequently his visions "caused his body to shake."[2677] He had a "vision . . . [of] a kind of arm stretching out from the moon in the direction of earth,"[2678]

2671 Pg. 170, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

2672 Pg. 60, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. For further visions not listed below, see, e. g., pgs. 47ff., *The Revival in the West*, Stead.

2673 Pg. 89, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2674 As Roberts recounted to the local newspaper:

> He [Roberts] said . . . It was . . . at Newcastle Emlyn. For days he had been brooding over the apparent failure of modern Christian agencies; and he felt wounded in the spirit that the Church of God should so often be attacked. It was about four p. m. Suddenly, in the hedge on his left, he saw a face full of scorn, hatred, and derision, and heard a laugh as of defiance. It was the Prince of this World, who exulted in his despondency. Then there suddenly appeared another figure, gloriously arrayed in white, bearing in hand a flaming sword borne aloft. The sword fell athwart the first figure, and it instantly disappeared. He could not see the face of the swordbearer. "Do you not see the moral?" queried [Roberts], with face beaming with delight. "Is it not that the Church of Christ is to be triumphant? . . . "I know what I saw. It was a distinct vision. There was no mistake. And, full of the promise which that vision conveyed, I went to Loughor, and from Loughor to Aberdare, and from Aberdare to Pontycymmer. And what do I see? The promise literally fulfilled. The sword descending on all hands, and Satan is put to flight. Amen." (pgs. 47-48, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead, reproducing an article from the *South Wales Daily News*, November 19).

2675 Roberts' experience paralleled that of Madame Guyon, who testified: "It seemed to me that God came at the precise time and woke me from sleep in order that I might enjoy Him" (pg. 43, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

2676 Pg. 86, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905); cf. pgs. 14-15, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones, pgs. 60-62, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

2677 Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2678 Pgs. 25-26, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; Pgs. 79, 136, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

"many visions about the sufferings of Jesus,"[2679] a "terrifying vision of hell,"[2680] a "vision . . . [of] a great conflict between Satan and the Archangel of God,"[2681] a "vision of a white horse and of a key which opened the Gate of Life,"[2682] a vision of "a person dressed in white, with a glittering sword in his hand, striking the devil until he fled and vanished,"[2683] various "visions of the devil and of the blessed Saviour,"[2684] and "dreams . . . such as that of Satan's face sneering at him in the midst of some garden shrubs"[2685]—although Satan not only sneered at Roberts in gardens in dreams, but also appeared while Roberts was walking in a garden hedge, until a glorious figure in white—the Church—struck Satan and made him disappear.[2686] Thus, "Evan Roberts . . . speaks of God and the devil with the assurance not only of one who has had communication with them, but who has actually seen them. The devil grins at him in his garden, he goes back into the house, and when he returns Jesus Christ is there smiling at him."[2687] After seeing a book called *The Gospel in Art*, he "experienced a new series of visions, each of which was centered upon biblical scenes," although the pictures in the book "bore a striking resemblance to his visions" of the actual events.[2688] Because of "visions and voices," in his revival meetings he said, "I have to say strange things,"[2689] and services, the large majority of the time, had "the scripture readings and . . . sermon" omitted for people getting up "to sing or speak" without any order.[2690] In his meetings, "the din was tremendous . . . constant interruptions [of] the speakers [took place as] excited men and women [rose] to pray, testify, sing, ask questions, recite verses, etc. . . . formal preaching [was] an impossibility."[2691] "Pentecostal enthusiasm" required that there "was no preaching . . .

[2679] Pg. 97, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. See pg. 138 for one example, where the figure that appeared to Roberts and was identified as "Jesus" was "looking smiling and pleasant," and so Roberts was sure that the particular "mission" he was then on "would succeed."

[2680] Pg. 521, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

[2681] Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2682] Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2683] Pg. 79, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

[2684] Pg. 136, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

[2685] Pg. 18, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2686] See pgs. 47-48, *The Revival in the West*, Stead.

[2687] Pg. 188, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Roberts said: "When I go out to the garden I see the devil grinning at me, but I am not afraid of him; I go into the house, and when I go out again to the back I see Jesus Christ smiling at me. Then I know all is well" (pg. 54, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

[2688] Pg. 105, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2689] Pg. 40, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2690] Pgs. 48-49, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; cf. pg. 99.

[2691] Pg. 48, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. Compare the account of women and young girls leading Andrew Murray's congregation in prayer, and the entire congregation in confusion, on

for . . . months" in various congregations.[2692] This de-emphasis upon preaching was accounted for by the conclusion that "Evan Roberts had a 'ministry of gifts' rather than a 'ministry of the Word,'"[2693] but while there was not much preaching of God's Word, at least there appeared to be plenty of alleged gifts, as Roberts believed that all the spiritual gifts of the Apostolic age were to be present and active in his day. On those instances where Roberts did attempt to preach, he might be "interrupted about thirty times by pleas and excited comments," as his meetings "sounded chaotic."[2694] "He made no preparation beforehand concerning what he should say" even when he did preach; "all was spontaneous response" to what was supposed to be the Holy Spirit.[2695] "Well-structured expository preaching . . . was just unworkable . . . [since] each service was dominated by testimonies, prayers, pleadings, and songs,"[2696] as indeed, his meetings had a veritable "Babel of voices . . . breaking forth simultaneously in prayer and song . . . [and] people . . . praying in several languages simultaneously,"[2697] as at times people would sing "again and again" a handful of lines from a song "twenty times,"[2698] or even hear a "chorus . . . sung, perhaps, a hundred times"[2699] in a meeting. It "was a new experience" to many churchgoers "to hear a large crowd sing over and over again for 15 or 20 minutes, without a moment's pause," a one-line "refrain" from a song.[2700] Such practices prepared the way for the "Pentecostal movements . . . [that] put their own seal on such worship"[2701] soon after the end of Roberts' ministry. Roberts also encouraged people to

---

pgs. 194-198, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis, where, however, Murray did not actively encourage such confusion as Evan Roberts did—a commendable course of action by Mr. Murray—although he did allow women to lead the congregation in prayer.

2692 Pg. 79, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. In the particular congregation discussed on pg. 79, preaching was eliminated for two months.

2693 Pg. 522, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2694 Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pg. 125 for a description of some representative chaos.

2695 Pg. 522, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2696 Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2697 Pgs. 72-73, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pg. 79, 86; pgs. 40-43, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2698 Pg. 86, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pgs. 44-45, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2699 Pg. 173, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. Cf. pg. 14, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

2700 Pgs. 87-88, "Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival," A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). In the particular instance mentioned, the crowd was repeating "*Diolch iddo, diolch iddo, Byth am gofio llwch y llawr* (Thanks to Him: always for remembering the dust of the earth)" the entire time. Compare pg. 31, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Contrast Matthew 6:7 and the type of worship found in the inspired songs of the Psalter.

2701 Pg. 177, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

pray the same words "over and over together, or every one separately, as [they were] inspired by the Holy Spirit."[2702] In many of his meetings in southern Wales "Mr. Roberts gradually ceased to speak at his own meetings. He [rather would] . . . sit silently in the pulpit and take no part—a spectacle rather than a prophet."[2703] "Evan Roberts accepted everything," all the people who "acted strangely," with the sole exception of "loud shrieking and wild gestures."[2704] "[E]ven in the most orderly meetings confusion reigns . . . Roberts generally preaches but little, sometimes not at all."[2705] "[H]ysteria [was] . . . a sign and proof of the apprehension of spiritual truths . . . [e]verything was in confusion, without order, without purpose, and often without decency," despite the fact that "[w]e have no record that such physical results followed the preaching of our Lord or the ministry of the apostles."[2706] No one must "reduce the interruption[s]," and Roberts forbade his helpers from trying to do so, because "the Spirit's prompting . . . must never be ignored or questioned."[2707] In fact, "[s]ometimes he threatened to leave a meeting if anyone tried to interfere in any shape or form."[2708] "One day he was in a chapel where ninety percent were English speaking, yet he refused to speak in English, not because he

---

[2702] Pg. 521, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope. Roberts instructed those who had been encouraged to stand up in his meetings, and were counted as converts for that reason, to "repeat th[e] [following] prayer in his or her turn:

Send the Spirit *now*, for Jesus Christ's sake.
Send the Spirit *powerfully* now, for Jesus Christ's sake.
Send the Spirit *more powerfully* now, for Jesus Christ's sake.
Send the Spirit *yet more powerfully* now for Jesus Christ's sake.

[Professed converts were to] [p]ray No. 1 over and over . . . Then No. 2 in the same way. Then No. 3. No. 4 after that" (pg. 521, *ibid*). Thus, the eight words that constituted the body of this prayer were to be repeated over and over and over, with the addition of the words "more," "powerfully," and "yet" at certain times, in direct contradiction to the command of Christ: "when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do*: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking" (Matthew 6:7; note also the tremendous contrast between the model for prayer set forth by the Lord in the following verses with the model set forth by Roberts). Roberts would also have whole congregations repeat this prayer over and over again, and then "would-be convert[s] would suddenly rise and declare . . . 'I have now received salvation.' . . . [T]his occurred scores of times" (pg. 36, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones; cf. pgs. 31-33). The vain repetitions were consequently responsible for the production of many professions in Roberts' meetings.

It is noteworthy that the rote prayer Roberts taught people to repeat fits in with the apparent confusion in his life between his alleged Spirit baptism and his alleged conversion.

[2703] Pg. 141, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Jones affirms that, in contrast, preaching did actually take place in various of Roberts's meetings in northern Wales later on.

[2704] Pg. 50, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2705] Pg. 88, "Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival," A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

[2706] Pg. 235, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

[2707] Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2708] Pg. 59, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

was unused to this but because 'the Spirit has forbidden me,'"[2709] the spirit world leading Roberts to speak in what was an unknown tongue to the overwhelming majority of his hearers, despite the Pauline prohibition on such action in 1 Corinthians 12-14. Answering criticism for downplaying preaching and the reading of the Word, Roberts answered: "Why should I teach when the Spirit is teaching?"[2710] After all, "the wonderful eloquence displayed by unlettered persons in prayer and speaking" was "proof of direct Divine inspiration,"[2711] was it not?

Although Scripture states that the knowledge of men's hearts is restricted to the omniscient God (1 Kings 8:39), Roberts could see into men's hearts and "discern souls in conflict," so that although "some called it telepathy," his supernatural powers were "accepted as one more sign that Evan Roberts was being led continually by the Spirit,"[2712] and charges that "the revival depended on his hypnotic skills and magnetism"[2713] were rejected. After all, "in the midst of another mass meeting in [a] 6,000 seat [auditorium], Evan detected that a hypnotist had entered the meeting and was trying secretly to control him. . . . [T]he man confessed to a theatre audience that this was the truth,"[2714] so Roberts was not using hypnotism himself but had clear power from the spirit world. Roberts knew "when anyone g[ot] up unmoved by the Spirit"[2715] in one of his meetings and could "see . . . insincerity and hypocrisy."[2716] He "kn[ew]" when "people . . . [were] prompted by false motives . . . in their prayers" and would consequently interrupt them and stop them from praying.[2717] He recognized when people had been truly converted, so that at times he would announce that someone had "decided" for Christ and the person would then reveal himself; for example, "at Saron, Evan predicted a dozen individual decisions to turn to Christ," and "[e]ach time someone surrendered," validating "his strange new powers."[2718] He "displayed a remarkable gift of detecting those souls who were secretly trying to come to Jesus."[2719] In another

---

2709 Pg. 106, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2710 Pg. 49, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2711 Pg. 91, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2712 Pg. 47, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2713 Pg. 49, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2714 Pg. 126, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2715 Pg. 70, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2716 Pg. 77, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2717 Pg. 60, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2718 Pgs. 82-83, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; the pages record substantial numbers of situations where Roberts exercised his powers to recognize true conversions in a great variety of settings.

2719 Pg. 89, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

meeting, "he began to cry out: 'There is a soul lost because someone has been disobedient to the promptings of the Spirit. . . . Too late! Too late!' . . . Oh! Dear people, it is too late! . . . [H]e explained that he was prohibited from praying for the soul that was lost."[2720] In a different meeting, at the "peak moment, Evan stopped the meeting and announced that there was someone in the congregation who wouldn't speak to his brother. He called for that person to confess his sin, threatening him with divine judgment and ordering him to leave. Because no one admitted this fault, the people had to remain on their feet a very long time. . . . Some accepted this kind of rebuke from a man whom they took to be a prophet; others felt it was a mistaken act done by an overtired young man,"[2721] since Roberts continued "months . . . of serial meetings, all-night sessions, and crises."[2722] Others called Roberts "an unbalanced crow stirrer, an exhibitionist, a hypnotist, and even an occultist . . . a prophet of Baal calling down false fire by his incantations."[2723] Roberts, however, had an answer for those who said he lacked sleep. Such a lack was not a problem for him. He said: "God has made me strong and manly. . . . My body is full of electricity day and night and I have no sleep before I am back in meetings again."[2724] For months, as the holiness revival progressed in 1904 and 1905, "he ate and slept little,"[2725] getting "two or three hours of sleep each night,"[2726] but the electricity that filled his body kept him going—at least until he experienced one his several serious nervous breakdowns.[2727] In meetings he would often have "nervous collapses" from which, however, he would usually "recover suddenly"[2728] and continue the meeting in most cases—at least until he came to the point in 1906 where he was "unable to stand or walk for almost a twelvemonth," remaining in "convalescence" in the Penn-Lewis household.[2729] In another meeting "he called to a man to confess his sin" and said, "The Spirit has given me that man's name and age," and

---

2720 Pgs. 90-91, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2721 Pg. 88, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2722 Pg. 91, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2723 Pg. 98, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2724 Pg. 41, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2725 Pg. 41, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2726 Pg. 51, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2727 By September 1906 he had already had four. See pg. 161, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. His breakdowns were "a divine plan to equip [Roberts] to do battle against Satanic powers and to train others for battle," resulting in the teachings of *War on the Saints* (pg. 174, *ibid*).

2728 Pgs. 113-114, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2729 Pgs. 165-167, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. It appears that Jessie Penn-Lewis's doctrine that "on the basis of Romans Six you may put in your claim for the healing of any bodily disease" (pg. 134, *Overcomer*, 1914) failed to heal Evan Roberts.

this fact was, Roberts said, to lead those who were "skeptical of the reality of this manifestation" to have "no doubt about it."[2730] On a different occasion "Evan Roberts became visibly upset and started to threaten someone with divine punishment for 'making a mockery of what was so divine . . . [m]ocking what has cost God his life-blood.' . . . After carefully scanning the congregation, again he urged someone to ask for forgiveness and then declared that the meeting could not proceed until the obstacle had been removed. . . . The remonstration went on for another ten minutes, but no one owned up."[2731] Later in a meeting he "lay a limp, inert mass on the reading desk, with outstretched arms as if pleading. Suddenly he straightened up . . . pointed to the gallery and declared that some person there possessed a heart full of scorn, skepticism, and sarcasm. That was an obstacle to the path of the Spirit, and the cause must be removed. He tearfully appealed to him to repent or quit the building," and "continue[d] to sob, with his face buried in his hands," but "[n]o response was made from the gallery."[2732] He would "place his hand on his neck, as if pressing something down. There was a jerking back of the head . . . as in persons whose nervous systems are somewhat deranged. . . . [T]hese . . . tremors . . . [are] attribute[d] . . . to Divine influence."[2733] Roberts also had a time when he was told to "remain in the house for six days in a silence which had been commanded by the Spirit" and "cancelled all mission engagements,"[2734] after a fashion similar to what had taken place with the prophet Ezekiel,[2735] while on various occasions he would "walk out of meetings after five minutes because he claimed to have discovered [spiritual] obstacles there."[2736] Surely such actions, and such abilities to see men's hearts, were evidence of the powerful supernatural forces that were at work in Evan Roberts.

While Baptist church membership, and that of old-school evangelicalism, began to decline after Evan Roberts finished his revivalistic course, Pentecostalism boomed, as Roberts's influence had led many others in the holiness revival to have supernatural encounters with the spirit world similar to those he had experienced. "It is impossible, and would be historically incorrect, to dissociate the Pentecostal Movement from . . . the

---

2730 Pg. 120, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2731 Pg. 90, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2732 Pg. 119, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2733 Pg. 89, "Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival," A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2734 Pg. 91, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. cf. pgs. 89-90, 114-115, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). Roberts broke his silence on the seventh day.

2735 Pgs. 110-112, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2736 Pg. 100, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

Welsh Revival [through which] . . . the spiritual soil was prepared . . . for [its] rise."[2737] Jessie Penn-Lewis wrote:

> [T]he Pentecostal character of the Awakening in Wales is unmistakably clear . . . the wider fulfillment of Joel's prophecy [in chapter two about signs and wonders through Spirit baptism] is at hand. Undoubtedly we are in a new era of the world's history, when we may expect supernatural workings of God such as have not been known since the days of the primitive Church. . . . [B]y [receiving] a baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire, "signs and wonders" w[ill] follow.[2738]

Not Roberts only, but very many saw visions and heard voices.[2739] Prominent ministers and witnesses testified that Wales was seeing what "was spoken by the prophet Joel . . . the promise [is] now evidently fulfilled in Wales": "If you ask for proof of that assertion, I point to the signs. 'Your young men shall see visions!' That is exactly what is happening. . . . It does not at all matter that some regular people are objecting to the irregular doings. . . . If you ask me the meaning of the Welsh revival, I say—IT IS PENTECOST CONTINUED, without one single moment's doubt."[2740] Consequently, throughout the holiness revival of 1904-5 there were "many stories of aerial lights, aerial choirs, flashes and visions."[2741] "Dreams, religious and otherwise, were registered by the score."[2742] "During the Revival many persons vowed that they had heard voices in the air calling them by name and speaking to them in distinct tones and words."[2743] The multiplication of such marvels from the spirit world was natural, since "[v]isions were looked upon as the gift of the Holy Spirit, a mark of Divine favour, and one of the concomitants of true conversion," and with the neglect of the Word of God "there were many who appeared to know more about their visions than about their Bible."[2744] Thus, "Miss Florie Evans," Evan Roberts's coworker, "could speak of visions and messages . . . [and] prophesied."[2745] The marvels attending Roberts made it clear that women were to preach and teach men:

> The old objection of many of the Welsh Churches to the equal ministry of women has gone by the board. . . . Women pray, sing, testify, and speak as freely as men . . . the toppling of the hateful . . . ascendency of the male. . . . Paul, it is true . . . found it necessary, while addressing the Church of Corinth, to draw a very hard and fast line limiting the sphere of female activity . . . Christianity, however, is at last sloughing the Corinthian limitation[.] . . . The Quakers began the good work. . .

2737 Pgs. 5-6, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

2738 Pgs. 77-78, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

2739 Pgs. 22-23, 100, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

2740 Pg. 87, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Capitalization reproduced from the original.

2741 Pg. 249, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2742 Pg. 73, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2743 Pgs. 136-137, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2744 Pg. 139, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2745 Pg. 89, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

> . Now in South Wales we see the fruit of this devoted testimony . . . [i]n the present Revival women are everywhere to the fore, singing, testifying, praying, and preaching.[2746]

Indeed, the visions were innumerable, but unlike Biblical visions, where God revealed real, specific, and knowable truth, the visions of the holiness revival either set forth all sorts of meaningless foolishness or specifically taught unbiblical errors. "[P]arishoners . . . heard bells chiming . . . a thunder clap followed by lovely singing in the air . . . [others heard] strange music, similar to that caused by the vibration of telegraph wires, only much louder. . . . The Vicar[2747] of a parish . . . heard voices singing . . . [g]radually the voices seemed to increase in volume until they became overpowering. . . . It was as real to his senses as anything he ever heard and the words were distinct, in Welsh."[2748] A "young girl, 18 years of age" who was "almost illiterate" was supernaturally enabled to pray with "the most refined and literary sentiments, couched in admirable phraseology[,]" and her "changed appearance" was very striking, becoming "much more gentle. Her face, previously course, has now quite a refined appearance . . . [becoming] a Madonna-like face" as she also has gained "contact with . . . her mother, though she has been dead about 15 years. . . . [S]he seems to feel her mother's unseen influence, certainly seeing and perhaps helping her in her difficulties."[2749] Another woman "heard the voice of her dead son, and [affirmed] that the conversations that had repeatedly passed between them were as real to her as those that had passed between them in the days of his flesh."[2750] A "young man . . . heard a voice speaking distinctly. The Spirit said (in Welsh)" a variety of things, including a command that "in the most public place" the young man was to deliver the message: "Tell them that hypocrisy is the worst sin against Me . . . [t]he Spirit,"[2751] a message contradicting what Christ said was the worst sin against the Spirit, to blaspheme Him (Matthew 12:31; Mark 3:29-30; Luke 12:10).[2752] The man also testified: "I had a vision . . . a beautiful light, pure, and brighter than any light I have ever seen, and clusters of something very soft and white falling upon me gently and covering me all over. I called them blessings." He also had other "dreams," although he

---

2746 Pgs. 55-56, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2747 Scripture teaches that no mortal is a Vicar; such a title demeans the glory of the Son of God.

2748 Pgs. 93-94, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2749 Pgs. 135-138, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905); cf. Deuteronomy 18:9-14 and the many other prohibitions in Scripture on contact with the dead.

2750 Pg. 137, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2751 Pg. 94-95, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2752 Of course, hypocrisy is very wicked and should in no wise be condoned.

said, "I doubted whether it was the Holy Spirit."[2753] The minister Joseph Jenkins was "clothed with strength from above, and he knew it," receiving power from the spirit world, after "a strange blue flame took hold of him until he was almost completely covered. It rose . . . from the floor of the room and billowed up, encircling him. It retreated and returned a second time, and then retreated and returned again."[2754] People professed conversion and were led to become members of congregations because of the marvels they experienced. In a "Revival service" at "St. Mary the Virgin's Church," a "young man . . . saw a lighted candle emerge from the font [for administering infant baptism and, according to Anglican dogma, regenerating infants thereby] and the figure of an angel shielding it with his wing[2755] from the draught that came from the open door. The flame was very small, and the least breath of wind would have extinguished it but for the protecting wing. Before the service was ended he gave his adhesion to the Church." He testified: "I did not believe in Christ before [the vision] that He was our God and my Saviour. I had always denied Him, but never again, for I believed then [at the time of the vision]."[2756] A woman who was hostile to the holiness revival, but whose husband was part of "the Church Army," "began to feel very queer," saw "the room" where she was become "all dark," and "it seemed as if the room was full, or like a swarm of bees around [her, and she] heard some sound . . . like the buzzing of bees," and then saw her "four children [who] had died in infancy . . . singing the hymn, 'O Paradise,'" and then "saw the children again and Jesus Christ . . . [a]s natural as you see Him on a picture[2757] . . . behind them, and the children said, 'Crown Him, Mam,'[2758] and they disappeared." As a

---

2753 Pgs. 94-95, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2754 Pg. 17, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones. Another vision received by Jenkins was connected to the events that led to Evan Roberts beginning to see visions himself and commencing his revivalistic course (pgs. 58-60, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

2755 While in Scripture the cherubim and seraphim have wings, no angel (מַלְאָךְ/ ἄγγελος) is said to be winged.

2756 Pgs. 95-96, 123-124, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2757 Pictures of Christ are idolatry and a violation of the second commandment, for "the acceptable way of worshipping the true God, is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imagination and devices of men, nor the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scriptures" (*2nd London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689*, 22:1; Exodus 20:4-6).

2758 While the children in her vision commanded this woman to crown Jesus Christ, the Bible never tells Christians to crown Him, since the one who crowns another has authority over the one who is crowned. As the eternal Son of God, Christ has reigned from eternity and will reign immutably to eternity (Hebrews 1:8-10), so nobody crowns Him, while as the God-Man, the Father exalted Christ as Mediator at the time of His ascension (cf. Psalm 110), so that, while the terminology of crowning Christ is not even used in connection with the ascension, the Father's exaltation of the Son of Man is the closest thing to such

consequence she "has been quite a different woman and is present in all the services."[2759] A boy whose father was far away testified: "I distinctly saw my father in the [revival] service [in a vision]. He knelt alongside of me and looked at me with a pitiful face and said, 'My dear boy, pray for me.' . . . I had never taken religion very seriously before, but I do now."[2760] Another man's testimony was noteworthy:

> [He saw] a faint light playing over his head. As it came nearer it increased in size . . . he saw . . . a man's body in a shining robe. The figure had wings . . . every feather in the wings . . . was heavenly beyond description. . . . [I]t did not touch the ground. He looked at the hand and saw the prints of the wounds . . . recognized Him as Jesus . . . [and] shouted—"O my Jesus," and the figure ascended . . . on His wing . . . out of sight.[2761] He felt filled with love, and from that time he can love every one without difference.[2762]

A lady felt that she had been cut off from God until she saw a "vision of Christ in his kingly robes . . . that had set all right."[2763] At another meeting people were filled with "agony . . . men and women jumping in their seats . . . others testifying that they had received the Holy Spirit, and one person said, 'Don't try to understand this, but throw yourself into it. It surpasseth all understanding.'" Here a person who "did not believe much in the Revival" was "caught in his hat and began walking down the staircase, when he was instantaneously knocked (as it were) unconscious. He ran down the stair, and he then jumped five of the steps to the floor[.] . . . He looked like a madman . . . and shouted out, 'Here is reality to-night.' . . . [H]e ran into the chapel, and on by the pulpit. He jumped on top of a seat, and he threw his hat with all his might up towards the ceiling of the church, and with a loud voice" gave out his experience. "It is above all understanding," he said. He remained partly unconscious for a fortnight . . . and he saw a vision of a place beautifully white, and a voice came to him that God would be his refuge and strength. . . . He was moved by the Spirit twice after this fortnight to

---

an affirmation in Scripture. The dead children, therefore, tell the woman to do something that is contrary to the Bible.

[2759] Pgs. 93, 130-133, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

[2760] Pg. 125, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

[2761] Since the Lord Jesus Christ does not have wings, this man did not see the Jesus who is the Son of God, but another "Jesus" (2 Corinthians 11:4); and the fact that he felt certain emotions as a result of his supernatural experience is no reason whatsoever for thinking that his experiences came from the Holy Spirit of God.

[2762] Pgs. 95-96, 139-141, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). Further details, unpleasant to repeat to those who rejoice to spiritually see Jesus by faith rather than seeking after His physical appearance, in accordance with the fact that even those who "have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth [must] know . . . him no more" (2 Corinthians 5:16), have been omitted. It is worth noting that the Apostle Paul testified that he was the "last of all" to see a bodily appearance of Christ (1 Corinthians 15:8).

[2763] Pg. 56, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

unconsciousness. How he escaped from injury while jumping and passing across seats was marvellous . . . he received such physical strength that he thought he could move away a tremendous weight."[2764] Another man, at a holiness revival meeting, testified:

> I had a thrill through my body, causing great pain. I cried bitterly; why, I don't know. . . . [For a few days] I felt great pain, and . . . I lost all appetite for food. . . . [at a] prayer meeting . . . there was great agony through my body. Why, I know not. But it remained through the week. . . . I prayed unto God to forgive my sins and reveal unto me Himself. I don't remember the prayer. I lost all consciousness that night. . . . I perspired very much, so that I thought that water had been thrown over me. . . . A voice told me that [a particular person was] in the meeting to-night by the door. And I said, 'No, he is not here[.'] . . . Then the voice told me the second time exactly the same words, and I answered him back[.] . . . I was astonished when I found [out that the voice was] true. Had the voice only told me once, I would [not] have believed . . . but when I heard the voice the second time, I was surprised [and found out what it said was true]. . . . [M]y body lost all its pain on that Saturday night . . . [and] I am happier than ever[.][2765]

By means of such visions, voices, excitements, and marvels—rather than by means of clear preaching of the gospel—vast numbers were professedly converted.[2766]

The "subject which has perhaps caused more excitement in the public mind than any other feature of the Revival" were the "mysterious lights . . . associated with the name of Mrs. Jones of Islawrffordd," a woman preacher and a "homely farmer's wife"[2767] in the holiness revival.[2768] After reading "Sheldon's book, *In His Steps*,"[2769] and "being much moved by it . . . she began her ministry early in December 1904" as an "evangelist" among the "Calvinistic Methodists" and others, receiving confirmation of her call to a preaching ministry "after seeing a strange light on her way from Islaw'r Ffordd to Egryn chapel."[2770] She affirmed that she had seen "quickly vibrating lights, as though full of eyes. She had seen light hovering over some hilltops. The light . . . frequently accompanied her, leading the way as she went."[2771] Witnesses stated that she "is attended by lights of various kinds wherever she goes," which were well attested and seen by a great number of people. These lights are "tokens of heavenly approval of Mrs. Jones and the Revival." Indeed, "Mrs. Jones solemnly stated . . . that [the planet] Venus . . . was a

---

2764 Pgs. 127-128, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2765 Pgs. 129-130, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2766 Further records of visions appear on pgs. 95, 100, etc., of *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2767 Pg. 179, "The Revival in Wales." *The East and the West: A Quarterly Review for the Study of Missions*. (1905) 174-188.

2768 Similar lights were also testified to in the Pentecostal works in India and Los Angeles that arose under the influence of the Welsh holiness revival.

2769 As already noted above, the Social Gospel advocate and heretic Sheldon influenced Evan Roberts very strongly as well.

2770 Pg. 184, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2771 Pg. 137, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

new star, had only appeared since the Revival, and was situated a short distance above her house." One man saw a mysterious light "from the beginning of the Revival [in his area] six weeks ago. Sometimes it appears like a motor-car lamp flashing and going out . . . other times like two lamps and tongues of fire all round . . . other times a quick flash and going out immediately, and when the fire goes out a vapour of smoke comes in its place; also a rainbow of vapour and a very bright star." Lights were seen both by those professedly converted in the Revival and those who were not, "Chapel members and non-members alike." Another entire family saw lights "hovering above a certain farmhouse . . . as three lamps about three yards apart, in the shape of a Prince of Wales's feathers, very brilliant and dazzling, moving and jumping like a sea-wave . . . continu[ing] so for ten minutes." Others, "a few minutes afte[r] Mrs. Jones . . . pass[ed], on the main road, . . . [saw] a brilliant light twice, tinged with blue." A woman "saw two very bright lights . . . one a big white light, the other smaller and red in colour. The latter flashed backwards and forwards, and finally seemed to become merged in the other." Another saw a large light "and in the middle of it something like [a] bottle or black person, also some little lights scattering around the large light in many colours. Last of all the whole thing came to a large piece of fog, out of sight." Another person saw a "pillar of fire, quite perpendicular, about two feet wide and three yards in height." Others saw "a cross and two other crosses [of light] . . . [t]he two crosses came nearer . . . and stood not far [away], and dozens of small balls of fire [were dancing back and fro behind the crosses . . . [while they] heard a voice singing." A "medical man" saw "a globe of light about the size of a cheese plate, or nearly the apparent diameter of the moon, over the chapel where Mrs. Jones was that evening preaching. . . . Mrs. Jones . . . declared that she had also seen it, but from within the chapel." At another meeting where "Mrs. Jones" was preaching and many were "very much affected . . . religious fervour was intense and the service lasted until 1 a. m.," people present saw "a ball of light about the size of the moon," with a "slight mist over it. The stars began to shoot out around it, [and] the light rose higher and grew brighter but smaller." Others saw a "block of fire" rising "from the mountain side and moving along for about 200 or 300 yards. It went upwards, a star" then "shot out to meet it, and they clapped together and formed into a ball of fire," the appearance changing into "something like the helm of a ship." Others present saw "a ball of fire, white, silvery, vibrating, stationary." From the ball "two streamers of gray mist [were] emanating . . . in the space between them a number of stars." A "meeting of the Salvation Army" in the same location was visited by "a black cloud from which emerged

first a white light, then a yellow, and finally a brilliantly red triangle."[2772] Evan Roberts was very far from the only one experiencing marvels in the Welsh holiness revival. Indeed, "the revival in Wales under Evan Roberts" not only "produced [these] psychological and physical abnormalities" among others in Wales, but "sparked them also in other countries (California, Norway, Denmark, Hesse, Silesia)," leading to "speaking in tongues and similar phenomena as a renewal of the gifts of Pentecost and powerful evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit" that produced the Pentecostal and charismatic movement.[2773] While such "tokens of heavenly approval" of women preachers "and the Revival" are radically different in character than Biblical miracles, possessing far greater similarity to pagan marvels and the marvels of medieval Romanism, they certainly proved that the religious excitement was not merely the work of men, but that the spirit world was powerfully at work in the Welsh holiness revival.

It was important for Roberts to have supernatural abilities to discern true and false conversion, since the methodology he employed in the Welsh holiness revival to produce regeneration was not, as in the Bible, bold, powerful, and clear preaching of the gospel (Romans 10:17; 1 Peter 1:23-25), but getting people to stand up.[2774] Those who stood up were assumed to have been converted. Roberts would "walk up and down the isles," look at specific people, and ask them, "Are you ready to stand up now and confess Christ?"[2775] People would think, "Why can't I? I am religious!" and then "stand up to confess" when Roberts asked them to.[2776] Roberts would, at times, call on "[a]ll who

---

[2772] Pgs. 97-107, 145-161, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). Many other marvels are documented by Fryer that are not reproduced here. Of course, not every minister or revival proponent endorsed every one of these marvels as divine, or even investigated all of them carefully; however, Biblical cessationism was hardly in great evidence in the Welsh holiness revival. Fryer simply documents the marvels that appear to be well attested.

[2773] Pg. 159, *Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 4: Holy Spirit, Church, and New Creation*, Bavinck. An illustration of the Higher Life theology moving into Pentecostalism is found on pgs. 178-179, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

[2774] Sometimes those who stood up would also come to a "big seat" at the front of a church building. For example, one person who professed conversion "had a vision," and consequently "went to the big seat to tell [the congregation] . . . [']Jesus Christ has forgiven my sin[.']" (pg. 32, cf. 72-73, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones). Another example of the methodology of standing up to be born again is found on pg. 147, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

The practice of equating standing up with conversion was present in Keswick and Higher Life circles from the origin of the movement; for example, at the Brighton Convention a Quaker leader reported that "manifest converting power" was present, evidenced by "some hundreds [who] rose to witness that they were recipients of salvation" (pg. 399, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; pg. 462, *The Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, 9:23-26. London: Barrett, Sons & Co, 1875).

[2775] Pg. 34, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; cf. pg. 182, "The Revival in Wales," A. T. Fryer.

[2776] Pg. 30, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

love Jesus to stand," as well as "all church members" and "[a]ll who love Christ more than anything else,"[2777] and was able to get great crowds to stand up in this way.[2778] In an atmosphere charged with extreme emotion, but little careful preaching, Roberts called on unsaved people to stand," and then "men" would "rise up and confes[s] Christ."[2779] "[A]midst prayers and exhortations in Welsh and English," people "rose one by one" and were assumed to be converted because they did so, while the "press circulated stories about Evan Roberts's irreverence, hysteria, mesmerism, and improper pressures upon impressionable females."[2780] Roberts' coworkers described scenes of "feverish emotionalism" where "the air was electrical" as "young men, nerved by the sympathetic atmosphere . . . r[ose], from floor and gallery [of a chapel meeting house, and] followed the formula set by the first, 'I get up to confess Christ.'"[2781] Large groups would go to the front of church buildings, and, in the words of one of Roberts' converts, be "asked . . . to confess Jesus Christ as our Saviour. . . . I did not understand it . . . [t]he thing was entirely new to me . . . but I accepted everything from him because I looked up to him . . . [by this confession] we had an interest in heaven."[2782] If not enough people stood up, Roberts would ask again. For example, "at the meeting in Van Road, Caerphilly . . . Evan asked, 'Will everyone who will confess Christ rise?' When only forty responded, Evan professed to be astonished. 'What! Is this the number?' he cried. . . . So the people were challenged again. They realized that they had not come to be entertained but to 'show their side.'"[2783] Sometimes, however, getting up one time would not work, and one would need to stand up more than once to go to heaven; for example, one man stood up twice because a spirit being told him in a vision that he had lost his salvation. "I could stand up to confess since I had been faithful to all the chapel meetings and was morally upright . . . I did stand up to confess Christ . . . [but a few days later] I saw . . . I felt Jesus coming to me and I was going to him . . . and as He came towards me—He was on the cross—He moved His hand and pushed me away. 'If God has deserted me,' [I thought], 'only a lost state awaits me.'" The man therefore "stood up" again and said, "Dear friends, God has departed from me; I have no hope; only total loss awaits me; pray for

---

2777 Pg. 49, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2778 E. g., pgs. 60-61, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2779 Pg. 52, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Compare pg. 44, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2780 Pg. 81, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2781 Pgs. 70-71, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2782 Pgs. 32-33, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2783 Pg. 60, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

me." People responded, "[I]f you are lost, where are we others?"[2784] At another meeting, Roberts exercised his supernatural powers to predict that "everybody present in that meeting was going to 'come to Christ' that day,"[2785] indicating that all present, including ministers and Roberts himself, were unconverted and were going to be saved that day by standing up, or that equating standing up with conversion produces incredible confusion and many false professions—unless the prophecy was to be taken allegorically. However, at the end of the day, "all . . . had stood up to declare themselves followers of Christ,"[2786] so it appears that Roberts' prophecy was not simply an allegory. A very sympathetic eyewitness described Roberts' procedure of producing conversions by putting pressure on people to stand up:

> Mr. Evan Roberts, toward the close of the meeting, asks all who from their hearts believe and confess their Saviour to rise. At the meetings at which I was present nearly everybody was standing. Then for the sitting remnant the storm of prayer rises to the mercy seat. When one after another rises to his feet, glad strains of jubilant song burst from the watching multitude.[2787]

Since getting people to stand up, repeating such calls to stand when not enough do so, putting pressure on the unconverted to stand up by having everyone watch them, and getting people to think that all who do not stand at Mr. Roberts's call are at that instant claiming to be openly and actively against Christ, is radically different from Biblical evangelistic methodology and a horrible recipe for producing spurious salvation decisions—and it was even immediately apparent that often people would stand and "confess Chris[t] to escape notice" that would come on them were they to stay seated[2788]—one must be a firm believer in Evan Roberts's supernatural powers to accept the validity of such a procedure. Only the authority of the marvels surrounding Roberts's work could validate what would otherwise be a very clearly anti-supernatural, fleshly, and devilish rejection of truly supernatural regeneration for the natural work of arising from a chair. For unless Roberts could do what no other man could, and see into everyone else's heart, the overwhelming majority of people whom he deceived into thinking that standing up is a sure sign of supernatural conversion and the new birth were in fearful danger of remaining unconverted, being deceived, and being eternally damned, while churches would end up filled with religious but unregenerate people, to the destruction of Christianity and the glory of the devil. Supernatural conversion by the

---

2784 Pgs. 29-30, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2785 Pg. 121, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2786 Pg. 122, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

2787 Pg. 32, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

2788 Pg. 60, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

miraculous power of the Spirit through the preached Word would be replaced with supernatural marvels performed by Evan Roberts and a merely natural outward response erroneously equated with regeneration.

Roberts, however, was able to use his supernatural powers to detect when people stood up but were not born again on that account.

> [On] one occasion Roberts refused to leave the building, when the service had been declared closed by the ministers, because he said that one man in an indicated gallery, a Welshman, he was certain had not confessed Christ as he ought to have done. The minister in charge of that gallery "tested" the people and reported that every one had confessed Christ. Roberts was not satisfied: six times was the appeal made during the next 25 minutes and not until the sixth test did a man come forward and admit that he had not been sincere in professing as a convert with the rest. Roberts directed the minister to speak to the man, and after a short talk he too gave in.[2789]

In such a manner, false professions apparently could be avoided. Furthermore, visions from the spirit world confirmed that people had indeed been truly saved through the ministry of Evan Roberts. A man who became an evangelist after professing conversion through Roberts's ministry recounted that he had felt "petrified . . . tossed about . . . puzzled . . . crushed . . . disturbed . . . and . . . mobbed," but then saw "a panoramic vision of Jesus moving through a crowd and a blind, beseeching beggar, whom he recognized as himself, pleading, 'Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me.'" The man related, "A sweet voice spoke within my spirit so clearly, unmistakably, [and] audibly, that the voices of all creation could never succeed in drowning its message: 'Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.' Heaven came into my heart that very moment."[2790] Ministers also claimed to be converted because of visions. For instance, an elder testified: "I was led up to the great white throne, where the Father was seated in his eternal glory. The Holy Spirit came to me and dressed me in the Son's righteousness. When He had clothed me in white raiment He introduced me to the Father. 'Here he is for you,' said He to the Father, 'what do you think of him in the Son's righteousness?' . . . Thanks be to Him!"[2791] While in Scripture people are not converted because they see visions telling them they have been saved, and in previous works of genuine revival concluding one was converted because of visions of such a kind was plainly warned against as soul-damning

---

[2789] Pgs. 90, 120-121, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). "211 had already accepted Christ" by standing up or raising their hands that night, and the Welshman was number 212.

[2790] Pg. 185, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

[2791] Pg. 189, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. In the Apostle John's vision, in Revelation 20:11-15, Jesus Christ is the One on the great white throne, not the Father, and only the damned are going to be judged at the great white throne. The Apostle's vision contradicts the vision of this minister in the Welsh holiness revival.

error,[2792] under Evan Roberts such work was set forth as evidence that the spirit world was accomplishing its ends and many were being truly born again. Indeed, even the

---

[2792] The words of the great theologian of the First Great Awakening, Jonathan Edwards, identify the confusion in such a "conversion" by means of a vision with painfully and frighteningly pinpoint accuracy:

> Persons having religious affections of many kinds, accompanying one another, is not sufficient to determine whether they have any gracious affections or no. . . . It is evident that there are counterfeits of all kinds of gracious affections; as of *love to God*, and *love to the brethren*, as just now observed; so of *godly sorrow for sin*, as in Pharaoh, Saul, Ahab, and the children of Israel in the wilderness; [Exod 9:27; 1 Sam 24:16-17 and 1 Sam 26:21; 1 Kings 21:27; Num 14:39-40] and of the *fear of God*, as in the Samaritans, *who feared the Lord, and served their own gods* at the same time, (2 Kings 17:32-33) and those enemies of God we read of, Ps 66:3, who *through the greatness of God's power, submit themselves to him*, or, as it is in the Hebrew, *lie unto him*, *i.e*. yield a counterfeit reverence and submission: so of *gracious gratitude*, as in the children of Israel, who sang God's praise at the Red Sea, (Ps 106:12) and Naaman, the Syrian, after his miraculous cure of his leprosy (2 Kings 5:15, etc.). So of *spiritual joy*, as in the stony-ground hearers, (Matt 13:20) and particularly many of John the Baptist's hearers, (John 5:35). So of *zeal*, as in Jehu, (2 Kings 10:6) and in Paul before his conversion, (Gal 1:14; Phil 3:6) and the unbelieving Jews, (Acts 22:3; Rom 10:2). So graceless persons may have earnest religious *desires*, which may be like Balaam's desires, which he expresses under an extraordinary view of the happy state of God's people, as distinguished from all the rest of the world, (Num 23:9-10). They may also have a strong *hope* of eternal life, as the Pharisees had.
>
> And as men, while in a state of nature, are capable of a resemblance of all kinds of religious affection, so nothing hinders but that they may have many of them together. And what appears in fact, abundantly evinces that it is thus very often. Commonly, when false affections are raised high, many of them attend each other. The multitude that attended Christ into Jerusalem, after that great miracle of raising Lazarus, seem to be moved with many religious affections at once, and all in a high degree. They seem to be filled with *admiration*; and there was a show of high affection of *love*; also a great degree of *reverence*, in their laying their garments on the ground for Christ to tread upon. They express great *gratitude* to him, for the great and good works he had wrought, praising him with loud voices for his salvation; and earnest *desires* of the coming of God's kingdom, which they supposed Jesus was now about to set up; and they showed great *hopes* and raised expectations of it, *expecting it would immediately appear*. Hence they were filled with *joy*, by which they were so animated in their acclamations, as to make the whole city ring again with the noise of them; and they appeared great in their *zeal* and forwardness to attend Jesus, and assist him without further delay, now in the time of the great feast of the *passover*, to set up his kingdom.
>
> It is easy from the nature of the affections, to give an account why, when one affection is raised very high, that it should excite others; especially if the affection which is raised high, be that of counterfeit *love*, as it was in the multitude who cried *Hosanna*. This will naturally draw many other affections after it. For, as was observed before, love is the chief of the affections, and as it were, the fountain of them. Let us suppose a person, who has been for some time in great exercise and terror through fear of hell; his heart weakened with distress and dreadful apprehensions, upon the brink of despair; and who is all at once delivered, by being firmly made to believe, through some delusion of Satan, that God has pardoned him, and accepts him as the object of his dear love, and promises him eternal life. Suppose also, that this is done through some vision, or strong imagination suddenly excited in him, of a person with a beautiful countenance smiling on him—with arms open, and with blood dropping down—which the person conceives to be Christ, without any other enlightening of the understanding to give a view of the spiritual, divine excellency of Christ and his fulness, and of the way of salvation revealed in the gospel. Or, suppose some voice or words coming as if they were spoken to him, such as these, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee;" or, "Fear not, it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," which he takes to be immediately spoken by God to him, though there was no preceding acceptance of Christ, or closing of the heart with him: I say, if we should suppose such a case, what various passions would naturally crowd at once, or one after another, into such a person's mind! It is easy to be accounted for, from the mere principles of nature, that a person's heart, on such an occasion, should be raised up to the skies with transports of joy, and be filled with fervent affection to that imaginary God or Redeemer, who, he supposes, has thus rescued him from the jaws of such dreadful destruction, and received him with such endearment, as a peculiar favourite. Is it any wonder that now he should be filled with admiration and gratitude, his mouth should be opened, and be full of talk about what he has experienced? That, for a while, he should think and speak of scarce any thing else, should seem to magnify that God who has done so much for him, call upon others to rejoice with him, appear with a cheerful countenance, and talk with a loud voice? That however, before his deliverance, he was full of quarrellings against the justice of God, now it should be easy for him to submit to God, own his unworthiness, cry out against himself, appear to be very humble before God, and be at his feet as tame as a lamb; now confessing his unworthiness, and crying out, *Why me? Why me*? Thus Saul, who, when Samuel told him that God had

widespread circulation of the idea that 100,000 people were converted in the Welsh holiness revival was a product of a "mystical experience" of Evan Roberts where he "receive[d] from God a piece of paper on which the figure 100,000 was written—giving rise later to the belief that 100,000 would be converted during the revival."[2793] "Evan Roberts had asked the Lord for 100,000 for Jesus Christ, and . . . he had actually seen Jesus presenting a cheque to His Father, and on it the figure '100,000.'"[2794] One who accepts Roberts' prophetic status would be quite correct in promulgating this figure, while those who believe that the Apostles and prophets were the foundation of the church (Ephesians 2:20), and, in consequence, their offices have ceased, would want far better evidence for 100,000 people being regenerated than a vision of Evan Roberts—evidence which is, however, lacking.[2795] Roberts himself, because of the lack of evidence of the new birth in many, eventually "saw that [many] had been touched emotionally but not truly convicted and converted during [many of his] revival meetings."[2796] He "lived to see many of his converts, some of them the most striking among the records of the

---

> appointed him to be king, makes answer, "Am not I a Benjamite, of the smallest of the tribes of Israel, and my family the least of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin? Wherefore then speakest thou so to me?" [1 Sam 9:21]. Much in the language of David, the true saint, 2 Sam 7:18, "Who am I, and what is my father's house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?" Is it to be wondered at, that now he should delight to be with them who acknowledge and applaud his happy circumstances, and that he should love all such as esteem and admire him and what he has experienced? That he should have violent zeal against all who make nothing of such things, be disposed openly to separate, and as it were to proclaim war with all who are not of his party? That he should now glory in his sufferings, and be very much for condemning and censuring all who seem to doubt, or make any difficulty of these things? And, while the warmth of his affections last, that he should be mighty forward to take pains, and to deny himself, and to promote the interest of a party favouring such things? Or that he should seem earnestly desirous to increase the number of them, as the Pharisees compassed sea and land to make one proselyte? [Matthew 23:15]. I might mention many other things, which will naturally arise in such circumstances. He must have but slightly considered human nature, who thinks that such things as these cannot arise in this manner, without any supernatural interposition of divine power. (pgs. 250-251, *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*, Jonathan Edwards)

[2793] Pg. 523, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope. This figure is an instance of the "folk memory of the revival, much of it elaborated by the passage of time" so that the recollection of events "as time progressed, became increasingly divorced from the events themselves" (pgs. 516, 534, *ibid.*). Unfortunately, such inaccurate folk tales too often pass for real history and are propagated in many popular-level Christian biographies, histories, and other narratives, so that, far too often, the people of God accept as factual what is merely legendary. See also pg. 20, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones; pg. 48, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

[2794] Pg. 60, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan; cf. pg. 66.

[2795] Apart from the visions of Evan Roberts, evidence for the 100,000 figure is derived from people who have sought to keep track of the numbers of people who stood up in meetings (cf. pg. 153, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905); some have also tried to tally, at least generally, increases in membership rolls.

In the Bible, those who professed salvation through repentant faith in Christ alone, submitted to believer's immersion, and then continued faithful to the Lord in His church and manifested evidence of a new heavenly nature were counted as converts (cf. Acts 2:41-47)—a standard not a little higher than that of standing up under extreme emotional pressure in a meeting, or than receiving a vision with the number 100,000 in it.

[2796] Pg. 147, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

Revival, go back, tired of their new home," to the world, the flesh, and the devil.[2797] However, this recognition came too late and did not affect the fundamental errors in his methodology during the holiness revival, as throughout he continued to employ techniques that were certain to produce many false professions. Consequently, "Evan Roberts grew more and more discouraged as he saw some groups of converts following after cults in which they barked at the devil, danced and swooned, or followed healers and prophetesses,"[2798] and critics of Roberts affirmed that he erred greatly in "assuming that remorse and confession were the same as true regeneration" as it "became sadly evident that the Spirit of God had been quenched."[2799] Roberts' practices contributed to laxity in guarding the membership of Calvinistic Methodist assemblies and other denominations influenced by his ministry, thus filling them with unregenerate members[2800] and ministers. Indeed, Roberts did not merely confuse regeneration and Spirit-produced repentance and faith in the crucified Christ with an outward response in his methodology, but his message itself was confusing enough that it could well be considered—by those who rejected his prophetic status and went by Scripture alone—a very unclear gospel. Evan Roberts did not regularly preach with any kind of careful clarity the gospel of salvation for totally depraved sinners based on the substitutionary death of the crucified and resurrected Christ and applied through regeneration to sinners who, in supernaturally produced repentant faith, looked away from themselves to Him for redemption (1 Corinthians 15:1-4; John 3:1-21). Instead, Roberts taught that the unregenerate must both sympathize with and love Christ before they can come to Him for salvation, thus denying the Biblical depravity of man (Romans 3:11) and affirming Pelagianism.[2801] It is not at all surprising that Roberts "did not at any time emphasize the necessity for the creation of a new will in and by the power of Christ."[2802] On the

---

2797 Pg. 80, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

2798 Pg. 158, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2799 Pg. 175, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2800 The rigors of early Calvinistic Methodist assembly membership are set forth on pgs. 103-122, *Fire in the Thatch: The True Nature of Religious Revival*, Eifion Evans.

2801 Roberts carried his Pelagianism with him into his doctrine of the Christian life; e. g., while Philippians 2:13 affirms that God works in the believer both to will and to do, Roberts believed: "God . . . will work in you up to the point of willing; but He cannot 'will' for you! He works in you up to the point of your will, and then through your act of 'will'—He will energize you for the 'doing' (Phil. ii. 13.)" (pg. 5, "Revival and Prayer," *Overcomer* 1910). It is astonishing that Roberts would quote Philippians 2:13 and in the same sentence deny that God energizes the believer both to will and to do.

Jessie Penn-Lewis likewise, with the Keswick theology in general, denied that God works in believers to both will and do, affirming rather that the Almighty is helpless without our independent choice: "God must get the consent of our wills for everything He does" (pg. 181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913; she misinterpreted Philippians 2:13 in a manner similar to Evan Roberts, pg. 132, *The Overcomer*, 1914).

2802 Pg. 88, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

contrary, he commanded: "[Y]ou need to turn that sympathy . . . I know you . . . listeners [already have] . . . into a flame of love before you can embrace Him as Saviour."[2803] Furthermore, he taught: "Christ . . . has a rope of three strands. First ask him to take you as you are. Then ask Him to forgive your sins. Then ask Him for strength for the future. This three-stranded rope of salvation is enough for the present, the past, and the future salvation of every sinner."[2804] Along these lines, Roberts counseled his helpers to find people who needed to stand up to be saved, and act as follows: "Put one hand on their shoulder, and the other hand in their hand. Ask them to pray God to forgive their sins for Jesus Christ's sake. Then ask them, do they believe in God; and if they will say they do, ask them to thank God for that."[2805] However, the Biblical response to the gospel is not "ask," but "believe,"[2806] and belief in "God" is not enough (James 2:19); one must be supernaturally enabled to rest upon the crucified Christ and His substitutionary atonement (cf. John 3:1-21). Worst of all, Roberts's salvation message was summarized by those who heard him as: "He says that if we would have Jesus save us, we must save ourselves first. He says that we must do all that we know is right, first. He says that we must leave off the drink and all that is bad; he says that we must pray and we must work, we must work hard. He says if Jesus Christ is to save us we must work along with Him, side by side, or, he says, the saving will never be done."[2807] The Welsh revivalism under Evan Roberts "is of a social and altruistic nature, and . . . differs from those [revivals] which

---

[2803] Pg. 53, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2804] Pg. 143, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2805] Pg. 49, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

[2806] Much of modern fundamentalism and evangelicalism also replaces supernatural conversion by repentant faith in the Christ who died as a Substitute for sinners and rose again with the repetition of a "sinner's prayer," based upon a misinterpretation of Romans 10:9-14 and Revelation 3:20. Note the careful discussion of these passages, and defense of justification by repentant faith alone instead of justification by faith and prayer, in "An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians," by Thomas Ross, available at http://faithsaves.net. While Evan Roberts affirmed that to "confess Christ was . . . an initial act of faith" (pg. 145, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones), the Bible teaches that one must believe and receive Christ's righteousness before one can genuinely confess Christ (Romans 10:10-11). However, at other times Roberts would, at least according to certain writers, correctly state that the gospel is to believe on Christ (cf. pg. 134, *ibid*.).

[2807] *Between College Terms*, Constance Louisa Maynard. (James Nisbet & Co.: 1910). Elec. acc. http://books.google.com & http://www.welshrevival.org/misc/maynard/01.htm. Maynard notes: "'He says we must save ourselves first.' Here is indeed a different Gospel from that of 1859." Compare the salvation message taught by the Pentecostals of Azuza Street: "When we preach a sinless life, some people say we are too strict. They say we will not get many to heaven that way. But, beloved, God cannot save contrary to His Word. All salvation contrary to the Word is not saving salvation" (pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:9 (Los Angeles, June-September 1907), reprinted on pg. 37, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

have preceded it whe[re] the doctrine was one almost exclusively of faith rather than works."[2808] Jessie Penn-Lewis recounted:

> Mr. Roberts would "test" the meeting, and put to it the four definite steps necessary to salvation . . . (1.) The past must be made clear by sin being confessed to God, and every wrong to man put right. (2.) Every doubtful thing in the life must be put away. (3.) Prompt and implicit obedience to the Holy Ghost. (4.) Public confession of Christ. Forgiveness of others as an essential to receiving the forgiveness of God was often emphasized, as well as the distinction between the Holy Spirit's work in conversion, and in baptizing the believer with the Holy Ghost . . . the full Gospel as preached at Pentecost.[2809]

Nevertheless, despite radical discontinuity between Roberts's message and the Biblical gospel of free grace in Christ, by equating with the new birth people abandoning a sitting position to assume a standing one, and changing the preaching of repentance and faith to the spiritually dead to calling on unsaved men who somehow allegedly love Christ to ask Him to help them have strength for the future, work hard, and then receive forgiveness, "hundreds of souls would rise"[2810] to receive salvation by standing up and be counted as converts every night.[2811] In a poor meeting, "only 760 decisions had been recorded"[2812]—in better ones, many, many more. Furthermore, believers did not obtain assurance of salvation by looking to Christ and also by seeing in the reflex act of faith[2813] the evidences of regeneration recorded in 1 John; rather, the doctrine of Roberts and his followers was, "Believe you are saved, and then confess it" to obtain "assurance of

---

[2808] Pg. 167, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

[2809] Pgs. 48-49, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Note that Jessie Penn-Lewis found acceptable such a method of receiving salvation, although it is clearly a false gospel. These four conditions of receiving "salvation" were also the way that an "outpouring of the Holy Spirit" was received (pg. 51, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead), further evidence that Roberts confused post-conversion Spirit baptism with the gospel, even as in his own personal history a great confusion of conversion and Spirit baptism is evident. Indeed, the four conditions also were the way through which ecumenical unity among those holding false and true doctrine would come to pass, and the one-world Church—a desirable goal, in Roberts' view—would be inaugurated (pg. 53, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

[2810] Pg. 49, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

[2811] Pg. 128, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2812] Pg. 129, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[2813] "By the direct act of faith, we embrace Christ as our Savior; by the reflex act, arising out of the consciousness of believing, we believe that He loved us and died for us, and that nothing can ever separate us from his love. These two acts are inseparable, not only as cause and effect, [but as] antecedent and consequent; but they are not separated in time, or in the consciousness of the believer. They are only different elements of the complex act of accepting Christ as He is offered in the Gospel" (pg. 100, *Systematic Theology*, Charles Hodge, vol. 3). "[T]he direct act of faith is occupied with the object presented to it, the promises of the gospel in Christ, and the reflexive act, being of a different nature, is concerned with looking back on the direct act which assures the soul of personally being a partaker of Christ. This reflexive act of faith is the gift of the Holy Spirit also, and must be ratified by His inward testimony" (pg. 68, "Does Assurance Belong to the Essence of Faith? Calvin and the Calvinists," Joel R. Beeke. *Master's Seminary Journal* 5:1 (Spring 1994) 43-73).

faith."[2814] Nobody who does not possess the ability to see people's hearts can rightly conclude that people standing up is the same thing as the supernatural production of repentance and faith within a dead sinner's heart by the Spirit of God, enabling a sinner

---

[2814] Pg. 107, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. Note that, since Roberts was a Methodist, it is not surprising that "Wesley and Fletcher" held to a related doctrinal error of an improper "immediate enjoyment of personal assurance" (pg. 180, *The Doctrine of Justification*, James Buchanan). Early in his ministry, "John Wesley summed up his thoughts on this subject in a letter written in January, 1740: 'I never yet knew one soul thus saved without what you call the faith of assurance; I mean a sure confidence that by the merits of Christ he was reconciled to the favour of God' [pg. 200, *Wesley's Standard Sermons*]. Thus the *cognition* that saving grace had worked in a life was seen as the final means to ascertain if saving grace had indeed been present. The implications of this teaching, taken by itself, seem to lead to a condition in which superficial self-analysis ('yes, I've got the witness') results in spirituality while the kind of doubt which assailed such people as Luther and even at times John Wesley himself results in a loss of the hope of salvation" (pg. 171, "John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance," Mark A. Noll. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132:526 (April 1975). However, by 1755 Wesley had moderated his position slightly, so that one could be shaken in his assurance without losing his salvation, although a total lack of assurance was still only compatible with a lost estate: "I know that I am accepted: And yet that knowledge is sometimes shaken, though not destroyed, by doubt or fear. If that knowledge were destroyed, or wholly withdrawn, I could not then say I had Christian faith. To me it appears the same thing, to say, 'I know God has accepted me'; or, 'I have a sure trust that God has accepted me.' . . . [Nonetheless,] justifying faith cannot be a conviction that I am justified. . . . But still I believe the proper Christian faith, which purifies the heart, implies such a conviction" (pgs. 452-453, Letter DXXXII, July 25, 1755, in *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley*, vol. 12, 3rd ed., with the last corrections of the author. London: John Mason, 1830). Furthermore, Wesley affirmed that objective marks cannot be elaborated to distinguish between the witness of the Spirit to one's regenerated state and self-delusion; "this kind of defense based on intuition . . . raised the specter of enthusiasm for some of Wesley's critics" (pg. 174, *ibid*.). In this doctrine of assurance Wesley's view was similar to that of Jacob Arminius: "Arminius thought that no one would be a true Christian who did not have a present assurance of present salvation. He wrote: 'Since God promises eternal life to all who believe in Christ, it is impossible for him who believes, and who knows that he believes, to doubt of his own salvation, unless he doubts of this willingness of God.'" (pgs. 164-165, "John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance," Noll, citing pg. 348, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation*, Carl Bangs. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971. Compare *The Doctrine of Assurance, with Special Reference to John Wesley*, Arthur S. Yates. London: Epworth, 1952).

Wesleyan confusion about conversion and assurance appeared in various preachers influenced by his theology, not Evan Roberts alone; thus, for example, Seth Joshua wrote: "[People] are entering into full assurance of faith coupled with a baptism of the Holy Ghost. . . . I also think that those seeking assurance may be fairly counted as converts" (pg. 122, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan, citing Mr. Joshua's diary. Of course, some people who think that they are in need of assurance truly are unconverted, but such clarity appears to be lacking in Mr. Joshua's comments. Spirit baptism has nothing to do with obtaining assurance in the Bible.). Methodist confusion on assurance passed over into the Pentecostal movement, which taught that assurance was of the essence of saving faith: "If God for Christ's sake has forgiven you your sins, you know it. And if you do not know it better than you know anything in this world, you are still in your sins. When you go down in the atonement, in the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, you are accepted. And if you are accepted, and He has given you a clean heart and sanctified your soul, you know it. And if you do not know it, the work is not done" (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:2 (Los Angeles, October 1906), reprinted on pg. 6, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

Scripture teaches that all believers can have assurance of salvation, but that assurance that one has personally passed from death to life is not of the essence of saving faith (cf. *London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689,* 18:1-4). However, Wesley's acceptance of baptismal regeneration was an even more dangerous error than his confusion on assurance (see "John Wesley's View on Baptism," John Chongnahm Cho. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7 (Spring 1972) 60-73).

to spiritually come to the Lord Jesus Christ and trust in His work on the cross for justification, a new heart, and eternal life. Furthermore, Biblical assurance is not obtained by simply convincing oneself that he is saved and then saying to others that he is. Consequently, the practice of equating people standing up with conversion will produce horrific numbers of false professions and spurious conversion decisions when practiced by anyone who does not have the kind of insight into the heart claimed by Evan Roberts.

Evan Roberts believed and taught many other ideas denied in or absent from the Bible. Following, Boardman, Murray, and many other Keswick leaders and exponents, Roberts taught that believers could escape physical death and become immune to disease by faith. The "missionary who is in a district where there is malarial fever . . . becomes immune by recognizing that he must not be a victim to the enemy—death. . . . He goes into the midst of it, but in faith it cannot touch him."[2815] While living with the Penn-Lewis household, Jessie and Evan practiced "binding Satan,"[2816] while "Evan Roberts . . . spent about eighteen sleepless hours a day in prayer."[2817] Mr. Roberts's "prayers," out of which were birthed the book *The War On The Saints*, "were Divinely inspired."[2818] The doctrines in *War on the Saints* show how a believer who has experienced post-conversion Spirit baptism "can have the authority to bind Satan," and even "co-work with God in the last defeat of Satan and all his hosts."[2819] Thus, after Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis had, they affirmed, bound Satan, and while practicing Throne Life prayer and experiencing a great mystic Higher Life, as Evan Roberts allegedly "entered into the sufferings of the Saviour/High Priest" and thus obtained a "position" from "which he could intercede continually for Christ's servants and witnesses who were exposed to deception,"[2820] Roberts received in a vision "the Translation Message given in October,

---

2815 Pg. 10, *Overcomer*, 1914.

2816 Pg. 166, *Overcomer*, 1914.

2817 Pg. 167, *Overcomer*, 1914.

2818 Pg. 189, "The Prayer Ministry of Evan Roberts," *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914, elec. acc. http://www.rewlach.org.uk/books/Overcomer1914/index.htm.

2819 Pg. 174, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Commanding Satan was practiced in the Welsh Revival, as recorded by Jessie Penn-Lewis (pg. 66, *The Awakening in Wales*).

2820 Pg. 191-193, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Roberts continued in his "gained position of intercession" in which he "entered into the sufferings of the . . . High Priest" for "nine years." Happily, Jesus Christ, the real High Priest, ever lives to make intercession for His own, and He does not stop after nine years, nor does He sleep, have indwelling sin, or the vast number of other sins and imperfections of fallen men—nor does the real High Priest need anyone else to enter into His sufferings, as His sufferings on the cross were sufficient once and for all (Hebrews 10:14).

1913,"[2821] in which he predicted "The Coming of Christ . . . the descent of the Lord to meet His Bride . . . the great procession of the King Bridegroom, the Son of the Most High, the Lord of Hosts . . . in 1914,"[2822] after hearing Penn-Lewis preach that Revelation 12:4 was about "Satan's all-out attack on the 'Man-Child Church,' which would occur just before Christ's coming to rapture His people away from this last warfare."[2823] Or, more accurately, according to Jessie Penn-Lewis, Evan Roberts, Otto Stockmeyer, and other Keswick leaders, the Rapture would be partial, taking away only those who have taken the third step of conquering death by faith—those who only believed in justification by faith, and then sanctification by a special post-conversion act of faith, would be left behind, the Rapture only taking the "'man-child' born of the church":

> By the simple expectation that the Lord may come any day to take away the Church, whether ready or unready, we shall never come to be translated. That is not the way. Justification is by faith, and is received by faith; sanctification is by faith, and is received by faith; and equally TRANSLATION CAN BE OBTAINED BY FAITH. Believe then . . . [that] Christ . . . is able, by the Spirit, to form a group of those to whom the Lord can manifest His salvation, full and entire, and whom He may take away before others, without dying, to His throne.[2824]

[2821] Pg. 190, "*War on the Saints:* A brief review of its dispensational significance," in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914. The Translation Message was specifically given on October 19, and its public proclamation was commanded by the same spirits that gave the message in the first place in November (pgs. 183-184, *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

[2822] *The Overcomer*, December 1914. At first Roberts was less specific, simply prophesying that Christ would return in his lifetime (pgs. 196-197, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones), and then predicting that Christ would return in under a decade (pg. 177, *The Overcomer*, December 1913), until finally 1914 became the specific year in which the Translation would take place. Perhaps Roberts believed he had an "intimation of the summons" to heaven in the Rapture that G. A. Pember spoke of (pg. 195, *Earth's Earliest Ages*), although such an intimation is Biblically impossible (Matthew 24:36).

Pentecostals were reprinting Evan Roberts' prophecy—the earlier version that Christ would come in his lifetime—for decades (cf. the reprint of Roberts' false prophecy on pg. 5, *The Pentecostal Evangel,* 1681 (July 27, 1946). The *Pentecostal Evangel* was the official periodical of the *Assemblies of God* denomination.). For obvious reasons, Roberts' prophecy that Christ would return in his lifetime was more easily propagated after 1914 than his date-setting prophecies.

[2823] Pg. 195, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. See also pgs. 194-199. Revelation 12:4 speaks about Satan's attempt to kill Christ when He was born in Bethlehem (Matthew 2:16-18); the verse has nothing to do with events in early twentieth century Great Britain. Mrs. Penn-Lewis similarly allegorizes the "Man Child" as the church in Chapter 11 of *War on the Saints*. Compare Charles Parham's allegorization of the "Man Child" described on pg. 85, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

[2824] "Prepare!" by Otto Stockmeyer, pg. 185 in *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Mrs. Penn-Lewis had Stockmeyer's article printed immediately after her record of Evan Roberts' Translation Message.

Penn-Lewis's argument for the partial-Rapture of the "Man-Child," so that to "have part in the rapture we must be sanctified and holy and live the life of a full overcomer," was proclaimed in almost identical language by Pentecostalism (cf. the detailed exposition on pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:12 (Los Angeles, January 1908), reprinted on pg. 50, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove; see also pg. 4, *The Apostolic Faith* I:10 (September 1907), reprinted on pg. 44, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove & pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:11 (October-January 1908), reprinted on pg. 45, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of*

After all, at the heart of the Keswick theology is the idea the blessings of Christ's death are inactive until they are especially appropriated by a distinct act of faith—so since "*all* the fruits of the sufferings of Christ ought to be obtained by faith," the believer who has entered into the Highest Life of the Higher Life rises up and is "CONQUERING DEATH BY FAITH," guaranteed not to suffer physical death but to be Raptured by a specific act of faith to that end.[2825] Only when, being already justified, one exercises a specific act of faith to activate sanctification does one receive this second blessing—to affirm otherwise is to return to the despised orthodox, non-Higher Life doctrine—and in exactly the same fashion, one will not partake of the Rapture without a specific, post-sanctification act of faith toward that end. God is so unable to Rapture those who do not specifically exercise faith to that end that even after the first group is taken away, subsequently other little groups will go up during the Tribulation period as they finally enter into the Translation plane of the Throne Life. That is, at the Rapture those with the Highest Life will rise "in the air just above our planet," where they will be judged while the Tribulation proceeded on earth. Those believers who were left behind will "ascend to Him" in little "after companies" as they finally grasped, as the Tribulation period went on, the truths taught in the inspired writings of Mrs. Penn-Lewis, and were purified enough to ascend to join their brethren in the air above the planet. A group would go here, and a group there; the "Parousia of Christ means His Presence in the air just above our planet, where His saints will gather unto Him," as "in successive Translations during the period of Tribulation on earth which will culminate in Armageddon."[2826] As people enter into the Throne Life, "[f]rom time to time various companies of saints who were not ready for the first Rapture [will] disappear from the earth and join their fellows."[2827] Since it was essential to have the Translation Faith truths taught by Mrs. Penn-Lewis to be Raptured, and nobody could discover these truths simply by reading the Bible, Mrs. Penn-Lewis wrote an article describing how one was to enter into the blessing of Translation faith: "How to get it, use it, and keep it," so that people do not fall back to the lower plain of the Christians who miss the Rapture.[2828] It was also essential to note that the Translation Message was for

---

"The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908), coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove). The identification of full overcomers who are ready for the Rapture with those only who have spoken in tongues (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:5 (January 1907), reprinted on pg. 18, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove), however, would not be followed by Penn-Lewis.

2825 "Prepare!" by Otto Stockmeyer, pg. 185 in *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Italics and capitalization in original.

2826 Pg. 203, "The Overcomer Literature Trust Fund," *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

2827 Pg. 193, "The Change of Dispensations," *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

2828 "The Spirit of Translation," pgs. 201-202, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

those "who understood that, like Enoch," Evan Roberts "walked daily with God,"[2829] and them only. People like Jessie Penn-Lewis and other followers of the Higher Life "find the witness in their own spirit" to Evan Roberts's prophecy, so that "they believe his message."[2830] When "his family [did] not believe his present messages," he "did not want to meet [them] anymore," and so he "rejected every attempt by [his] family" at restoration, recognizing that his "special vision and . . . burden message"[2831] required "the absolute isolation of his spirit from those who do not believe his testimony."[2832] He refused "to meet or correspond with his closest relatives," and when "his father went up to see him . . . Evan . . . would not talk."[2833] His "family [was] shown the door" so that he could, every moment, give himself to prayer.[2834] He persisted in this rejection of his family to the extent that he did not even attend his mother's funeral.[2835] Recognizing the truth of the end of the world in 1914, Roberts and Penn-Lewis ceased to publish the *Overcomer* magazine in that year—there would be no more need of it once the return of Christ took place;[2836] as Roberts and Penn-Lewis knew from the spirit world, "the End-Age of the Son of Man was dawning,"[2837] and *The Overcomer* would no longer be necessary, for as Evan Roberts prophesied, "Translation is at hand! We know in the spirit that our ministration to the Church is ended! . . . WE AWAIT TRANSLATION."[2838] However, a permanent literature trust was set up, as Mrs. Penn-Lewis's writings would be "needed by others after the departure of the watching believers," that is, those Christians who missed the partial Rapture would need her works to find out what went wrong.[2839] Penn-Lewis, Roberts, and others "were all in high

---

2829 Pg. 196, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2830 Pg. 184, *The Overcomer*, December 1913.

2831 Pgs. 203-204, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones.

2832 Pgs. 182-183, *The Overcomer*, December 1913.

2833 Pg. 170, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. His "nervous condition" was also the stated reason for why "when his mother went seriously ill, the news was not passed on to Evan" (pg. 170, *ibid*.).

2834 Pg. 193, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2835 Pg. 210, Review of "*Glory Filled The Land, A Trilogy On The Welsh Revival Of 1904–1905.* Richard Owen Roberts, ed.; H. Elvet Lewis, G. Campbell Morgan and I. Neprash. Wheaton, IL: International Awakening Press, 1989," Jim Elliff, in *Reformation and Revival* 8:2 (Spring 1999) 206-213.

2836 "An Accomplished Ministration," by Evan Roberts, in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914, pgs. 178-181. As Jessie Penn-Lewis declared: "God Himself will speak to His watching saints to make ready for His Coming; for if the Holy Spirit is preparing to withdraw from the world, we may reasonably expect that He who so definitely led His servants in the past, has now as clearly led to the closure of their service in the *Overcomer*, as a work completed, ere the Church ascends" (pg. 186, *The Overcomer*, December 1914).

2837 Pg. 201, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2838 Pg. 179, "An Accomplished Ministration," *The Overcomer*, December 1914. Capitalization retained from the original.

2839 Pg. 176, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

spirits . . . and decided to celebrate the end of the spiritual warfare[.] . . . All went out in raincoats and galoshes to the rocks where Mrs. Penn-Lewis dashed a bottle of eau-de-cologne on the rock, saying, 'In the Name of the Triune God I dash this bottle against the rocks in honour of the finished warfare with the Prince of Death.'"[2840] The groundwork for the Translation message had been prepared for some time; in 1902 Mrs. Penn-Lewis had written *Studies in Job*, which described "the mystery of the suffering which will be a message for the church in its final stages on the eve of the 'Translation.'"[2841] Evan Roberts then received "a revelation by the Holy Spirit of . . . our Lord['s] coming . . . in our life-time . . . the 'translation' . . . is at hand."[2842] Furthermore, "the Revival which broke out in Wales in 1904 had a *dispensational* significance, and was actually, speaking in a general sense, the beginning of the period in which God set His Hand to close up the Christian dispensation," as the "issue of *War On The Saints* had a [similar] dispensational significance [which] can be seen if it be considered in relation to the Welsh Revival . . . because of the 'Time of the End,' in which it appeared," namely, the few years before the end of the world which was to take place in 1914.[2843] The "latter rain" spoken of by Joel, both Penn-Lewis and Pentecostalism knew, was not actually a prophecy about rain, as the context of Joel 2:23 would indicate, but an allegory about the Holy Spirit being poured out;[2844] "the Revival in Wales" was the "beginning of the 'latter rain' which [would] prepare the Church of God for the Lord's appearing."[2845] *War on the Saints* was written so that the Church could make the second coming of Christ take place, as Christian overcomers learned to bind the devil and "drive the forces of Satan from their place in the heavenlies" by warfare prayer, "making way for the Church to ascend to her place of triumph with the Lord. . . . The . . . greatest, ultimate result of the operation of the truths concerning the deceptive workings of Satan and the way of victory [brought to light in *War on the Saints*], is in connection with the dispensational position of the Church, in view of the closing days of the age, and the Millennial Appearing of the Ascended

---

[2840] Pg. 247, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

[2841] Pg. 91, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

[2842] Pg. 177, *The Overcomer*, December 1913.

[2843] Pg. 190, "*War on the Saints:* A brief review of its dispensational significance," in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

[2844] This allegorization, of course, was central in the "latter rain" doctrine of Pentecostalism; the "latter rain" concept was believed and taught by even the earliest Pentecostals such as Charles Parham (cf. "The Strange Early History of Pentecostalism," by David Cloud, and numerous other resources on the *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*; also pg. 81, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; pgs. 26-28, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

[2845] Pg. 17, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

Lord."[2846] "The dispensational significance of the Revival in 1904 meant . . . the beginning of the decade allotted by God for the awakening, maturing and preparation of those who belonged to the Body of Christ—all in view of ultimate Translation . . . [and] the Coming Reign of Christ" ten years[2847] after the 1904 Welsh holiness revival.[2848] The fact that the "Translation" of the overcomers in the church to heaven was coming was evident because of signs: "The week of the Advent Message witnessed such events in the world that it was called the 'Black Week,'" for that week "the following were some of the notable disasters which occurred. In Wales the Senhenydd Colliery disaster; the collapse of a Zeppelin in the North Sea; the burning of a liner in mid-ocean; the wreck of an express in Liverpool; a railway accident in London; and in Russia so many railway disasters that a special commission of enquiry was appointed—all occurring within the one week."[2849] Such were evident signs that the period of "fiery tribulation" had come and of the end of the world in 1914.[2850] The *Overcomer* magazine "picked up its readers in 1909, drawing out, as with a magnet, from the midst of others, those who knew in any degree the two-fold message of the Cross, as taught in Romans vi., and then led them on, line upon line, precept upon precept, through the earlier stages of the Baptism of the Spirit, the experimental pathway of death with Christ, the life joined in spirit with Christ in God, and the war in the heavenlies, depicted in Ephesians vi. The culmination was reached in 1913 in the Translation message, which in 1914 has been amplified more in detail concerning experimental preparation for the imminent Coming of the Lord. . . . [T]he paper has been a Testimony committed to certain members of the Body of Christ, to declare to other members of the Body, for the specific leading of them on in the deep things of God in preparation for their reigning with Christ," so that those who "were among the most spiritual of the Church six years ago, and . . . were then able to recognize the truths set forth as of God" in the paper, were by 1914 fully equipped by it for the reign of Christ which was to come in that year.[2851] Indeed, at times even an exact day was pointed out. On April 16, 1914, Evan Roberts "entered the breakfast room dressed in

---

2846 Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

2847 Pg. 194, "The Change of the Dispensations," in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

2848 Pg. 190, "*War on the Saints:* A brief review of its dispensational significance," in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

2849 Pg. 191, "*War on the Saints:* A brief review of its dispensational significance," in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

2850 When the world did not end in 1914, Jessie Penn-Lewis retained much of the theology developed around her and Evan Roberts' date-setting; thus, she preached in 1927, the "great tribulation" was almost upon the world, and "with prophetic words . . . she spoke of days of persecution which the Church w[ould] face in the near future" (pgs. 296, 301, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard).

2851 Pg. 174, "The Finished Testimony," by Jessie Penn-Lewis, in *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

his going-out suit. When he came back he told [all those present], 'The Translation is very near. Prepare!'" All present "got tickets to mark everything and . . . went to [their] rooms to put all straight."[2852] However, the world did not end, neither on that day, nor in that year. Such a false prophecy (cf. Deuteronomy 18:20-22), however, was not really a false prophecy, nor were Roberts and Penn-Lewis false prophets for making, endorsing, promulgating, and defending it—on the contrary, it was evident—at least *ex post facto*—that the sin was not in Roberts and Penn-Lewis, but in the universal church. While at first this explanation for failure was not clear, since in late 1915 Penn-Lewis was still "striving 'to hold fast the 'Translation Faith' . . . thinking of how near . . . was the 'heavenly call,'"[2853] it finally became apparent that the abysmal failure of the prophecy—which had been widely proclaimed in the secular press[2854]—was not because of the sins of those who had made and propagated it. "[T]he delay factor [was] caused by lack of full spiritual unity," Roberts and Penn-Lewis taught—"Divisions must cease, disunity must be confessed, hasty judgments must be canceled, warnings against each other destroyed, certain books withdrawn, and tears of repentance shed"[2855] by others—though not, it appears, by them for their false prediction. In fact, part of the reason for the failure of Christ to return in 1914 was criticism of Evan Roberts for making such a prophecy.[2856] Had the false prophecy been received rather than rejected, it would have come to pass. While it was therefore evident that those who rejected the supernatural visitations of Roberts and Penn-Lewis were the real problem, around this time there arose "deep depression in Evan's spirit and new forms of pain in Jessie's body," and not only did publication of *The Overcomer* cease, but "the prayer watch was . . . moved elsewhere, and the book production slowed down and suspended."[2857] The *Overcomer* magazine did

---

2852 Pg. 248, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

2853 Pg. 249, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. The eschatological views of her later years are recorded on pgs. 281-290, *ibid*.

2854 Pg. 178, *The Overcomer*, December 1913. *The Overcomer* magazine itself had a worldwide influence, reaching "the spiritual section of the Church in every land," being distributed in "Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Soudan [*sic*], Egypt, North Africa, Japan, Korea, China, Thibet [*sic*], India, Burmah [*sic*], Northern and Southern Europe, North and South and Central America, and isle after isle on the seas" (pg. 186, *The Overcomer*, December 1914).

2855 Pg. 214, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. One notes that this requirement that spiritual unity and holiness increase as a prerequisite for the coming of Christ is exactly the opposite of what Scripture affirms the last days will be like (2 Timothy 3:1ff.)—but since setting dates for the return of Christ is also exactly the opposite of the teaching of Scripture (Matthew 24:36), perhaps one ought not to be surprised.

2856 Pgs. 196-199, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2857 Pg. 216, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

not return until 1920,[2858] by which time, it seems, the fallout from Roberts's and Penn-Lewis's blatantly false prophecy had been mitigated.

Roberts's "claims to special insights and divine orders and supernatural visitations" led critics to say that his "overheated imagination . . . [was] a fatal blow to real . . . religious movements,"[2859] but the critics surely were not correct, although after Roberts' ministry had run its course, in the areas where he had preached "the revival disappeared, and [Roberts' work] has made those valleys in Wales almost inaccessible to any further divine intervention."[2860] "Many . . . voiced criticism of the revival for its failure to achieve any long-lasting results,"[2861] and Roberts himself, some time later, "explained [as] tragic errors" a variety of his supernatural declarations, affirming that they were "evidence of Satan's power to exercise control . . . by entering into the heart, influencing the mind, and troubling the spirit,"[2862] so Evan Roberts himself affirmed that Satan had entered his heart, and affected his mind and spirit, in the Welsh holiness revival.[2863] "Roberts later became very critical of the revival for its emphasis on emotional excess and what he saw as the influence of demonic powers."[2864] He declared: "[D]uring the revival in Wales, I, in my ignorance, did not escape the wiles of the enemy."[2865] Indeed, Evan Roberts confessed that he had not "escaped the wiles . . . [of] the arch-fiend," but had "deep, varied, and awful experiences of the invisible powers of darkness."[2866] "In "later years . . . he . . . would question whether it was the Holy Spirit who commanded these things,"[2867] and "he confessed to a fear that he had been tricked by Satan."[2868] In fact, he came to see that many of the "visions and voices he had known and all the examples of his strange power to look into people's thoughts and feelings" were "proof that he . . . had been deceived" during the Welsh holiness revival, and he recognized that in important aspects of his holiness revival message also "he had been

---

2858 Pg. 218, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

2859 Pg. 101, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2860 Pg. 183, *The Pentecostals*, Walter Hollenweger.

2861 Pg. 527, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope. The "social effects of the revival," although significant, lasted "only for a short time" (pg. 528, *ibid*.). "Concern was expressed in the denominational press as early as 1907 that the chapels were emptier than they had been" (pg. 529, *ibid*.).

2862 Pg. 102, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2863 Cf. also pg. 521, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2864 Pg. 525, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2865 Pg. 168, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2866 Pg. 180, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

2867 Pg. 120, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2868 Pg. 126, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

deceived by the father of lies,"[2869] although not all of his encounters with spirits were evil, to be sure—only some of them were, and the "antidote to deception" was not *sola Scriptura* and cessationism, but the doctrine of the Cross that Jessie Penn-Lewis had herself learned by a vision in accordance with her belief in the Quaker Inner Light.[2870] However, Roberts acknowledged that "he began to find it hard to distinguish Satanic suggestions from the Spirit's promptings, and even harder to discern which 'voices' were only echoes of desires within his own mind." He "could not always see when his visions and voices were . . . spiritual" and when they were not, saw that he needed help so that he could get to the place where he could "differentiate [the] voice [of the] Lord . . . from the cunning of the Evil One,"[2871] and even "told . . . [an assembly of] students that he was not even sure whether the Spirit suggested things or actually spoke,"[2872] although another time he contradicted himself and said: "I am as certain that the Spirit has spoken to me as I am of my own existence," as he was "[a]t the time . . . hearing this actualized voice" as he was "heading for a bout of nervous prostration and depression and perplexity."[2873] Sometimes a spirit would speak to Evan in Welsh, sometimes in English, and sometimes in both.[2874] He had such close connections with the spirit world that "a voice" even told him things as small as to "draw a fourth line" underneath a word he had underlined three times or to command: "[R]ise from your bed."[2875] A "voice" led Evan on the "journey which ended in a full acceptance of the doctrine of identification with the Crucified One"[2876] learned by vision and then preached by Jessie Penn-Lewis. In any case, although Satan had entered his heart, many of Roberts' visions "were truly inspired," and these marvels validated that the statements in Joel 2:28-32 and Acts 2:17-21 about visions were being fulfilled in Wales,[2877] as, after all, Roman Catholic "monks" and

---

2869 Pg. 159, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2870 Pg. 173, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2871 Pg. 113, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2872 Pg. 105, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2873 Pg. 108, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2874 Pgs. 110-112, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2875 Pg. 114, 116, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2876 Pg. 113, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2877 Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. The historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism correctly notes that Acts 2:17-21 and Joel 2:28-32 do not refer to events taking place after the first century and before the seventieth week of Daniel 9; see "Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism," by Thomas Ross. Elec. acc. http://sites.google.com/site/thross7. **Change this b/c of adding paper in.**

"Welsh heroes" had experienced similar supernatural guidance.[2878] Since only some of his supernatural encounters were Satanic, when Roberts emerged briefly from two decades of seclusion in the Penn-Lewis household in the "Little Revival" of 1928-1930, which was "short-lived" and restricted to "the faithful ones in and near Gorseinon and Loughor" rather than being "a national awakening,"[2879] he again employed his powers of seeing people's hearts, and also was involved in "healings, exorcisms, and . . . prophesyings," since all such "gifts of the Spirit were scriptural" for the present day, a view he had held since at least the time of the 1904 Welsh holiness revival on.[2880] "It was hardly surprising that some thought that Evan Roberts had become an Apostolic or Pentecosta[l]."[2881] However, it was "an unpleasant shock for" Roberts to discover that already in "1931" there were "few signs of the [1928-1930] revival's lasting influence."[2882] "One year later he went into final retirement and vanished into the shadows of history,"[2883] becoming "almost a forgotten man."[2884] Many considered his lack of attendance at prayer meetings and other church events in favor of discussions among poets and attendance at "theatres" a "proof of serious backsliding."[2885] Roberts

---

2878 Pg. 109, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Further instances of visions, voices, and similar manifestations, some of which Roberts affirmed were from God, and others from Satan, are recorded on pgs. 25, 26, 29, 31, 35, 40, 48, 77, 84, 104, 113, 135, 154, 267, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

Penn-Lewis argued: "Joel said *in those days* will I pour out my Spirit.' The expression [i]s in the long Hebrew tense, expressing continuance of action, literally an *incoming, unfinished,* and *continuous* outpouring[.] It therefore appears that the words 'in those days' cover the whole dispensation of the Spirit, beginning with the Day of Pentecost" (pgs. 14-15, *The Awakening in Wales*). For this reason, although Joel is actually not speaking about the "dispensation of the Spirit" in the church age in context, since "those days" (Joel 2:29; 3:1, בַּיָּמִים הָהֵמָּה) refers to the Tribulation period (3:1ff.), Penn-Lewis nonetheless goes on to argue in later portions of *The Awakening in Wales* that the signs and wonders of Joel 2 should be expected in her time and in the remaining portion of this age. Her alleged proof from the fact that the Hebrew verb אֶשְׁפֹּךְ, "I will pour," is in the imperfect tense, which is exactly what Joel would use to express a simple future, and which cannot possibly bear her "incoming, unfinished, and continuous" idea the overwhelming majority of the time the verb appears in the imperfect tense in the Bible (Genesis 37:22; Exodus 29:12; Leviticus 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; Deuteronomy 12:16, 24; 15:23; 2 Kings 19:32; Job 16:13; Psalm 42:4; 102:1; 142:2; Isaiah 37:33; Jeremiah 7:6; 22:3; Ezekiel 7:8; 33:25; Daniel 11:15; Hosea 5:10; Joel 2:28–29) is not a little curious, but since she knew no Hebrew, perhaps it is understandable.

2879 Pg. 216, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2880 Pg. 221-223, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2881 Pg. 221, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2882 Pg. 224, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Indeed, in the 1930s there was "a serious decline . . . [in the] thousand nonconformist chapels of Welsh Wales . . . [a great] decline in spiritual vitality" (pg. 225, *ibid*.), a decline, indeed, that set in immediately after and as a result of Roberts' ministry in the holiness revival of 1904. Roberts wrote about the decline in Welsh Christianity in the years after the holiness revival in 1904 through the 1930s: "Where are the multitudes which used to grow on the rich meadows of the precious Gospel?" (pg. 269, *ibid*).

2883 Pg. 224, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2884 Pg. 225, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2885 Pgs. 228, 248, cf. 225-258, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

"abandoned his rigorist ethics, went to football matches and smoked a pipe."[2886] In 1942, advising David Shepherd in a letter, Roberts "said nothing at all about praying" and wrote: "The only word I would have you receive from me is, 'Use your commonsense. Revelation tends to undermine it. Harness your intellectual powers and drive hard.'" This advice was very "unlike the man who saw visions . . . and even more unlike the great intercessor and valued adviser of *The Overcomer* period. Surely some kind of personal declension had overtaken him."[2887] He lived a reclusive life in his old age, living off from the gifts of "Welsh friends . . . which supplemented his pension and the quarterly allowance from the Aged and Infirm Fund."[2888] He "show[ed] little enthusiasm . . . when people began to talk about a fortieth year anniversary meeting of the revival . . . [in] 1944 . . . and he finally sent his excuses."[2889] After leaving the home of Jessie Penn-Lewis, he "spent most of the rest of his life in lodges in Cardiff. Although initially dedicating himself to a ministry of intercessory prayer," he evidenced growing "dissatisfaction as he grew older. Notebooks in which he wrote during the last decade of his life reveal him as a lonely and somewhat bitter figure and are . . . almost totally devoid of religious zeal. Witness the following verse, written in English and dated 1 December 1944:

> I've changed, I doubt it not, I've changed a lot,
> I know I feel a change as great as odd,
> To think I have come home and am forgot
> As much by kin as I have been by God.[2890]

He died in a Cardiff nursing home on 29 January 1951."[2891] Roberts' final testimony was, sadly, far more like that of Demas (2 Timothy 4:10),[2892] and like those who confused standing up with conversion and regeneration in Roberts' holiness revival meetings, than that of the Apostle Paul: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished *my* course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day" (2 Timothy 4:7-8).

While Roberts' testimony of the new birth is far from certain, he affirmed that during his work in the holiness revival Satan had entered his heart, and he died with

---

2886 Pg. 182, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2887 Pgs. 239-240, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2888 Pg. 247, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2889 Pg. 249, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2890 Calvinistic Methodist Archive, National Library of Wales, 25632, cited pg. 526, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2891 Pg. 526, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

2892 Contrast the inaccurate statement that Roberts died "a man of rare charm and spirituality" on pg. 129 of *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck. Polluck would have done well to dig more deeply rather than simply reproducing the hagiography of Roberts' obituary.

scarcely a glimmer of Christian piety, throughout the Welsh holiness revival Roberts' "spiritual input" was "through ministering the gifts of the Spirit," leading Welsh Christendom to a "new respect for the possibilities of supernatural happenings, such as visions, guidances, and discerning of spirits . . . prophesyings and healings," releasing "vital forces into chapels and churches of his day," which were spread to "revival converts" and then "all over the world through the literature and conferences of *The Overcomers*," so that "charismatic and other fellowships . . . have inherited his teaching."[2893] "Amongst the 'children of the revival' . . . from Wales speaking in tongues became very prominent in the early days of the Pentecostal movement,"[2894] so that through them Pentecostalism spread all over Wales.[2895] The practices of Evan Roberts, and those influenced by him in the Welsh holiness revival, were almost identical with those of Pentecostalism. Higher Life leaders recognized that a "similar gracious work of the Spirit to that in Wales is in progress [in Los Angeles at Azuza Street],"[2896] since "the Welsh revival . . . served as an inspiration and model for the Pentecostal revival."[2897] The only significant difference was that Roberts was a passionate continuationist who prepared the way for the restoration[2898] of ecstatic jibber-jabber, but had not personally

---

2893 Pg. 254-256, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

2894 Pg. 184, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2895 Already by 1908 Pentecostalism had filled South Wales; pgs. 34-37, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

2896 Pg. 86, *Way of Faith* (Columbia, S. C.), September 6, 1906, quoted in *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As it Was in the Beginning*, 2nd ed., Frank Bartleman. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, n. d. orig. pub. 1925.

2897 Pgs. 141-142, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

2898 The onset of the Pentecostal movement was, indeed, new—ecstatic babbling did not exist among true churches or orthodox Christianity, although it was found in association with demon possession among spiritualists and others:

> [T]he Church came to regard speaking in tongues as an infallible sign of demon possession. Yet, with few exceptions, the Pentecostals have maintained that speaking in tongues has had a continuous history from the Apostolic age to the present. Although, they say, the practice fell into eclipse at an early point, a succession of small groups kept it alive until its full restoration to the Church in the 20th-century Pentecostal revival. . . . Pentecostals have constructed a history of the "true," or at least "spiritual," Church from the days of Pentecost to the present. They have compiled long lists of "authorities" to show that tongue-speaking was practiced by the sub-Apostolic church, the Waldenses, the Albigenses . . . Anabaptists. . . . and many others; and that Luther, Finney, and Moody spoke in tongues while Wesley endorsed it. These claims are, with the exception of the [grossly heretical] Camisards, Shakers, and Mormons, without factual foundation, as [even] some Pentecostal writers . . . have recognized. Some [advocates of the invented Pentecostal history of orthodox Christian tongues-speech] depend upon forced interpretations of primary sources, others are based upon secondary works presumed to be authoritative. . . . [T]he only groups . . . for whom speaking in tongues is well attested were the . . . Camisards in the late 17th century, Ann Lee's Shaking Quakers, . . . and the Irvingite, Mormon, and Spiritualist movements, which grew out of the . . . revivalism of the 1830's and 1840's. . . . [S]peaking in tongues has apparently been non-existent in the . . . historic Christian churches since the Apostolic era . . . while modern Pentecostalism is phenomenologically related to . . . the Shakers, Mormons, Irvingites, and Spiritualists—who had previously practiced tongues-speaking. (pgs. 25-27, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson)

added that particular marvel to his roster, while the Pentecostals took over the marvels and continuationism of Roberts and added a gift of babbling to them. As Roberts's revival was, so the Pentecostal Azuza Street revival was anti-doctrinal, anti-creedal, and ecumenical.[2899] Both works were filled with marvels of healing of the Faith Cure variety,[2900] visions of and encounters with what were affirmed to be the Lord Jesus, Satan, and other supernatural beings,[2901] and supernatural lights.[2902] Both works were characterized by disorganized meetings that went on for hours and hours and were led by supernatural powers, with total spontaneity as to what took place,[2903] rather than organized meetings directed by preachers or other church officials,[2904] people falling to the ground as "slain by the Spirit,"[2905] a heavy emphasis upon testimonial as a validation of their work and a corresponding absence of careful exposition of Scripture,[2906] predominant support from those not well-grounded in Scripture and opposition from church leadership,[2907] a rejection of grammatical-historical interpretation of Scripture for experience-based interpretation and a downplaying of doctrine,[2908] prophetic exhortations delivered not by men only, but also women and children, to the entire congregation,[2909]

[2899] Pgs. xiv, xxiv-xxv, 16, 24, 34, 68, 75, 83, 167-173, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2900] Pgs. xii-xiii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2901] Pgs. xii, 17, 25-26, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2902] Pg. 60, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. The supernatural lights, comparable to those of the Welsh holiness revival, were also affirmed to be present, among many other instances, when Parham first spoke in tongues (pg. 54, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson) and when the father of European Pentecostalism, T. B. Barratt, did so, whose influence "in connection with the Pentecostal Revival . . . would be difficult to overestimate" (pg. 189, cf. 14-15, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee; cf. pgs. 49, 84, 124, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Cf. pg. 121 for Barratt's connection to A. B. Simpson and to Azuza Street). Indeed, "Balls, streaks, and pillars of fire were seen so often that they were known as 'the "like as of fire,"' referring to and misusing Acts 2:3 (pg. 263, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

[2903] Pgs. 57-59, 131, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2904] Pgs. 16, 84, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2905] Pgs. 59-60, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2906] Pgs. xxi, 87-88, 175, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2907] Pg. 27, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2908] Compare pgs. 154-155, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

[2909] Pgs. 59, 103, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. One of the twelve "elders" of the Azuza Street Mission was a ten-year-old girl; her mother was another "elder" (pg. 70, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.). Either both the mother and her ten-year-old daughter were "the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly" (Titus 1:6), or the spirits at work at Azuza led the leaders there to reject what Paul recorded through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

and little preaching[2910] or no preaching at all.[2911] The sole difference of note in Pentecostalism was an increased amount of babbling,[2912] the spawn of the spirits that produced identical babbling in many pagan religions as a result of demon possession.[2913] A description of a meeting at Azuza Street, and one where Evan Roberts ministered marvel-working power, is almost identical. The following eyewitness description of the Pentecostal Azuza Street Mission could, with a change of a few minor details and with the removal of the specific added marvel of babbling as an alleged restoration of Biblical tongues, be a description of many a meeting with Evan Roberts:

> Breathing strange utterances and mouthing a creed which it would seem no sane mortal could understand, the newest religious sect has started in Los Angeles. Meetings are held in a tumble-down shack on Azuza Street . . . and devotees of the weird doctrine practice the most fanatical rites, preach the wildest theories and work themselves into a state of mad excitement in their peculiar zeal. Colored people and a sprinkling of whites compose the congregation, and night is made hideous in the neighborhood by the howlings of the worshippers who spend hours swaying forth and back in a nerve-[w]racking attitude of prayer and supplication. They claim to have "the gift of tongues," and to be able to comprehend the babel.
>
> Such a startling claim has never yet been made by any company of fanatics, even in Los Angeles, the home of almost numberless creeds. Sacred tenets, reverently mentioned by the orthodox believer, are dealt with in a familiar, if not irreverent, manner by these latest religionists.

2910 Pg. 84, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan; pg. 68, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

2911 Pgs. 87-88, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2912 The question is not one of the absence in Wales or presence in Pentecostalism of unintelligible speech. The holiness revival under Roberts featured the practice, rooted in pre-Christian Welsh paganism, of the Welsh *hywl*. The Welsh *hywl* was an "ancient and sacred" Welsh practice (pg. 45, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson) found in the Welsh holiness revival as "speaking in a strange, weird, curious mesmeric manner: it is a unique kind of incantation" (E. Cynolwyn Pugh, "The Welsh Revival of 1904-1905," *Theology Today* XII (July 1955) 226-235, elec. acc. http://www.revival-library.org/catalogues/1904ff/pugh.html). While the *hwyl* was not identical with modern Pentecostal gibberish-speech, nonetheless "[s]ome observers of the Welsh revival, hearing unfamiliar speech in prayer and preaching . . . . the . . . Welsh 'hwyl,' . . . reported that worshippers were speaking in tongues" (pg. 45, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). See also pg. 147, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

2913 "Speaking in tongues as a sign of Spirit possession has a history whose origins very likely lie deep in mankind's past. Reports of the practice extend from ancient to modern times in virtually every region of the world. What astonishes the novice student of tongue-speaking is how extraordinarily common this seemingly exotic [to those in Christendom] practice has been and still is. The phenomenon has certainly been far more extensive and frequent among non-Christians[.] . . . [S]peaking in tongues [was] evident in the inspired prophecies of the Oracle of Apollo at Delphi . . . the Thracian cult of Dionysius, the Egyptian cult of Osiris and Isis, the Syrian cult of Adonis, the Phrygian cult of Attis and Cybele, and the Persian cult of Mithras. . . . [The] Spirit . . . through possession, gave men all sorts of miraculous powers. The pneumatic state was one of ecstasy in which pneuma banishes the human 'nous' [or] 'mind' and acts or speaks through man. The deity [demon] spoke out of the pneumatic's mouth in words that neither he nor anyone else could understand unless they were translated by the Pneuma itself. To prove that he was indeed a pneumatic, a person had to demonstrate the presence of the Pneuma within him by engaging in ecstatic behavior, especially ecstatic speech" (pgs. 20-21, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

> An old colored exhorter [William Seymour], blind in one eye, is the major-domo of the company. With his stony optic fixed on some luckless unbeliever, the old man yells his defiance and challenges an answer. Anathemas are heaped upon him who shall dare to gainsay the utterances of the preacher.
>
> Clasped in his big fist the colored brother holds a miniature Bible from which he reads at intervals one or two words—never more. After an hour of exhortation the breth[ren] present are invited to join in a "meeting of prayer, song, and testimony." Then it is that pandemonium breaks loose, and the bounds of reason are passed by those who are "filled with the spirit," whatever that may be.
>
> "You-oo-oo gou-loo-loo come under the bloo-oo-oo bloo-oo," shouts an old colored "mammy," in a frenzy of religious zeal. Swinging her arms wildly about her, she continues with the strangest harangue ever uttered. Few of her words are intelligible, and for the most part her testimony contained the most outrageous jumble of syllables, which are listened to with awe by the company.
>
> One of the wildest of the meetings was held last night, and the highest pitch of excitement was reached by the gathering, which continues to "worship" until nearly midnight. The old exhorter urged the "sisters" to let the "tongues come forth" and the women gave themselves over to a riot of religious fervor. As a result a [plump] dame was overcome with excitement and almost fainted.
>
> Undismayed by the fearful attitude of the colored worshipper, another black wom[an] jumped to the floor and began a wild gesticulation, which ended in a gurgle of wordless prayers which were nothing less than shocking.
>
> "She's speakin' in unknown tongues," announced the leader, in [an] awed whisper, "keep on sister." The sister continued until it was necessary to assist her to a seat because of the bodily fatigue. Among the "believers" is a man who . . . claims to have been miraculously healed and is a convert of the new sect. Another speaker had a vision in which he saw the people of Los Angeles flocking in a mighty stream to perdition. He prophesied awful destruction to this city unless its citizens are brought to a belief in the tenets of the new faith.[2914]

Indeed, "the most enduring effect of the [Welsh] revival was the contribution it made to the development of Pentecostalism in Britain. . . . The revival . . . creat[ed] new, Pentecostal denominations. . . . it was the Pentecostals who would continue the revival emphases[.]"[2915] It is very clear that the "origins of the British Pentecostal movement" are found "in the revival in Wales . . . which played such an important part in the origins of Pentecostalism"[2916] as a whole, since the "British Pentecostal movement . . . [was of] decisive importance . . . for many European Pentecostal bodies,"[2917] and so the Welsh holiness revival was truly at the root of European Pentecostalism in general. Donald Gee, a "very influential figure in the growth of the Assemblies of God,"[2918] and, indeed, the "greatest teacher of the Pentecostal movement . . . was brought to the Pentecostal movement by the revival in Wales" after being "converted in 1905, during the revival in

---

2914 *Los Angeles Times*, April 18, 1906, pg. 1, reprinted on pgs. 175-177, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2915 Pg. 530, "Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905," Robert Pope. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57:3 (July 2006) 515-534; cf. pgs. 213, 222, etc., *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2916 Pgs. 176, 183, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2917 Pg. 208, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2918 Pg. 107, *A Light in the Land: Christianity in Wales, 200-2000*, Gwyn Davies.

Wales."[2919] Gee went on to become the chairman of the British Assemblies of God and the president of the Bible School of the Assemblies of God in London. He took long worldwide journeys to spread the Pentecostal message everywhere.[2920] Indeed, if "one looks through a year's issues of almost any Pentecostal journal, it is virtually impossible not to come across an article by him."[2921] Keswick theology permeates the Assemblies of God and other Pentecostal denominations.[2922] Gee "compares Evan Roberts with the healing evangelists of Pentecostalism."[2923] Daniel Powell Williams professed conversion through Roberts' ministry and went on to found the Pentecostal Apostolic Church.[2924] George Jeffreys, founder of the Elim Pentecostal Movement with his brother Stephen, were leading spiritual products of the holiness revival.[2925] George Jeffries had "responded totally to Evan Roberts's call to obey the Spirit in everything," and was possessed by the "revival fire" along with his brother Stephen, so that they became the "evangelists and founders of great Pentecostal movements,"[2926] as George Jeffries came to spread not only Pentecostal marvels and healings but also British Israelism.[2927] After being "drawn into the revival in Wales . . . George and Stephen Jeffreys . . . brought into

---

2919 Pg. 208, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. Gee made a salvation decision through the preaching of Seth Joshua (pg. 34, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Gee).

2920 Pg. 208, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2921 Pg. 209, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2922 "For years a standard Assemblies of God theology was Myer Pearlman's work, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*. What Pearlman taught about sanctification is right in line with Keswick ideas. [See pgs. 249-267, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible* (Pentecostal Classics), Myer Pearlman. Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, rev. ed., 1981; note, e. g., his reference to the "Victorious Life" movement on pg. 264.] This is also true of the teaching of Ernest S. Williams, for twenty years the general superintendent of the Assemblies of God. [See pgs. 31-61, *Systematic Theology*, Ernest S. Williams, vol. 3. Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, 1953, where Keswick writers such as Evan Hopkins, J. Elder Cumming, and Andrew Murray are cited and a Keswick view of sanctification is espoused; Wesleyan influence appears also in vol. 2, pgs. 256-264.] More recently, the preeminent theologian in the American Assemblies of God has been Stanley Horton. His teaching fits well with that of his earlier colleagues. [See pgs. 167-196, *What the Bible Says About the Holy Spirit*, Stanley M. Horton. Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, 1976.] The Assemblies of God is not unique in the Pentecostal movement in its tight correlation with Keswick views. Representative of the Foursquare Church is the standard theology written by Duffield and Van Cleave. In this one can see the same patterns as are found in Keswick, too. [See pgs. 291-324, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1983.] There is no question that the Keswick movement had an important role in the shaping of the theology of much of the Pentecostal world" ("Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm).

2923 Pgs. 176-177, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2924 Pg. 530, "Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905," Pope.

2925 Pg. 530, "Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905," Pope.

2926 Pg. 185, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

2927 George Jeffries prominently preached British Israelism as he, after 1940, founded the "Bible-Pattern Church Fellowship," another Pentecostal denomination he originated some years after he co-founded the Elim Pentecostal movement (cf. pgs. 186-187, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee).

being . . . [t]he Elim Pentecostal churches."[2928] Stephen participated in "large . . . healing campaigns" that perpetuated within Pentecostalism the characteristics of Faith Cure healings, namely, "mechanical and auto-suggestive methods of healing . . . relatively small numbers healed, [and] the considerable difference [in number] between those who 'professed conversion in the campaigns' and those who later joined"[2929] churches. Furthermore, the "father of the British Pentecostal movement . . . [and] a leading personality in the international Pentecostal movement . . . the Anglican priest A. A. Boddy, took part in the revival movement in Wales and worked with Evan Roberts. He was convinced that the Pentecostal movement was a direct continuation of the revival."[2930] Soon he was hosting "national and international Pentecostal conferences" in his Anglican church.[2931] As an Anglican priest wanting to spread charismatic doctrine and practices, "Boddy . . . was fortunate in having a Bishop who was exceptionally lenient, and even sympathetic, [to] the notorious Pentecostal meetings" he held, namely, the great Keswick continuationist "Handley G. Moule," who "raised . . . no ecclesiastical hindrances . . . to those remarkable scenes in connection with a Parish Church in his diocese" because of his sympathy for Boddy.[2932] "Boddy . . .[also] brought the Keswick understanding of 'baptism in the Spirit' as an enduement of power into the British Pentecostal movement,"[2933] so that "through his influence, a Keswickian understanding of 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' became normative for most Pentecostal movements."[2934] The Anglican priest distributed thousands of copies of his charismatic promotional work

---

[2928] Pg. 197, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. "[M]ost of the . . . Elim congregations . . . had been founded by George Jeffreys" (pg. 207, *ibid*).

[2929] Pg. 207, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. Cf. pgs. 148-151, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

[2930] Pgs. 184-185, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. "Boddy was . . . the acknowledged leader of early Pentecostalism in Britain" (pg. 60, "Boddy, Alexander," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen). Boddy's personal testimony to his association with Evan Roberts and the parallels between the Welsh holiness revival and the Pentecostal revival appears on pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:6 (Los Angeles, February-March 1907), reprinted on pg. 21, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove. Note also pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:8 (May 1907) & pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:9 (Los Angeles, June-September 1907), reprinted on pgs. 33, 37, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove.
reprinted on pg. 37, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove)

[2931] Pg. 71, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[2932] Pgs. 23-24, 88, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

[2933] "Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm.

[2934] Pg. 253, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

Pentecost for England at the Keswick Convention in 1907, leading many into the experience of Pentecostal tongues,[2935] for at the 1907 Keswick "[t]hose who [had] tongues [were] present, and unable and unwilling to control them when moved by the Spirit."[2936] Boddy went on to found the "Sunderland Conventions," which from "the point of view of the early history of the Pentecostal Movement in the British Isles . . . must occupy the supreme place in importance. . . . From those early Sunderland Conventions the Pentecostal Flame was carried into practically every corner of the British Isles."[2937] Similarly, Pentecostals were engaged in prominent proselytizing at the 1908 Keswick.[2938] Indubitably, the British "prominent Pentecostal streams were . . . deeply influenced by the revival in Wales"[2939] and its Keswick continuationism.

The Welsh holiness revival was central to the spread of Pentecostalism on the European continent, as it was in Britain:

> [G]lossolalia gained renewed attention through the phenomena that accompanied the revivals in Wales, Los Angeles, Christiania, Hamburg, Kassel, and other places. . . . [T]he revival in Wales under Evan Roberts produced . . . psychological and physical abnormalities . . . and sparked them also in other countries (California, Norway, Denmark, Hesse, Silesia)[.] . . . [O]pinions . . . strongly diverged. [Pentecostals] viewed speaking in tongues and similar phenomena as a renewal of the gifts of Pentecost and powerful evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit, but others . . . pronounced everything to be a work of the devil and a deception of the antichrist.[2940]

2935 Pgs. 20-21, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

2936 Pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:6 (Los Angeles, February-March 1907), reprinted on pg. 21, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove. The article is predicting what would take place: "'Tongues' at Keswick." Pentecostals were present at, promoted, and enjoyed Keswick from the time of the rise of Pentecostalism; see, e. g., the account of Pentecostal attendance at Keswick on pgs. 12-13 of the Pentecostal *Latter Rain Evangel* of September, 1922; a message from the 1922 Convention, where the Keswick speaker testifies that he was healed by the Higher Life of the body from arm pain, is reproduced on pgs. 19-24.

2937 Pgs. 37-39, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

2938 For example, the Pentecostal journal *Confidence* records:

> At Keswick [in 1908] . . . We had heard a message on the power of the Christ Life. The mid-day meal over, we were on the lake, a happy Pentecostal party. . . . Our hearts were full of praise, as we sang: . . . "Jesus . . . Blessed Saviour, Sanctifier, Glorious Lord and coming King. . . . Keswick Convention this year was again the meeting-place for very many of the Lord's Children, and we were glad to see there faces we had looked into at the [Pentecostal] Sunderland Conference. There were also hungry ones there longing to know experimentally the secret of victory and of power.
>
> A brother from Jersey was telling those to whom the Lord led him, how he had left Keswick for three days to visit Sunderland, and had there received a mighty deliverance, a Vision of Jesus and of his own nothingness, and the overwhelming Baptism of the Holy Ghost with the Sign of Tongues. . . .
>
> We saw other friends with copies of [the Pentecostal periodical] 'Confidence' under their arms ready for enquirers. . . . Many of us thank God for Keswick in the past. . . . [T]he Lord . . . is calling His people to an experimental Pentecost, their Birthright because of the Shed blood of Calvary. (pgs. 13-14, *Confidence: A Pentecostal Paper for Great Britain*, 5 (August 15, 1908).

2939 Pg. 107, *A Light in the Land: Christianity in Wales, 200-2000*, Gwyn Davies.

2940 Pg. 503, *Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 3: Sin and Salvation in Christ*, Bavinck & pg. 159, *Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 4: Holy Spirit, Church, and New Creation*, Bavinck.

News of the Welsh holiness revival brought "expectation . . . almost to a boiling point . . . [i]n Germany in 1904."[2941] The groundwork for Pentecostalism had been laid by Keswick continuationist "American Holiness evangelists"[2942] such as Robert Pearsall Smith and the central German Higher Life advocate, the Lutheran Theodore Jellinghaus.[2943] Jellinghaus recognized that "the 'doctrine of the Keswick Conventions' which he . . . taught for many years [was] the source [of] . . . the rise of the Pentecostal movement."[2944] Soon after 1904 "[e]very [German] Evangelical journal published enthusiastic reports of the beginnings of the Pentecostal Movement in Wales and India,"[2945] and, through such testimonials, charismatic phenomena began to arise all through Germany in hearts prepared for Pentecostalism by Keswick theology. "Objections based on the Bible and systematic theology were insolently rejected," for Pentecostals argued: "We do not need to investigate whether it is biblical to speak of a baptism of the Spirit and a new experience of Pentecost, for we can see all around us men and women, and not only individuals, who can testify from their own blessed experience that there is such a thing."[2946] In line with the Welsh holiness revival's repudiation of the mind, logic, and systematic theology, Pentecostals taught: "We need no more theology or theory. Let the devil have them. . . . Away with such foolish bondage! Follow your Heart!"[2947] Although Pentecostal founders knew that "many 'winds of doctrine' blew at Azuza Street" and there were "intrusion[s] of spiritualists and mediums into their midst," nonetheless it was clear to the charismatics that the work was a real "revival [and] the

---

2941 Pg. 221, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2942 Pg. 221, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2943 See chapters 6-7 of *Perfectionism*, vol. 1, B. B. Warfield, for an analysis of the rise and progress of the German Higher Life movement and a study of the embrace and promulgation of Higher Life theology by Jellinghaus through the influence of Robert P. Smith at the Oxford Convention (cf. pg. 225, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874), along with the later Jellinghaus' and German evangelical repudiation of the Higher Life and the Pentecostal doctrine that logically develops from it.

2944 Pg. 225, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. The affirmation of Jellinghaus was true for not Germany only, but Pentecostalism in general (cf. pg. 45, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee).

2945 Pg. 222, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. The Welsh holiness revival was key to the spread of Pentecostalism to India. "Wales was . . . the cradle . . . India . . . the Nazareth . . . Los Angeles . . . [the] world-wide restoration of the power of God" in the Pentecostal movement, for "[m]en who had been both in the Wales and India revivals declared this [charismatic one] to be the deepest work of all" (pgs. 90, 107, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan).

2946 Pg. 222, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

2947 Pg. 92, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. The teaching at Azuza Street, that "[w]hat the people need is a living Christ, not dogmatic, doctrinal contention" (pg. 101, *ibid*) is fine, ecumenical, non-dogmatic Keswick theology.

beginning of a historic awakening."[2948] The international impact of the Welsh holiness revival, as the source of European Pentecostalism, was truly profound.

Not only was the Welsh holiness revival the spark of Pentecostalism in Britain and on the European continent, but it was central to the rise of American Pentecostalism also. The Azuza Street Mission, where "the Pentecostal movement ignited,"[2949] was "regarded by Pentecostal publicists as the place of origin of the world-wide Pentecostal movements," was established by W. J. Seymour, who had been seeing visions from his youth and had adopted the Faith Cure theology of the Higher Life for the body, after which he suffered from smallpox and became permanently blind in one eye.[2950] "Seymour . . . in common with Evan Roberts' leadership in the Welsh Revival . . . preached very little, and more or less allowed things to go their own way."[2951] Seymour's work found fertile soil in Los Angeles because of the preparatory work of "Joseph Smale and Frank Bartleman . . . preachers who had been influenced by the revival in Wales."[2952] As the Higher Life continuationist foundation for Pentecostalism was being laid in Los Angeles, the "religious life of the city was dominated by Joseph Smale, whose large First Baptist Church had been transformed into the 'New Testament Church' due to the effects of the Welsh revival which were being felt in Los Angeles at the time."[2953] Smale's transformation from a Baptist into a continuationist gift-seeker is paradigmatic of the type of influence the Welsh holiness revival under Evan Roberts exerted. The methodology and practices of Evan Roberts had swept into Los Angeles in

---

2948 Pgs. xx-xxi, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2949 Pg. 43, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.

2950 Pg. 595, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

2951 Pg. 12, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee. In a manner also reminiscent of Evan Roberts' actions in the pulpit, in Seymour's meetings "[h]e usually kept his head inside the top . . . [of] two empty shoe boxes . . . during the meeting, in prayer" (pg. 58, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan). Indeed, "[w]hile Brother Seymour kept his head inside the old empty box in 'Azuza' all was well" (pg. 89, *ibid*).

2952 Pg. 22, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. Hollenweger affirms that Smale and Bartleman were Baptists, but they were only so in the sense that Jezebel (Revelation 2:20) or Diotrephes (3 John 9) or Judas (Acts 1:25) were Baptists before they publicly apostatized. The meeting and coworking of Seymour and Bartleman is described on pgs. 41ff., *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2953 Pg. xi, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. See pgs. 13-42 for a detailed description of how the separation from Baptist doctrine and the adoption of Pentecostalism took place. While the statement above is a reasonable summary of events, a more detailed description would note that Smale actually left—with much of his congregation—the First Baptist Church to establish the New Testament Church; there was a church split, with some wishing to continue to practice Baptist doctrine instead of adopting wholesale the practices of Evan Roberts.

1905, being concentrated in Smale's First Baptist Church.[2954] "The revival in Smale's church was sparked by news of the great Welsh revival of 1904-5 led by Evan Roberts. A trip to Wales by Smale and an exchange of letters between Bartleman and Evan Roberts demonstrate a direct spiritual link between the move of God[2955] in Wales and the pentecostal outpouring in Los Angeles in 1906."[2956] After Smale "returned from Wales," having "been in touch with the revival [there] and Evan Roberts, [he] was on fire to have the same visitation and blessing come to his own church in Los Angeles. . . . They were waiting on God for an outpouring of the Spirit there."[2957] Smale began to "preac[h] . . . on the revival in Wales,"[2958] instead of preaching only the Bible. Meetings in his church were carried on in a manner identical to that of those with Evan Roberts.[2959] Soon "Pastor Smale [was] prophesying of wonderful things to come. He prophesie[d] the speedy return of the apostolic 'gifts' to the church," as others, prepared by the testimonials to the Higher Life and marvels worked in Wales, had "been expecting just such a display of . . . power for some time," thinking that "it might break out any hour."[2960] After fifteen weeks of daily meetings, Smale and those he had led away from Baptist convictions separated themselves from those who wanted the old paths and organized the "New Testament Church" to continue to spread the innovations and strange fire from Wales.[2961] As tongues began to break out at the Azuza Street Mission,[2962] "Brother Smale had to come to 'Azuza,'" for many of his church members were there, speaking in gibberish. Smale "invited them back home, promised them liberty in the Spirit," and tongues were "wrought mightily at the New Testament Church also."[2963]

2954 Pg. xv, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2955 That is, one who accepts Pentecostalism would consider both the work of Evan Roberts and the work of Pentecostalism a move of God in revival blessing. One who rejects Pentecostalism would also need to reject the work of Evan Roberts in Wales.

2956 Pg. xvi, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2957 Pg. 13, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Scripture never teaches believers in the church age to seek another outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit was poured out in the book of Acts, and He is now present. The Lord will not pour Him out again until the Tribulation period after the Rapture of the saints.

2958 Pg. 27, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2959 See a description on pgs. 20-21 of *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. A simple change of names from "Smale" to "Roberts" would be the only thing necessary to change the description from a meeting in Los Angeles to one in Wales.

2960 Pg. 16, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2961 Pgs. 26-27, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2962 The tongues-speech present at the precursors to Azuza at 214 North Bonnie Brae Street, etc. are described by Anderson on pgs. 64ff. of *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*.

2963 Pg. 54, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

"Brother Smale was God's Moses, to lead the people as far as to the Jordan" in preparing them to speak in tongues by introducing the practices of Evan Roberts—then "Brother Seymour led them over" into the tongues experience.[2964] Tongues were present "at Azusa Street [and] at the New Testament Church, where Joseph Smale is pastor; some of his people were among the first to speak with 'tongues.'"[2965] Not long afterwards "Brother Elmer Fisher" led the "baptized saints"—those who had spoken in tongues—"from the New Testament Church" to found "the 'Upper Room' mission," which "became for a time the strongest mission in town" to spread the Pentecostal experience.[2966]

Frank Bartleman[2967] was likewise profoundly impacted by the Welsh holiness revival on his journey to becoming an Apostle of Pentecostalism. He was born to a Quaker mother, adopted the Gospel of Wealth form of pseudo-Christianity, a form of religion dependent on Social Darwinism[2968] and with similarities to the Word of Faith doctrine that all believers should be rich, through the preaching of Russell Conwell, "author of the gospel of wealth classic, *Acres of Diamonds*."[2969] Conwell baptized Bartleman and licensed him to preach, at which time Bartleman "decided to 'trust God' for his body. A lifelong devotion to the doctrine of divine healing followed,"[2970] although Bartleman was "in his own words . . . a 'life-long semi-invalid' who 'always

---

[2964] Pg. 62, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2965] Pg. 86, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2966] Pgs. 84-85, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan; pg. 70, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. Smale's New Testament Church experienced a split over Pentecostalism, even as Smale's First Baptist Church did over Evan Roberts' Welsh revivalism.

[2967] Bartleman's book is the "only extant narrative by a participant in the April 1906 events" associated with the founding of the worldwide Pentecostal movement in Los Angeles (pg. 49, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970).

[2968] Pg. 31, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Mapes Anderson.

[2969] Pg. xii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. While Paul defined preaching the gospel as proclaiming the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and salvation for sinners through faith in Him (1 Corinthians 15:1-4), the Gospel of Wealth preached a different gospel (Galatians 1:8-9). "Exhorting his audiences—who paid for admission—Conwell, in his 'Acres of Diamonds' address, said: 'I say that you ought to get rich, and it is your duty to get rich . . . to make money honestly is to preach the gospel'" (pg. 174, *Who's Who in Christian History*, ed. Douglas & Comfort). Conwell may have held to the true gospel, but his writings and sermons are either entirely devoid of it or almost entirely so, and he failed to preach it, if he believed in it at all, with anything close to the clarity with which he preached the need to get rich.

[2970] Pg. xii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

lived with death looking over my shoulder'"[2971] and lived in "poor health to the end."[2972] Furthermore, as an unregenerate person, Bartleman was able to reject the Trinity and the true gospel by working with and accepting the modalism and works-salvation of the Oneness Pentecostal movement, becoming an important leader in the "Jesus-only" heresy shortly after it began.[2973] Nevertheless, Bartleman, "[s]tirred by the revival in Wales in 1904 . . . quickly became part of the Azusa Street meetings and the new movement."[2974] After hearing F. B. Meyer testify to the marvels going on in Wales through the work of Evan Roberts—a work which Meyer associated with the presence of the miraculous gifts of 1 Corinthians 12,[2975] where tongues are included—Bartleman's heart was passionately stirred to see the same marvels take place in Los Angeles also. He read chronicles of the Welsh holiness revival and began to distribute many thousands of copies of such works, which were used to "spread the fire in the churches wonderfully." He "spoke . . . on the revival in Wales" in religious organizations such as the "Friends Church" and other congregations committed to the Higher Life continuationism.[2976] He also received the ability to prophecy from supernatural spirits, and he "prophesied continually of a mighty outpouring" that was to come.[2977] Indeed, among those brought under the influence of Evan Roberts, the "spirit of prophecy began to work . . . on a large scale," as people prayed for the gifts of "discernment of spirits, healing, [and] prophecy."[2978] Through testimonies about what was going on in the Welsh holiness revival, the expectation of a soon-coming mighty restoration of all the sign gifts spread rapidly through the already very sympathetic Higher Life assemblies. Evan Roberts and his holiness revivalism brought a widespread expectation of the restoration of all the sign gifts, including

---

2971 Pg. xii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Bartleman's father was also a continuationist, as a Roman Catholic. Bartleman, despite his belief in the Faith Cure, wrote in 1925: "My health had been poor, from a child" (pg. 1, *ibid*. Bartleman's grammar leaves not a little to be desired throughout his book.) Nor was Bartleman able to heal his own child, who tragically died in 1905 (pg. xv, *ibid*). Bartleman also, despite Romans 13, "occasionally ran afoul of the law" for regularly creating what was essentially Christian graffiti (pg. xiv, *ibid*)—if one can call law-breaking and producing graffiti Christian, which is very highly dubious.

2972 Pg. xxiii-xxiv, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. "Frank Bartleman, like Parham, was afflicted with ailments from infancy: gastric fever, double vision, varicose veins, frequent toothaches, and almost daily sick headaches and dyspepsia" (pg. 102, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; quote marks in the original source, Bartleman's *From Plow to Pulpit: From Maine to California*, pgs. 6-12, have been removed).

2973 Pg. xxii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2974 Pg. 74, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

2975 Pg. 172, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

2976 Pg. 29, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2977 Pgs. 7-12, 19, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2978 Pg. 19, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

tongues.[2979] Bartleman began to correspond with Evan Roberts, exchanging letters "which linked us [in Los Angeles] up with the revival there [in Wales]." Roberts and Bartleman rejoiced together that in Wales and Los Angeles many a "soul [was] finding its way to the White Throne."[2980] Roberts called the prophesying, marvel-working Bartleman "[m]y dear brother in the faith" and his "comrade" in the "terrible fight" with the "kingdom of evil," as both engaged in the warfare with spirits described by Roberts and Penn-Lewis in *War on the Saints*. Following the pattern of Evan Roberts,[2981] Bartleman plunged into "a constant conflict in prayer with the powers of darkness," experienced much "Soul Travail," was "deal[t] with . . . much also about the 'blood,'" and learned much about "'the fellowship of His sufferings' in prayer," with the result that, again following the pattern of Evan Roberts,[2982] his "nerves were getting very worn."[2983] Roberts wrote to Bartleman concerning the marvels that were taking place in Los Angeles:[2984] "I was exceedingly pleased to learn the good news of how you are beginning to experience wonderful things."[2985] A vision of a being that Bartleman and another wonder-worker thought was Jesus Christ confirmed that an outpouring was going to come.[2986] "Slowly but surely the conviction is coming upon the saints of Southern California that God is going to pour out His Spirit here as in Wales. . . . Wales will not long stand alone in this glorious triumph . . . 'Pentecost' is knocking at our doors . . . in the very near future . . . a deluge . . . will sweep all before it."[2987] Although the Lord Jesus repeatedly warned: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign,"[2988]

[2979] See pgs. 63-68, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

[2980] Pg. 33, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Since only the damned, not the saved, will be judged at the White Throne judgment recorded in Revelation 20, many souls appearing before the White Throne would also be something that would cause Satan and his demons to rejoice—if anything can cause them to rejoice.

[2981] E. g., pg. 22, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2982] "I can sympathize with Evan Roberts' nervous breakdown, after the revival in Wales," Bartleman wrote, after being forced to a period of extended rest himself from doing the same sort of work as Roberts (pg. 93, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan).

[2983] Pgs. 39-40, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Bartleman misinterprets the passages he speaks of in the same manner that Roberts and Penn-Lewis misinterpreted them.

[2984] It is noteworthy that Jessie Penn-Lewis's *Overcomer* magazine was also being read in Los Angeles, and that "Los Angeles" was recognized as "the *centre* of this country [the USA] for Occultism of all kinds" (cf. pg. 2, *The Overcomer*, January 1910).

[2985] Pgs. 15, 22, 25, 31, 33, 64-65, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2986] Pg. 17, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2987] Pg. 37, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[2988] Matthew 12:39; 16:4.

nonetheless, while working with Smale at the New Testament Church, where both men were charter members,[2989] in February 1906 Bartleman began to "ask the Lord to pour out His Spirit speedily, with 'signs following.'"[2990] It became evident what was coming: "A final call, a world-wide Revival. Then judgment upon the whole world. Some tremendous event is about to transpire."[2991] "It was into this charged atmosphere that Seymour came, early in 1906. In his first sermon . . . he preached on Acts 2:4," declaring that the initial evidence of Spirit baptism was speaking in tongues to those who already believed that tongues were "one of the gifts that were to be poured out upon sanctified believers"[2992] because of Higher Life continuationism and the Welsh holiness revival. The soil was ripe. Very shortly thereafter tongues—or at least gibberish claiming to be tongues[2993]—had broken out in Los Angeles. "Sunday Morning, April 15, [at] the New Testament Church . . . [a] colored sister was there and spoke in 'tongues.' . . . It seemed like Pentecostal 'signs.' . . . [A] few nights before, April 9," at a "little cottage on Bonnie Brae Street . . . the Spirit had fallen" and a "number had spoken in 'tongues.' . . . The pioneers had broken through, for the multitude to follow."[2994] The spiritual warfare taught and modeled by Roberts and Penn-Lewis had come to its fructifying point.

2989 Pg. 27, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2990 Pg. 40, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2991 Pg. 42, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2992 Pg. 65, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

2993 Robert Anderson notes:

> In the earliest years of the Pentecostal movement, the German scholar Mosiman carefully investigated many cases of Pentecostal tongues-speech . . . [n]ot once did he hear any foreign language, nor was he able to authenticate a single claim that any tongue-speaker had spoken in a language previously unknown to him. . . . [N]early every non-Pentecostal observer of tongue-speakers has recognized its non-linguistic, 'gibberish' character. . . . [S]tudies now completed or in progress have concluded that speaking in tongues is incoherent, repetitive syllabification having neither the form nor the structure of human speech. . . . [L]inguistic analysis of speaking in tongues . . . . [indicates that Pentecostal] tongue-speech . . . lacked all of the elements essential to any language, even a hypothetical or newly created one: vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and a systematically related phonological-semantic structure . . . speaking in tongues bears no systematic resemblance to any natural language, living or dead[.] . . . Where it is asserted that non-Pentecostals confirmed the real linguisticality of tongue-speech, these witnesses are either unnamed, cannot be found, or are incompetent to judge. The only reliable evidence is the growing volume of recorded tongue-speech which in every single instance flatly and unambiguously contradicts Pentecostal claims to xenoglossy . . . speaking in a language unknown to the speaker. (pgs. 16-18, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson)

Anderson discusses and provides further sources for numbers of scientific studies, not a one of which gives a shred of evidence that Pentecostal "tongues" are anything other than meaningless babbling.

It is also noteworthy, in light of the claim by modern gibberish-speakers that they are speaking a "heavenly language," that one who was caught up to heaven and heard a real heavenly language declared under inspiration that "it is not lawful for a man to utter" on earth the heavenly speech he heard (2 Corinthians 12:4).

2994 Pgs. 42-43, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. The cottage at Bonnie Brae Street was the place the fanatical meetings were held before the Azuza Street location was acquired.

"Demons are being cast out, the sick healed, many blessedly saved, restored, and baptized with the Holy Ghost and power."[2995] The Power behind the marvels of the Welsh holiness Revival had moved into Los Angeles. The signs that had been sought for had come. The Welsh holiness revival had given birth—the world-wide Pentecostal movement had come forth in Los Angeles.

Pentecostal pioneers, having been brought by the influence of the Welsh holiness revival to the point where tongues had been restored, spread Pentecostalism from Azuza Street in Los Angeles, California onward to the rest of the world with an astonishing rapidity,[2996] so that the spirits that authored the confusion of the Welsh meetings authored also the babbling that was allegedly a restoration of the gift of tongues and the many other heretical doctrines and practices found at Azuza Street and budding Pentecostalism.[2997] British Israelism, the partial-Rapture theory,[2998] modalism, and practices such as unmarried men and women kissing each other, all accompanied with many supernatural marvels, were blazed abroad everywhere.[2999] Bartleman and Smale[3000] were not by any means exceptional in their transition from Welsh holiness revival and Keswick influences into Pentecostalism; vast numbers of men in Higher Life and "holiness leadership . . . promptly took places of leadership in the pentecostal revival. It was the Kings, the Tomlinsons, the Seymours, the Bartlemans, the Barrats, the Pauls, the Parhams, the Masons, the Ebys—all of the holiness movement . . . that dominated the pentecostal revival's formative years."[3001] Throughout the American "south . . . there were significant shifts of groups of holiness churches to the new movement . . . other holiness bodies were also affected."[3002] First in Los Angeles,[3003] and then in the rest of

---

2995 Pg. 64, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

2996 Compare the description on pgs. 71ff., *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

2997 E. g., a well-documented summary of some of the extremely numerous, bizarre, and stomach-turning heresies of Parham, Seymour's mentor, covers pgs. 83-89 of *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

2998 Many early Pentecostals taught that "the Pentecostal movement was 'the Bridal call' and that only those who accepted it would be taken up in the Rapture and receive high rewards in the coming Kingdom, while those who rejected it would suffer the terrors of the Tribulation and hold positions subordinate to the Pentecostals in the Millennium" (pg. 148, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

2999 Pg. 23, cf. 199, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; pg. 69, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

3000 See pgs. 23, 27, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

3001 Pg. 75, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

3002 Pg. 75, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

3003 Pg. 71, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson, describes the torrent of members of Higher Life churches and workers in Holiness associations turning to

the world, huge numbers of Higher Life churches and individuals moved into Pentecostalism. For example, all the members of the Southern Florida Holiness Association except three became Pentecostals in the Church of God, and their camp meeting became a pentecostal center, while all the Nazarene churches in Florida, except one, turned Pentecostal.[3004] Entire Higher Life denominations, such as the Pentecostal Holiness Church, the Fire Baptized Holiness Church, the Church of God, the United Holy Church of America, and the Pentecostal Free Will Baptist Church, entered the charismatic fold wholesale after receiving the strange fire arising from Azuza Street. The majority of the Church of God in Christ turned Pentecostal after its leader became a charismatic at Azuza Street.[3005] "Most important for the rapid dissemination of the Pentecostal message was its propagation at convocations of Holiness people gathered from all across the nation and around the world. . . . From these places the Pentecostal evangel was carried . . . back to the innumerable religious groups and locals from which they came. . . . Initially, the use of Holiness resources and institutions was of enormous, perhaps crucial, significance for spreading the Pentecostal movement."[3006] The supernatural spirits that led Evan Roberts throughout the Welsh holiness revival unleashed an incalculable impact on the United States and the rest of the world through the rise of worldwide Pentecostalism. As people came from all over the world to see the marvels in the work of Evan Roberts, and took from Wales the same strange fire to their own countries, so people came to Azuza Street from across American and from other continents, took the Pentecostal fire with them,[3007] and returned home to bring countless others, especially those already prepared for Pentecostalism by the continuationism of Keswick and the Higher Life theology, into the Pentecostal fold.[3008] "The Welsh Revival" was "the last 'gap' across which the latest sparks of the holiness enthusiasm leapt igniting the Pentecostal movement."[3009] Pentecostalism was the true child and heir of the Welsh holiness revival work of Evan Roberts. It is historically certain that the

---

Pentecostalism in Los Angeles, while whole Holiness churches closed their doors and moved to Azuza Street with their congregations or adopted Pentecostalism where they were.

[3004] Pg. 75, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

[3005] Pgs. xix-xx, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan

[3006] Pgs. 73-75, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

[3007] Pgs. 149, 159, 178-179, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Nonetheless, Pentecostal missionaries had to learn the languages of the foreign peoples they sought to reach (pg. 178, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.), as the gibber-jabber of tongues were not real languages, as were the tongues on Pentecost (Acts 2).

[3008] Pgs. xix-xxi, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[3009] Pg. 46, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.

"world-wide . . . Pentecostal . . . revival was rocked in the cradle of little Wales . . . becoming full grown in Los Angeles."[3010]

In addition to his central role in the rise of Pentecostalism, Roberts also influenced Christendom to adopt the practice of women leading men in public congregational prayer[3011]—something without example in Scripture,[3012] although encouraged by Roberts' Keswick forefather, Robert Pearsall Smith[3013] in line with Quaker opposition to Biblical complementarian gender roles—and the holiness revival played a significant role in "chang[ing] attitudes towards the public role to be fulfilled by women" as women led in "speaking . . . giving testimony . . . and, occasionally, preaching" in the holiness revival meetings.[3014] Furthermore, the holiness revival broke down denominational walls for an ecumenical setting aside of doctrinal differences.[3015]

[3010] Pg. 19, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[3011] "Throughout the nineteenth century women were banned from any public role in church life, but now they were set free to pray and praise openly," because of Evan Roberts' misinterpretation of Joel 2:29 (Pgs. 37-38, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; cf. pg. 43). At times he would have church services run by the women who helped him (pg. 80, *ibid*.). His practice of having little children likewise direct in prayer, song, and testimony (cf. pg. 79, *ibid*) has not been as widely adopted. Compare pgs. 82-83, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905); pgs. 163-165, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. The New Measures propagated by Charles Finney had likewise included women leading mixed congregations in prayer.

[3012] Of course, the Bible does record prayer meetings where both men and women were present, but it is noteworthy that in such passages the grammar of the texts do not affirm that women led the congregation in prayer; e. g., Acts 1:13-14 states that "these" (v. 14)—the male leaders of v. 13—"continued . . . in prayer and supplication," while "the women" were simply "with" them, so that the natural interpretation of the passage is that the men, and in this case, the male spiritual leadership, led in prayer, while the rest of the church, including the women, prayed silently in agreement with the words addressed to God by the ministers. That is, the οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες of v. 14 are Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Φίλιππος καὶ Θωμᾶς, Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Ματθαῖος, Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμων ὁ Ζηλωτής, καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου of v. 13, while these male spiritual leaders were simply σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ Μαρίᾳ τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ.

[3013] In Robert P. Smith's "meetings everyone who felt inwardly moved to it, led in prayer. Even women were permitted to do so," because of the "baptism of the Spirit," as Smith "longed for the return of the Apostolic age" with its signs and wonders. It is noteworthy that while Smith was preaching, "by his side in the pulpit there stood or sat men who interrupted the discourse with prayers and songs," a matter also comparable to the disorder found in Evan Roberts's meetings, although not to the same extent ("Die Heiligungsbewegung," Chapter 6, *Perfectionism*, B. B. Warfield, vol. 1). Compare the record of Smith praying a single sentence, followed by people praying single sentences throughout the gathered assembly, sometimes in various languages, on pg. 291, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

[3014] Pg. 533, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

[3015] Cf. pg. 63, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Pentecostals such as Donald Gee, George Jeffries, Alexander Boddy, and Frank Bartleman, who were products of the Welsh holiness revival, continued this emphasis upon ecumenicalism (cf. pgs. 198, 206-213, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger & pgs. 167-173, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan). It is not surprising that, following its Higher Life antecedents, "the first beginnings of classical pentecostalism were decidedly ecumenical," and the "neo-pentecostal movement, since its beginnings . . . has been *de facto* ecumenical" (pgs. 33-34, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan). Parham's belief about

Anglicans, with their false sacramental gospel, and many independent congregations of a tremendous variety of doctrinal persuasions, were united[3016] in leading meetings in State-church facilities and free church chapels alike, teaching that there must be a united one-world church in preparation for the return of Christ.[3017] All denominations celebrated united prayer meetings[3018] and "sectarianism [was] almost annihilated,"[3019] as Evan Roberts's teaching led the many Biblical commands about ecclesiastical separation to be ignored. Rather, it was taught that "the Holy Ghost is no respecter of denominations."[3020] "Mr. Roberts said: 'Don't talk about denominations these days,'" pounding the pulpit as he spoke—"Away with all that."[3021] Evan Roberts and his revivalism taught Anglicans that they did not need "a new . . . Prayer Book, Creed, or Church,"[3022] although Anglicanism taught baptismal regeneration. As the sayings of the Druids were acceptable at the Broadlands Conferences,[3023] so one of Roberts's "finer sermons" was

---

how ecumenism is to be achieved is described on pg. 84, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

3016 One Anglican minister testified:

> No one dependent for information on the newspapers can have any idea of the extent to which the [Anglican] Church has participated in the movement. . . . [In a] typical . . . instance . . . [the] Vicar . . . atten[d] revival services under Evan Roberts[.] . . . [He then] began to hold . . . meetings . . . himself. . . . Dissenters proposed to continue the meetings and to invite [Anglican] Churchmen to attend their buildings . . . The meetings . . . dr[ew] us all together in a wonderful way, and we have come to know each other and trust each other more thoroughly than would otherwise have been possible in many years. . . . The better spirit between [State] Church and Dissent is not confined to one or two localities. . . . Baptist preacher[s] sent . . . to the priest of th[eir] district . . . the names of . . . people . . . who had given their names for Confirmation at his Revival services. . . . In a well-known town a Baptist preacher holding services in the streets . . . urged any [State] Church listeners who had not been confirmed to give in their names to the clergy. . . . [A] man . . . applied at once to his Vicar in consequence of this appeal. . . . [T]he [Anglican] Church's mission services have been attended by hundreds, and probably thousands, of Dissenters. . . . Compare Evan Roberts' teaching and questioning with that of some of the [Anglican] Church missioners and the difference is barely discoverable, so far as the general line is concerned. Where Roberts stops short, on the sacramental life, the [Anglican] missioners were, of course, strong, [since] in the sacramental life lies the way of preservation[.] (pgs. 183-185, "The Revival in Wales," A. T. Fryer. *The East and the West: A Quarterly Review for the Study of Missions*. (1905) 174-188)

Shame on the Baptist preachers who rejected Christ's command for separation from all false religion, including sacramentalism (2 Corinthians 6:14-18), and joined with Evan Roberts in promoting a false and unbiblical unity between truth and error.

3017 Pgs. 61, 67, 127, 142-143, 197-198, 207, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. There will, indeed, be a united one-world "church" before the revelation of Christ at the end of the Tribulation period, but God calls it "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth" (Revelation 17:5), so it is not a little unwise to prepare the way for it.

3018 Pg. 126, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

3019 Pg. 119, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

3020 Pg. 62, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

3021 Pg. 75, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

3022 Pg. 161, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

3023 E. g., pgs. 88-89, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

"based upon the Archdruid's call . . . [for] peace and unity at every level of life,"[3024] for "Evan Roberts preached about the power of Pentecost to sweep away divisions of . . . denomination,"[3025] as the spirit powers behind his preaching did not lead people to separate from false religion and join true churches, but to unite the false and true in one ecumenical unity. Thus, not only Pentecostalism and charismatic phenomena, but also feminism and ecumenicalism, were products of Roberts's work.

While Pentecostals, feminists, and advocates of ecumenicalism had much to cherish from the work of Evan Roberts, his work had many critics among Baptists and other advocates of the older orthodoxy and theology of revival. Critics of Evan Roberts affirmed that his work was destroying a genuine revival movement in Wales that had already been taking place, "particularly, though not exclusively, among the Baptists . . . prior to Roberts beginning his mission."[3026] They thought that "[d]elusions and extravagances in various forms were countenanced and even fostered . . . the wave of inordinate emotionalism with its accompanying evils . . . undoubtedly was one of the causes that silenced the Spirit, and drove [Him] from among the people."[3027] They argued that "violent bodily exercises . . . contortions and prostrations . . . did not possess any specific spiritual value, and did not convey any moral lesson[,] [nor left any] salutary impression . . . behind[,] [but were] the weakness of man rather than the power of God."[3028] For example, Roberts' opponents affirmed his work "sounded the death-knell of the Revival in the Avan Valley. The flame was there, but it was extinguished. The tide began to ebb, and ebb it did; and the last state of that Church is worse than the first."[3029] At "Zoar, Neath," church leaders and congregants averred, "[Roberts] has spoilt our meeting," as "people seemed to have turned their faces away from God, and were looking to the Revivalist."[3030] In "[n]umerous other instances . . . vast multitudes . . . [experienced] the Revival wave, feeling that they were face to face with the realities of life, conscious of the Divine presence in their midst, only to be told by Evan Roberts within five minutes of his appearance that the Holy Spirit was not there, because *they* had hindered His operations and refused to give obedience."[3031] The "Tabernacle Baptist

---

3024 Pg. 61, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

3025 Pg. 80, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

3026 Pg. 517, "Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905," Robert Pope. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57:3 (July 2006) 515-534.

3027 Pg. 141, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3028 Pg. 238, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3029 Pg. 51, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3030 Pg. 53, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3031 Pgs. 53-54, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original.

Church on the Hayes, Cardiff" was a "case in point" of the fact that "in the majority of cases [Roberts'] appearances had a dispiriting effect. Many were converted who had neither seen nor heard Evan Roberts; and some of the most successful meetings were held in the districts and towns to which Evan Roberts had refused to go on the ground that the Holy Spirit had not given him any message for them."[3032] In those "Nonconformist places of worship where the ministers and elders were strong and wise enough to curb the . . . impulsive and excitable . . . and to keep the movement within due and proper limits[,] . . . [t]housands were converted, and the vast majority of them remain[ed] faithful[.]"[3033] Roberts was influenced by "the Keswick movement and holiness teaching" and his theology of revival placed him "in the same camp as the American revivalist, Charles G. Finney;" his beliefs were, consequently, in contrast to and "beyond the tradition of the Welsh revivals" of the past, which had held a notably different theology of revival, affirming that it was "wholly dependent on the grace of God."[3034]

The evangelical Congregationalist minister Peter Price "believed a genuine revival was taking place apart from Roberts' activities"[3035] and "stated that Roberts's emphasis on direct and unmediated divine inspiration denied the need for the objective preaching of the person and work of Christ and so created 'a sham revival,' which was hindering 'the true revival' that had long preceded Roberts' work."[3036] For example, "for nearly two years the Revival flame was ablaze in Cardiganshire . . . before Evan Roberts was heard of . . . and it was a pure work of God in that county. That pure stream became impure under the hoof of the enemy" as Roberts' methods took hold.[3037] In Price's important "letter to the *Western Mail* . . . he wrote that there were two revivals in Wales,

---

3032 Pg. 77, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3033 Pgs. 113-114, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Unfortunately, Morgan mentions that such Nonconformist churches were a minority; the majority that fell under the influence of Evan Roberts and his methods were central in the decline in Welsh Nonconformity after the passing of the holiness revival.

3034 Pg. 520, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope. Affirming that revival is wholly dependent upon the grace of God does not mean that God does not answer the prayers of His people for revival; rather, it recognizes that even such prayers, and not answers to them only, are a product of His grace.

3035 Pg. 231, *The Making of the Modern Church: Christianity in England since 1800*, B. G. Worrall.

3036 Pg. 555, "Evan Roberts," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

3037 Pg. 112, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan; cf. pg. 116-117 for other examples of revival before Evan Roberts. Other men began to copy the practices of Evan Roberts. "These men . . . followed Evan Roberts from place to place, picked up his platitudes and broken sentences, [and] went about the country repeating them and imitating his methods and contortions. Thus it was that some of the finest elements in our Christian religion, so far from being strengthened in this Revival, were actually discouraged. So great was the passion for results that men forgot what was due to reverence and even to decency. Sensationalism was consecrated" (pg. 140, *ibid*).

one a true revival based on the substitutionary atonement of Christ and the other a sham revival based on emotionalism for which Evan Roberts was the major spokesman."[3038] Price wrote:

> I write the following in the interest of the religion of Jesus Christ, and because I sympathize with visitors who come from long distances to see the Revival in South Wales.
>
> Now, I think I can claim that I have had as good an opportunity as most people to understand what is really going on in South Wales; and I have come to the conclusion that there are two so-called Revivals going on amongst us. The one, undoubtedly, from above—Divine, real, intense in nature, and Cymric[3039] in its form. . . . the real Divine thing. . . .
>
> [But] people . . . may attempt to make the thing, and lo! there comes out a calf and not a God. . . . Those who will do this are the shallow ones, the noisy ones, those who think themselves filled the most with the Spirit, but who are the least. They are, in fact, the imitators, who say, "There's something wrong here. The Spirit is not here. I have had a vision["] . . . the stock sayings of Evan Roberts . . . [also] repeated . . . by . . . [his] imitators[.] . . . Others may be found imitating his bodily contortions, sighs, etc. This mimicry is . . . done by the would-be Evan Robertses quite as much for their own sakes as for the sake of their visitors. Breaking into song while another prays, or speaks, or preaches, is another form of the attempt to imitate Evan Roberts's meetings.
>
> But these things are merely the accidents of the true Revival, and form no part of its kernel. For there is a kernel, which is overwhelming in its Divine power, and many thousands have experienced it, and there are ample signs that many thousands more will be touched by it.
>
> There is, then, a Revival which is of God—of God alone—yes, a most mighty—an Almighty Revival . . . due to the earnest prayers of godly men and women for many years, and also to the extremely earnest preaching of the Gospel, emphasizing especially the Atonement, meaning by the Atonement the substitutionary death of our Lord Jesus Christ for the sins of the world.
>
> Some preachers, again, laid great emphasis upon the Person and ministry of the Holy Ghost. Others, again, gave attention to the ethical aspect of our religion, but with less effect, in my opinion, as far as the present Revival is concerned. I have witnessed bursts of this real Revival as far back as two years ago. I understand that there are several would-be originators of the Revival; but I maintain that the human originator of the true Revival cannot be named. And this, to me, is one of the proofs that it is of Divine origin. I have witnessed indescribable scenes of this real Revival, effects that can never be put on paper. Hence, I have a right to say that the real Revival has not been and cannot be reported.
>
> But there is another Revival in South Wales—a sham Revival, a mockery, a blasphemous travesty of the real thing. The chief figure in this mock Revival is Evan Roberts, whose language is inconsistent with the character of anyone except that of a person endowed with the attributes of a Divine Being. If not, what is he? Are there four persons in the Godhead, and is Evan Roberts the fourth? If so, I would call him the Commander of the Third Person, or the Master of the Spirit, for the . . . words which I myself heard from him on Monday night last at Bethania Chapel, Dowlais. The Spirit being somewhat reluctant to obey him, he said, "He must come"; but the Spirit (of whom he talked most glibly, just as a child speaks of its toy, but somewhat more off-handedly) would not obey the orders. . . . [H]e spoke as if the Spirit was entirely in his grip . . . judging by his behaviour and talk, the Holy Spirit is led by Evan Roberts!
>
> My honest conviction is this; that the best thing that could happen to the cause of the true religious Revival amongst us would be for Evan Roberts and his girl-companions to withdraw into their respective homes, and there to examine themselves, and learn a little more of the meaning of Christianity, if they have the capacity for this, instead of going about the country pretending to show the Way of Life to people many of whom know a thousand times more about it than they do. Why, we have scores of young colliers in Dowlais with whom Evan Roberts is not to be compared either in intellectual capacity or spiritual power.

[3038] Pg. 525, "Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905," Robert Pope. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57:3 (July 2006) 515-534; also D. J. Roberts, *Peter Price*, Swansea 1968, pgs. 90-109.

[3039] Welsh in language or culture, from the Welsh *Cymru* "Wales," *Cymry*, "the Welsh," etc.

But it is this mock Revival—this exhibition—this froth—this vain trumpery—which visitors see and which newspapers report. And it is harmful to the true Revival—very harmful. And I am horrified lest people who trust to what they see at Evan Roberts's meetings and to newspaper reports should identify the two Revivals—the true and the false—the Heavenly fire and the *ignis fatuus*.

Before Evan Roberts visited Dowlais, we had the holy fire burning brightly—at white heat; and at my own church alone we could count our converts during the last five or six months by the hundreds. But what happened when Evan Roberts visited the place? People came from all parts anxious to see the man, to understand something of the movement, and to get some of the fire to take home with them. I suppose that most of them did see the man; but I doubt whether they understood the movement—even the mock movement. They had no chance to understand the true movement, nor had they a chance of catching any of the true fire, for it wasn't there. I will say that with much effort Evan Roberts, together with his co-operators (and, evidently, they understand one another thoroughly, and each knew his or her part well and where to come in), managed, by means of threats, complaints and incantations, which reminded me of the prophets of Baal, to create some of the false fire. But never in my life did I experience such agony—the whole procedure being utterly sacrilegious. I should say that Evan Roberts must have seen and felt that he was a failure at Dowlais; but to cover the circumstance of failure, there appeared in the paper, after he had proved himself so, a prophecy concerning certain misgivings of his as to whether he ought to have undertaken a mission to Dowlais.

I should like to ask Evan Roberts a few questions; I have many more which I might ask; but I will be satisfied now with a few: . . . He said that there was someone in the lobby who was accepting Christ; but no one did. What Spirit told him this lie? . . . Why does he wait until the meetings attain the climax of enthusiasm before he enters? If help is valuable at any stage, is it not mostly so at the commencement, in order to kindle the fire? . . . Why does he visit places where the fire has been burning at maximum strength for weeks and months? Would it not be more reasonable for him to go to places which the fire has not reached? . . . What spirit makes him bad-tempered when things don't come about exactly as he wishes? . . . What spirit makes him say, "Ask God to damn the people if you don't ask anything else?"

"Yes, but he has a lovely face and a beautiful smile," so some women say. This is the last resort.

May I repeat that I have written the above in the interest of the religion of Jesus Christ, and out of sympathy with visitors who come to see the Revival. I may have to suffer persecution for writing the above—even by Spirit-filled (!) men; but I don't seek the renown of the martyr; still, if martyrdom for the truth be necessary, I am ready. To the true Revival—the gloriously real Revival—I will say and pray with all my soul,

"Cerdd ymlaen, nefol dân"

But to the bogus Revival I will say with all my soul,

"Cerdd yn ol, gnawdol dân."

Peter Price, January 31, 1905[3040]

[3040] See *The Western Mail*, February 1-6, 11, 1905. The Welsh portion of his letter desires heavenly fire and wishes for the end of sensual fire.

Price's letter is reproduced on pgs. 141-145 of *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan, who also includes responses by readers to Price, both negative (pgs. 146-154, arguing that "Mr. Roberts . . . without doubt is inspired," is "the mouthpiece of the Living God," and is "a prophet of the present age" while Price is a "mean, jealous, cad, whose actions are too contemptible to find words for," who must be "a shareholder in a Brewery," since "Jesus Christ don't want [*sic*] us to judge and point out things" and Price should be "warn[ed] . . . against the awful harm you are doing *even if you are right* [emphasis in original]." Price is "blasphem[ing] the Holy Ghost" and he must "ask God to forgive you and to save you" since he is "not a Christian," not "born again," and one whose letter "will . . . land you into Hell [*sic*]" which will "burn your never dying soul"), and positive (pgs. 154-161, "I feel there is a sad deficiency in the leading of Mr. E. Roberts besides doubtful teaching from a scriptural point of view," "Sir—I am in entire sympathy with you in the noble stand you have made in the interest of 1.) Pure Christianity 2.) Moral Courage and 3.) Sincerity," "[T]here are hundreds today who believe the same [as you] but have not the courage to openly

Thus, in the view of Price and other advocates of the older theology of revival, a real "Revival, of which [Roberts] was not the originator, not the medium, and not the feeder," had already been going on. "There had been for months and years—there were even then—influences at work that were independent of [Roberts'] initiative or control,"[3041] but his revivalism was quenching this genuine work of God. "Evan Roberts had no controlling or constructive influence over the real Revival[,] . . . [but] was out of touch with [it]. . . . This [real Revival] . . . was the result of spiritual forces that had been quietly at work for years. . . . Evan Roberts was . . . the embodiment of the . . . rubbish . . . the waves of hysteria . . . [and] psychic manifestations . . . [that] were looked upon as necessary adjuncts to a successful meting, and became at last, in the estimation of the press and the public, *the* characteristic marks of the Revival."[3042] As fanaticism and revivalism displaced true revival produced by the Holy Ghost, "Evan Roberts" became "the central figure in the Revival of 1904-5; but he was not its *originator*, much less its *conceiver*."[3043] Price "by no means st[ood] alone in his attitude. . . . Many other ministers share[d] his opinions . . . [about] 'the sham Revival' . . . of which . . . Mr. Evan Roberts [was] the chief exponent," hindering the "real Revival" that had been going on.[3044] "[T]housands of sane, righteous people fully endorsed the opinions of Price . . . many eminent, spiritually-minded pastors and laymen agreed[.]"[3045] The pastor of the Baptist church at Builth Wells wrote to Mr. Price:

> Permit me to thank you for your frank and straightforward speaking . . . on the "Double Revival." . . . For some time I have longed to see someone who resided in the zone of fire, to rise and repudiate the gross excrescences which are passing for the real thing in the Revival in Wales. It is something monstrously base to tolerate without protest the barbarous falsehoods that are being accepted in the name of Christianity. My Dear Sir, we are in for one of the greatest religious siftings that Wales ever experienced. . . . From all sane and thinking men, who love true Religion and who try to augment its forces with intelligent thought, you will only receive the gratitude you merit.
>
> God bless you for your stand and bravery. I shall . . . accumulate facts . . . and join you in your fight for true Christianity.[3046]

---

and frankly admit so[,] and honestly Evan Roberts is a great stumbling block to this Revival as we at Treorky found to our cost when we had him. He placed a damper on every Meeting," "Your remark about E. R. as in command of the Holy Spirit . . . I have often denounced as blasphemous and also [something that] would drive the weak minded insane and the doubters to unbelief," "You have won the admiration of hundreds of fellow Christians (if that matters any) by your dauntless courage. Oh that the virtue of having the courage to express one's convictions were one that was not so rare," etc.).

[3041] Pg. 57, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

[3042] Pgs. 68-69, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

[3043] Pg. 112, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

[3044] Pg. 181, "The Revival in Wales," A. T. Fryer. *The East and the West: A Quarterly Review for the Study of Missions*. (1905) 174-188.

[3045] Pg. 270-271, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

[3046] Pg. 158, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

Indeed, as time passed, not only those who had been critical of Roberts' practices from the beginning, but "even sympathetic ministers felt the Word was being dethroned and the singing too exalted . . . [in] Evan Roberts' work."[3047] "[G]ood men, and . . . godly . . . were seen looking very frowningly upon the . . . Revival, critically and reprovingly too[.]"[3048] The "Baptist minister . . . Dr. Davies" thought much of Roberts' ministry was "mass hysteria."[3049] Other ministers "object[ed] to the visions seen" and to "women" leading in "public prayer, exhortation, [and] testifying."[3050] "[O]fficial disapproval was not confined to the Baptists, and one c[ould] find strong words from . . . leaders in other denominations."[3051] Many objected when people would "burst into song, or prayer, or testimony in the middle of the sermon, or sometimes from the start of the service so that the preacher could only listen."[3052] "Many of the ministers did not preach for months,"[3053] and many recognized that such a downgrade of the preached Word did not fit Scripture at all. Even "[g]rumblings about the inferior quality of the new revival hymns grew louder and louder."[3054] People warned that the "flippancy manifested, especially by the young and others who had just [adopted revivalistic ideas] . . . helped to kill the [real] Revival."[3055] Many noticed that "the conversions in the chapels attended by Evan Roberts were fewer than in the chapels where he was *not* present."[3056] The true "Revival . . . transfigured many individual souls . . . [who] never saw Evan Roberts . . . never had . . . tumultuous gatherings . . . [but] owe[d] all that [they were] to the agency of [their] own pastor."[3057] Criticism poured in, affirming: "In the present revival, the Bible is ignored, and it is claimed that visions and new revelations are received . . . the elders are condemned as heretics if they do not yield, and conform to the methods of the young [cf. 1 Peter 5:5]. The officers of the churches are at present ignored, although they have been set apart in office by the churches; thus, the Apostles of the Lamb are ignored; the hand of God is ignored; the Holy Spirit is ignored; and that by some other spirit that has possessed our young people."[3058] "Evan Roberts's claims to direct Spirit guidance" were

---

3047 Pg. 124, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3048 Pg. 262, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3049 Pg. 251, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3050 Pg. 259, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3051 Pg. 261, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3052 Pg. 262, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3053 Pg. 42, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.
3054 Pg. 264, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3055 Pg. 35, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.
3056 Pg. 77, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.
3057 Pgs. 259-262, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.
3058 Pg. 262, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

considered "profane, and his visions blasphemous, because he was not, as were the Apostles, endowed with Spirit gifts, [proven in] healing the sick, raising the dead, giving sight to the blind,"[3059] and other Apostolic miracles (2 Corinthians 12:12). "Baptist leaders in Gwent" considered various practices of Roberts "unseemly and disorderly," while "senior ministers and laymen in Pembrokeshire . . . were responsible for the early opposition of the Welsh Baptists there."[3060] One "fervent Baptist minister . . . split a revival meeting" by stating the obvious truth, clearly taught by the Holy Ghost in Scripture and patterned in the real revival in the book of Acts, that "baptism by the Spirit did not dispense with the need for water baptism. . . . [He] carried on his attack on the revivalists for preaching obedience to the Spirit yet not practicing that virtue by being baptized themselves."[3061] The newspaper "*Y Celt Newydd* . . . sounded a warning note about voices and visions and the danger they posed to true revival."[3062] Many "church leaders . . . disavow[ed]" the work of Roberts and "oppose[d] . . . signs and wonders . . . [v]isions, voices, spiritual promptings, [and] inspired prayers."[3063] They believed that it was a serious error to stress "signs rather than faith . . . psychic and bodily experiences rather than the Word of God . . . ecstasies in special meetings rather than . . . simple, quiet and consistent obedience to the Spirit of the One who is in us."[3064] In rural Wales, the "response of the Baptists . . . to the revival [work of Evan Roberts] was initially very cautious. The editor of the local Baptist journal, *Y Piwritan Newydd* ('The New Puritan') . . . stated that he could not go along with the mode of activity in some meetings[,]"[3065] as various aspects of the revivalism were "sure to be working against Baptist principles."[3066] Indeed, Baptist church membership "had been increasing for many years prior to the revival [led by Evan Roberts]," with "Baptist membership increas[ing] by 24,000 in 1905," the largest rate of increase; in 1905 "Independents increased by 12,000 . . . and the Calvinistic Methodists increased by just under 16,000." Baptist critics of Roberts affirmed that genuine revival was overcome by the revivalism of Roberts and his followers. "[T]here c[ould] be no doubt . . . [t]hat Evan Roberts did repel, that he quenched rather than inflamed the Revival flame in many districts[.] Evidence of this

---

3059 Pgs. 270-271, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3060 Pg. 260, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3061 Pg. 261, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3062 Pg. 257, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3063 Pg. 275, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3064 Pg. 276, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3065 Pg. 92, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
3066 Pg. 261, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

fact abounds, and is indisputable."[3067] While the revivals in the book of Acts led to the continued multiplication of churches for many years, after the revivalism of Roberts had finished its course Independent and Calvinistic Methodist "membership began to decline in 1906," followed by the beginning of membership decline in "1907 for the Baptists."[3068] With the ascendency of Keswick and continuationist doctrine and the revivalism of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis, "decline set in so quickly after the revival's end"—a fact which "did not augur well for the future of Nonconformity in Wales,"[3069] as, indeed, a decades-long decline set in almost immediately after Roberts finished his revivalistic course.

As the work of Evan Roberts filled congregations with false doctrine, filled church membership rolls with unregenerate people, and hardened Wales to a true work of the Holy Spirit, serious spiritual declension manifested itself as soon as the strange fire died down. Already by 1909 a very serious "decline of evangelical Christianity [was] most manifest" throughout Wales.[3070] "All over the Principality there [was] not only a serious and general falling off in the number of adherents, but there is hardly any interest taken in fundamental theology."[3071] "Wesleyan Methodism [was] confronted with a serious decrease of membership" and the "spiritual state of the Wesleyan Church" was the matter of the "greatest apprehension."[3072] Losses also accrued to the other "Nonconforming bodies," for these had "unquestionably lost their old grip upon the people."[3073] A "grave note of religious pessimism" came to "pervad[e] Welsh Nonconformity" as there was a "lamentable falling-off in Welsh Sunday schools, in the attendance, in the interest taken and in the registered results."[3074] Roberts' revivalism failed to produce lasting results: "[T]he Welsh Revival of 1904-5 . . . has not been followed by any marked progress of either a political or religious character. . . . There has not sprung up in its track anything of a general and permanent character. . . . Vital religion has not been made more effective[.]"[3075] This fact resulted in "a great change . . . in public opinion . . . and events justify the change. Ministers in general are distressed at

---

3067 Pg. 49, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3068 Pg. 529, "Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905," Pope.

3069 Pg. 529, "Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905," Pope.

3070 Pg. 15, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3071 Pg. 15, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3072 Pg. 205, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3073 Pg. 206, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Many drifted into Anglican sacramentalism (pg. 206, 208, *ibid*) or simply into rationalism and infidelity.

3074 Pg. 219, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3075 Pgs. 242, 254, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

the number of [alleged] converts who have cut themselves off from the way of His life. Their judgment is not a hasty one. People seem harder than ever—due to the effects of the Revival."[3076] In sharp contrast to the revivals in the Bible, and real revivals in church history, only four years after the ministry of Evan Roberts burned out nothing positive was evident "in the sense of curbing the passions of the great masses of the people, in the purifying of their common speech and in eradicating their criminal tendencies. If a plebiscite of the magistrates, solicitors, colliery owners, and prison officials, were taken [in 1909], their *unanswerable* reply would be in the negative. A disenchanted nation remains neither stimulated in thought nor enriched in character."[3077] Indeed, by 1909 historians could record:

> [I]n looking back at the Welsh Revival of 1904-5 we find that its success is by no means commensurate with its proportion, with its excitement at the time, with its professed statistics of individual or collective results, or even with the money expended upon it. . . . [There was a] complete failure of the Revival to permanently regenerate churches and districts to any considerable degree. . . . [T]he Revival . . . . did not produce subsequent discipline of morals, but it was subversive of, and antagonistic to, the spirit that produces results in practical life. The religious disappointment of thousands of individuals in Wales today is such as to have made their 'last state worse than the first.' . . . The moral condition of the Welsh people . . . [i]n many ways . . . was better . . . *before* the Revival than it is today. . . . The whole attitude of the people has undergone a deplorable change, and the change is both rapid and widespread. No one conversant with the inner life of Wales can fail to observe the alarming spread of the personal and domestic disuse of the Bible. . . . There is an alarming ignorance of the contents of the Bible among the rising generation . . . [t]he Bible is becoming less and less the Book of the rank and file. The . . . preacher [engages in] less close study of the Bible. Preaching is more topical than expository. . . . [The] methods [of] . . . Evan Roberts . . . did undoubtedly repel not a few, and hardened rather than softened the hearts of some who longed for a higher life. . . . It is a fact within the knowledge of any and every man that football, the music-hall, and the public house, are the dominant interests of . . . the very thousands that thronged the various chapels during the Revival season. Sunday shows of various sorts, that were compelled to close their doors at that time, are now in the zenith of their popularity, and there is not power enough in the churches or among the ministers and clergy to check their progress. Since the Revival various socialistic organizations have invaded the valleys, and . . . thousands . . . hear the "socialistic gospel" . . . the social application of the "New Theology" [theological modernism]. If materialistic socialism, without a tinge of reverence for sacred things and sacred institutions, is either the direct or indirect result of the Revival of 1904-5, then it cannot but be a source of sorrow to God-fearing people that the Revival ever came. The reaction is on a large scale . . . and the reaction is still in progress. . . . Many—very many—of [the] . . . Free Churches . . . have been obliged to revise their roll of membership [downward], and are now lamenting over the deadly indifference that has overtaken the flock. The apathy, the levity, the decay of religious faith, the lapse in the habit of prayer, the disinclination to take part in religious work, the non-attendance of adherents, and the decline of the Sunday School, together with the prevalence of vice in its various aspects . . . have followed the Revival. The general condition of the churches is worse than it was in the days preceding the outbreak in 1904. There is a loss of appeal in the Gospel message, and an alarming disregard of sacred institutions. . . . The fall of the spiritual thermometer is very marked. . . . [I]n very many instances contributions towards foreign missions and the maintenance of the ministry have decreased . . . [so that they are] much less than they were two and four years previous to the Revival. . . . [T]he general condition of things among the churches in the Principality is worse since the Revival than before. . . .

3076 Pgs. 241-242, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

3077 Pgs. 254-255, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original.

> [T]here is a retrogression and a reversion to a more unsatisfactory type of religious life. . . . [The] mission . . . [of] Evan Roberts . . . did not produce a reversion to a higher type of reverence or moral life. The converse is true.[3078]

The evils in the work of Evan Roberts, feared by many Baptists and other old-line evangelicals, who believed in the older and more Scriptural theology of revival, came to pass.

Jessie Penn-Lewis was, in her day, "Keswick's leading female speaker . . . the woman destined to make the most impression at Keswick."[3079] "Only those who . . . kn[ew] her longest and most closely can fully appreciate how strongly [she] influenced . . . Evangelical life and thought of her time."[3080] Indeed, a condensation of her book *The Warfare with Satan and the Way of Victory* was even found among the volumes of the epoch-making series, *The Fundamentals*.[3081] She came from a Quaker family, had significant "Quaker linkages,"[3082] and, among other events in her notably limited education, went, as she affirmed, to "a school . . . opened by a Quaker lady," along with receiving training from a "Quaker gentleman."[3083] Her husband William Penn-Lewis had a strong Quaker background as "a follower of George Fox,[3084] a professed Quaker and descendent of . . . William Penn,"[3085] so that Jessie's married name of Penn-Lewis[3086]

[3078] Pgs. 74, 78-79, 88-89, 127, 251, 254-257, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original.

[3079] Pgs. 120, 155, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[3080] Pg. iii, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard, 2nd ed. preface by Bernard W. Matthews, 1930.

[3081] "Thankfully, too, may be placed on record the fact that a concise summary of 'The Warfare with Satan and the Way of Victory' was selected as one of the papers for insertion in Vol. X of 'The Fundamentals,' a series of volumes re-stating the Fundamental Truths of the Christian Faith, issued free by the generosity of 'Two Christian Laymen' to workers throughout the world" ("The Overcomer Literature Trust Fund," pg. 203, *The Overcomer*, December 1914; cf. Chapter 13, "Satan and His Kingdom," Jessie Penn-Lewis, pgs. 183-199, *The Fundamentals*, vol. 4, ed. Torrey).

[3082] Pg. 274, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[3083] Pg. 5, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard; cf. pg. 6, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

[3084] George Fox (1624-1691) was the "Founder of the Society of Friends, otherwise known as Quakers. . . . In 1646 he announced his reliance on the 'Inner Light of the Living Christ.' . . . [H]e taught that truth is to be found primarily not in Scripture or in creed but in God's voice speaking to the soul. . . . his colleagues . . . included William Penn" (pg. 425, "Fox, George," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell).

[3085] Pg. 139, *I Saw The Welsh Revival,* David Matthews. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1951. After his marriage to Jessie, Mr. Penn-Lewis' Quaker background still showed itself (pg. 11, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). At Mr. Penn-Lewis' funeral, preached by F. B. Meyer, "Dr. Meyer remarked that [the] quiet garden attached to the Friends [Quaker] Meeting House was peculiarly appropriate as the last resting place of William Penn-Lewis, as he was a descendant of William Penn, one of the Pilgrim Fathers, the founder of Pennsylvania" (pg. 290, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard). Mrs. Penn-Lewis, buried by her husband in this Quaker graveyard, would also refer to what one or another "old Quaker" or "old Quakers" had said in her writings (cf. her letter from Coonoor, S. India,

pointed back to that extremely influential early anti-Trinitarian Quaker who founded the state of Pennsylvania. Throughout their long married life, "every Sunday, [Mr. Penn-Lewis] and his wife went to . . . a Society of Friends Meeting," except on certain occasions when they attended "an Anglican service" or, "sometimes, a lively evangelical meeting."[3087] She could justify the disorder and confusion of the meetings led by Evan Roberts through an appeal to the Quaker principal of worship: "By the immediate operations of the Holy spirit, [Christ] as the Head of the church, alone selects and qualifies those who are to present His messages or engage in other service for Him; and, hence, we cannot commit any formal arrangement to any one in our regular meetings for worship."[3088] Mrs. Penn-Lewis would, on various occasions, give the "message" at "the Friends' Meeting House" up to the very end of her life.[3089] Both Mr. and Mrs. Penn-Lewis were buried in a Quaker graveyard, "the Friends Burial Field at Reigate,"[3090] their funerals being held in Quaker meeting houses, thus identifying with the Quaker movement and its heresies in the choice of their final resting place.[3091] Furthermore, Mrs. Penn-Lewis' "mother was one of the first to join . . . the Good Templar Movement" in her town, and Jessie "was keenly eager to be a Templar too," so she followed her mother as a "Templar" in the demonic cult of Freemasonry.[3092] The "very first Lodge night after [her] twelfth birthday . . . [she was] initiated into the coveted circle." She soon became "Chief Presiding Officer of the juveniles . . . [in the Minor] Lodge," while her husband-to-be was "Treasurer of [that same] Lodge at th[at] time."[3093] She "continued as secretary of the Lodge by re-election quarter after quarter until . . . compelled to give it

---

March 3, 1903, reprinted in "The Life of Faith" of March 25th 1903; Chapter 3, *Soul and Spirit*, by Jessie Penn-Lewis, etc.).

3086 Before her marriage she was "Jessie Jones" (pg. 7, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). More details about her early life and marriage are contained in her diaries and her booklet *The Leading of the Lord*.

3087 Pg. 155, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3088 "Public Worship" in the Orthodox Quaker *Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887* (http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml).

3089 Pgs. 300-301, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3090 Pg. 295, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3091 Pgs. 290, 306, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3092 Compare "Freemasonry and the Christian," Eddy D. Field II & Eddy D. Field III. *Master's Seminary Journal*, 5:2 (Fall 94) 141-158; also *The Secret Teachings of the Masonic Lodge*, John Ankerberg & John Weldon (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1990).

3093 Pg. 4, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard. Garrard was Mrs. Penn-Lewis' secretary and confidant for decades, and after Penn-Lewis' death Garrard "serve[d] as general secretary and magazine editor" of *The Overcomer* "for sixteen years" (pgs. 305ff. *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pgs. 10, 86, 156, 250, 297).

up"[3094] because of her father's death. Her Quaker and Masonic influences were connected, as a "Quaker . . . undertook to teach [her] the secretarial work [of the Lodge]."[3095] However, Mrs. Penn-Lewis' parents and she did not stick exclusively to Quaker and Freemason meetings; she had Calvinistic Methodism in her background also, since, for example, her grandfather was a minister in the "C. M. Connection," and, what is more, was "said to be the most metaphysical preacher of his day" in that movement.[3096] Jessie's devout mother consequently "had ideas that children could be brought up without the knowledge of sin."[3097] Jessie also attended Anglican services. For instance, after marrying William,[3098] the Penn-Lewis family attended "the Church of the Annunciation . . . [where Mr. Penn-Lewis had been] attending [before their marriage]," an Anglican congregation where the "Vicar was an extreme High Churchman" who believed in a damnable sacramental salvation, the Papist confessional, and other "strong Anglo-Catholic views."[3099] During the second year of her marriage, Jessie "began to feel very ill at ease about the Lord's Return" and she was professedly converted to Christ,[3100] although she did not say a word to anyone about this professed conversion until a year and a half later, when, having moved to the Anglican parish where Evan Hopkins was the minister, she was simply "asked if she were 'a Christian,'

3094 Pg. 6, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3095 Pg. 6, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3096 Pg. 1, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3097 Pg. 2, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard; cf. pg. 4, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

3098 Neither Jessie nor William even professed conversion to Christ before their marriage (cf. pgs. 8-10, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard).

3099 Pgs. 6-7, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

3100 Pgs. 6-7, Garrard; cf. pg. 9, Jones. Describing her professed conversion, Penn-Lewis testified: "[I had] a deep inward desire to know that I was a child of God[.] . . . [T]aking . . . my (too little read) Bible from the shelf, [I] turne[d] over the leaves, and [my] eye f[ell] [upon] the words, 'The Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all': again a casual turn of the sacred pages, and [I read] the words, 'He that believeth hath Eternal Life.' . . . [I considered] whether I did believe that God had laid my sins upon the Lamb of God on the Cross: a pause of wonderment that it really said that I had Eternal Life if I simply believed God's Word: a quick cry of 'Lord, I do believe'—and [I] passed from death unto life." One hopes that Mrs. Penn-Lewis was truly regenerated, although the facts that she wished to know that she "was" a child of God, befitting her Quaker background, rather than desiring to "become" one (cf. Luke 5:31-32; 19:10), that her description of her professed conversion sounds dangerously like an affirmation that the new birth is a matter of a "believe that," a mental assent to certain facts (James 2:19), rather than a supernaturally wrought and spiritual coming to the Person of Christ in repentant faith and trusting in His death and shed blood (cf. John 6:37), and that she entirely omits any mention of repentance (cf. Luke 13:3), including repentance of the false gospels taught in Quakerism, Masonry, and Anglo-Catholicism (2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1), make the genuineness of her conversion a matter of serious doubt, especially as she continued to associate with Quakerism and other false religions that taught a false gospel (Galatians 1:8-9) the rest of her life, and she certainly was never immersed into the membership of a Bible-believing and practicing church upon profession of faith as did regenerate people in the Bible (cf. Acts 2:41-47; Mark 16:16).

and her . . . answer 'Yes' was her first open confession of Christ,"[3101] this response allegedly proving not merely her religiosity, but her supernatural true conversion and regeneration.[3102] She soon became "a fluent and powerful" woman preacher in "open

---

[3101] Pg. 8, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. Any soul-winner with even a modicum of discernment knows that in a "Christian" culture like 19th century Britain the fact that someone, when asked if he is a Christian, will respond with the word "yes," by no means proves his regeneration. A large majority of 21st century Americans would say "yes" to the same question, yet they are no more the true children of God than were the majority of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Hopkins himself professed to be converted after reading 1 John 1:9. He testified: "I saw that there was a covenant . . . and if I was among those who confessed their sins, I was in the agreement, and that He was *faithful* to the Son, and *just* to the promise made to the Son, to forgive me then and there. I saw, at once, that I had pardon" (pgs. 27-28, *Evan Henry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). One hopes that Hopkins was truly converted, although 1 John 1:9 is not about how one is born again, and justification is granted to those who come to a particular point where, as lost sinners, they come to Jesus Christ in repentant faith (Mark 1:15; John 3:16; 6:37), while there is no promise in the Bible that says that as long as one is "among those who confessed their sins" one will enter the kingdom of God. Whatever one may conclude from Evan Hopkins own testimony of conversion—one can be happy that, unlike so many Anglican priests, he at least had something he could say, and he never adopted Anglo-Catholicism—the rampant confusion within Anglicanism about the way of salvation helps to explain why Jessie Penn-Lewis could be accepted as a true believer, rather than as simply a religious but very possibly unconverted person, simply because she said "Yes" when asked if she were a Christian.

[3102] Perhaps Penn-Lewis's weak view of conversion and regeneration contributed to her passing beyond the more typical Keswick division of Christians into those who are spiritual and those who are perpetually carnal into her own four-fold division, a division in which she was followed by Watchman Nee. She taught in her *Four Planes of the Spiritual Life* that "[b]elievers in Christ . . . all lived on one of four planes: the evangelistic plane, the revival or Pentecost plane, the path of the Cross plane, or the spiritual warfare plane. Each of these had a commencement, a continuation, and a consummation before you went on to the next" (pg. 224, cf. pg. 233, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). That is:

> There are four planes—broadly speaking—in the spiritual life of the believer, and of the Christian worker: The first plane we may call the "evangelistic" plane; that is, the plane where the soul knows the new birth; knows that he has eternal life in Christ; where he becomes a soul winner, preaches salvation from the penalty of sin, and is used to lead others to Christ; where the entire objective is winning souls for Christ; where he is faithful in proclaiming the gospel of salvation in Christ.
>
> Then there is the second plane, which may be called the "revival" plane; or the stage in personal experience where the believer receives the fulness of the Holy Spirit, learns to know Him and to obey Him; to rely upon Him and to look to Him to work as he co-operates with Him, and is used to lead others into the experience of the fulness of the Spirit.
>
> Then there is the third plane, which we may call the plane of the "path of the cross," where the believer experimentally apprehends his position in Romans 6 in fellowship with Christ's death; is brought into "conformity" to His death (Philippians 3:10); he learns the fellowship of His sufferings, and is led to walk in the path of the Cross in every detail of practical life. Here the believer is able to interpret to others the way of the Cross, and to lead others to know Romans 6 and 2 Corinthians 4:10-12 in experience.
>
> The fourth plane is the plane of spiritual warfare. It is really the "ascension" plane, where the believer knows his union with Christ, seated with Him "far above all principality and power"; and where, in service, he is in aggressive warfare against the powers of darkness; learns to have spiritual discernment to detect the working of the devil; and learns the authority of Christ over all the power of the enemy. (Luke 10:19)
>
> Or to put it concisely—the first is the plane of salvation, or the new life; the second is the plane of the Spirit; the third is the plane of victory over sin; the fourth is the plane of victory over the powers of darkness. The individual believer, if he goes forward in the Christian life with God, is generally—not always—led just in this order also. First, he receives salvation; second, he receives the Holy Ghost; third he is led along the path of the Cross; fourth, he walks in the path of conflict and victory, resulting in "power" over all the power of

air" meetings connected with Hopkins' congregation,[3103] although because of a difficult ministry experience she "would have cracked" without the stabilizing influence of some other women.[3104] Also, opposition because of "her unorthodox views . . . caused [her great] pain."[3105] Nonetheless, throughout her life she regularly preached in congregations, conventions, and settings of the most varied kinds to both men and women,[3106] despite "strong prejudice based upon misunderstanding of Paul's"

> the enemy. The individual worker, also, finds he is used in these four planes of service. First, he is used to lead others to Christ; second, he is used to lead them into the fulness of the Spirit; third, he is used to interpret to them the path of the Cross; and fourth, to discern the devices and workings of the devil, and to have power over "all the power of the enemy," through union with Christ on the throne.
>
> Madame Guyon truly says that in every plane of the spiritual life there is a beginning, working out, and a consummation of the life in that degree, followed by a passage into the next plane, where there is again a beginning, a working out, a consummation. . . . Further, it is true that, speaking generally, it often takes years to get through each plane! ("Four Planes of the Spiritual Life," Watchman Nee, reprinting "an excerpt from *Life Out of Death*, a book by Jessie Penn-Lewis. It was originally published by The Overcomer Literature Trust, Parkston, Poole, Dorset, England." Elec. acc. http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/article_pdf.php?aid=18101)

Penn-Lewis's four-fold division of Christians into a lower class, higher class, even higher elite class, and highest and most elite class, will be convincing to those who accept the inspiration of her writings, and her reference to Madame Guyon will perhaps impress those who receive the Romanist mystic's writings as a spiritual authority, but for those who accept the *sola Scriptura*, the total absence of Biblical evidence for Penn-Lewis's four-fold partition of the people of God will lead them to reject her doctrine out of hand. However, while Mrs. Penn-Lewis had no support for her ideas in the Bible, she did find some in the stages in the Higher Life expounded at the Broadlands Conference (pgs. 191-193, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

Mrs. Penn-Lewis, while she had no support in Scripture for her four-fold division of Christians, did, however, find some support in the teaching of her Quaker predecessor, Hannah W. Smith, and the Broadlands Conference, where, e. g., Mrs. Smith did not speak of the Higher Life alone, but also of "the bird life . . . of sunshine and song" (pg. 196, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Perhaps one had the Lower Life lived by the body of non-Keswick Christians, the Higher Life lived by the elite few, and the Bird Life lived by those whose sense of Biblical teaching had completely gone to the birds.

[3103] Pg. 10, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3104] Pg. 13, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3105] Pg. 41, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3106] E. g., *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard, pgs. 77-78, 88-96, 107-109, 130-131, 156-158, 185-187 (in Moody's church and college, where her influence led to a "revival" where "[a]ll order was dispensed with . . . [s]ome would be praying for pardon, some were singing, and some asking for the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and others for Healing," pg. 105, *The Trials and Triumphs of Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones), 187-188 (A. B. Simpson's church and the CMA Nyack Institute), 194-196 (1901 Scottish Keswick convention to both men and women, where, as at many Keswick-themed conferences in other parts of her homeland and in many foreign countries, her preaching to men was "blessedly sealed by the Spirit of God," so that "in after years there was no suggestion of a limited ministry [to women only] whenever [Penn-Lewis] was able to come to Scottish Conventions"), 199, 203, 274, 277 ("the Voice of the Spirit of God" leading her to powerfully preach a misinterpretation of John 12:24 at the Swanwick Conference she started), 286 (many "ministries revolutionized" by the doctrines she preached), 301, *ibid*. She also led meetings where men and women prayed in different languages at the same time in a confusion that clearly violates the pattern set in 1 Corinthians (cf. pg. 80, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard; pgs. 53, 57, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, where a confused meeting was said to be "a forerunner of the Welsh revival."). Compare also, for her preaching, pgs. 41 (at Keswick), 45 (leaving her husband behind while she went on preaching tours in various countries), 49-57, 71-74 (pg. 74

prohibitions in 1 Corinthians 14:34-40 and 1 Timothy 2:11-15,[3107] but in accordance with the Quaker practice of "encouraging women to be ministers."[3108] Generally, "the pastors [were] strongly opposed,"[3109] but women were to reject pastoral counsel, receive women preachers anyway, and preach themselves; many did,[3110] being "faithful to the power of the Lord" against their "local clergym[e]n, who said women should not speak at meetings."[3111] Penn-Lewis knew that Paul did not really mean to prohibit women preaching to men when he wrote: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church," and "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." Rather, Penn-Lewis knew that "Psalm lxviii 11-12 (see R. V.) must surely have been a prophecy of these days in which we live," proving that women in the New Testament dispensation are "to prophesy and preach"[3112] to men, although nothing of the sort is in view in the psalm if one adopts a grammatical-historical interpretation of the Hebrew text, the Authorized Version, or even the Revised Version to which Penn-Lewis refers.[3113] However, "God had given her the text of a 'new translation' of [the]

---

records an example, not only of a mixed preaching service, but a special "men-only" service), 86, 97 ("meetings and conventions in Canada and the great northern cities of the United States,"), 103-108, 113, 138-139, 146 (preaching at the Welsh Keswick at Llandrindod and influencing Welsh holiness revival men like Seth Joshua, while "open[ing] up new truths to such key people"), 149, 153, 161-162, 196-197, 232, 235 (where the men handled the simple matters, but she, as one above them, "would step in later to comment on the more complex questions"), 240-241, 259-265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3107 Pg. 73, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

3108 Pg. 431, "Friends, Society of," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell.

3109 Pg. 50, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pgs. 161-162.

3110 Compare "God Is Using Women: Opportunities for Women at Keswick," chap. 8, pgs. 148-166 in *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present and Future*, by Charles Wesley Price and Ian M. Randall. Carlisle: OM, 2000.

3111 Pgs. 138-139, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Mrs. Penn-Lewis followed her own advice of rejecting pastoral counsel. When, in 1897, even "several Keswick leaders, including her own Vicar [Evan Hopkins], distrusted her teachings as 'too subjectivist,'" and Hopkins warned her about "a misinterpretation and a misapplication of texts of Scripture," rather than submitting to their objections, she "felt the Lord was calling her to publish her messages as a top priority" because she was "[i]solated more and more from former colleagues" (pg. 60, 62, *ibid*.).

3112 Pg. 73, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

3113 Mrs. Penn-Lewis also employed other texts that do not, grammatically-historically interpreted, prove her point about women preachers, such as Joel 2 and Acts 21:9 (see pgs. 73-74, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard). In her argument for women preachers from the Spirit baptism text in Joel 2, Penn-Lewis follows the argumentation of Phoebe Palmer, the Methodist woman preacher with a Quaker background ("Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm) who made that passage central to her case for women preachers, as well as popularizing the connection between the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification and Spirit baptism (in which she had the help of Asa Mahan; "Asa Mahan

Psalm."[3114] Soon after beginning her public work, she "saw that [she] should know the Holy Spirit as a Person . . . through reading Andrew Murray's *Spirit of Christ*," leading her to a variety of special spiritual experiences, although she testified, "I could not understand why it made so little difference in my service . . . [i]n these respects [of serving Christ in different ways], I was just the same as before, until, some three years later," she received a "Baptism of the Spirit for service."[3115] She later was able to meet "Mr. Murray" and have "a long talk" with him, "the first contact of a fellowship in God which deepened into a bond in the Spirit between [their] two souls."[3116] Penn-Lewis also discovered, after staying at Bethshan, Boardman's faith-cure "House of Rest,"[3117] the doctrine of healing espoused by Mahan, Boardman, and Murray, learning "what it meant to take [Christ's] life and strength for [the] body when needed for His service."[3118] Shortly after adopting the Faith Cure doctrine, she began seeking a "Spirit baptism" of the sort "Finney and Asa Mahan"[3119] experienced, and, not able to figure out whether or

---

and the Development of American Holiness Theology," Donald W. Dayton. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1974): 60-69). Palmer's "work quickly extended beyond Methodism into a large number of Protestant denominations, helping to fuel interest in Christian perfection, holiness and 'the higher Christian life' throughout much of English-speaking Protestantism" (pg. 502, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals,* ed. Larsen). Her views of Spirit baptism and entire sanctification "largely defined the 'holiness revival' or 'holiness movement' that grew from her work and that of other proponents of Christian perfection, Christian holiness and the higher Christian life. . . . In England, Palmer introduced her ideas during an extended preaching tour between 1859 and 1863. Later, other American revivalists, notably Robert Pearsall Smith and his wife Hannah Whitall Smith, and Asa Mahan, followed up her visit, preaching versions of her theology throughout the British Isles. Their work led directly to the organization of the Keswick Conventions and the ongoing Keswick 'Higher Life' Movement among British evangelicals . . . [and] also influenced modern Pentecostal and charismatic movements. . . . [I]t is clear that her emphasis on Pentecost and the baptism with the Holy Spirit and her interpretation of the early chapters of Acts . . . laid the groundwork for much modern Pentecostal and charismatic thinking" (pgs. 502-503, *ibid*). Naturally, Mrs. Palmer was a continuationist, as her preaching of post-conversion Spirit baptism and perfectionism led to "trances, visions, sleeps, dreams, and miracles" (pg. 66, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan). Interestingly, her husband was a homeopathic physician (pg. 501, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals,* ed. Larsen), supplying another strand in the web that connects the pagan ideas of the nineteenth century Mind and Faith Cure movement to the healing theology of the twentieth century Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements.

[3114] Pg. 50, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3115] Pgs. 13-15, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3116] Pg. 48, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. Their continuing friendship is evident from, e. g., the fact that Andrew Murray wrote a preface to the Dutch edition of her book *The Cross of Calvary and Its Message* (see pgs. 220-221, Garrard; pg. 203, *The Overcomer*, December 1914) and that she led various groups of people in studies on spiritual life based on Murray's writings (pg. 97, *ibid*.). Those who translated Murray's writings often translated hers as well (e. g., pg. 204, *ibid.*).

[3117] Pg. 16, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3118] Pg. 17, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. She records an instance where Murray's doctrine allegedly worked to cure a cold on pgs. 101-102, *ibid*.

[3119] Pg. 24, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

not the Bible taught their doctrine,[3120] set aside Scripture and all "books" of theology to simply pray until God revealed directly to her what she could not figure out by means of that Word of God that is "more sure" than even His audible voice (2 Peter 1:16-21). She then, by means of a vision and "revelation" where she saw a "hand holding up in terrible light a handful of filthy rags" and heard what was allegedly God's voice, adopted what became an influential Keswick doctrine of crucifixion with Christ and the central aspect of her later preaching and writing, based on a misinterpretation of Romans 6, and as a result of receiving that crucifixion doctrine by revelation also received the kind of baptism that Finney and Mahan had experienced.[3121] She further explained, in continuity with the Keswick healing doctrine stretching from Boardman through to Simpson, Murray, Nee, and many others, that she was "healed . . . when the Baptism of the Spirit came . . . in 1892 . . . when there came to me that revolution in Christian life which can only be described as a 'Baptism of the Spirit' . . . [and which] enabled [me], physically, to endure and to accomplish labour . . . beyond both natural and physical powers,"[3122] since the believer's co-crucifixion with Christ gives him both spiritual victory over sin and Satan and physical healing. Penn-Lewis wrote:

> If you have learned the inner life of victory . . . you . . . have in union with Christ . . . life and healing for soul and body. . . . [It is the weak Christian] who is not able to trust beyond the use of means for recovery[.] . . . Isaiah said, "By His stripes we are healed." . . . I got the inside clue [when] . . . I saw this Hebrew rendering . . . "IN HIS HEALED WOUNDS THERE IS HEALING FOR US!" . . . [J]ust as we are "crucified together with Him," and share in His victory over sin and Satan, so in a still deeper sense "crucified with Him" *when we stand in victory over sin and Satan*, the life of Jesus ministered by the Holy Spirit indwelling the spirit, can heal the bruised and broken bodies of all who thus by faith apprehend their identification and union with Him . . . as I stand in identification with His death, the VERY LIFE that healed Him, which comes to me as I am joined to Him in spirit, can heal my broken body . . . It is "identification" again, with Him in His death, and a deeper appropriation of His Risen and healing life. . . . [H]ealing . . . is all for each believer in the finished work of Calvary.[3123]

Thus, bodily healing is part of the Christian's inheritance for today and also a product of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, so that the truly spiritual Christian will reject medicine for the Faith Cure; Penn-Lewis bore her "testimony to the truth of Matt. viii. 17, and

---

3120 The Bible certainly does not teach the Finney/Mahan doctrine of Spirit baptism. See the appendix "Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism."

3121 Pgs. 18-29, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

3122 Pg. 183, "An Autobiographical Sketch," *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914.

3123 "Experimental Difficulties," pgs. 186-187, *Overcomer*, 1911. Capitalization and italics retained from the original. It is not clear who Mrs. Penn-Lewis received her unusual "Hebrew rendering" from, for the Hebrew וּבַחֲבֻרָתוֹ נִרְפָּא־לָנוּ׃ is properly rendered "with his stripes we are healed," as in the Authorized Version, while the rendering that gave Mrs. Penn-Lewis the "inside clue" is a corruption of the passage. Note her very clear identification of the Higher Life for the spirit and the Higher Life for the body, the Keswick theology and the Faith Cure.

Rom. viii. 11" and "st[ood] by faith upon these Divine facts,"[3124] for "[h]ealing is part of the finished work of Calvary[,] [and] 'In His healed wounds there is healing for us[.]' . . . The same life-power that healed and restored His broken body can heal and quicken my broken body."[3125] Consequently, "on the basis of Romans Six you may put in your claim for the healing of any bodily disease."[3126] One simply "definitively drop[s] [one's] 'body' at the Cross" and then becomes "quite well" as Christ's bodily life then begins to flow into the person who has entered the Higher Life;[3127] healing comes by "taking the Risen Life of the Crucified Christ to quicken the mortal body,"[3128] since "diseases spr[i]ng from inward soul sicknesses such as lust and anger . . . [and] deliverance and victory over the soul's imprisoning passions was a part of Christ's victory on the Cross."[3129] Evan Roberts exercised this healing ability on himself, so that he was "bubbling over with joy and shouting about his wonderful new body that had become strong by faith," delivered from "nine years" of sickness—delivered, that is, at least for a few hours, since "twenty four hours later he was knocked out completely with strain" and continued to be as ill as before.[3130] Similarly, "fellow-Welshman, Stephen Jeffries, in the early stages of his 'Faith healing' that caused scores of conversions in South Wales . . . became a celebrated figure in London," at least until "some of the healed people testified that they had not been healed permanently."[3131] Such a loss of the effectiveness of a Keswick healing had an explanation, however; just as the Higher Life will spiritually be lost by ceasing to maintain the decisive act of faith, so bodily healing is lost whenever one ceases to maintain faith,[3132] in radical discontinuity with the type of healing practiced by Christ and the Apostles. In further discontinuity with the truly miraculous healings recorded in the Bible, which brought about actual and perfect physical deliverance from disease, Mrs. Penn-Lewis' "healing" at the time of her alleged Spirit baptism left her with "large cavities" in her lungs which were from thenceforth in perpetual danger of "active

---

3124 Pg. 264, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. However, she also affirmed that a certain kind of bodily weakness can assist one in prayer and thus may be spiritually beneficial. Perhaps she made this affirmation because she was herself in a very weak bodily state at the time of her writing.

3125 Pgs. 278-279, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3126 Pg. 134, *Overcomer*, 1914. Pg. 278, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard, records an instance of a girl healed from some unspecified affliction by adopting Penn-Lewis' view of Romans 6.

3127 Pgs. 149-150, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard. See also pgs. 284-285.

3128 Pg. 271, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3129 Pgs. 273, 276, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3130 Pgs. 248-249, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Thus, for the next number of months, he was so sick that he was "in no state to do anything," even answer letters.

3131 Pg. 271, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3132 Pg. 149, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

disease,"[3133] and she continued to endure terrible "ill-health and suffering"[3134] and "constant poor health and much pain"[3135] for the rest of her life as "the lung weakness" grew ever the "more manifest."[3136] The poor woman suffered from "bouts of pleurisy and neurasthenia . . . weeks of asthmatic attacks and hypertension . . . weeks each year . . . plagued with chills, migraines, and bronchial attacks, which left her too exhausted to think . . . pneumonia [that left her] just a shadow of herself . . . pain and helpless weakness . . . over-straine[d] heart . . . recurrent flu . . . enforced convalescence . . . serious hemorrhage . . . almost fatal illness . . . [and other] sicknesses for forty years."[3137] Her doctor told her, "Your lungs have been weak ever since I have known you—now 30 years or more,"[3138] and she lived in "constant expectation of a 'final release' from her pain-racked body."[3139] Finally she died, with work she felt she still had left to do,[3140] although she had taught that, because of "the fifth to the eight [*sic*] of Romans," she "expected to be enabled for full service in all the will of God until the Lord comes."[3141] She did not, however, manage to live until the Lord came, or even until all the work she thought she was supposed to do was accomplished—instead, she died just like people who did not share her revelatory insight into Romans. However, there were other explanations for her continuing and severe illnesses, and for her death, than that her Keswick doctrine of healing was erroneous; for example, when she suffered three serious attacks of pneumonia in 1926-1927, each time being "brought very near the gates of death," and each one leaving "her weaker in body," until, at length, she actually died in 1927 at the age of 67, her ill health was not because of a false doctrine of healing, but because, in line with the teaching at the Broadlands Conference[3142] and later Keswick meetings, by getting pneumonia she was enduring "the 'fellowship of the sufferings of Christ . . . for His Body's sake, the Church,' which made it difficult for the physical

---

3133 Pg. 65, Garrard; cf. pg. 93, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; pg. 183, "An Autobiographical Sketch," *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

3134 Pg. 17, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3135 Pg. xi, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

3136 Pg. 190, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3137 Pgs. 14-15, 19, 67, 79-85, 91, 93, 113, 163-164, 204-207, 213, 231, 249-250, 277, 292, 298-299, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3138 Pg. 298, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3139 Pg. 15, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3140 Pgs. 301-302, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, for instance, records her plans for "a new syllabus" for various writings, articles for the next edition of *The Overcomer*, and "advance plans the Eccleston Hall Conference" where she had chosen the "Keynote speech."

3141 Pgs. 263-264, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3142 Pg. 25, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

frame to respond to the life which the Risen Lord was ready to give."[3143] Those who are skeptical of her extra-biblical revelations and doctrines, instead of accepting such an excuse as valid, would rather greatly pity both her severe bodily sufferings and her continuing Keswick Faith-Cure delusion.

While Mrs. Penn-Lewis' Spirit baptism produced a kind of bodily healing that fell far short of the apostolic pattern, it produced a spiritual state that far exceeded what was experienced by the Apostles, for, she wrote, "I have never had to fight a battle of 'surrender of will' from that time,"[3144] having entered by Spirit baptism into a realm of spiritual experience higher than any promised in the Bible or experienced by men like the Apostle Paul in their lifetime (Galatians 5:17; Romans 7:14-25).[3145] However, while her entry into the Higher Life came to her, she affirms, directly by a revelation and mystical experience—one of the vast numbers of supernatural revelations and visions she received[3146]—she also had the help of "Madame Guyon," who was most "influential"[3147] upon Mrs. Penn-Lewis when introduced to her by "Mrs. Evan Hopkins"[3148] as Jessie sought Spirit baptism and Higher Life sanctification in 1888. Penn-Lewis did not compare Guyon's writings with Scripture to see if they were trustworthy (Acts 17:11; 2 Peter 1:16-21), but adopted Guyon's spirituality because "the Lord spoke" to her and told her that "this is the path."[3149] Having discovered by revelation from the spirit world the value of Guyon's writings, Penn-Lewis testified: "I owe a great deal to the books of Madame Guyon, and the way she showed me the path to life 'in God' . . . her 'Life' . . . [led me to] clearly s[ee] the way of the Cross . . . [and the need for] '*dying*' not '*doing*'

3143 Pgs. 297-298, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard. While Mrs. Penn-Lewis employs words that are similar to those in Colossians 1:24, her meaning is certainly very different from that of the Apostle Paul. Compare pg. 186, "Experimental Difficulties," *The Overcomer*, 1911, for Mrs. Penn-Lewis's doctrine of Christians "sharing His [Christ's] suffering for souls, and for the world."

3144 Pg. 22, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3145 It is noteworthy that even John Wesley, while preaching Methodist perfectionism, "never claimed the experience for himself. He was a very honest man. He taught this perfectionism but he would never say that it was true of himself." Indeed, for "many years he had great difficulty of producing any examples of it," although at one point "he felt he could produce 30 such people; but only one of the 30 seemed to persist—the others fell away" (pg. 311, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, D. M. Lloyd-Jones). Mrs. Penn-Lewis, however, once having received her second blessing, was one of the very, very few who—in their own opinion, at least—seems to have kept it.

3146 E. g., pgs. 82-90, 114, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, describe an assortment of her "ecstatic and mystical states," visions, voices, and other phenomena from the spirit world.

3147 Pg. 16, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Books such as Guyon's *Autobiography*, *Spiritual Torrents*, and *Short Catechism* are specifically mentioned as influential (cf. pgs. 16, 22, *ibid*.).

3148 Pg. 34, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3149 Pg. 34, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard; pg. 16, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[to] produce spiritual fruit."[3150] That is, Penn-Lewis learned from Guyon the alleged truth of Quietism, "an effortless spiritual life" that is "stripped of [even the] vestiges of self"[3151] by passing beyond "effort or feeling or even faith"[3152] to mystical union with the Divine, "the Christ-life,"[3153] where "your own personality as a separate identity [is] merged in Him,"[3154] and "God is—we are not."[3155] Connecting her Quietism to the teachings of the "old Quakers" and her peculiar view of the soul and spirit, Penn-Lewis taught that one must reject "creaturely activity . . . [which] is manifestly the energy of the creature being used in the service of God rather than the creature seeking in spirit to co-operate with the Holy Spirit given to him as the Gift of the Risen Son of God."[3156] The Quietism learned from Guyon and the spirit world that produced her writings brought Penn-Lewis "into the stream of life at Keswick . . . in one spirit with . . . all" the ministers and spiritual teachings at the Keswick Convention of 1892,[3157] where speakers included

---

3150 Chapter 4, *The Centrality of the Cross*, Jessie Penn-Lewis; cf. pgs. 34-35, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard.

3151 Pg. 16, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Compare the discussion in the excerpt above from "A Warning Exhortation Against Pietists, Quietists, and all Who in a Similar Manner have Deviated to a Natural and Spiritless Religion under the Guise of Spirituality," by Wilhelmus à Brakel.

3152 Pg. 61, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3153 Pg. 63, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. It is noteworthy that "Christ-life" phraseology was in use among the metaphysical and New Thought cults of the late nineteenth century. For example, at Emerson College, where "New Thought metaphysics" were taught rather than "historical Christian orthodoxy," in "praise of the faculty at his graduation in 1896, one student remarked, ['']You have taught us not only how to think but what to think. You have taught us not only how to live but what to live. You have broadened our horizons, and made of us larger and better men and women, so that we shall go out from here better equipped to live the Christ life.'" (pg. 37, *A Different Gospel*, citing John M. Coffee, Jr. and Richard L. Wentworth, *A Century of Eloquence: The History of Emerson College, 1880-1890*, quoting Albert Armstrong, *Emerson College Magazine* (May, 1896), pg. 108). The terminology of the Christ-life was also employed by Mary Baker Eddy and her Christian Science cult, in testimonies that could be phrased in an identical way by advocates of the Keswick theology through the substitution of "Higher Life" or "Keswick" for "Christian Science." For example:

> Through the practice of Christian Science Jesus demonstrated the Christ-life, and every application of Christian Science has for its fruits Christ-like living, and tends to lift man above sin, sickness, and death. Is there anything the Christ-life does not satisfy, any heights or depths it cannot touch, any misery it fails to alleviate, any sin it will not destroy, any aspirations it does not fulfil? That Christian Science does supply these human needs today is the testimony of thousands of men and women. (pg. 218, "What is Truth?" by Charles D. Reyholds, in the *Christian Science Journal*, XXII:4 (July 1904). 193-256)

After all, "Christian Science so includes and enforces th[e] vital trut[h] of . . . a living of the Christ-life . . . that every Christian Scientist finds [himself] renewedly and increasingly emphasizing [it] in his thought and life." After all, the Christ-life is key, for "it is the normal work of the Christ-life to heal us of sickness as well as sin" (pg. 474, *Christian Science Journal* XXII:8 (November 1904) 457-536)

3154 Pg. 323, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3155 Pg. 335, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3156 Chapter 3, *Soul and Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

3157 Pg. 35, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

the annihilationist George Grubb.[3158] Penn-Lewis also "prepared reprints of works by . . . Madame Guyon"[3159] to spread Guyon's Roman Catholic mysticism to others.

Indeed, Jessie Penn-Lewis produced her writings under inspiration, she believed, just like Madame Guyon did, and the writers of the Bible did. Just like "Madame Guyon again and again describes how she wrote, under the hand of God, many things which it was not in her own mind and spirit to write . . . writing . . . treasures of knowledge and understanding that [she] did not know [her]self to possess . . . with incredible quickness, for the hand could hardly follow the Spirit,"[3160] writing, that is, under a supernatural inspiration, Penn-Lewis commented in her "heav[ily underscor[ed] . . . two-volume edition of Madame Guyon's 'Autobiography'" the "similarity of experience" between the two women, in that Jessie felt that Guyon's description of her writing by inspiration was "exactly how I have always written."[3161] The same spirit that moved Guyon to write by inspiration—which, unfortunately, was the very god of this world that worked in Hindu and other pagan mystics, and that authored Rome's many wretched heresies, such as justification by imparted righteousness, salvation by works, transubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, image worship, and the acceptance of non-canonical Apocrypha as inspired—also moved Jessie Penn-Lewis, in accordance with the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light, to write by inspiration. Penn-Lewis' writings were thus nothing but "determined obedience to the 'heavenly vision,'" and, she said, "I cannot write one sentence unless I receive it from God" by "inspiration," thus producing her "Overcomer Literature" in this manner.[3162] For example, by means of a "special vision," she described how she had one of her books revealed to her: "[A]s I was going to bed, there suddenly flashed upon me [the book] *The Message of the Cross*[3163] with every chapter marked—the whole scheme, every heading, chapter and title. Next morning I arose with every bit of it printed on my mind. I went to my study—locked the door—took each passage and wrote it as rapidly as it was possible. . . . Will the devil leave me alone over

---

[3158] Pg. 35, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pg. 274, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*. Since Hannah W. Smith was a universalist, it should not be surprising that other heretics who rejected the doctrine of hell were embraced and promoted at Keswick.

[3159] See pg. 230, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Brynmor Pierce Jones. Brunswick, N.J.: Bridge-Logos Publishers, 1997.

[3160] Pg. 177, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3161] Pg. 177, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3162] Pgs. 53-55, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3163] The book was very influential; for example, "a professor in the Moody Bible Institute . . . said that . . . *The Message of the Cross* had helped him greatly," and he "took steps to have [Penn-Lewis's] books distributed in Chicago" (pgs. 97-98, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

this?"[3164] In association with this book she also narrates: "In a dream I arose and went downstairs and sat alone far away in the vision. A voice came to me from the glory . . . [t]he knowledge was unspeakable." She wrote:

> I was suddenly within the veil. . . . It seemed as if I and the Lord were one. He stood before the Father holding out His pierced hands, but it was I who stood there, too, in Him. He was saying 'Father I have died,' but I was saying it, too. Calvary seemed far away down on the hillside.
>
> This was the Risen Lord with marks of the wounds, in the presence of the Father—and I was there. I saw Calvary within the veil. My whole being was melted.[3165]

These visions built upon her supernatural encounter earlier in the year:

> I suddenly began to feel pressed and burdened. My head fell on my breast with heavy breathing and for some time I groaned heavily. Then God spoke, 'He who knew no sin was made sin on our behalf.' I felt as if part of myself or a member of my body was corrupt and loathsome. It was part of me and tied to me by life and I could not be separated from it.
>
> Thus I knew what it meant for Him who knew no sin to be made Sin, to have identified with Him and the accursed ones, corrupt with the fallen life and yet joined to Him their Redeemed. For a week I walked so strangely under ceaseless condemnation. All I did seemed wrong. My conscience void of offense seemed to become all offense without a cause. . . . The lesson was that it was all permitted of God to teach me how truly the Pure and Holy One suffered as He became SIN on our behalf.
>
> It was a fellowship of Christ's sufferings in the one sense, that it lets one understand His agony as the sin-bearer. . . . This was the first deep knowledge of the Cross.[3166]

Thus, the material for her books came from the spirit world, visions, dreams, voices, experiences with heavy breathing, groaning, parts of her body feeling corrupt and loathsome, and so on. Her teaching on "those deeper aspects of Romans 6 and Colossians 2"[3167] were "revealed" to her in such a manner—rather than from the study of the Bible, which teaches, on the contrary, that while Christ endured the punishment of the sinful world in a vicarious way, sin being imputed to Him, He nevertheless was never personally sinful. Thus, by her visions and revelations, she gained that "deep knowledge of the Cross" which contradicts what Scripture teaches about the work of Christ on the cross. Writing to F. B. Meyer, she said, "I have been given by the Divine Spirit the

---

3164 Pg. 66, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3165 Pg. 89, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3166 Pgs. 87-88, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones. Evan Roberts also experienced similar ecstatic "ordeal[s]" through which, he claimed, "he had, in a most realistic sense, been partaker of Christ's sufferings" (pg. 174, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905). Nothing in the Bible states or implies that believers endure the kind of penal agony that Christ endured on the cross. Philippians 3:10, which contains the words to which Mrs. Penn-Lewis alludes in her vision from the spirit world that led her to her discovery of her peculiar version of Higher Life theology, refers to the Apostle Paul suffering persecution at the hands of men for Christ's sake, and has absolutely nothing to do with Mrs. Penn-Lewis's doctrine. The Lord Jesus took the wrath of God against sinful mankind "by Himself" and completely satisfied God's wrath by His one offering on the cross (Hebrews 1:3; 9:27-28; John 19:30). When Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts claim to share in Christ's penal sufferings they are guilty of terrible spiritual confusion and blasphemy.

3167 Pg. 201, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

interpretation of the Cross to the Christian."[3168] She "was specially chosen . . . and equipped with deep spiritual truths in these last days for the Church, truths that no one else held,"[3169] since they are not in the Bible. Furthermore, the spirits that gave her revelations not only miraculously produced *The Message of the Cross*, "every bit of it," although she did not delight in writing it,[3170] but enabled her to know the future by "reveal[ing] to her that the book would be greatly used"—and it was, in fact, "being studied more and more on the very eve of the Great Awakening" in the Welsh holiness revival "in 1904."[3171] Nor was *The Message of the Cross* by any means her only book inspired in this manner—her other books were "God-inspired"[3172] as well. "God's Hand was upon me . . . and I wrote . . . all He showed me," she claimed, "chapter[s]" of her writings coming through "vision[s]"[3173] and "revelations,"[3174] "God . . . pouring light . . . and [her] pen running without halting,"[3175] as she "wr[ote] what He gave me . . . even as Moses in the Mount with God."[3176] Likewise, her magazine articles were inspired. Even historical reports of events "were sounding like prophetic messages," for "she simply refused to separate her reports from her burden messages given directly by the Lord."[3177] She could also, free from the constraint of careful study of the Bible because of her inspiration, write "the actual matter [of a book] in one week"[3178] as "there poured from her pen . . . message[s] . . . so definitely given of God . . . truly prophetic . . words."[3179] However, although she wrote every sentence and word of her writings under inspiration

---

[3168] Pg. 231, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3169] Pg. 304, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

[3170] One of her later books, *Studies in the Song of Solomon*, was her "first book written with delight" (pg. 67, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones). It seems that writing inspired works was not especially enjoyable for Mrs. Penn-Lewis, at least much of the time, although her *Studies* volume was inspired as well (pg. 220, *ibid*.), so at least once in a while writing under inspiration was enjoyable. Unfortunately, the first book she delighted in writing was one "in which the *Song of Solomon* is not interpreted in the traditional manner" (pg. 220, *ibid*.), but was rather radically and grossly misinterpreted—under inspiration, of course.

[3171] Pgs. 66-67, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

[3172] Pg. 220, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

[3173] Pgs. 151-153, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3174] Pg. 172, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3175] Pg. 174, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3176] Pg. 173, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. Kenneth Hagin likewise received his books by inspiration (cf. pgs. 61ff., *A Different Gospel*, McConnell).

[3177] Pg. 140, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

[3178] Pg. 191, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones; Penn-Lewis here speaks of her book "Face to Face." Other books took a variety of periods to be received by inspiration, although they generally were produced far more quickly than volumes are that employ careful, Spirit-dependent study, painstaking exegesis, and sound hermeneutics, since Mrs. Penn-Lewis could dispense with such work, and was hardly capable of it in any case.

[3179] Pgs. 220-221, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

from the spirit world, she still needed to spend "ceaseless labour in proof correcting . . . and [other] details"[3180] that, it seems, supernatural inspiration did not get right at first. So great were the new revelations associated with her that she told others that the "Holy Ghost [could] tak[e] hold of" them also, "according to 1 Chron. xxviii:19," a passage which describes how David received truth under the infallible inspiration of God, and "inspire" even those who "translate" her writings into other languages; "God will take hold of your mind and your pen," she affirms of her translator-to-be[3181]—so one does not even need to learn English to read her inspired writings, but can read inspired translations of her works in foreign tongues. Nor was inspiration limited to her as a prophetess, and to those who translated her writings; inspiration was given to many who had entered into the highest levels of the Higher Life—all those, for example, who were to rise in the partial Rapture were the recipients of "revelation" and "inspiration" from God.[3182] Furthermore, not Mrs. Penn-Lewis' writings alone, but sundry other books, inspired as were the books of the Bible, could be written in modern times. The process of 2 Peter 1:15-21, where "prophecy" and "scripture" came from "holy men of God . . . moved by the Holy Ghost," was taking place in her day, she knew. Penn-Lewis described how one could write in the present day under the same kind of inspiration that was involved in the production of the Bible, both exalting modern writings to the level of Biblical inspiration and downgrading Biblical inspiration by affirming that it did not involve "dictation," when every jot and tittle of Scripture was indeed dictated, although not mechanically, by the Holy Spirit through holy men of old. In her exaltation of modern "inspired" writings she also attacked the plenary character of Biblical inspiration, affirming that there were levels of inspiration in the Bible, some parts being from God and some parts being what the human writer simply felt like recording.[3183] Thus, Penn-Lewis—under inspiration herself, of course—wrote:

> True writing under the hand of God [takes place today]. . . under Divine guidance . . . *moved* by the Holy Spirit (2 Peter 1:21) . . . writing under the guidance of God . . . by the movement of the Holy Spirit in the man's spirit[.] . . . The Scriptures bear the marks of their having been written in this way. Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (2 Peter 1:21). They spake from God, but as *men* they received and uttered, or wrote the truth given in the spirit, but transmitted through the full use of their divinely enlightened faculties. Paul's writings all show the

---

3180 Pg. 153, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3181 Pg. 128, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3182 Pg. 201, "The Spirit of Translation," *The Overcomer* December 1914.

3183 Penn-Lewis justifies her heresy on inspiration by twisting statements in 1 Corinthians 7 about what Christ said in His earthly ministry and what Paul received by inspiration but was not taught by the Lord during His earthly ministry, but was nonetheless equally the Word of God with the rest of the canon ("not I, but the Lord" vs. "I say," cf. 1 Corinthians 7:40; 14:36-37; 2 Peter 3:16), with alleged levels of inspiration, so that Paul's epistle is wrested into an affirmation that some of his writings came from the Lord and some were simply what he thought was nice.

> fulfillment of the[se] . . . requirements[.] . . . In Paul, too, we see the clear discrimination possessed by a spiritual man, able to recognize what came from God in his spirit, and what was the product of his own thought. . . . Note the varying language in 1 Cor. 7:6, 8, 10, 12, 25, 40, "I say," and "Not I but the Lord." . . . [W]riting under the guidance of God . . . is not given by dictation[,] but] . . . "supernatural revelations" [are for] today[.][3184]

Thus, by means of the inspiration of her writings and their inspired translation, Jessie Penn-Lewis followed Madame Guyon and became "a teacher of the deep things of God."[3185]

Indeed, Mrs. Penn-Lewis tied in her inspiration with her role as a woman preacher, for those "passages of the Apostle Paul's writings" that plainly proclaimed the sinfulness of women preachers "were bound to be *in harmony with the working of the Holy Spirit*[3186] in the Nineteenth Century" during which she had "proved . . . in her own life" the propriety of woman preaching by her spiritual experiences and "God sp[eaking] with mighty power through His handmaiden." Had not the preaching, teaching, counseling, public prayer, and other acts of female leadership over men in the Welsh Revival demonstrated that the Most High accepted such disobedience to Scripture,[3187] just as the marvels Penn-Lewis further proclaimed: "The Lord has set a the seal of blessing on my messages at Keswick [and elsewhere]," and she knew that "the whole current of life moving through the spiritual Church is towards clear and open ground for women in the work of God," so failing to preach would be "disobedience,"[3188] regardless of what the plain statements of the Bible might affirm to the contrary. As she wrote in her apologetic for women preachers, *The Magna Carta of Women*, "The Spirit of God has never been poured forth in any company in any part of the world without the

---

3184 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Italics retained from original. Some capitalization has been changed. The fact that Penn-Lewis warns that "many" claims to "supernatural revelations" and inspiration are in error does not change the fact, but only makes it all the clearer, that she thinks *some* such claims are not error—only "many," but not "all" modern claims to write under inspiration, as the Apostle Paul did, are false.

3185 Pg. 192, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3186 Emphasis in the original.

3187 Pgs. 261, 264-265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Concerning the general abandonment of Biblical gender roles in the Welsh holiness revival, an abandonment that was certainly not limited to Jessie Penn-Lewis alone, note also pg. 36, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. It is interesting that in "the story of all holiness movements . . . [t]he place of women is an important part," from Phoebe Palmer, to Catherine Booth, to Hannah W. Smith, onward (pgs. 165, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; the woman preachers at Keswick are described on pgs. 148ff.). The neglect of *sola Scriptura* for testimonials by women to their experience of sanctification contributed to the rise of women preachers as testimonial morphed into authoritative proclamation (cf. pgs. 148ff., *ibid*).

3188 Pg. 197, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

'handmaids'[3189] prophesying"—at least in the types of alleged revival with which she was associated—and we "dare not quench the Spirit . . . by saying that only men were inspired by the Holy Spirit."[3190] Her argument from Acts 2 for woman preachers anticipated the Pentecostal position exactly.[3191] Thus, "[w]omen could be entrusted with prophetic and teaching ministries of the highest kind."[3192] If, by "a special vision . . . [her] sermon[s] [were] inspired,"[3193] and she was "God's special messenger" who properly "asserted her special status as a messenger of God,"[3194] who would dare to question her preaching? She warned: "you will fear lest you touch His revealings to me in the least degree . . . given by Him directly to me."[3195] When Jehovah spoke directly from heaven on Mount Sinai, or speaks in His Word the Bible, men must fear and tremble before Him: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the LORD hath spoken" (Isaiah 1:2). But now hearken—Jessie Penn-Lewis has spoken. Who dares not fear? Indeed, she wrote that she received by revelation her special doctrine of the Cross and sanctification at the time "it pleased God to reveal His Son I me that I might preach Him."[3196] After consulting with others who saw visions, and feeling "a strange prompting to sing and preach," Penn-Lewis "was no longer reluctant to share her [own] visions with others," and shortly thereafter "began her public preaching" in earnest, receiving supernatural ability to "speak to men's meetings and fe[el] not a twinge of

---

3189 Mrs. Penn-Lewis's appeal to Acts 2:17-21 to support her continuationism and doctrine of women preachers was standard Quaker practice:

> As it is the prerogative of the Great Head of the church alone to select and call the ministers of His Gospel, so we believe that both the gift and the qualification to exercise it must be derived immediately from Him; and that, as in the primitive church, so now also, He confers spiritual gifts upon women as well as upon men, agreeably to the prophecy recited by the apostle Peter, 'It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,' (Acts 2:17) respecting which the apostle declares, 'the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' (Acts 2:39) As the gift is freely received so it is to be freely exercised" ("Public Worship," *Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887*. Elec. acc. http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml).

Compare the similar attempt to use Acts 2 by Phoebe Palmer (pg. 88, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

3190 Pg. 265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3191 E. g., see the argument for women preachers from Acts 2:17-18; 21:9 on pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:12 (Los Angeles, January 1908), reprinted on pg. 50, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove.

3192 Pg. 265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones, cf. pgs. 259-265.

3193 Pg. 66, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3194 Pgs. 99, 109, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3195 Pg. 100, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones. Penn-Lewis's arguments for women preachers were largely dependent upon the work of Katharine Bushnell, whose invalid arguments were reproduced—under inspiration, of course—by Mrs. Penn-Lewis (cf. pgs. 161-163, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

3196 Pg. 25, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

nerves."[3197] Naturally, a "woman who is called to preach is likewise called to an understanding of the Word which will agree with that inward voice"[3198]—Quaker Inner Light and direct revelations must be used to interpret the Bible, which, therefore, must not be the sole and sufficient authority for faith and practice, despite 2 Timothy 3:16-17. For that matter, "there were times when she" did not "compose an address" but simply "appeal[ed] to the Holy Spirit to give her a message" to preach, or supernatural influences "told her to throw away her notes" or to simply "arise, nothing doubting, and speak," bestowing upon her supernatural "power . . . and liberty" apart from study of the Scriptures; while sometimes a "minister was not pleased" by this preaching without study, "it matters not."[3199] Her writings and messages thus reflected her "personal experience"[3200] and were "confirmed by numbers of letters in [her] possession, as well as by the witness of God to many another soul," rather than by careful attention to sound principles of Biblical exegesis; she had "no desire to dogmatise or systematize,"[3201] and, for that reason, pressed upon Christian workers as a dogma not to be questioned: "Do not dogmatize over anything."[3202] She "return[ed]" theological "books" when sent to her with "nothing to say about them" because she was "not concerned about 'systems,' . . . hav[ing] no time for" them,[3203] preferring what she could learn by mystical experiences, visions, and revelations.

Mrs. Penn-Lewis's disregard for systematic theology was evident in her confusion and false doctrine about who God Himself even was. As at the Broadlands Conferences preaching that "Jesus Christ is . . . the Holy Spirit"[3204] was acceptable, so Mrs. Penn-Lewis could make modalistic affirmations about God as a single "Person manifested as Father, Son, or Holy Spirit."[3205] She could deny the omnipresence of God the Father and God the Son, claiming that they were not on earth, and deny the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit by affirming that He was on earth, but not in heaven:

> God the Father, as a Person, is in the highest heaven. His *presence* is manifested in men as the "*Spirit* of the Father." Christ the Son is in heaven as a Person, His *presence* in men is by His Spirit. The Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of the Father, and of the Son, is on earth in the Church. . . .

3197 Pgs. 38-39, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3198 Pgs. 268-269, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard.

3199 Pgs. 19, 28-29, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3200 Pg. 61, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3201 Pg. 56, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard.

3202 Pg. 226, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones. Jones notes that she, at times, "answered [doctrinal questions] in a very dogmatic fashion" (pg. 227, *ibid*.).

3203 Pgs. 67-68, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard.

3204 Pg. 170, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

3205 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

> The Person of God [which, it seems, is again only modalistic and solitary, not Trinitarian] is in heaven, but the *presence* is manifested on earth, in and with believers; through and by the Holy Spirit; in, and to the human spirit, as the organ of the Holy Spirit for the manifested presence of God.[3206]

Scripture teaches that all three Persons of the Trinity are within the believer (John 14:23), not the Holy Spirit only (which is necessary, in any case, since the Divine essence is undivided), so that while the Spirit certainly is in the Christian (Romans 8:9), Christ is in the believer also: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" (2 Corinthians 13:5; Galatians 2:20). However, Penn-Lewis wrote: "The thought with many is that the *Person* of Christ is in them, but in truth, Christ as a *Person* is in no man,"[3207] an affirmation which, happily, is false, as then all would be reprobates. Nevertheless, she knew that it was necessary to adopt all this confusion and false doctrine on the Trinity and the Divine attributes in order to "understand the counterfeiting methods of evil spirits"[3208]—confusion about and blasphemy against the Triune God would certainly be of great help in resisting evil spirits, at least to those who think it is well to reject theology for mindless mysticism. Thus, while Penn-Lewis did not have time for theology, she had plenty of time to pour over the writings of Madame Guyon, be "influenced by . . . mystical treatises . . . by Fenelon,"[3209] and read other mystics and heretics,[3210] so that "[s]ome of her language . . . sounded like the mystic cults."[3211] "It is the mind, not the heart, that is the trouble," she wrote; "experience may easily be of God and yet the mind" can get in the way. "Christians . . . know too much[,] [and therefore are] sinking . . . further away from the true life in God."[3212] Thus, her preaching and writing "c[ame] from, and appeal to, the heart rather than the intellect."[3213] God "could not use me for writing," Penn-Lewis wrote, when her "natural mental activities [were]

3206 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. It is not affirmed that Mrs. Penn-Lewis was indeed a modalist, rather than a Trinitarian; she could speak of the "three Persons of the Trinity" within almost the same breath as referring to God as a single "Person." Rather, the affirmation is that she did not know what she was talking about in her Trinitarian affirmations, as evidenced in her failure to recognize or employ the Biblical (cf. Hebrews 1:3) and classical Trinitarian distinction between God as one in essence or nature and three in Person. Nor is it affirmed that Mrs. Penn-Lewis, if pressed, would necessarily boldly, fixedly, and stubbornly deny the omnipresence of the Father, Son, and Spirit; rather, her blasphemy on this subject is likely simply a product of her great, willful, and culpable ignorance of theology.

3207 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

3208 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

3209 Pg. 61, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3210 E. g., Hannah Whitall Smith (pg. 169, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones).

3211 Pg. 197, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones; the statement is by "Dr. Pierson, who had worked well with her during the conventions in Wales."

3212 Pg. 336, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3213 Pgs. 190-191, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard.

aroused."[3214] Thus, rather than carefully examining the context of passages of the Bible and recognizing the fact that a genuine work of God employs a "sound mind" (2 Timothy 1:7), one could instead know one had the correct interpretation of Scripture by emptying one's mind and having "the Holy Ghost commen[d] the message to every man's conscience" through direct revelation.[3215] Penn-Lewis' writings therefore do "not contain 'mental' matter, *i. e.*, matter which is merely the product of the mind, even a *spiritual mind*,"[3216] but material gained by "fresh and living experience" that showed what the true meaning of the Bible was.[3217] It is, then, not unexpected that those who use their minds—as the Spirit that inspired the Scriptures commands (Isaiah 1:18; Romans 12:1; 2 Timothy 1:7)—come to reject both her claims of inspiration and the theology of sanctification she allegedly received by inspiration. To recognize the inspiration of the writings of a woman who plainly contradicts Scripture, exalts ignorance of theology, promulgates a doctrine of healing that does not actually heal, believes she has deep knowledge of the Cross because parts of her body begin to feel loathsome, and predicted the end of the world in 1914, one must truly set aside his mind.

Nonetheless, Mrs. Penn Lewis preached worldwide in Quaker, Anglican, Lutheran, Salvation Army, Y. W. C. A., China Inland Mission, and many other settings[3218] to audiences that readily adopted the theology of sanctification and healing she had received from the spirit world by inspiration. She "joined the staff of the women's meetings . . . [at] Keswick . . . by the invitation of the Trustees" in 1899,[3219] having already "been present at the Convention . . . [y]ear after year"[3220] before this time,

---

3214 Pg. 149, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard.

3215 Rejecting the Biblical fact that in genuine spirituality, worship, and Christian service the mind is always active (2 Timothy 1:7), not empty, is also a feature of Pentecostalism: "When singing or speaking in tongues, your mind does not take any part of it" (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* II:12 (Los Angeles, May 1908), reprinted on pg. 54, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove; cf. pg. 12, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert M. Anderson), even as in demon possession in pagan religions the "pneuma banishes the human . . . mind . . . and acts or speaks" (pgs. 20-21, *ibid*). Pentecostalism receives no support for its dangerous error that the mind is inactive from 1 Corinthians 14:14, which, when it specifies that the understanding is "unfruitful" or ἄκαρπος, "does not mean that the mind did not function, but rather that the product of the mind did not bear fruit and did not edify" (*The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the New Testament*, Rodgers & Rodgers, on 1 Corinthians 14:14).

3216 Emphasis in the original.

3217 Pgs. 252-253, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard; pg. 174, *The Overcomer*, December, 1914.

3218 cf. pgs. 131, 144-145, 156, 245, etc., *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Mary Garrard.

3219 Pg. 184, "An Autobiographical Sketch," *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914; pg. 199, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

3220 Pg. 178, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

and continued her "service in the Women's Meetings at Keswick . . . [until] 1909."[3221] She preached "[a]t Keswick also, for many years, [at] open meetings . . . addressed on the Sundays preceding and concluding Convention week,"[3222] for she was as "an influential figure in the Keswick Convention,"[3223] being asked to deliver Bible Readings to mixed gender audiences at Keswick.[3224] Many people came to Keswick specifically to hear her preach.[3225] After 1909 "she still continued one of the Trustees of the Convention," simply "retir[ing] from the leadership of the Women's Meetings and from the heavy organizing work"[3226] to focus on her message of warfare with Satan and the coming end of the world. She remained closely associated with Keswick until her death; shortly before her passing she was found "at Keswick in July 1927 . . . [and] travelled to Llandrindod Wells [the Welsh Keswick] on July 29th, as one of the speakers of the Convention."[3227] She was also "a standing member . . . [of] the Council of Reference" for the Welsh "Llandrindod Keswick Convention"[3228] that she helped to found,[3229] and it "was Jessie's special task to introduce [Keswick-type] conventions to North Wales."[3230] Indeed, she was the initiator of the process through which the Llandrindod Wells Convention began.[3231] She also "helped organize . . . many new Keswick-type local conventions."[3232] She did, however, give up some of her responsibilities in 1909[3233] to focus on that "message of the Cross" she had received by direct revelation accompanied with feelings of corruption in her body parts, a message which needed to be "proclaimed anew" to prepare "the Church . . . for translation at the Lord's appearing,"[3234] and to that

---

3221 Pg. 185, "An Autobiographical Sketch," *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914.

3222 Pg. 244, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3223 Pg. 525, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope.

3224 Pg. 155, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

3225 Pg. 157, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

3226 Pg. 238, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3227 Pg. 299, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3228 Pg. 147, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3229 Pgs. 121-122, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

3230 Pg. 152, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3231 Pg. 168, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

3232 Pg. 163, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3233 When, in 1911, she received an inspired "telegram . . . from Evan Roberts saying, 'Withdraw at once,'" she gave up responsibilities at the Welsh Keswick as well (pg. 147, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones).

3234 Pg. 210, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

end her booklet "The Word of the Cross" was printed in the millions of copies and translated into "no less than one hundred languages and dialects"[3235] as a result of a vision[3236] of "someone coming in shining armor covered with precious stones[,] and this being was filled with God"—Dr. Rudeshill, the printer of her works himself,[3237] although not long afterwards he "lost all his enthusiasm for her work."[3238] At times a new book she had received by revelation would be "by far the most popular book at Keswick th[at] year."[3239] Her works filled "Japan, China, . . . India[,] . . . Jamaica, Mexico . . . other Caribbean centers . . . Canada . . . the Australian States . . . Singapore . . . [and] Kenya . . . [were translated into] German, French . . . Swedish, Russian, and other Baltic languages . . . also into Yiddish . . . Italian . . . Hungarian, and other languages," and influenced Christendom in many other nations. In short, her "message was reaching the whole world," as distribution of her works was taken over by the "Christian Literature Crusade," prominent publisher for Christian and Missionary Alliance literature.[3240] In America, "the name of Jessie Penn-Lewis had become a household word and . . . her books were in great demand."[3241] Her doctrines spread so widely that they have "permeated the teaching of the Church of God, even in circles where her name is scarcely known."[3242]

Penn-Lewis' theology "of the Cross was the Lord's preparation of a group of His servants who should carry the message to Wales,"[3243] just as her influence as a "founder of the 'Welsh Keswick' at Llandrindod Wells"[3244] and her influence in the continued development of the Welsh Keswick, the Llandrindod Wells Convention, which began in 1903,[3245] and her preaching at its meetings from the first, were central developments in

---

3235 Pg. 217, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3236 Pg. 213, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3237 Pg. 109, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3238 Pg. 140, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis,* Jones.

3239 Pg. 180, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3240 Pgs. 308-313, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pg. 178, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

3241 Pg. 104, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3242 Pg. 197, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3243 Pg. 199, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard.

3244 Pg. 525, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival," Pope. Thus, Calvinistic Methodists were already by February 1904 spreading Penn-Lewis's beliefs and Keswick theology in Wales as a precursor of the holiness revival there (pg. 517, *ibid*).

3245 Pgs. 145-146, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Compare the discussion of the connection between the beginning of the Welsh Keswick conference at Llandrindod Wells and the Welsh holiness revival under Evan Roberts on pgs. 44-45, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

the rise of the Methodist and Anglican aspects, especially, of the holiness revival[3246] of 1904 in Wales, a movement of which she also served as chronicler[3247] and doctrinal guide.[3248] She "was . . . a special correspondent to several of the men most deeply involved in the Revival. . . . Few were more intimate with the workings of revival, few were in such constant touch with the chief instruments and their prayer partners, and few were so well-known abroad that their reports of miraculous events would be believed and responded to."[3249] She, herself Welsh,[3250] "founded Keswick in Wales, and was the inspiration behind many other conventions."[3251] As the Keswick theology contributed to the work of the Welsh holiness revival under Evan Roberts, the holiness revival, in its turn, strongly influenced those worldwide who accepted the Keswick theology: "Keswick leaders helped to bring Keswick emphases to Wales and there was a determination to introduce the Welsh Revival to a wider audience."[3252] It is not surprising, in light of her claims to miraculous gifts, supernatural visitations, and inspiration, that she put the Welsh Revival on a level with the religious excitement that birthed the Pentecostal movement in Los Angeles, California, from which the entire Pentecostal and charismatic movements have originated, since she believed, as did Evan

---

[3246] However, the holiness revival movement weakened denominational distinctives and ecclesiastical separation so that people "from all denominations drew together" (pg. 129, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). Indeed, Roberts and Penn-Lewis affirmed in *War on the Saints* that a mark of "counterfeit" revival is "a spirit of separation" over "non-essentials" (pg. 143, *ibid*.); contrast Matthew 5:18-19; Luke 16:10. Nothing that the King of heaven commands is non-essential.

[3247] Her reporting sought to be "factual, but . . . also selective" (pg. 128, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

[3248] Pg. 221-226, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir,* Garrard. For example, her doctrine of women preachers was advanced because of the Revival; "women were now taking a principal part . . . just as she had foreseen" (pg. 120, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). She influenced not only the most prominent preacher, Evan Roberts, but also led other ministers of the holiness Revival, from Seth Joshua to R. B. Jones; she had led the latter, for example, "into a new understanding of how to obtain victory over all defeatedness through the Cross. Using the very same proof-texts that she had shown him, he had preached with new authority . . . about renewed revival . . . and never looked back again." (cf. pgs. 120ff., *ibid*.)

[3249] Pgs. 119-120, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3250] Pg. 155, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[3251] Pgs. xi, 94-95, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Her preaching and influence also contributed to holiness revival movements in other lands; for example, after she preached in Egypt in 1904, there was revival "blessing among both Coptic and Methodist congregations" (pg. 132, *ibid*.), despite the fact that the Copts believed in a false sacramental gospel akin to that of Roman Catholicism and never repented of their accursed heresies.

[3252] Pg. 169, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

Roberts,[3253] that people in their day were experiencing the "gifts of prophesy, tongues, healings, and other spiritual experiences, connected with the work of the Holy Ghost."[3254] Just as the "heavens [were] opened" in a powerful "working of the Holy Spirit . . . [in] Revival . . . in Wales," a like heavenly stream was at work in "the Pentecostal Movement in Los Angeles."[3255] She found acceptable the teaching, coming from "Los Angeles, California . . . [of] many [Pentecostal] Azuza Street leaders and of the Pacific Apostolic Faith Movement" that set forth teachings on sanctification and miraculous gifts "[l]ike the Overcomer Testimony founded by Jessie Penn-Lewis"[3256] and Evan Roberts.[3257] Those "Americans who had visited each revival center in Wales, especially places where Evan Roberts could be seen," returned home, and soon "new signs and wonders had begun in the United States," as "the Spirit had come in power upon Los Angeles" and other places.[3258] Not only did people come from the Welsh holiness revival to America to raise up and support Pentecostalism, but the literature of the supernatural work in Wales through Evan Roberts circulated widely at Azuza Street[3259] and other roots of the Pentecostal movement as the worldwide influence of the Keswick continuationism so zealously promoted by Mrs. Penn-Lewis prepared the way for the rise of worldwide Pentecostalism. As the revivalism in Wales spread into India, "Pandita Ramabai, a high-caste widow . . . heard the news of the Welsh revival."[3260] Ramabai, an avid supporter of

---

[3253] Roberts believed in the continuation of "tongues and prophesyings and visions," but only for those who had wisdom and experience as Christians (pg. 173, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.). Others would be deceived by Satan and be wild fanatics. Nonetheless, Roberts was very far from calling wild fanatics all those who were shouting "shabbalaboba, shawannabogo, sinwanafaco," and so on, and thinking that such gibberish was the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit.

[3254] Pg. 53, *War On The Saints*, Full Text, Unabridged ed., by Jessie Penn-Lewis & Evan Roberts. New York, NY: Thomas E. Lowe, 1974. Roberts & Penn-Lewis warned that Satan was counterfeiting these gifts as well.

[3255] Pg. 38, *The Overcomer*, II:3 (March 1910). She did think that there were elements of dangerous pseudo-spirituality, a stream from beneath, as it were, in both the Welsh holiness revival and in the tongues movement (e. g., in addition to pg. 38, also pgs. 9-10, *Overcomer*, 1910), but any mainline Pentecostal would issue the same sort of warnings, as even those at the heart of the Azuza Street meetings did. The problem was by no means the tongues themselves or the continuationism.

[3256] Pg. 179, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3257] "Jessie and Evan . . . jointly found[ed] and staff[ed] *The Overcomer* . . . [and] signed documents naming them as co-sponsors of" the magazine. "The two founders contributed about seventy five percent of the contents" for the first few years (pgs. 211, 213, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

[3258] Pg. 170, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3259] See, e. g., pg. 29, *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements*, David D. Bundy. Wilmore, KY: B. L. Fisher Library, Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975.

[3260] Pg. 193, "The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day," Frederick G. Henke. *The American Journal of Theology*, 13:2 (April 1909) 193-206.

women preachers like Mrs. Penn-Lewis,[3261] had spoken at Keswick in 1898 after learning the Keswick theology of receiving the Spirit from a missionary,[3262] and not long after the rise of the Welsh holiness revival "Pandita Ramabai's witnessing and praising bands . . . adopted tongues."[3263] By 1906 they both warmly welcomed Pentecostal leaders[3264] and were contributing to the spread of tongues internationally.[3265] "Jessie . . . commended the leaders of [her] group,"[3266] although "[c]onfusion reigned" there as people, "with shoulders and bodies twitching and jerking" experienced "extreme agony" as they "had been speaking in tongues," while others experienced, based on a gross and blatant misinterpretation of Luke 12:49, a "baptism of fire" that involved a "flood of fire poured on [one's] head, and . . . burning inside [that was] rather hard to bear."[3267] Furthermore,

---

[3261] Pg. 161, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Amy Carmichael, who "had lived . . . as the widowed [Quaker Keswick founder] Robert Wilson's adopted daughter since the age of twenty-two" (pg. 89, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.) and the faith cure healing evangelist who turned Pentecostal Carey Judd Montgomery, among others, similarly believed in women preachers (cf. pgs. 125-127, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton; however, Mrs. Montgomery could not heal herself, nor her husband, pg. 132; cf. pgs. 51-52, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee).

[3262] Pg. 154, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Ramabai came to associate herself with the Christian and Missionary Alliance and other Keswick continuationist groups (pg. 154, *ibid*).

[3263] Pgs. 27-28, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee. Tongues had spread like wildfire by 1907; note the extensive coverage of the tongues movement under her ministry on pg. 4, *The Apostolic Faith* I:10 (Los Angeles, September 1907); pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:12 (January 1908); pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* II:12 (May 1908), reprinted on pgs. 44, 49, 53, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove; cf. also pg. 7, *The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God*, 442-443, April 29, 1922.

[3264] Pg. 147, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan; pgs. 28-29, 47, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

[3265] E. g., Donald Gee records how Ramabai's propagation of tongues contributed to many in the United States adopting the practice and to the formation of the Methodist Pentecostal Church in Chile (pgs. 57-58, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Gee).

[3266] Pg. 183, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3267] Pgs. 193-194, "The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day," Frederick G. Henke. *The American Journal of Theology*. Bartleman provides a further description of the work of the spirit world, accompanied with tongues, that Jessie Penn-Lewis commended:

> The girls in India so wonderfully wrought upon and baptized with the Spirit (in Ramabai's mission), began by terrifically beating themselves[.] . . . They jumped up and down . . . for hours without fatigue[.] . . . They cried out with the burning that came into and upon them. Some fell as they saw a great light pass before them[.] . . . About twenty girls went into a trance at one time and became unconscious of this world for hours; some for three or four days. During that time they sang, prayed, clapped their hands, rolled about, or sat still. . . . The Spirit was poured out upon one of the seeking girls in the night. Her companion sleeping next to her awoke [and] s[aw] fire envelope her[.] . . .Many of these girls were invested with a strange, beautiful and supernatural fire. . . . At Kara Camp pictures appeared on the walls to a company of small girls in prayer, supernaturally depicting the life of Christ. The figures moved in the pictures and were in colors. Each view would last from two to ten minutes and then the light would gradually fade away, to reappear in a few moments with a new scene. These appeared for twelve hours . . . [as] [i]n Wales colored lights were often seen, like balls of fire, during the revival there. (pgs. 35-36, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-day Pentecost*, by Frank Bartleman. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1980)

"Vicar Alexander Boddy . . . had stood with Evan Roberts in revival meetings and been thrilled by the evidences of the Holy Spirit's work in their midst," and "by the following year . . . he heard with joy about [the] Azuza Street Mission in Los Angeles, California, and other places . . . sought the same blessing and found himself worshipping the Lord in 'new tongues.'"[3268] Penn-Lewis's "old frien[d] . . . Mrs. Groves . . . [was a] missionary who had joined in the [Pentecostal] Latter Rain experience," and Jessie Penn-Lewis wrote to her that when one "reach[es] the very roots of faith down in the Cross, and from there ascend[s] into a life of purity and worship . . . 'Tongues' c[an] be one expression."[3269] She printed "a long tribute to the [Lutheran] pastors who met at the Barmen Conference" in 1907 and stated: "We acknowledge that God might give all the gifts of the Spirit in our own day. The church should allow herself to be ready."[3270] Mrs. Penn-Lewis was thus "[f]ar from denying the gift of tongues," but "asked only that those who had no gifts would exercise patience, and that those who had received the gift would stay humble,"[3271] and, therefore, "was criticized by strict evangelicals as one who took too soft a line."[3272] Her writings on Pentecostalism were "not written in a spirit of opposition or adverse criticism,"[3273] for, as a Quaker, she agreed with the fundamental continuationism of Pentecostalism. Indeed, Charles Parham, that key founder of the modern "tongues" movement, recognized the affinity of his fanaticism with that of Quakerism by affirming that extra-Biblical "Divine inspiration is the basic principle of Quakerism," as it was central to his own theology, leading him to believe that the "Holy Spirit" by "inspiration" spoke through him in the various "language[s] of the world."[3274] It is, therefore, not in the least surprising that Mrs. Penn-Lewis believed that "the best

---

While trances, beating of oneself, and the rest, when evaluated by the Bible, were far more in line with what took place in connection with demon possession than with the work of the Holy Spirit, Jessie Penn-Lewis nonetheless commended Ramabai's work—for it was of the same character as the work that took place in Wales through Evan Roberts and which was encouraged by Mrs. Penn-Lewis herself. The "Pentecostal . . . revival was rocked in the cradle of little Wales. It was 'brought up' in India, following; becoming full grown in Los Angeles" (pg. 19, *ibid*).

[3268] Pg. 183, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; pg. 6, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee. Note the reception and commendation by American Pentecostal and Azuza Street leader Frank Bartleman on pg. 148, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

[3269] Pgs. 192-193, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3270] Pgs. 194, 175, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Compare the background in Germany that led this conference at Barmen in *Perfectionism*, vol. 1, Chapters 6-7, B. B. Warfield.

[3271] Pg. 142, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3272] Pg. 169, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3273] Pg. 227, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

[3274] Pg. 67, *The Everlasting Gospel*, Charles F. Parham.

qualities of the Pentecostal movement could be accepted,"[3275] although she criticized certain of its more extreme aberrations.[3276] Her teachings also contained the seeds of a variety of Word of Faith heresies.[3277]

Not only did Penn-Lewis see the Welsh holiness revival as a phenomenon similar to the Pentecostal revival, but the movement in Wales led her also to the composition of *The War On The Saints*[3278] with Evan Roberts. This book, which was part of the preparation for the end of the world in 1914, was intended "[o]nly [for] those who have experienced the baptism of the Holy Spirit," as all others would not be able to "understand and benefit"[3279]—Christians who simply searched the Scriptures and therefore rejected the doctrine of a post-conversion Spirit baptism certainly would find no value in the book, as it was not based on grammatical-historical interpretation of the Bible, but upon "inquiries and testings . . . evidence . . . of counterfeit signs, visions,

---

[3275] Pg. xv, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3276] For example, Penn-Lewis was happy that the followers of "Lady Pandita Ramabai" in India "had adopted tongues but forbidden rollings, groanings, and other body movements" (pg. 142, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). Thus, a "careful study of all her correspondence in 1907-1908 would silence those who have misrepresented Jessie Penn-Lewis as an uncompromising enemy of all forms of Pentecostalism" (pg. 143, cf. pgs. 177-194, *ibid*.). Nor is one surprised that a "full set" of her works has been compiled and is stored at the "Assembly of God College, Mattersey . . . England" (Pg. 317, *ibid.*).

[3277] For example, she anticipated the Word of Faith heresies that speaking words create reality in a manner comparable to the way in which God created the world *ex nihilo* by His speech, and that God Himself lives by faith. Commenting on Mark 11:22-24, and assuming that the text of the Authorized Version is mistranslated in Mark 11:22 and the correct rendering should be "have the faith of God," she wrote:

> The words . . . "Have faith in God," are really . . . *"Have the faith of God[.]"* . . . The "faith of God" is this, that when *He* speaks the word the thing is *done*. God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. The words you speak are of the greatest importance in the prayer life. In this spiritual sphere, what *you say* creates. . . . "The faith of God" is the faith which God had when He said: "Let there be light." God does not doubt that it will be as He has said. . . . Remember that your *words* are of importance in the spiritual realm. "They overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." [Revelation 12:11, which, it seems, is also supposed to support the idea that words create reality.] . . .Apply this to everything in your life, and it will make you beware of your words" (pgs. 56-58, *The Spiritual Warfare*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Italics in original.)

The heresy that God lives by faith found its way from Penn-Lewis, through Keswick and Higher Life leaders such as A. B. Simpson, who misinterpreted Mark 11:22-24 likewise to teach that God lived by faith (pg. 40, "Does God Act by Faith?" A. B. Simpson. *The Alliance Weekly* 59:3, July 19, 1924), into the Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements; see, e. g., pg. 98, *In His Presence*, E. W. Kenyon. Kenneth Hagin stated: "God ha[s] faith. . . . Evidently God had faith in His [own] faith, because He spoke the words of faith and they came to pass" ("Having Faith in Your Faith," Kenneth E. Hagin. Tulsa, OK: Faith Library, 1980, 4-5, cited pg. 346, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur).

[3278] Note that the seventh and subsequent editions of *War on the Saints* commend the articles and subsequent book by John A. MacMillan, *The Authority of the Believer*; see the analysis of MacMillan below.

[3279] Pg. 228, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, citing the preface to reprinted editions of *War on the Saints*.

exercises, and manifestations . . . [and] testimonies."[3280] Indeed, "Evan Roberts disclosed later that [the book] had included his spiritual autobiography because he had long since realized that he too had been deceived and harassed by Satan," although by the time *War on the Saints* was written, he had now obtained "power to understand and discern,"[3281] so one did not need to fear that the book itself was a product of Satanic deception—after all, the book had cosmic dispensational significance in preparing for the end of the world in 1914, so no deception could possibly be involved. Roberts called "*War on the Saints* . . . my unnamed biography."[3282] *War on the Saints* stated that believers, even those who have received the second blessing of the baptism of the Spirit, "devoted believers . . . honest and earnest believers . . . who have been baptized with the Holy Ghost . . . who sigh and cry over the powerlessness of the true Church of Christ, and who grieve that her witness is ineffective . . . can be deceived, and even possessed by deceiving spirits."[3283] Deception is usually associated with possession: "Christians are as open to possession by evil spirits as other men, and become possessed . . . in most cases, unwittingly . . . apart from the cause of willful sin."[3284] However, sometimes believers, without any known sin, and without even being deceived, may be possessed; through "unknown . . . sin . . . even by a believer, an evil spirit may take possession of the mind, or body, without there being any experience of deception."[3285] Demons can not only possess ordinary believers without known sin, and who are not deceived, but even the most spiritual believers can be possessed. Indeed, "the most spiritual believers, baptized with the Holy Spirit, and most fitted to be used of God in Revival service, may become deceived and possessed by demons in their outer being through accepting the counterfeits of Satan."[3286] In fact, *War on the Saints* teaches:

3280 Pg. 228, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3281 Pg. 229, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pgs. 180-183.

3282 Pg. 102, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

3283 Compare William Boardman's earlier warning that entry into the Higher Life can lead one into fanaticism, an affirmation he proved, not with Scripture, but with the testimony of a lady who consecrated herself and then became a Shaker (pgs. 144-149, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman).

3284 Chapter 4, *War on the Saints*.

3285 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*.

3286 Pg. 283, *War On the Saints*, Roberts & Penn-Lewis. Roberts & Penn-Lewis follow Robert P. Smith in this affirmation. Smith explained: "You may have special temptations of Satan after this time of [Spirit] baptism at Oxford. . . . Never forget that the highest elevations of experience involve the most fearful dangers" (pgs. 257, 259, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Of course, since Robert's Baptism involved the "thrill" and "intense emotion" (pg. 259, *ibid*) of his erotic bridal Baptism doctrine, it was not surprising that the Baptism and Higher Life he proclaimed led to fearful dangers and special temptations by Satan.

> [S]ouls who are (a) not disobedient to light, or (b) living in any known sin, but the contrary . . . become possessed by evil spirits, through deception over absolute surrender to God (as they supposed), and whole-hearted reckless abandonment to 'supernatural power' which they believed was of God, but through ignorance, were not able to discern as counterfeits by demons of the Spirit of God. . . . Evidence of believers wholly consecrated to God in spirit, soul and body, in will and fact, becoming possessed in mind and body by demons, is now available, having all the symptoms and manifestations . . . described in the Gospels. Multitudes of believers are possessed in various degrees[.]

Vast multitudes of believers were possessed, Mrs. Penn-Lewis knew, and possessed, not in some lesser sense, but to the fullest extent and in every way that people were indwelt and controlled by Satan and his demons recorded in Scripture:

> Evidences are now available, proving that . . . possession in its fullest degree, has taken place in believers . . . such cases having all the symptoms and manifestations described in the gospel records. The demon answering questions in his own voice, and speaking words of blasphemy against God through the person . . . the demon, or demons, in the body, using the tongue, and throwing the body about at their will."[3287]

Mrs. Penn-Lewis knew that the teaching that believers could be possessed to the uttermost extent by demons was extremely important, for: "IF THEY [demons] GET INSIDE THEY WILL MAKE HIM [the Christian or other possessed person] DO WHAT THEY WILL."[3288] Unfortunately, nobody could know if he had sinned enough to allow demon possession to occur,[3289] so demons could be possessing and controlling Christians without their being the slightest bit aware of the situation. It was all the more necessary, then, to study *War on the Saints* to find out what to do in what could seem to be the almost inevitable onset of demon possession as one came under Mrs. Penn-Lewis's influence.

In fact, as Mrs. Penn-Lewis's teachings spread, it was "becoming more and more prominent . . . [for] CHRISTIAN[S] TO BE POSSESSED BY EVIL SPIRITS,"[3290] but this was certainly not because her teachings were themselves demonic. No, the

---

3287 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*. Some apologists for *War On the Saints* have affirmed that the book employs its own peculiar definition of demon "possession" that does not really mean "possession" in the manner recorded in the Bible, but something lesser, such as mere demonic influence, so that it allegedly does not affirm that believers can be possessed in the full sense of the term. However, such a view is entirely false, as the plain declarations by Mrs. Penn-Lewis above make clear. While *War on the Saints* affirms that there are degrees of demon possession—another doctrine that, according to the Bible, at least, is false—when Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis taught that believers can be "possessed," as possessed as the worst case of possession recorded in Scripture, their words were not an accidental slip of the pen. Then again, since Penn-Lewis wrote under inspiration, her word choice obviously could not be an accident.

3288 Pg. 205, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, citing *The Overcomer*. Capitalization in original.

3289 "The needed degree of ground given to an evil spirit in order to possess, cannot be clearly defined" (Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*).

3290 "Believe Not Every Spirit," pg. 71, *Overcomer* 1912. Capitalization in original. Compare Robert P. Smith's warning that those who enter the Higher Life should "expect revelations of the world of darkness" (pg. 43, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

recognition that the most spiritual believers, those who have drunk the deepest of the Higher Life Mrs. Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts were propagating, those who have risen to the level of perfection so that they do not have any known sin, may nevertheless be demon possessed, makes it clear how absolutely essential *War on the Saints* truly is—for with the Bible alone, nobody would be able to know such things as these, now brought to light under inspiration by Roberts and Penn-Lewis in preparation for the end of the world. Indeed, Scripture would indicate that believers cannot be demon possessed (1 John 4:4), so it is essential to read *War on the Saints* to discover, from "experience" and "evidences" and "fact" outside of the Bible, that the literal interpretation of God's holy Word must be rejected[3291] on this subject:

> The fact of the demon possession of Christians destroys the theory that only . . . persons deep in sin, can be "possessed" by evil spirits. This unexamined, unproved theory . . . serves the devil well[.] . . . But the veil is being stripped off the eyes of the children of God by the hard path of experience; and the knowledge is dawning upon the awakened section of the Church that a believer . . . can . . . be possessed.[3292]

Indeed, the "facts" Penn-Lewis speaks of made it so clear that Christians could be possessed that texts to the contrary—such as 1 John 4:4 & 5:18—are not only not exegeted anywhere in the course of the hundreds of pages of *War on the Saints*, but they are not even cited. What need is there of exegesis when one has experience? An exegetical and theological argument against believers being demon possessed, such as the following, could surely be simply rejected out of hand:

> Christians cannot be possessed . . . [*daimonidzomai*]. This is true for the following four reasons.
>
> 1.) The believer has new life in Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, if Spirit indwelling means anything, it should mean that Christians cannot be victimized, indwelt, and/or possessed by demons. John seems to conclusively say this when speaking of false teachers in the lineage of the Antichrist who bring a "spirit" of false doctrine. He asserts, "You [believers] are from God … and have overcome them; because greater is He who is in you than he who is in the world" (1 John 4:4). Likewise, believers are God's temple. Thus, God promises that He "will dwell in them and walk among them; and … will be their God, and they shall be [His] people" (2 Cor 6:16). In short, while Satan and his minions unceasingly attempt to assail believers, it is unthinkable that they could come in and possess, control, or victimize the saints with the apparent benign acquiescence of the indwelling God.

[3291] Mrs. Penn-Lewis, answering the question, "How are we to know when the Lord speaks to us in a word of Scripture," does not speak about interpreting the Bible literally, grammatically, and historically, but states instead: "It depends *where* the text comes from. Can you detect what comes from the Holy Spirit in your spirit, and what from your own mind? You may walk after the 'soul'—that is after your mind—and not 'after the spirit.' Satan has access to your mind, and he knows texts . . . [say,] [']what is of God [in the text] I take, and what is of the devil I refuse, now may God prove which is which!' Constantly do that, and you will . . . live after the Spirit . . . learn[ing] in experience . . . without even knowing whether it is God or Satan in specific matters" (pg. 186, "Experimental Difficulties," *The Overcomer*, 1911). One is to reject the use of one's mind in interpreting the Bible in favor of mysticism, teaches Mrs. Penn-Lewis. Naturally, careful exegesis and the literal interpretation of Scripture will pass away with such a methodology.

[3292] Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*. Naturally, no Scripture is given to support Penn-Lewis's assertions.

2.) The believer also has the guarding protection and preservation of the Son of God. As John says, "We know that no one who is born of God sins [i.e., habitually sins; present tense]; but He who was born of God keeps him, and the evil one does not touch him" (1 John 5:18). Of course, no Christian can live without sin or without being attacked from Satan. Still, the believer here is promised that he will not be overcome by the devil and his forces. John's verb for "touch" is *hapto*, which denotes *to take hold of*,[3293] not a mere superficial encounter but rather a *fastening on*[3294] or *overpowering* encounter. What John means is that Satan cannot *finally* overtake and possess the believer. Further, the believer is described as one "born of God," a state of continuing eternal life (perfect passive of *gennao*); as such, he cannot practice sin (present tense of *hamartano*). The reason for this is the keeping power of another who has also been born of God in a similar, though infinitely greater, sense.

3.) Satan has been defeated through the cross work of Jesus Christ.[3295] This guarantees that a believer is forever freed from Satanic control and victimization. Jesus Himself, in view of His coming death, pronounced this defeat, saying, "Now judgment is upon this world; now the ruler of this world will be cast out" (John 12:31). Paul similarly speaks of Christ's "disarm[ing] the rulers and authorities … [and] ma[king] public display of them, having triumphed over them through" the cross (Col 2:15). Christ, by His infinite atonement for sin forever broke the hold of evil angels[3296] on those who have been forgiven. In another place, Christ's death is said to have rendered the devil "powerless" (Heb 2:14). Further, the believer's union with Christ . . . assures him that the merit and validity of the Savior's infinite and eternal cross work is forever efficacious against any hostile takeover attempt by Satan or any of His angels. The believer's position of being in Christ, of being already judicially-seated in the heavenly places with Christ (Eph 2:6), makes Satan's attempts to successfully dominate him futile.

4.) Demon possession requires complicity. Strong observes that "the power of evil spirits over men is not independent of the human will. This power cannot be exercised without at least the original consent of the human will."[3297] For instance, when Satan desired to afflict Peter, it was within Peter's power to pray for help in resisting the temptation (Luke 22:31, 40). Similarly, the expelled and wandering unclean spirit in Mark is said to be "seeking rest," perhaps implying that he is looking for someone hospitable to his homeless plight (Matt 12:43). As such, the complicity would approximate an active availability for or exposure to demonic takeover. And, a true, Spirit-indwelt believer could not participate in such drastic accessibility. Granted, a Christian may be harassed by Satan and demons due to moral failure or willful sinning, but this sort of harassment is not coterminous with demonization.[3298]

While Scriptural exegesis and legitimate conclusions from literally interpreted Scripture—that is, God's own self-testimony—could be rejected out of hand, what the demons themselves had testified was important. In fact, the demons had themselves taught that believers could be possessed, and that they could be cast out by the sign gift of exorcism and by the binding of Satan and his compatriots—that is, these affirmations

---

3293 BDAG, s.v. *"hapto,"* p. 130.

3294 R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1966), p. 538.

3295 *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, s.v. "Demon," by A. Scott Moreau, p. 165.

3296 So F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), pp. 110–11.

3297 *Systematic Theology*, pp. 457–58.

3298 Pgs. 395-398, *A Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity, Volume 1: Prolegomena and the Doctrines of Scripture, God, and Angels*, Rolland McCune.

were, in truth, the doctrines of demons (1 Timothy 4:1)—so, clearly, it was a good idea not to listen to the Word of God, but set it aside and take heed, instead, to such seducing spirits and use what devils said through people who were possessed to figure out the truth.[3299] While Scripture teaches that the sign gift of exorcism has ceased and believers are not to command, talk to, or in any way dialogue with demons,[3300] Jessie Penn-Lewis knew better. The fact that believers could be possessed was validated by people who had

---

[3299] Thus, to prove that Christians can be demon possessed, and that demons can be cast out by the techniques of *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis cites the following:

> *The Case of a Christian Lady* . . . In the Spring of this year (1912) [this servant of God] who was possessed, came here, and the spirits possessing her spoke through her in voices utterly unlike her own. They would utter through her the most awful blasphemies against God, and against our Lord Jesus Christ, and would prophecy [*sic*] concerning the Church[.] . . . When the frenzy comes upon her, she is fearfully shaken, dashes about the room, made to howl like a dog, and her hands clenched, her face drawn with horrible contortions, etc., etc. . . . in the interval [between fits she] is the MOST LOVELY SPIRITED CHRISTIAN WOMAN. . . . This sister is not one who has not got faith. She is well grounded in the same faith, and has the same light as we have; but we have here to do with a demon[.] . . . It would also be an error if one were to think that PRAYER AND COMMANDING had not been of any use, for in these last three weeks God has done great and glorious things . . . [although] [t]he demon is still there, it is true[.] . . . [making] a desperate and plaintive howling . . . that lasts all the time we pray. . . . *Later*. . . For about a fortnight now the demon has been silent. For eight days he did not speak a single word, only he cried out twice: "THE AUTHORITY CASTS ME OUT!" The only thing he does is howling and gnashing of teeth. Some days ago we prayed for about one-and-a-half hours. In this way it goes on now for ten or fourteen days—there is only this terrible crying . . . There is not any blasphemy, nor cursing God, no more asserting threatenings, and all the sayings that he would not depart, that it would not suit him—all this has ceased. Instead of the dreadful ravings and outbursts of rage, there is now the desperate howling, often a dreadful screaming . . . the sister is almost free from his tormenting her . . . . The demon must have received a terrible blow from God . . . [i]t was so last evening; when we prayed, the desperate cry began at once, and I felt once more the impulse to command the demon in the Name of the Lord Jesus to depart. He then gave a great start, he trembled, howled, stretched out both hands as if imploring mercy, and begging us not to do that, but *he was not allowed to utter a single word*. But there followed strong reaction and vomiting, and this was repeated as often as I spoke the command in the Name of the Lord Jesus to depart. Of course we have to go on praying just as earnestly, but as God has done such great things, and if we go on praying, also the last blow will be given. The demon will have to depart. . . . [T]he demon's acknowledgment of the power and authority granted to those who commanded him, and the other spirits to depart, is striking. The spirit in possession said: "Oh, this authority, this authority which they have now recognized, is an awful thing for hell!" Pleading for mercy at another time the evil spirit said, "Do leave off your commanding. For three weeks I have suffered unbearable torments because of it. Do not tell anybody that we had to yield to the authority . . . . Oh, these prayers of believers . . . they always pray, they are no longer afraid" ("Demon Possession Among Christians," in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Capitalization and italics in original).

While Mrs. Penn-Lewis believes that such a story is evidence that her doctrine is true, it is obvious to those who are regenerate and apply the *sola Scriptura* that the whole story stinks of the pit and that the devils were in charge of the whole situation. When Christ and the Apostles used the genuine gift of exorcism, devils did not take weeks or months to be expelled—they were cast out immediately. What kind of evidence for Christianity would it be if Christ or an Apostle told a devil to leave somebody, and the devil said no, refused to leave for weeks and months, led the alleged Christian who was possessed to howl and cry, scream, be tormented, and vomit, for hours and hours, for days and weeks, while "authoritative" commands to leave were offered over and over and over again? The devils want people to think that they are able to resist the Almighty power of God so that they can say no to Him, just as they want people to think that they can possess Christians. The astonishing spiritual blindness involved in believing a demon is telling the truth when it validates a doctrine of warfare prayer is itself an evidence of Satanic delusion.

[3300] See the convincing argument on pgs. 398-400, *A Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity, Volume 1: Prolegomena and the Doctrines of Scripture, God, and Angels*, Rolland McCune.

the sign gift of "discerning of spirits" in modern times,[3301] as the sign gifts, whether exorcism, or "discerning of spirits . . . the gifts of healing . . . the working of miracles . . . tongues," and the rest (1 Corinthians 12:9-10), did not pass away in the first century, but, in accordance with Penn-Lewis's Quaker and Keswick continuationism, are for modern times also; through post-conversion Spirit baptism "the Holy Spirit. . . . is able to distribute to each the gifts of the Spirit, for effective witness to the Risen Head, 'dividing to each one severally even as He will.' (See 1 Cor. 12:4-11)."[3302] Furthermore, post-conversion Spirit baptism, with its distribution of miraculous gifts, is the essence of revival. In revival, as the gifts are distributed, not only can believers who are spiritual, not living in any known sin, and not disobedient to any light, be demon possessed, but revival, Spirit baptism, and the contemporary distribution of the gifts of 1 Corinthians 12 actually leads to demon possession. Few who are revived are not also deceived by Satan at that time, with vast numbers of the most spiritual believers becoming possessed and vast numbers of less spiritual believers simply being deceived, for revival is the hour of Satan's power, and Satan's most effective harvest time:

> We have seen that the period in the believer's life wherein he receives the Baptism of the Holy Spirit is the special time of danger from the evil supernatural world, and the Baptism of the Spirit is THE ESSENCE OF REVIVAL. Revival dawn, is, therefore, the great moment for deceiving spirits to find entrance into the believer by deception through counterfeits, resulting sometimes in . . . possession[.] . . . Few go through the crisis without deception by the enemy in more or less degree[.] . . . If the believer does become deceived by evil spirits at the time that he is baptized with the Spirit . . . he begins through deception to descend into a pit which ultimately means depth of darkness, bondage and misery. . . . Those who do not discover the deceptions sink into deeper deception, and become practically useless to God and to the Church. Revival is the hour and power of God, *and of the devil*[.] . . . [T]he devil [is] . . . DOING HIS WORK, FROM THE DAWN OF REVIVAL. . . . Revival . . . is his greatest harvest time. He is netting his victims, mixing his workings with the workings of God, and beguiling the saints more effectively than he was ever able to do with his temptations to sin. Satan was never more active among the sons of God. . . . To put it in bluntest language, the Revival hour is the occasion for evil spirits to obtain 'possession' of spiritual believers[.] . . . Believers who are not so abandoned to the Spirit escape the acute 'possession,' but . . . are equally open to deception[.][3303]

Consequently, the "revival . . . in Wales . . . [was] followed [by] . . . evil spirit possession . . . under the guise of the Holy Spirit,"[3304] so that the "Awakening in Wales" led, by 1906, to "what may be called the 'hour and power of darkness' upon the Church of Christ."[3305] The "outpouring of the Spirit of God in Wales" was followed by an

---

3301 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*.

3302 Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*.

3303 Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*. Capitalization in original.

3304 Pgs. 44-45, 55, *War On The Saints*.

3305 Pg. 233, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

"outbreak of demons upon the spiritual Church" in the country.[3306] Indeed, "since the Revival in Wales . . . almost without exception, in every land where revival [that is, revivalism of the sort experienced in Wales under Evan Roberts and promoted by Mrs. Penn-Lewis] has broken forth, within a very brief period of time the counterfeit stream has mingled with the true . . . [in] the Church of God."[3307] The rampant spread of demon possession and devilish counterfeits of true spirituality was not, however, evidence that something was terribly wrong with the theology and practice of Evan Roberts, Mrs. Penn-Lewis, and their followers in the Welsh holiness revival, nor did the fact that nothing like a horrific domination by Satan and his demons take place in connection with true revival in the book of Acts seem a cause for concern. The fact that those who adopt and practice the theories of consecration, revival, and Spirit baptism of Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts, and advance the farthest in the Higher Life, are especially in danger of demon possession is simply a corollary of truth about Christian sanctification[3308] received by Mrs. Penn-Lewis and Mr. Roberts through visions, voices and inspiration, and can therefore be trusted, although few things sound, to the ear of one who has not experienced the power of the spirits that have influenced Penn-Lewis and Roberts, more unbiblical and dangerous.

However, since "PURE Revival . . . has to do with the spirit, not the intellect,"[3309] the fact that one's intellect cries out that *War on the Saints* is filled with unscriptural and irrational nonsense is not important. Rather, one can have hope, because "[t]he Church of Christ will reach its high water mark when it is able to deal with demon possession; when it knows how to 'bind the strong man' by prayer; 'command' the spirits of evil in the name of Christ, and deliver men from their power,"[3310] by practicing what *War on the Saints* teaches, including both a doctrine of "binding the strong man," Satan, by a type of warfare prayer that is not found in the Bible,[3311] and a false doctrine of how to deal with

---

3306 Pg. 184, "An Autobiographical Sketch," *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914.

3307 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

3308 Hannah Whitall Smith affirmed something similar: "[T]he nearer we seek to approach our God, and the more we try to please Him, the greater our [spiritual] dangers! . . . [I]t is . . . very perplexing" (pg. 36, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Mrs. Anna Shipley, August 8, 1876). Hannah Smith's perplexity is solved if the Higher Life theology she shared with Mrs. Penn-Lewis is actually a pagan mysticism, not Christian spirituality. An increase of demon possession and other profound spiritual dangers is then easily understood.

3309 Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*.

3310 Pg. 43, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. 9th ed.; New York, NY: Thomas Lowe, 1912, 1963.

3311 Thus, Evan Roberts recorded—in all capitals, to boot—that he was confronted with the following question:

> I AM ASKED WHERE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT IS IT IMPLIED THAT WE CAN PRAY AGAINST (a) ENVIRONMENT, (b) EVIL SPIRITS, (c) SATAN, (d) THE FOE, (e) SPIRITUAL WICKEDNESS, (f)

demon possession, all of which were passed on to John A. MacMillan, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, Pentecostalism, and the Word of Faith movement.[3312] Indeed, the deity set forth by Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis is helpless and unable to defeat sin and Satan without people binding the devil.[3313] Binding Satan and evil spirits was even necessary to allow Jesus Christ to return and catch up His saints (or at least those saints who had passed beyond justification, and the second blessing of the Higher Life, and the third blessing of the Warfare with Satan Life, into the Highest Life, the Throne Life "far above" Satan[3314]); the Lord was helpless until the Higher Life practitioners had bound all

---

> FORCES OF DARKNESS? IS THE POSITION A SCRIPTURAL ONE, AND SPIRITUALLY CORRECT TO TRUTH AND FACT?

To this question Roberts replied:

> Praying "against" the powers of darkness is Scriptural, and in accord with truth, and attested facts of Christian experience. It can be clearly seen in Scripture and in the history of the Christian church, that . . . God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the destruction of sin and Satan. . . . A questioner . . . [who] is not "spiritual" . . . cannot understand, or interpret in a spiritual sense, the language used by the Apostle in connection with the warfare with the forces of darkness. Let any questioner take to God the whole matter, and ask for a leading into all truth concerning it; then he will be shown the true meaning of the words, not from intellectual reasoning, but from Divine enlightenment, and the experiences of life" ("The Scriptural Basis For 'Warfare' Against The Powers Of Darkness," by Evan Roberts, in *War on the Saints*).

Roberts never provides a single example, out of hundreds of prayers that are recorded in the Bible, of even one example of his warfare prayer concept, nor of people binding Satan by prayer, much less does he prove his idolatrous concept that God allegedly is powerless to destroy Satan without people binding the devil first. Only if the literal interpretation of the Bible is rejected, the sufficiency of Scripture concerning prayer is set aside, and God's Word is twisted and interpreted in light of "the experiences of life," while "intellectual reasoning" is rejected for a "spiritual sense" that is derived from "attested facts of Christian experience" instead of the grammar and context of passages does Roberts get any evidence for his warfare prayer doctrine from the infallible revelation of God.

[3312] "[T]he concept [of binding Satan] was taught, not only in early Alliance circles through Simpson and MacMillan, but also . . . [by] teachers such as Andrew Murray, Jessie Penn-Lewis and Watchman Nee. . . . Chinese spiritual leader Watchman Nee, whose father-in-law was an Alliance pastor and who was influenced by Penn-Lewis, Murray and Simpson, also taught authoritative prayer and the power of binding and loosing in 1934" ("A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement," Paul King, *Alliance Academic Review*, ed. Elio Cuccaro. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1996). Thus, MacMillan wrote: "[In] [p]rayer . . . God's believing people . . . bind the . . . principalities and powers, the world-rulers of this darkness, the hosts of wicked spirits in the heavenlies . . . [and] hold back . . . the working of the power of the air," and thus "procure . . . peace on earth" and an end to many wars, among other things (*Alliance Review*, October 7, 1939, 626-627). MacMillan allegorized Psalm 149:8 to prove his affirmations. Similarly, Watchman Nee taught: "Matthew 18:18, 19 deals with prayer. . . . It is a binding, not an asking God to bind. [In] commanding prayer . . . [we] bind all the evil spirits and demons; and bind Satan and all his activities. We may rule as kings over all things" (pgs. 72-77, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Watchman Nee).

[3313] "God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the destruction of sin and Satan. . . . God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the overthrow of sin and Satan, just as God needed the co-operation of Israel in His dealing with the Canaanites. Christ said, 'First bind the strong man.' This implies and involves praying against the strong man. How does the binding take place, and what is it that binds but PRAYER?" ("The Scriptural Basis For 'Warfare' Against The Powers Of Darkness," by Evan Roberts, in *War on the Saints*.)

[3314] "[A]dvance in conquest brings the believer nearer and nearer until he breaks through the plane of war into the place 'FAR ABOVE PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS.' It is *there* that you will not be 'troubled.' For there is an experimental advance in spirit to the plane 'far above,' and THIS IS THE PREPARATION OF THE CHURCH FOR THE MASTER'S COMING . . . [these] souls . . . 'far above all

the evil spirits so that the Rapture could take place,[3315] and even then He could only catch away those believers who had achieved the Throne Life and Translation Faith and consented to Him taking them—the rest God would have to leave behind: "We must first get what may be called the 'translation' spirit. . . . We *have to put our wills for this*. God must get the consent of our wills for everything that He does. . . . Just as you give your consent to your spirit being 'far above,' so you must say, 'Lord I consent to translation."[3316] Happily, the evil spirits had all been bound in 1913,[3317] brought down to a great extent by the almost omnipotent prayers of Evan Roberts,[3318] and people were learning through *The Overcomer* magazine that, as they had exercised a distinct act of faith for justification, another distinct act of faith for sanctification, a third distinct act of faith for bodily healing, a fourth distinct act of faith for the Throne Life of overcoming Satan, so now they could exercise a fifth distinct act faith to bring Christ back, allowing the Redeemer to catch them up—therefore, Christ could and would return in 1914. Penn-Lewis recounts how the Higher Life practitioner is to bind Satan:

> In Matthew 12:29 the Lord said, "*First bind* the strong man," and then "spoil his goods." . . . The Church must learn this "binding" power of prayer for it is written, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven" (Mat. 18:18). And what can this "binding" mean except

---

principality and power' . . . [are] prepared for translation at the time of the end. . . . [T]he spirit must first learn to ascend. We must first get what may be called the 'translation' spirit. . . . God must get the consent of our wills for everything that He does. . . . Just as you give your consent to your spirit being 'far above,' so you must say, 'Lord I consent to translation" (pgs. 179-181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913, reprinting a sermon preached by Mrs. Penn-Lewis at the "Leicester Conference for Workers, Nov. 13, 1913." Capitalization and italics retained from the original.).

3315 Evan Roberts, talking to a reporter about how he and other Christians had bound Satan and all the evil spirits by 1913, using the techniques in *War on the Saints*, Mrs. Penn-Lewis's *Warfare with Satan*, etc., so that the Rapture could now take place, as prophesied in the Translation Message, stated:

> Had not this warfare [with Satan] been carried out, then when our Lord came these hosts of evil angels would make war. The translated [would] rise into the air, and the dead [would] arise, and all would be involved in warfare. But God means that the warfare with the evil hosts shall finish before Christ comes[.] . . . [When the] translation takes place, the spirit hosts of evil shall be bound up . . . if they were not bound before the translation they would also interfere with that. (pgs. 187-188, *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

3316 Pgs. 179-181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Italics in original. The helplessness of her god before the human will was very important, and required italicization, for Mrs. Penn-Lewis.

3317 "It dawned on me that if the hosts of evil are to be put into the abyss there will come a moment when the warfare will cease[.] . . . I prayed that the whole warfare . . . [with] the hosts of evil . . . should stop. . . . I can see now that there has been sufficient prayer to bring about that incarceration . . . the actual incarceration of the foe, [the end of] this warfare [which] would fulfill the DISPENSATIONAL PURPOSES of God . . . the translation is at hand" (pg. 186, "Be Ye Ready," Evan Roberts. *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

3318 "October 19th [1913] . . . was the wonderful night when years of dispensational warfare-burden on this man of God . . . Mr. Roberts . . . rolled away, as a piece of work accomplished in the unseen realm. . . . The Lord is coming to TRANSLATE His saints. . . . [First] the 'War' book was published . . . [t]hen on Oct. 19th came a great burst of prayer against death . . . [b]efore long what relief came to my mind! . . . Not death, but TRANSLATION; not dissolution, but a change! . . . The light had come . . . for the saints at the close of this dispensation . . . TRANSLATION" (pg. 183, "The Translation Message of Evan Roberts," *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Capitalization retained from the original.).

> restraining the working of the enemy by appealing to the conquering power of Him who was "manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil"? . . . Christians . . . [should] t[ake] Christ at His word, and aloud, with united hearts and voices . . . "bind" the adversary.[3319]

While, since her articles and books were received by inspiration, Penn-Lewis might appeal to her own authority as a prophetess and her experience as one who knew of the deep things of Satan to validate her doctrine of "binding the strong man," she certainly could not appeal to anything in the Bible to support it, as neither Matthew 12:29, nor Matthew 18:18, nor any other text of Scripture supports her contention.[3320] In Matthew 12, Christ proved that He as the Messiah (v. 23) and the Son of God, by the Spirit of God was casting out devils that had possessed men, thus validating that He was stronger than Satan, the "strong man," and all his fallen angels (v. 29), because He could "enter . . . [Satan's] house" or kingdom and free those Satan had kept captive, "spoil his house," by casting out demons. While it is perfectly appropriate for believers to pray that Satan and his devils would be hindered in their attempts to stop the work of God, Matthew 12 is specifically about Christ casting out demons and so validating His Messianic claims, not about the work of God going forward in a general sense, or an alleged "'binding' power of prayer." None of the hundreds of prayers in Scripture mention believers binding Satan to advance the work of God in some general sense, nor, for that matter, is there the least hint that any Christian in the Bible thought that he was to bind Satan in prayer or in any other way at all. In fact, Scripture is very clear that when the Millennial kingdom begins "an angel [will] come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he [will lay] hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and b[i]nd him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled" (Revelation 20:1-3; cf. Revelation 9:14).[3321]

[3319] Pg. 374, "How to Pray for Missionaries," Jessie Penn-Lewis, *The Alliance Weekly*, 72:24, June 12, 1937, 373-375, & 72:26, June 26, 1937, 406-407. Italics in original. While Scripture does not bear out Mrs. Penn-Lewis's contentions, she affirms that a meeting of atheists was broken up by binding Satan in this fashion, one of "many . . . proofs" from experience for her Satanic binding and loosing doctrine. By binding Satan, Mrs. Penn-Lewis affirms, the many "thousands of God's people" who are possessed by demons like those of Mark 9:17-18 can be delivered (pg. 374, *ibid*). In her article, she ties her doctrine of binding Satan into the throne-power teaching developed at more length by John MacMillan.

[3320] Taking out of context another verse, Evan Roberts wrote: "The power of Revelation 12:10 should be received by faith" (pg. 213, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones), but it is very difficult to see how a verse about Satan having great power on earth during the Tribulation period when he is cast permanently out of heaven has the slightest relevance to Keswick advocates or Pentecostals attempting to bind Satan in the church age.

[3321] Mrs. Penn-Lewis allegorizes Revelation 20 as follows: "There is a systematic warfare of prayer possible against the kingdom of darkness, which would mean co-operation with the Spirit of God in the liberation of the Church, and hasten the ultimate binding of the great serpent, and casting him down to the pit. (Rev. 20:1). A material 'chain' could not bind a supernatural being, and it may be that 'the great strong angel' typifies the mystical 'Christ'; consisting of the Head and members—the 'Man-Child' caught up to

Satan is not bound now (1 Peter 5:8; Job 2:2), and when he will be bound in the Millennium, a powerful angel, not a Christian, will bind him, and cast Satan into the bottomless pit. A Christian, who is far weaker than Satan, should also consider if it is wise to seek to bind that mighty angel when the devil is far more powerful than any fallen man—especially since he will not have the blessing of the Spirit in his endeavor, since God has never stated that men are to bind the devil in the dispensation of grace. The Lord Jesus, by contrast, both with His inherent power as God and the power of the omnipotent Spirit working in Him without measure as the Messiah and God-Man, has every right and ability to bind Satan according to His will. Furthermore, unless a Christian is praying for the coming of the Millennial kingdom when he prays for Satan to be bound, he is asking for something that is not going to happen, and if a Christian claims, or a group of Christians claim, that they can bind Satan, they are actually opening themselves up for Satanic delusion—at least if one goes only by the Bible, rather than by the inspired writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis. The fact that Christians cannot bind Satan explains why, although countless Pentecostals, Word of Faith advocates, and practitioners of Keswick continuationism claim, all over the world, to bind Satan all the time, so that every minute of the day someone somewhere in the world is praying that Satan would be bound, Satan remains the god of this world (2 Corinthians 4:4) and is as unbound and active as ever. The radical change that will take place in the world when Satan actually is bound—and stays bound—in the Millennial kingdom (Revelation 20:1-3) stands in the sharpest contrast with the total absence of any such change when Pentecostals follow Jessie Penn-Lewis and claim to bind Satan, since he somehow is loosed from their "binding" and as active as ever the second after they make their prayer, and even while, deluded by his lies, they are praying it.

Likewise, neither Matthew 18:15-20 nor Matthew 16:18-19 have anything to do with Christians binding Satan.[3322] The "binding" and "loosing" of Matthew 16:19; 18:18 refer to making decisions about what is right and wrong, about the regulation of right

---

the Throne—when the members will have been liberated from the power of the enemy, and then commissioned to lay hold of the Deceiver to cast him into the abyss, and shut him up for the thousand years" (Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*). Anyone who finds such an allegory convincing in the least is not likely to be concerned about literal interpretation or the actual meaning of Revelation 20, nor will he be especially worried that no passage in Revelation actually mentions "the great strong angel," or that the only passage in the book that mentions a "strong angel" specifically contrasts this angel with the Lord Jesus (Revelation 5:1-6).

[3322] It is true that the verb δέω, "to bind," appears in both Matthew 12:29 and Matthew 18:18. However, this fact does not prove that the same idea is in view in both passages any more than the fact that Herod has John the Baptist bound (δέω) in Matthew 14:3 or a donkey is bound (δέω) to keep it from wandering away in Matthew 21:2 proves that the latter two texts refer somehow to demons being cast out and to the binding of Satan.

behavior and teaching, comparable to Jewish use of the terms "binding" and "loosing" to declare what was permissible or impermissible (cf. Matthew 23:4, 13; Luke 11:52).[3323] Peter, as one of the Apostles, possessing Divine authority as represented by the metaphor of the "keys" (Matthew 16:19; cf. Isaiah 22:22[3324]), declared, based on the coming of Christ, the abolition of Old Testament ceremonies such as circumcision, dietary laws, and festival days for the Gentiles (Acts 15:10, 19) and the end of the distinction between Jews

---

[3323] Commenting on Matthew 16:19, "And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," John Gill wrote:

> This . . . [refers to] doctrines, or declarations of what is lawful and unlawful, free, or prohibited to be received, or practiced; in which sense the words, אסור ומותר, "bound and loosed," are used in the Talmudic writings, times without number, for that which is forbidden and declared to be unlawful, and for that which is free of use, and pronounced to be so: in multitudes of places we read of one Rabbi אוסר, "binding," and of another מתיר, "loosing"; thousands, and ten thousands of instances of this kind might be produced; a whole volume of extracts on this head might be compiled.

Similarly, the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (H. R. Balz & G. Schneider, vol. 2, on λύω) notes:

> Binding and loosing are spoken of in Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 as a figurative designation for authoritative ecclesiastical action. Here one may assume the presence of Jewish rabbinic usage [cf. *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch I-IV* (1922-28), H. Strack & P. Billerbeck, I, 738–42; IV, 304–21]. *'Asar* and *hitîr* in Hebrew and *ʾᵃsar* and *šᵉrā'* in Aramaic are used, in regard to discipline, for the imposition and repeal of the synagogue ban and, in regard to the teaching office, for binding interpretation of the law— "forbid and permit."

Commenting on Matthew 16:19, Luz & Koester (*Matthew: A Commentary. Hermeneia*) write:

>). The primary meaning is "forbidding" and "permitting" with a halakic decision of the rabbis, that is, the interpretation of the law. Less frequently, but documented in contemporary sources, a judge's activity is meant. Then "to bind" and "to loose" correspond to "to put in fetters" or "to acquit." . . . In later rabbinic terminology there is a source for "to impose the ban" or "to rescind" it . . . Furthermore, it is the rabbinic conviction that God or the heavenly court recognizes the halakic decisions and the judgments of rabbinical courts. Thus not only the concepts "binding/loosing" but the entire saying is rooted in Jewish thought. [Matthew 16:19] is presumably thinking of teaching, while in 18:18 the thought is of judging, without the two meanings being mutually exclusive.

The concept of sitting in Moses' seat (Matthew 23:2), as the following verses demonstrate, likewise refers to authoritative teaching (cf. Matthew 5:1-2ff.; 13:1-2; 24:3; 26:55), properly from the only true and ultimate authority for the believer, the Word of God.

[3324] It is noteworthy that in Isaiah 22:22, while the connection is not necessarily the most clear and direct, the verbs "open" and "shut," פָּתַח and סָגַר, can be used for "loosing" and "binding." Thus, פָּתַח can bear the sense of "loosen" (cf. in the Piel Genesis 24:32; Isaiah 20:2; 58:6; in the Qal, which is found in Isaiah 22:22, note Deuteronomy 20:11; Judges 3:25; 19:27; Isaiah 14:17; 26:2; 45:1; Nehemiah 13:19; etc., and the nature of the Piel as resultative in relation to the Qal), and the Hebrew פָּתַח is translated with λύω in the LXX in Genesis 42:27; Job 39:5; Psalm 101:21 (102:21); Isaiah 5:27; 14:17; 57:6; Jeremiah 47:4 (50:4). For סָגַר, compare Judges 3:23; 9:51; Isaiah 24:22; 45:1; 60:11, and the use of אחד for this verb in the Targum and Peshitta of Isaiah 22:22. Compare in the Mishna: "And further did R. Eliezer say, 'They unloose a vow by reference to what happens unexpectedly [a new fact].' And sages prohibit. . . . R. Eliezer permits [declares the vow to be unbound]. And sages prohibit [declare the vow to remain binding]." (*Nedarim* 9:2: אָמַ֣ר ר׳ אֱלִיעֶ֗זֶר פּוֹתְחִין בַּנּוֹלַד וַחֲכָמִ֗ים אוֹסְרִין . . . ר׳ אֱלִיעֶ֗זֶר מַתִּיר וַחֲכָמִ֗ים אוֹסְרִ֑ין׃ וְעוֹד).

Note also that "*Sipre* to Deuteronomy 32:25 applies Isaiah 22:22 to rabbinic permission and prohibition of specific actions" (*The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Nolland, in the *New International Greek Testament Commentary*, on Matthew 16:18-19.)

Unsurprisingly, Isaiah 22:22 has as little to do with binding Satan as Matthew 16:19; 18:18.

and Gentiles in the church age (Acts 10:28; 11:2-3, 18), "binding" believers to New Testament worship and lifestyle and "loosing" them from Old Testament worship and lifestyle.[3325] Interpreting Matthew 16:19 in light of its Jewish background in this manner has been standard practice for centuries, while Mrs. Penn Lewis's view that the verse refers to binding Satan by prayer does not appear to have existed before her lifetime.[3326] Similarly, Matthew 18:18 indicates that every one of Christ's true churches[3327] has Divine authority to preach and teach God-given truth about doctrine and lifestyle, and consequently the ability to excommunicate members of the congregation (Matthew 18:15-17) who refuse to believe and practice the God-given truths of the Word that the church binds and looses (Matthew 18:18) by its preaching and discipline. The church has authority to declare God's will and pronounce the actions of its wayward member as sin. Furthermore, Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 refer to teachings, issues, or actions, not to personal beings—not humans, and certainly not fallen angels—being bound or loosed; the passages refer to "whatsoever" is bound or loosed, not "whosoever" is bound or loosed (cf. also Matthew 5:19).[3328] If one were to insist, despite the "whatsoever," that

---

[3325] R. T. France notes:

> Taking up the imagery of Isaiah 22:20–22, Jesus declares Peter to be the steward (the chief administrative officer) in the kingdom of heaven, who will hold the keys, so that, like Eliakim, the new steward (cf. Isa 22:15) in the kingdom of David, "he will open, and no one shall shut; he will shut and no one shall open." The steward is not the owner. He has both authority (over the rest of the household) and responsibility (to his master to administer the affairs of the house properly). The keys are those of the storehouses, to enable him to make appropriate provision for the household, not those of the outer gate, to control admission. . . . [as in] the role of the steward in [Matthew] 24:45; also Luke 16:1–8. . . . The metaphor of "tying up" and "untying" speaks also of administrative authority. The terms are used in rabbinic literature for declaring what is and is not permitted. When the same commission is given to the whole disciple group in [Matthew] 18:18 it will be specifically in the context of dealing with sin within their community. . . . Such authority to declare what is and is not permissible will of course have personal consequences for the person judged to have sinned, but it is the prior judgment in principle which is the focus of the "tying" metaphor, and there, as here, the objects of both verbs will be expressed in the neuter, not the masculine; it is things, issues, which are being tied or untied, not people as such. The historical role of Peter in Acts well illustrates the metaphor, as it was to him that the responsibility fell of declaring that Gentiles might be accepted as members of the new *ekklēsia* (10:1–11:18), though of course the exercise of his disciplinary authority could also have dire personal consequences for those who stepped over the mark (Acts 5:1–11; cf. 8:20–24). (*The Gospel of Matthew: The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, R. T. France, on Matthew 16:19).

[3326] Thus, a work such as *A History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19 from 1781 to 1965*, Joseph A. Burgess (Ph. D. Diss., University of Basel; Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, MI: 1976) notes the recognition of the Jewish background to the binding and loosing metaphor as signifying authoritative teaching in sources from Buxtorf (1639) and before, to Lightfoot (1655), to vast numbers of more modern writers (pgs. 62-64, cf. 77-78). This view became "standard practice for Protestant exegetes" in at least very large portions of the time period Burgess focuses upon (pg. 92). In contrast, not a sentence of Burgess' dissertation breathes even a hint of the existence of Mrs. Penn-Lewis's position before her lifetime (cf. pg. 105).

[3327] Note that close connection of the two references in Matthew to the ἐκκλησία and to binding and loosing (Matthew 16:18-19; 18:17-18).

[3328] That is, in Matthew 16:19, ὃ ἐὰν δήσῃς . . . ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς employs the neuter pronoun ὃ, rather than the masculine form, and Matthew 18:18 likewise employs the neuter ὅσα, not the masculine, in ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε . . . ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε. Contrast Josephus, *Wars of the Jews* 1:111 (1:5:2:111), where the

persons were in view, those being "loosed" by the church in Matthew 18 would be members of the assembly who had been "bound" by joining the congregation, so unless fallen angels or Satan himself had been immersed upon profession of faith into the membership of a New Testament church, nothing about binding Satan is contained in Matthew 18. No modern advocate of Keswick or Pentecostal theology is the Apostle Peter, so Matthew 16:19 does not help advance Jessie Penn-Lewis' position. Nor does the binding and loosing take place in Matthew 18:18 through prayer; rather, the congregation receives Divine guidance in prayer (Matthew 18:19)[3329] so that its preaching and discipline, its binding and loosing, are in accordance with the will of Christ, who is God present in their midst (Matthew 18:20; 1:23), and in accordance with the preceding and directing antecedent will[3330] of the Father in heaven. Binding and

---

masculine pronoun οὗς is employed when persons are in view: τούτοις περισσὸν δή τι προσεῖχεν ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρα σεσοβημένη περὶ τὸ θεῖον οἱ δὲ τὴν ἁπλότητα τῆς ἀνθρώπου κατὰ μικρὸν ὑπιόντες ἤδη καὶ διοικηταὶ τῶν ὅλων ἐγίνοντο διώκειν τε καὶ κατάγειν οὓς ἐθέλοιεν λύειν τε καὶ δεσμεῖν καθόλου δὲ αἱ μὲν ἀπολαύσεις τῶν βασιλείων ἐκείνων ἦσαν τὰ δ' ἀναλώματα καὶ αἱ δυσχέρειαι τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρας. "Now, Alexandra hearkened to them to an extraordinary degree, as being herself a woman of great piety towards God. But these Pharisees artfully insinuated themselves into her favor by little and little, and became themselves the real administrators of the public affairs; they banished and reduced whom they pleased; they bound and loosed [men] at their pleasure; and, to say all at once, they had the enjoyment of the royal authority, whilst the expenses and the difficulties of it belonged to Alexandra."

In Matthew 5:19, ὃς ἐὰν οὖν λύσῃ μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὃς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, note the connection between "breaking" or "loosing" and "teaching," which in the context (v. 20-48) is contrasted with the improper use of teaching authority by the Pharisees.

Philo speaks of the binding and loosing of things and thus employs neuter forms in *On the Eternity of the World* 13; the material creation has the potential for nonexistence, it is argued: "Now everything which has been bound together is capable of being dissolved, but it is the part of an evil ruler to dissolve that which has been well combined and arranged, and which is in good condition." τὸ μὲν οὖν δὴ δεθὲν πᾶν λυτόν, τὸ γε μὴν καλῶς ἁρμοσθὲν καὶ ἔχον εὖ λύειν ἐθέλειν κακοῦ.

Note further that in Matthew 18:18 the pronoun ὅσα is plural; the church, by its preaching and teaching, binds and looses numbers of doctrines; contrast the singular "brother" mentioned in 18:15-17. Were Satan the being in view in 18:18, the plural pronoun would be unexpected.

[3329] Note the continuation of the "two or three" idea of Matthew 18:16 in the "two" of Matthew 18:19. Even the smallest true church has the promises of Matthew 18:15-20 and is bound to practice the passage's teachings.

[3330] This fact is verified by both the future perfect passive periphrastics in Matthew 16:19; 18:18 and the context. Mantey writes:

> "I will give to you the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, but whatever you bind (δήσῃς, an aor. subj.) on earth *shall have been bound* (ἔσται δεδεμένον) in heaven, and whatever you loose (λύσῃς) on earth *shall have been loosed* (ἔσται λελυμένον) in heaven." Or in other words, Christ was informing his disciples that he was elevating them to the same rank and privileges that the scribes enjoyed, but at the same time he warns them not to perpetuate the abuses of the scribes, who taught things contrary to the Scriptures. Like scribes, they were to be interpreters of God's will to men, but in this capacity they are cautioned not to exceed their authority. Man is to ratify and obey God's decrees. This passage does not teach that God concurs in men's conclusions; but rather it teaches that those who live in accordance with Christ's directions will decide to do just what God has already decided should be done. (pg. 246, "The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in John 20:23, Mt 16:19, and Mt 18:18, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58:3 (September 1939) 243-249; cf. contra

loosing is practiced by a true church in conjunction with and as a result of prayer, but not by means of prayer. Furthermore, the verb tenses for "shall be bound" and "shall be loosed" indicate that the binding and loosing constitutes a continuing condition.[3331] The

---

Mantey, 'The Meaning of John 20.23, Matthew 16.19, and Matthew 18.18,' Henry Cadbury, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939), 251–54; contra Cadbury and favorable to Mantey, *The Greek Perfect Tense in Relation to John 20:23, Matthew 16:19 and 18:18*, William Dayton. Th. D. Dissertation, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1945)

In accordance with the Greek, the Latin Vulgate translates: "Et tibi dabo claves regni cælorum. Et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in cælis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in cælis. . . . Amen dico vobis, quæcumque alligaveritis super terram, erunt ligata et in cælo: et quæcumque solveritis super terram, erunt soluta et in cælo" (Matthew 16:19; 18:18). "The Latin Vulgate also translates as 'Will have been bound,' 'will have been loosed,' exactly corresponding to the Greek. It is the Church on earth carrying out heaven's decisions, communicated by the Spirit, and not heaven ratifying the Church's decisions" (Comment on Matthew 16:19, *Matthew, The Anchor Bible*, W. F. Albright & C. S. Mann. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971). Compare pg. 80, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, William Chamberlain (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1979); "Binding and Loosing," *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, gen. ed. Chad Brand, C. Draper, A. England.

Comparable future perfect passive periphrastics in the LXX are found in Genesis 30:33: πᾶν ὃ ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ῥαντὸν καὶ διάλευκον ἐν ταῖς αἰξὶν . . . κεκλεμμένον ἔσται παρ᾽ ἐμοί, "Every one that is not speckled or spotted among the goats . . . if found with me *will have been stolen* by me," and Genesis 43:9 (LXX; also Genesis 44:32): ἐὰν μὴ ἀγάγω αὐτὸν πρὸς σὲ καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου ἡμαρτηκὼς [perfect active] ἔσομαι πρὸς σὲ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας; the sinful negligence took place before the time of the failure to present Benjamin before Jacob, with resultant durative blameworthiness. The LXX overall is generally supportive of Mantey—see the perfect passive periphrastics in: Genesis 30:33; 41:36; Exodus 12:6; 28:7; Deuteronomy 28:33; Judges 13:5; 1 Samuel 25:29; 2 Samuel 7:16; 1 Chronicles 17:14; 2 Chronicles 7:15; Nehemiah 5:13; Tobit 13:14; Sirach 10:1; 42:8; Nahum 3:11; Zephaniah 2:4; Isaiah 9:18; 11:5; 17:9; 27:10; 33:12; Jeremiah 14:16; 43:30; 51:14; Ezekiel 24:17; 29:12; 30:7; 44:2; 46:1; 48:12; Daniel 2:20, 41 (var.), 42. Extrabiblical examples include: "'I feel that if I clear myself before you *I shall have cleared (apolelogemenos esesthai*) myself through you before the rest of the Greeks' (Lucian, *Philaris*, I, 1). 'Now if you do this, you *will have bestowed (ese katatetheimenos*) a great favor upon me' (Papyri BGU 596,13). 'And if you send them away scot-free, much security *will have been voted (epsephismenoi esesthe)* to them to do whatever they wish' (Lysias, XXII, 19). . . . Other future perfects occur in Lysias XII, 100; Papyri Par. 14, 50:8.24" (pg. 135, "Evidence That the Perfect Tense in John 20.23, Matthew 16.19 Is Mistranslated," Julius R. Mantey. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 16 (1973), 129–38). In the New Testament, Luke 12:52; Hebrews 2:13 are the only other future perfect periphrastics, and Hebrews 2:13 is active; Luke 12:52 is the only future perfect passive periphrastic other than Matthew 16:19 & 18:18. Compare the future passive periphrastics in related generally contemporaneous corpora, in which the sense of future periphrasis argued for by Mantey finds support, although not universally so; thus, see in the apostolic patristics 1 Clement 10:3; 58:2; Barnabas 11:3, 6; Shepherd 51:9; 55:4; compare, in Justin Martyr, *Trypho* 60, 81, 123; in Josephus, *Antiquities* 13:70; also *Protoevangelium of James* 12:1; *Enoch* 3:8; 98:6; *Sibylline Oracles* 1:286; *Testament of Levi* 4:6; *Letter of Aristeas* 40; *Ordinances of Levi* 58, 61, 64.

3331 The examination of the future perfect periphrastics in the preceding footnote validate that the continuing state notion of the Greek perfect remains present in future periphrasis; indeed, one would expect the periphrastic construction to emphasize the state. It is noteworthy that even (incorrect) critics of Mantey's (correct) "shall have been" translation do not dispute that an abiding state is brought about by the action of the future perfect periphrastic; thus, Cadbury writes: "In the two passages of Matthew [16:19; 18:18] the future perfects seem to imply a permanent condition . . . I would suggest for Matthew's future perfects an expression 'shall be once for all" (pgs. 252-253, 'The Meaning of John 20.23, Matthew 16.19, and Matthew 18.18,' Henry Cadbury, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939), 251–54), and Stanley Porter, while advocating his erroneous atemporal view of Greek tense (cf. pgs. 504-512, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace), nonetheless translates Matthew 16:19 as "whatever you might bind upon the earth shall be in a state of boundness in heaven; and whatever you might loose upon the earth shall be in a

doctrine taught by the Apostles and promulgated by true churches is permanently binding on the people of God, who have also been permanently loosed from Old Testament ceremonial regulations.[3332] However, it seems that those who abuse Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 to support their doctrine of binding Satan—the large majority of whom are not members of Biblical Baptist churches, and thus people to whom Matthew 18:18, and 16:19 so much the more, do not apply in any case[3333]—fail to keep him bound for very long at all,[3334] although no other congregation or individual is likely to be praying for Satan to be loosed, since prayers to loose Satan appear to be vastly fewer in number than those to bind him. Scripture affirms that Satan will not be bound until the Millennial kingdom, and the texts Penn-Lewis employs to support her doctrine of Christians binding Satan are ripped out of context. Therefore, since the Bible gives no support to her view, her conclusions are only as sure as her claim to extra-Biblical inspiration. Only to the extent that the prophetic powers she and Evan Roberts possessed were validated by their prediction of the end of the world in 1914, to that extent, at best, can one rely on their advice for how to battle devils and bind Satan in *War on the Saints*.

---

state of loosedness in heaven" since he affirms the sense is "shall be in a state of being bound or having boundness" (pgs. 155, 160, "Vague Verbs, Periphrastics, and Matt 16:19," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* (Córdoba, Spain) 1 (1988), 155–73). Indeed, every future perfect in the New Testament retains the idea of a continuing resultant state (Matthew 16:19 (ἔσται δεδεμένον . . . ἔσται λελυμένον); 18:18 (ἔσται δεδεμένα . . . ἔσται λελυμένα); Luke 12:52 (ἔσονται . . . διαμεμερισμένοι); 19:40 (κεκράξονται); Hebrews 2:13 (ἔσομαι πεποιθώς); 8:11 (εἰδήσουσίν).

[3332] One who wished to argue that binding and loosing pertain specifically and directly to the joining of and excommunication from a congregation in Matthew 18 (they indirectly do so, since when the congregation, on the basis of Scripture, declares the actions of a member "sin," it is then to act upon that teaching authority and remove the sinning individual from membership), also are consistent with the abiding state involved in the verb tenses; one does not need to add a person to a membership roll (cf. Acts 1:15; 2:41, 47) or remove a disobedient church member over and over again; once is enough.

[3333] The authority to bind and loose, entrusted to Peter as representative of the Apostles as members of the church in Matthew 16:19, is perpetuated through the congregation of saints, as verified by Matthew 18:18. Parachurch institutions and all religious denominations that exist outside of the succession of Bible-believing and practicing Baptist churches that has existed from the first century until the present day have no authority to bind and loose, to teach the Bible (cf. Matthew 28:18-20), or even to exist.

[3334] Thus, in the book *Binding and Loosing: How to Exercise Authority over the Dark Powers*, by K. Neill Foster and Paul L. King, Mr. Foster had "believed in the principles of binding and loosing for many years and had published some material on the subject[,] [that is, a book entitled *Warfare Weapons*.] . . . We liked how it worked[,] [although] I no doubt would, [at this time], have admitted that my views could have been part of a private interpretation" (pgs. 2-4), until at length he finally came to conclude that the Bible actually taught what he already knew, without Biblical proof, "worked," had practiced "for many years," and had written a book about, without being able to defend it exegetically. The authors are sure that their doctrine "works," although their book has an entire chapter called "When It Doesn't Happen," trying to explain what is going on when "[b]inding is a farce, loosing a dream," and it "simply doesn't work . . . simply does not take place" (pg. 209, see 209-216, *ibid*.), although Matthew 18:15-20 guarantees the binding or loosing with no exceptions whatsoever. The doctrine taught by the Apostles and by Biblical churches is always binding, with no exceptions, no "farces," no instances where the truths of the New Testament are only a "dream," and no instances when the promises of God fail to take place.

Indeed, one need not fear that since *War on the Saints* records Evan Roberts' own spiritual autobiography, while likewise affirming, in descriptions that speak of Roberts' own experience, that even the most spiritual believers can be demon possessed, that Evan himself had been demon possessed—on his own admission—during the time of his preaching in the Welsh holiness revival. Nor need one fear when Jessie Penn-Lewis preached that "her chronic suffering" was a result of "possessions" and "the hold of the dark powers," as she experientially "knew and proved," for she had been delivered from such possession over "15 years" before the time of the production of *War on the Saints*.[3335] No, even if the authors of the book, both of whom had highly questionable testimonies of personal conversion, indicated that they had themselves been demon possessed,[3336] *War on the Saints* was excellent and wholesome material—and more. In fact, Penn-Lewis taught, "the only ones who will be able to stand as the influence of the Deceiver ensnares and engulfs the whole of the inhabitants of the earth"[3337] in the final days before the end of the world in 1914 will be those who accept the teaching of *War on the Saints* and the Satanic warfare doctrines set forth in the *Overcomer* magazine, so *War on the Saints* was the most necessary book on earth, as the Bible, by necessary consequence, was not sufficient on its own to protect people from the influence of the Deceiver. On the other hand, the "measure of hostility shown to [*War on the Saints*] by readers will be the measure of the deception by evil spirits into which he or she has fallen," affirmed the "champions of the book."[3338] The Bible alone was insufficient to deal with demons—instead of the Bible, one needed to learn things from familiar intercourse with the demons. However, Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis could "testify" that they had "no superficial experience" of the "deep things of Satan," but could "fathom" those depths because they had themselves mined them through their "deep, varied, and awful experiences of the invisible powers of darkness . . . [h]ad we escaped the wiles, we could have written from conjecture and imagination about the arch-

---

3335 Pg. 238, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3336 Compare the preaching at the Broadlands Conference: "What is needed in a witness [is] . . . *personal knowledge*. . . . Can you say . . . ['I know He casts out devils, for He has cast out devils from me.'?]" (pg. 215, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in original.).

3337 Pg. 278, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

3338 Pg. 181, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Interestingly, while Penn-Lewis never, at least in public, wavered on the book's contents, "[o]nly a year after the manual appeared, Evan Roberts told some friends that it had been a failed weapon which had confused . . . the Lord's people" (pg. 182, *ibid*), so it appears that only Jessie Penn-Lewis herself, but not her co-author, continued to be free from deception by evil spirits.

fiend, but then it would have been in the vital points essentially wide of the mark."[3339] Since they had been deceived by the devil and had experienced the very darkest of the deep things of Satan, their writings were to be trusted in the way the teaching of those who had never been deceived by Satan and experienced his deep things—such as the sinless Author of the Bible, who had never been deceived by Satan, Jesus the Christ—could not. The reason that the teachings found in *War on the Saints* were "practically unknown, and unprepared for in the literature of the Church," was not because the book was saturated with false doctrine, demonic apostasy, and fanaticism, but because the truths of the book could only be revealed after the "seven years [of] . . . dispensational warfare . . . [with] demons" that followed the 1904 Welsh holiness revival in "the Time of the End" shortly before the return of Christ in 1914.[3340] "*Dispensationally* the Book was in sequence to the Revival of 1904, and *dispensationally* it antedated the Translation Message given in October 1913, just one year after its issue."[3341] Besides, the doctrines of *War on the Saints* led people such as the head of the Y. W. C. A. in Finland to experience supernatural healing,[3342] and victories over evil spirits took place by means of positive confessions that anticipated those of the Word-Faith movement,[3343] which was

---

[3339] Pg. 180, "An Accomplished Ministration," *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

[3340] Pg. 191, "*War on the Saints*: A Brief Review of its Dispensational Significance," *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

[3341] Pg. 191, "*War on the Saints*: A Brief Review of its Dispensational Significance," *The Overcomer*, December 1914. Italics in original. Mrs. Penn-Lewis capitalizes the "B" of "Book" in the quotation, not for the Bible, but for *War on the Saints*—this latter is "the Book" in the quotation, a practice Penn-Lewis continues in the article cited above.

[3342] Pgs. 244-245, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3343] Pg. 265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Thus, *War on the Saints* has repeated affirmations such as:

> The believer should . . . declare his attitude . . . [t]he last word spoken, alters, ratifies, or nullifies previous ones . . . it is helpful for the believer to assert his decision . . . the declaration is having effect in the unseen world[.] . . . It is essential that believers should understand the value of the act of refusal [of evil spirits], and the expression of it. . . . The believer in conflict may say with effect: "I refuse all the authority of evil spirits over me: their right to me: their claims upon me: their power in me: their influence in or upon me["] . . . a strong, primary weapon of victory i[s] declaring deliberately . . . . The believer must now insist on EXPRESSING HIMSELF IN VOICE" (Chapters 9, 10, *War on the Saints*, capitalization in original).

What Word of Faith idolater could want more? Penn-Lewis was not the only Higher Life antecedent to the Word-Faith doctrine of positive confession. "[H]oliness leaders such as Simpson, Andrew Murray . . . and Hannah Whitall Smith all . . . advocate[d] positive confession" ("A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement," Paul King, *Alliance Academic Review*, ed. Elio Cuccaro. (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1996). Murray wrote: "It is needful also to testify to the faith one has. . . . You must, before you are conscious of any change, be able to say with faith, 'On the authority of God's Word I have the assurance that He hears me and that I shall be healed.'" (pgs. 46, 48, *Divine Healing: A Series of Addresses*. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1900). The believer is to "speak out [his] desires in the name of Christ" (pg. 54, *The Prayer-Life: The Inner Chamber and the Deepest Secret of Pentecost*. London: Morgan & Scott, 1914). Indeed, even an unconverted person comes to faith from unbelief by means of positive confession; Murray wrote: by "speak[ing] out . . . you will insensibly come to . . . confidence that He is also yours" (pg. 36, *Why Do You Not Believe? Words of Instruction and*

also anticipated in the book's affirmation that prayer is more of a "manipulative ac[t]" than simply a "cooperative ac[t]" with God.[3344] For, while the Bible taught that sign gifts such as exorcism were miraculous powers possessed by Christ and given to the Apostles as one of the "signs of an apostle" (2 Corinthians 12:12) and as a confirmation of the Word proclaimed by them,[3345] as is evident from the fact that the generality of believers in Scripture never even claimed to have the ability to cast out demons at will, *War on the Saints* taught that every "believer" who has entered into the Higher Life has "power to wield [Christ's] Name, and in His name to have authority to cast out demons."[3346] Today "demons are cast out immediately after the simple prayer of faith by the Christians. . . . men [are] delivered from demon-possession after one prayer," in the same way, allegedly, that demons were miraculously cast out in the first century, although, unlike when the Biblical gift of exorcism was truly and properly exercised, sometimes modern exorcists are unable to cast devils out.[3347] Similarly, today supernatural "[v]isions may have their source in . . . God . . . Divine 'Visions' [are] given . . . [d]reams can come from . . . God . . . [w]riting in its source may be from . . . God[.] . . . There is a true seeing and hearing . . . of supernatural things . . . of supernatural words . . . [and] of the revelations of God,"[3348] so cessationism is certainly false, and believers who adopt Keswick and Pentecostal continuationism can receive revelatory dreams and visions, and can produce inspired writings in this present age. By means of the truths of *War on the*

Encouragement for All Who Are Seeking the Lord. Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1894). Hannah Whitall Smith wrote: "Put your will, then, over on the believing side. Say, 'Lord, I will believe, I do believe,' and continue to say it" (Chapter 6, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*). Again she wrote: "Those three little words, repeated over and over, — 'Jesus saves me, Jesus saves me,' — will put to flight the greatest army of doubts that ever assaulted any soul. I have tried it times without number, and have never known it to fail. . . . I beg[in] to say, over and over, 'The Lord does love me. He is my present and my perfect Saviour; Jesus saves me, Jesus saves me now!' The victory [is] complete. . . . Confess it to yourself. Confess it to your God. Confess it to your friends" (Chapter 14, 5, *ibid*). A. B. Simpson wrote: "Faith will die without confession" (pg. 35, *Seeing the Invisible: The Art of Spiritual Perception*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1994).

Paul King ("A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement," *Alliance Academic Review*) also affirmed that William Boardman was also an antecedent to positive confession, referring to two texts on pgs. 261, 263 of *The Higher Christian Life* (New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1984) in which one "spoke out the faith," but an examination of these references fails to prove Boardman was truly an advocate of something like positive confession.

[3344] Pg. 206, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3345] Compare Mark 16:17, 20.

[3346] Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

[3347] Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Immediately after stating that the practice of first century exorcism was taking place, Penn-Lewis mentions that sometimes people would be possessed for "weeks, months, years" without the allegedly miraculous gifts actually working.

[3348] Chapter 5 & "The True Workings Of God, And Counterfeits Of Satan," *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

Saints, "what happened when Christ was on earth, will happen again when the casting out of evil spirits will become a recognized part of all Christian and ministerial activity."[3349] *War on the Saints* will lead men to practice exorcism and then lead to the restoration of all the first century sign gifts—it will destroy the cessationism believed and practiced by Christians and churches because of literal exegesis of the Bible and the acceptance of its sole authority for faith and practice. The spread of such Quaker, Pentecostal, and Word of Faith notions is certainly a great benefit to at least one side in the war between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. Besides, Evan Roberts himself wrote: "Satan came to me but he was driven to flight,"[3350] so Roberts had tested the doctrine in *War on the Saints* in his own personal experiences with Satan—the book, and the teachings of Roberts and Penn-Lewis in general, were "precisely true according to experience."[3351] Surely such apparent victories over evil spirits and powerful answers to prayer were not themselves part of a deeper Satanic deception, but validated the teaching of Roberts and Penn-Lewis on Satanic warfare and the book *War on the Saints*. Certainly in modern times demons would not pretend to be cast out or actually leave human victims in order to advance a deeper deception by validating unbiblical Keswick continuationism, although in Christ's day devils worked in exactly this sort of way by allowing the sons of the Pharisees to cast them out (Luke 11:19) in order to validate anti-Christ Pharisaic doctrine as true. No, although God's Word records exactly such deception, today this Biblical warning should be set aside or ignored, just as it was by Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis. Besides, neither Evan Roberts nor Jessie Penn-Lewis thought they were demon possessed while writing the book, although they confessed that they had been possessed earlier—at least while writing the book under inspiration they testified that they were possessed no longer. Although they also taught that one could be possessed and not know it, one clearly had nothing to fear. Furthermore, while literal exegesis of the Bible would indicate that true Christians could not be possessed, since *War on the Saints* could simply ignore texts that support such a truth (what need to allegorize Scripture when it can be ignored?) and affirm the contrary, and as nobody could possibly think that Mrs. Penn-Lewis was herself unconverted, her experiences being demon possessed were surely salutary, as being filled with demons also leads one to be filled, not with spiritual blindness and darkness, but with spiritual discernment. While Roberts

---

3349 Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

3350 Pg. 113, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

3351 Pg. 180, *The Overcomer*, December 1914. This status of being "precisely true according to experience" was more exact, admittedly, than the conformity of their teachings to Scripture. They claimed that their demonology was "correct" only "in principle according to the Scriptures"—which it was not—but it was "precisely true," not just true "in principle," according to experience.

and Penn-Lewis record in their book many curious statements which are totally impossible to prove from Scripture, happily, they could still appeal to the fact that they were themselves recipients and oracles of revelation from the spirit world that supplemented the Bible and brought them to different conclusions than they would have made had they followed Scripture alone. Thus, *War on the Saints* affirms that the "Bible throws much light upon the Satanic powers, which cannot fail to be discerned by all who search the Scriptures with open minds, but these will not obtain as much knowledge of the subject from the sacred record, as will those who have understanding *by experience*"; one is to gain "through experience . . . a personal witness to the . . . Scripture . . . testimony concerning the existence of supernatural beings, and their works, and the way they deceive, and mislead the children of men."[3352] That is, the Bible is perhaps not to be entirely discounted, but its testimony is not able to give as much knowledge as one can obtain by personal interaction with and experiential fellowship with misleading demons. Experience must supplement searching the Scripture with an open mind, and grammatical-historical interpretation of the Word of God must give way to experience-oriented interpretation. Rejecting the total sufficiency of the Bible alone, and the literal interpretation of Scripture, to favor experience instead, will not open one up to Satanic deception, but will help one to successfully fight the devil, Penn-Lewis informs her readers. In fact, perhaps experience is really to entirely replace Scripture in knowing how to deal with demons: "Believers will be taught the truth about themselves only by experience, therefore God permits experience . . . God has permitted Satan to sift His people."[3353] Believers will not be taught by the Bible alone about how to deal with demons—no, they will be taught by experience alone. Out with *sola Scriptura*, and in with *sola experientia*. In any case, whether the Bible is to be set aside or simply supplemented by experience, as both Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis knew experientially, a "purified 'theology' . . . and a true demonology" certainly came not from the study of Scripture alone,[3354] but by being demon possessed and then becoming free

---

[3352] Chapter 1, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Italics in original; Penn-Lewis wished to emphasize the importance of gaining knowledge of the ways of the devil "by experience," not by Scripture alone, grammatically-historically interpreted.

[3353] Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*.

[3354] The incredible lack of careful Bible study is painfully manifest throughout the book, not only from its extreme sloppiness in handling God's holy Word with the text and its exegetical fallacies in general, but from what appears to be a lack of even a careful examination of the Biblical passages that speak of angels and demons. Such simple facts as that the Bible never speaks of a plurality, but only of one archangel, Michael, who is "the archangel" (1 Thessalonians 4:16; Jude 9), have been overlooked by Mrs. Penn-Lewis, who repeatedly speaks of a plurality of archangels (cf. Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*). Perhaps she simply received information that contradicted the Bible from the spirit world as she wrote by inspiration.

from demon possession by means of the unscriptural techniques described in *War on the Saints*. "[T]he believer understands the systematic workings of the forces of Satan . . .[t]hrough aggressive warfare against the foe . . . [t]hrough the knowledge gained by reading the symptoms of deception and possession in his own case, he is now able to read them in others, and see their need of deliverance, and finds himself compelled to pray for them, and work toward that goal." Through experiencing "the methodical, planned and systematic attacks of the forces of the enemy" one discovers truth: "By these attacks, the knowledge of the active operations of the lying spirits" comes to light.[3355] Not grammatical-historical exegesis of a sufficient Scripture (2 Timothy 3:16-17), but being possessed, being systematically attacked by Satan, and having experiences with demons that make one think he is free from their power through utilizing the techniques of *War on the Saints* are the way to true theology and demonology. The teachings of *War on the Saints* are themselves a product of such personal interactions with demons by people who have been demon possessed, and as such, they are necessary additions to the Bible, for accepting doctrine from people who have been self-professedly demon possessed, and received teachings from their personal interactions with demons, is not the height of folly, but obviously the smart way to go.

After all, with the Bible alone, one could never discover such truths as those that *War on the Saints* describes as follows:

> [E]vil spirits . . . bury themselves in the very structure of the human frame, some acting directly upon the organs or appetites of the body, others upon the mind or intellect, sensibilities, emotions and affections, and others more immediately upon the spirit. In the body they specially locate themselves in the spinal column, nervous system, and deepest nerve centers, through which they control the whole being; from the ganglionic nerve center located in the bowels, the emotional sensibilities, and all organs affected by them, to the cerebral nerve center in the head; the eyes, ears, neck, jaws, tongue, muscles of the face, the delicate nerve tissues of the brain. . . . Demons . . . are of various types, greater in diversity than human beings, and these demons always seek to possess a person congenial to them in some characteristic. The Bible tells us . . . of despotic demons, theological demons, screeching and yelling demons. There are demons that act more particularly on the body, or some organ or appetite of the body. There are others that act more directly upon the intellect, or the sensibilities, and emotions, and affections. There are others of *a higher order that act directly on man's spiritual nature*, upon the conscience, or the spiritual perceptions. . . . Demons . . . seek out those whose make-up and temperament is most congenial to themselves and then seek to fasten themselves on to some part of the body, or brain, or some appetite, or some faculty of the mind, either the reason, or imagination, or perception; and when they get access, they bury themselves into the very structure of the person[.][3356]

Furthermore, with only the Bible, one would never know that "evil spirits want the body, and . . . so persistently work to gain access and possession . . . [b]ecause in it they find

---

[3355] Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*.

[3356] Pgs. 162-163, *War On The Saints*, & "How Demons Attack Advanced Believers." Italics in original.

'rest' (Matt. 12:43), and seem to find some relief for themselves,"[3357] for Matthew 12:43 actually states that unclean spirits seek rest, and find none, so one would need the inspired writings of Mrs. Penn-Lewis to know that, when they possess men, unclean spirits seek rest, and find some, the allegedly true, allegorical meaning of the text of Matthew, although one with no support whatever from the literal interpretation of the passage.[3358] Nor would one be able to discover the fact that there are degrees of demon possession,[3359] so that demons can possess one's left arm, or right ear canal, or facial muscles, or nerves,[3360] or divide up portions of one's soul, or mind, or sensibilities, and possess some portion of them, or any other portion of the person whatever—an affirmation fundamental to the entire system of *War on the Saints*—from the Bible alone, as there is not a shred of evidence for it in the Word. The Bible never teaches that a "buzzing in the ears" is caused by an "evil spirit locating in the nerves of the ear," or that "shortsightedness" so that "things look misty and blurred" should lead a man to fear that "evil spirits control the physical eyes," or that "talkativeness" could well be because [e]vil spirits may 'possess' [people] . . . only in the organs of speech."[3361] Much less would anyone ever conclude simply from the Bible that one needs to know what portion of the body, or soul, and so on, is possessed before exorcism is possible, but *War on the*

3357 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*.

3358 While Matthew 12:43 certainly does speak of spirits that are not currently possessing any individual, the fact that devils that are not possessing sinners have no rest does not mean that those who are possessing the lost do find rest, any more than the fact that there is no true spiritual rest to wicked men who are on the earth proves that wicked men in hell do find spiritual rest. As devils are perpetually underneath the righteous judgments of God, they never have rest in any situation.

3359 Mrs. Penn-Lewis's pervasive terminology of "ground" given to demons is also absent from the Bible, although perhaps some of what she means by this concept may actually be expressed using other terms in the Bible. However, by rejecting Biblical terminology and demonology for her own terminology, the spirits that inspired Mrs. Penn-Lewis to write *War on the Saints* can influence the saints away from Biblical truth about resisting the devil to unscriptural concepts by using Mrs. Penn-Lewis's nonbiblical terms to transition from Biblically present to Biblically absent ideas through her imprecise language.

3360 What do the evil spirits do when they locate themselves in the various portions of the body and possess them? Perhaps their work when living in the ear canal may be illustrative: "[E]vil spirits may take hold of the nerves of the ear, so that the person cannot hear what he should, yet is permitted to be alert enough in bearing[,] all [in order] that he should not hear" (Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*). Let all hear the great truths supplementing the Bible in *War on the Saints*—at least if demons are not possessing one's ears and making one hard of hearing—in which case one had better read the book instead of listening to it read or expounded—although the "eyes" are also "liable to possession" (Chapter 5, *ibid*), so it may not be possible to see the book and read it, either—in which case one had better just cry out for help—unless one's "tongue" has become subject "to possession," along with the eyes and ears, in which case learning braille to read the book may be the only option—although since all "other parts of the body" of the Christian may be possessed, even the hands may be unable read the book in braille, if they also have been possessed. In that case it may be best to simply think about what to do—unless the Christian's brain has been possessed.

3361 Chapter 7, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

Saints revealed what is truly necessary to escape from possession: "When the believer is fighting free from possession, he . . . must know the place of the spirit, the soul, and the body, in the conflict, *e.g.*, if evil spirits have a hold on the muscles of the bodily frame there must be effort, and *use of the muscles* to dislodge them, and so in every other part of the being."[3362] None of the texts in the Bible that employ the verbs for demon possession or exorcism indicate that either possession or exorcism has degrees,[3363] nor is there the slightest evidence that one must find out that demons are, say, in one's muscles and then wiggle those muscles to dislodge the demons. Nor does the Bible indicate that manifestations of sin by believers are sometimes caused by demons, so that when a believer acts or thinks sinfully he may not really have sinned, because the devil made him do it. However, in *War on the Saints* Mrs. Penn-Lewis not only discovered that the devil can make believers act sinfully—after all, there are "unclean demons . . . demons . . . of drunkenness, of gluttony, of idleness,"[3364] and so on—but that believers should not confess their sins when the devil makes them sin. If Christians confess the sins that the devil allegedly did through them, they will become demon possessed. A believer who only had 1 John 1:9, Luke 11:4, and related passages would simply confess all his sins and trust that God had cleansed him from all unrighteousness, and with the Bible alone he would never know that drunkenness, idleness, overeating, and so on, could actually be sins from demons rather than sins from himself—but *War on the Saints* shows that, after

---

3362 Chapter 8, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Italics in original.

3363 Note the δαιμονίζομαι texts (Matthew 4:24; 8:16, 28, 33; 9:32; 12:22; 15:22; Mark 1:32; 5:15–16, 18; Luke 8:36; John 10:21; cf. the texts with ἀκάθαρτος and πνεῦμα) and the texts with the verb "cast out" (ἐκβάλλω) relevant for demon possession (Matthew 7:22; 8:16, 31; 9:32–34; 10:8; 12:22, 24, 26–28; 17:18–19; Mark 1:32, 34, 39; 3:15, 22–23; 6:13; 7:26; 9:38; 16:9, 17; Luke 9:49; 11:14–15, 18–20; 13:32). In every case, neither the possession nor the deliverance from possession was a matter of degree. While an unconverted person could have a greater or lesser number of demons within him, in no case was there a statement or even an implication that only certain portions of a person were possessed, or that when demons were cast out they were not actually cast out from all of the person, but only from certain parts of him. Indeed, in not a single one of the seventy-six instances where the verb *cast out* appears in the New Testament can demons or anything else be cast out and yet still be present within whatever they were cast out of in some lesser degree (Matthew 7:4–5, 22; 8:12, 16, 31; 9:25, 33–34, 38–10:1; 10:8; 12:20, 24, 26–28, 35; 13:52; 15:17; 17:19; 21:12, 39; 22:13; 25:30; Mark 1:12, 34, 39, 43; 3:15, 22–23; 5:40; 6:13; 7:26; 9:18, 28, 38, 47; 11:15; 12:8; 16:9, 17; Luke 4:29; 6:22, 42; 8:54; 9:40, 49; 10:2, 35; 11:14–15, 18–20; 13:28, 32; 19:45; 20:12, 15; John 2:15; 6:37; 9:34–35; 10:4; 12:31; Acts 7:58; 9:40; 13:50; 16:37; 27:38; Gal 4:30; James 2:25; 3 John 1:10; Revelation 11:2). If *sola Scriptura* is true, and Mrs. Penn-Lewis's writings are not inspired and an authority to set alongside of or above the Bible, then her doctrine of degrees of demon possession is another one of the Satanic lies, errors, and heresies that saturate her writings.

3364 "How Demons Attack Advanced Believers," in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Compare the Pentecostal idea of disease-causing demons: "A demon might be in the flesh as in the case of a cancer" (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:11 (Los Angeles, October-January 1908), reprinted on pg. 46, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

engaging in various sins, one should first be neutral towards them, not ashamed of them, and then one needs to find out what percentage among sins committed were actually the responsibility of the devil, and be careful to avoid confessing those sins, for even one mistake in confessing a sin that the devil really did through the believer opens the believer up to demon possession.[3365] Furthermore, while the Bible teaches that the true God is sovereign, self-sufficient, and does not need anything (Acts 17:25), the deity of *War on the Saints* needs prayer or it is unable to do what it wants to,[3366] and it is unable to overthrow and destroy sin and Satan without people helping out by binding the devil and utilizing the techniques in Roberts' and Penn-Lewis' work,[3367] affirmations that call to mind both Word of Faith doctrine and the myths about how the Greek gods became hungry if enough people did not offer them sacrifices. Indeed, the deity of Mrs. Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts is even helpless to initiate the second coming of Christ until people bind Satan and his demons and so clear the air—only then can the Rapture, the partial Rapture of the Overcomers, take place.[3368] However, the deity of *War on the*

3365 "Evil spirits can also counterfeit sin, by causing some apparent manifestation of the evil nature in the life, and matured believers should know whether such a manifestation really is sin from the old nature, or a manifestation from evil spirits. The purpose in the latter case is to get the believer to take what comes from them, as from himself, for whatever is accepted from evil spirits gives them entry and power. When a believer knows the Cross and his position of death to sin, and in will and practice rejects unflinchingly all known sin, and a 'manifestation' of 'sin' takes place, he should at once take a position of neutrality to it, until he knows the source, for if he calls it sin from himself when it is not, he believes a lie as much as in any other way; and if he 'confesses' as a sin what did not come from himself, he brings the power of the enemy upon him, to drive him into the sin which he has 'confessed' as his own. Many believers are thus held down . . . but . . . would find liberty if they attributed [their sins] to their right cause[,] [namely, the devil]. There is no danger of 'minimizing sin' in the recognition of these facts" (Chapter 6, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis).

3366 Compare the inability and weakness of Finney's deity, passed down through the Oberlin theology into the Higher Life movement: "But if God can not prevent sin, will He not be unhappy? No; He is entirely satisfied to do the best He can, and accept the results" (pg. 222, *Sermons on Gospel Themes*, Charles Grandison Finney. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1876).

3367 "Prayer fulfills some law which enables God to work, and makes it possible for Him to accomplish His purposes. If such a law does not exist, and God has no need of the prayers of His children, then asking is a waste of time" (Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*). "God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the destruction of sin and Satan. . . . God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the overthrow of sin and Satan, just as God needed the co-operation of Israel in His dealing with the Canaanites. Christ said, 'First bind the strong man.' This implies and involves praying against the strong man. How does the binding take place, and what is it that binds but PRAYER?" ("The Scriptural Basis for 'Warfare' Against the Powers of Darkness," by Evan Roberts, in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis). Mrs. Penn-Lewis's and Evan Roberts's affirmations here are among the more loathsome of the regular Pelagianizing affirmations that fill their book.

3368 "It dawned on me that if the hosts of evil are to be put into the abyss there will come a moment when the warfare will cease[.] . . . I prayed that the whole warfare . . . [with] the hosts of evil . . . should stop. . . . I can see now that there has been sufficient prayer to bring about that incarceration . . . the actual incarceration of the foe, [the end of] this warfare [which] would fulfill the DISPENSATIONAL PURPOSES of God . . . the translation is at hand. . . . Had not this warfare [with Satan] been carried out, then when our Lord came these hosts of evil angels would make war. The translated rise into the air, and

Saints is not the only being that has needs that only people can meet—demons can also need people to get a drink. "[F]acts gathered from experience [are] sufficient to prove that certain varieties of demons live on the juices in human blood."[3369] How necessary *War on the Saints* truly must be—filled to the brim, as it is, with affirmations about demons and their wiles that are entirely absent from Scripture! While critics[3370] would affirm that the Satanic warfare doctrines in *War on the Saints* and *The Overcomer* are themselves occasions for awful spiritual delusion, and for evil spirits to gain power over people, those who recognize the inspiration of the writings of Roberts and Penn-Lewis need not trouble themselves about the bizarre, unscriptural, and idolatrous features that burst forth on page after page of their writings, nor about the great grief and quenching of the Holy Spirit that their unscriptural nonsense produces in a Christian soul, but can rest in confidence in their prophets in these last hours before the parousia in 1914.

Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts taught, by revelation from the spirit world, and in the company of Keswick founder Hannah W. Smith,[3371] that power over Satanic forces takes place when a believer claims a position in heavenly places, basing this conclusion on, among other texts, Ephesians 1-2, although these chapters never command believers to claim anything. The foundation was in this manner laid for the throne-life and spiritual warfare doctrines nourished and developed from within a Keswick context[3372] by John MacMillan, the Christian and Missionary Alliance in general,[3373] and

---

the dead arise, and all would be involved in warfare. But God means that the warfare with the evil hosts shall finish before Christ comes . . . [when the] translation takes place, the spirit hosts of evil shall be bound up . . . if they were not bound before the translation they would also interfere with that." (pgs. 186-188, "Be Ye Ready," Evan Roberts. *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

3369 "How Demons Attack Advanced Believers," in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

3370 E. g., *The Red Letters*, Miles J. Stanford.

3371 E. g., Mrs. Smith evidenced her appreciation of the Throne Life in her description of her friend Frances Willard, who, after influence from the Higher Life movement, gained a tremendous sympathy with Hannah's universalism, as well as ecumenicalism, spiritualism, feminism, and socialism (see, e. g., pgs. 155ff., *Frances Willard: A Biography*, by Ruth Bordin. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1986): "It is lovely having Frances Willard in one's house. . . . She realizes more than anyone I ever knew one's idea of being 'seated in Heavenly places,' without, however, the slightest trait . . . of dogmatic assertion. . . . She believes that God . . . is working out for the whole human race a glorious destiny when all sin shall be done away, and every sinner shall be . . . made one with Him" (pg. 122, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of H. W. S,"* ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her friends, October 17, 1893).

3372 E. g., A. T. Pierson preached at Keswick in 1905, "when all hearts were warmed and subdued by the mighty happenings of Wales," the throne-power doctrine: "[W]e are . . . taught . . . [in] the Epistle to the Ephesians . . . the grandest revelation of the power of a child of God. . . . Why, you sway the scepter that God sways" (pg. 457, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson, reproducing "The Inbreathed Spirit," A. T. Pierson, pgs. 453-460). In the spirit of the work of Evan Roberts, a rector present at Pierson's sermon noted: "the Holy Spirit fell. The speaker was kept from completing his address by the sobs and cries[.]" (pg. 528, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen).

3373 Thus, for example, A. B. Simpson also taught on this theme of throne life; cf. *Christ in the Bible Commentary* (1992), 5:413-414. Mrs. Penn-Lewis, after her American preaching tour which had included

the charismatic and Word-Faith movements. In 1897 Mrs. Penn-Lewis was preaching to the China Inland Mission about the "throne-life victory with Christ in God" possessed by that subcategory of believers who had entered the Overcoming Life, what her Quaker ancestors had called the Hidden Life. The elite believer who has entered into this "place of victory 'far above' all the principalities and powers . . . sits with Christ in His place of victory" with "Satan and all his hosts under his [the believer's] feet," able to exercise "authority over the nations." Such believers experience Christ's "throne life of victory," and, now "encased in Christ, and wielding His authority . . . can command all the hosts of hell" and make them obey.[3374] Ephesians 1-2 are said to teach that "the Holy Spirit . . . will certainly impart to us the life of the Risen Lord. He will lift us in real experience into our place in Him, seated with Him in the heavens far above all principalities and powers . . . far above the powers of darkness."[3375] Mrs. Penn-Lewis used her authority as a believer to effect, for example, "the dislodging of the hosts of darkness from the atmosphere" over Russia, an action that was key for "the Holy Spirit . . . to work unhindered"[3376] in that place. Her revelatory gift was important in the discovery of the Throne-Life and its power over evil spirits, as neither the Lord Jesus nor the Apostles ever gave Christians an example of removing demons from the atmosphere over a country or taught that such a removal was key for the Spirit's unhindered work. Penn-Lewis taught that the believer can use his authority to influence world events, such as the first world war, and even change the "day of the rapture and perhaps the day of final judgment." The believer's authority can change "all . . . a teaching in Mary Baker Eddy's Christian Science magazine, *Active Service*, sounded very [much] like this."[3377] Furthermore, based on a misinterpretation of Luke 10:19 also picked up by MacMillan, Simpson,[3378] and Pentecostalism, Penn-Lewis wrote: "The soul hidden with Christ in

---

the CMA "Nyack Institute in Nyack, New York," subsequently "for many years . . . kept in close touch with . . . Nyack" (pg. 105, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.).

3374 Pgs. 90-93, *The Warfare with Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis; the book "is based on a series of addresses given by Mrs. Penn-Lewis in 1897, at a day of waiting on God at the C. I. M. Hall, London" (preface, *ibid*). Compare Penn-Lewis's 1906 work *Throne Life of Victory*. Evan Roberts also preached about Throne Life under Jessie Penn-Lewis's influence (cf. pgs. 160-161, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

3375 Pg. 74, *The Warfare With Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

3376 Pgs. 147-148, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

3377 Pgs. 282-283, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. B. P. Jones, however, in his very positive biography of Mrs. Penn-Lewis, affirms that it is simply "curious" that Mary Baker Eddy's teaching was "very like" that of Mrs. Penn-Lewis while affirming that the two really were different.

3378 For example, Simpson, in his *Christ in the Bible Commentary*, 4:163, argues that Luke 10:19 is a promise valid for all Christians throughout the age of grace, although the verse is, when interpreted in context, only given to the "seventy"; furthermore, Simpson affirms that since that Christ has all authority

God has authority over all the power of the enemy . . . he has power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and power to deliver and loose others from the bonds of the evil one."[3379]

Mrs. Penn-Lewis taught further doctrines that differed greatly from those in the Bible. She denied central aspects of progressive sanctification,[3380] propagated the strange ideas that "the spirit . . . is severed or 'disentangled' . . . cut away . . . from the embrace of the soul" in sanctification,[3381] and taught that only the human spirit is regenerated, doctrines she passed on to Watchman Nee. Indeed, "[m]any of her teachings are echoed in the works of Watchman Nee, who acknowledged his many debts to Jessie Penn-Lewis."[3382] She also taught bizarre notions obviously absent from Scripture, possibly derived in part from her many books on psychology,[3383] and illustrated by her concept of "soul-force,"[3384] a concept, rooted in the Broadlands Conferences,[3385] that she passed on to John A. MacMillan,[3386] Watchman Nee, and others. Penn-Lewis wrote:

---

over the creation, He gives that authority to every believer, so that animals, Satan, men, and so on, are subject to the believer.

Foster and King (pgs. 139-140, *Binding and Loosing*) argue that Andrew Murray also employed the sorts of binding and loosing powers taught in Pentecostalism because, as recorded on pgs. 41-42 of *Andrew Murray*, William Linder, Jr. (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 1996), Murray had certain dogs snap at him but not bite him. The conclusion that a person has exercised Pentecostal powers to bind and loose Satan because dogs snapped at him but did not bite him is not a little weak, but the argument is representative of Foster and King's overexuberance, at times, to find support for Pentecostal and Word of Faith ideas in earlier writers.

[3379] Pg. 77, *The Warfare With Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Compare Chapters 2, 11, *War On The Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

[3380] "There is no *gradual* deliverance from sin, no gradual process of death to sin or deliverance from the world, or the flesh." Chapter 4, Jessie Penn-Lewis, *The Centrality of the Cross*. Elec. acc. http://www.worldinvisible.com/library/jessiepenn-lewis/8791/8791tc.htm; also pub. Fort Washington, Pa.: Christian Literature Crusade, 1996.

[3381] Chapter 5, *The Centrality of the Cross*, Penn-Lewis.

[3382] Pg. 225, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

[3383] Pg. 224, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

[3384] Penn-Lewis was likely also influenced in her soul-force ideas by gap theorist G. A. Pember, who believed that one "can act by his soul-force on external spirits. He can accelerate the growth of plants and quench fire; and, like Daniel, subdue ferocious wild beasts. He can send his soul to a distance, and there not only read the thoughts of others, but speak to and touch these distant objects, and not only so, but he can exhibit to his distant friends his spiritual body in the exact likeness of that of the flesh" (pg. 252, *Earth's Earliest Ages*, Pember). Pember joined Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis in advocating a partial Rapture, teaching that "those who are believers in Christ and, therefore, a part of His redeemed . . . but have not yet been sufficiently cleansed and sanctified . . . and are thus not ready to pass into the heavenly Tabernacle . . . may be as Elisha witnessing the departure of Elijah: or as the disciples on the mount of Olives when they beheld the cloud receiving their Master out of their sight, but were not yet prepared to follow Him" (pg. 195, *ibid*), Elijah and the Lord Jesus, in their resurrection and ascension, allegedly acting as types of a partial Rapture.

[3385] E. g., those who congregate at Broadlands testify that they "know the fact" that "spirit acts on spirit," one human spirit directly on another person's spirit (pgs. 258-259, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910), a concept obviously related to the soul-force idea that souls can act upon each other, although the spirit-force

> [M]an . . . [can] generate 'soul-force' [by] . . . so bring[ing] his body under the control of his own soul, that he can project his soul and spirit, and, while living on this earth, act as if he were a disembodied spirit. . . . The man who attains to this power is called an 'adept' and . . . can consciously see the minds of others.[3387] He can act by his 'soul-force' on external spirits. . . . He can subdue ferocious wild beasts and send his soul to a distance, and he can exhibit to his distant friends his spiritual body in the likeness of that of the flesh. . . . Soul-force . . . [is] latent in the human frame. . . . psychic power [is] latent in the human frame.[3388]

While Penn-Lewis denied that such a "force" should be cultivated, affirming rather that it was evil, she nonetheless believed that her extra-scriptural "force," which is that of the *chi* of Eastern paganism and the New Age, is "very real . . . even when a man becomes regenerate."[3389] It appears to be connected to nerves in the pit of the stomach, according to Penn-Lewis, for these nerves are the instrumentality for the performance of miracles. "[R]evelations and prophecies, speaking and singing with tongues, healing and miracles" come from the force through the "lower nerve-centers (the ganglionic system, or the 'vegetative' nerves, as they are called), which have their chief seat in the region round the pit of the stomach[.] . . . These nerves . . . display abilities which our ordinary organs of sense do not possess, and] they receive impressions from a realm usually closed to us, such as clairvoyance, presentiments, prophecy, speaking with tongues, etc."[3390] As already noted, Penn-Lewis affirmed that only the spirit of man is regenerated.[3391] Thus, the "converted man [is] one who has had his spirit regenerated . . . his renewed spirit [is] indwelt by the Spirit of God. . . . The believer . . . has been quickened in spirit, is born of the Spirit and the Spirit of God dwells in his spirit."[3392] She connected her doctrine that only the spirit is regenerated with her doctrine that believers can be possessed by demons:

---

idea of Broadlands is viewed positively, while the soul-force concept is considered, at least by Mrs. Penn-Lewis and those influenced by her, as negative.

3386 "[E]very man is endowed with a certain amount of telepathic power . . . and . . . a few have weird powers of clairvoyance[.] . . . [There are] occult powers of the soul of man . . .the occult powers are quite separate and distinct from those manifestations of demoniacal power" (pg. 719, "The Soul Powers," John A. MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, 70:45, November 9, 1935).

3387 Penn-Lewis here contradicts 1 Kings 8:39.

3388 *Soul & Spirit*, Penn-Lewis, Chapters 6, 8-9.

3389 Chapter 8, *Soul & Spirit*, Penn-Lewis.

3390 "Light on 'Abnormal' Experiences," in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Penn-Lewis also affirmed, contrary to modern science, that these nerves in the stomach pit "set in action . . . the organs of speech," for somnambulists, such as those exalted by Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple (pgs. 39-40, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890), affirmed that such was so, even if scientists did not.

3391 Similarly, both E. W. Kenyon and Phineas Quimby taught that "the human spirit was 'the real man' and that knowledge that comes through the spiritual senses 'independently of the brain' is greater than that which comes through the physical senses" (pgs. 103-104, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell), setting the stage for the Word of Faith concept of "revelation knowledge," which is very similar to the doctrine of Penn-Lewis and Watchman Nee.

3392 *Soul and Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Chapters 2-3, elec. acc.

> [W]hen the spirit of the man has been quickened into life and he has been delivered from the power of sin, the soulish life and elements in the physical body are open to evil powers. . . . [T]he soulish life [is used by] . . . evil spirits . . . to accomplish their plans[.] . . . This working of the enemy through the mind of a believer, when the heart and spirit may be true to God, is a most serious fact in the Church of God today[.] . . . In the physical body, the adversary can work upon the nervous system and use the animal magnetism which is inherent in every human frame, as well as many other elements open to the powers of evil, in addition to 'the works of the flesh' and what is generally called sin. These elements are in the very 'makeup' of the human vessel and . . . give . . . ground . . . to the spirits of evil to attack, or gain admittance to mind or body. . . . For full elucidation of this aspect of truth, see *War on the Saints*, a textbook on the work of deceiving spirits among the children of God.[3393]

As the quotation above demonstrates, Penn-Lewis assumed[3394] the reality of "animal magnetism," a Satanic concept developed by "Franz Anton Mesmer (1734–1815)" with clear "historical ties to pagan worship and folklore . . . pagan and occultic rituals . . . [and] old cultic practices and superstitions." Mesmer, whose ideas undergirded the Faith and Mind Cure doctrines that were precursors of Pentecostalism,[3395] was rightly "accused . . . of being a magician and charlatan," but his ideas led to later demonic and cultic errors, as well as modern psychotherapy, as "the term magnetism . . . [was] dropped . . . and . . . hypnosis . . . introduced . . . [becoming key to the development of] the New Thought movement (a religious, metaphysical healing cult) . . . [the] Christian Science

---

[3393] *Soul & Spirit*, Penn-Lewis, Chapter 3, elec. acc.

[3394] Compare the affirmation of Hannah W. Smith: "I have found by experience, and I am convinced from philosophy, that . . . subtle unseen spiritual forces . . . emanate from our spirits," and that these forces "are far more important than the outward tangible influence that we exert consciously" (Letter to Daughter, November 3, 1884, reproduced in the entry for December 21 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

[3395] Discussing Pentecostal founder Charles Parham, Robert Anderson notes:

> Healing was widely taught and practiced among Holiness people as well as among the Quimby-Christian Science-New Thought constellation of sects and the Spiritualists. Parham was most strongly influenced on this subject by John Alexander Dowie and A. B. Simpson. . . . Notions similar to those of speaking in tongues and 'Redemption of the Body' were common among the Spiritualists. Parham indirectly acknowledged his debt to these contemporaneous religious movements, and even recognized the affinity between his own doctrines and theirs, especially those of Christian Science and Spiritualism." (pg. 87, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*; cf. pgs. 217-218 on the similarities of spiritualism and Pentecostalism)

Thus, Parham stated: "[W]e heard and studied the . . . claims of Medical, Mental, and Christian Sciences, hypnotism . . . the power of spiritualism . . . the possession of mediums, [and] speaking under the control of evil spirits." Having studied these Satanic works, Parham claimed that the powers that he exercised were comparable to those of these demonic manifestations, only that "God has the real of which these sorceries are the counterfeit" (pg. 26, *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness*, Charles Parham; cf. pg. 79). That is, the marvels Parham, and his associates, claimed to perform were not of a fundamentally different character than those in the spiritualism he studied and those performed by evil spirits. His supernatural tongues, for example, were like those of demon-possessed people, only, he claimed, from a better source. Unlike the miracles in the Bible, which were in a different and vastly superior category to the modern marvels of spiritualists, Christian Science cultists, and Mind Cure devotees, Parham's marvels were comparable.

[cult of] Mary Baker Eddy . . . [and] Freud's . . . creat[ion] [of] a new field of therapy, psychoanalysis, which soon became the new rage."[3396] David MacLeod noted:

> The now discredited Franz Anton Mesmer (1734–1815) was a French physician who has been called the father of psychotherapy, the discoverer of hypnosis, and the progenitor of clairvoyance, telepathy, and communication with the beyond. . . . He claimed that a magnetic force emanated from his hands that enabled him to direct the actions and thoughts of his subjects. The effects upon his patients included: convulsions, involuntary movements of the limbs, rapid blinking and crossing of eyes, and piercing cries, tears, hiccups and uncontrollable laughter. He performed healings using an indwelling force he called . . . animal magnetism[.][3397]

The recognition of animal magnetism was widespread in the early Higher Life and Keswick movement, as, for example, it was employed by many mediums whom the Mount-Temples knew and learned from at Broadlands, their home and center for Higher Life agitation and promotion.[3398] David Cloud wrote:

> Mesmer . . . an astrologer and occultist, proposed a healing technique through hypnosis and the flow of "animal magnetism" from the practitioner to the patient. He held the occultic view that there are thousands of channels in our bodies through which an invisible life force flows and that illness is caused by blockages. The practitioner of animal magnetism could allegedly cure sicknesses by overcoming the obstacles and restoring the flow. The term "to mesmerize" is based on Mesmer's hypnotic practices, and the field of modern hypnotism stemmed from his techniques. Mesmerization or hypnosis produced two occultic movements in the 19th century. One of these was the New Thought or Mind Science movement. Phineas Quimby (1802-66), a student of Mesmer, called his 'mind healing' theories the Science of Health and had a deep influence on Mary Baker Eddy, the founder of Christian Science. The other occultic movement produced by hypnotism was spiritism. Another Mesmer student, Andrew Jackson Davis, published a book in 1847 which he said was dictated to him by spirits while he was in a mesmeric trance. The *Encyclopedia of Psychic Science* says, "The conquest by spiritualism soon began and the leading Mesmerists were absorbed into the rank of the spiritualists."[3399]

Penn-Lewis's acceptance of the reality of the myth of animal magnetism (even though she does not endorse it as good, but recognizes it as evil[3400]) is another false doctrine promulgated by her.

Jessie Penn-Lewis's attempt to prove that only the spirit is regenerated from verses that actually connect the new birth and the spirit consists of one sentence, containing one allusion to uncited Scripture: "It is the spirit that is regenerated—'a new spirit will I give you.'"[3401] Perhaps the fact that the actual references with the words "a

---

3396 Pgs. 594-597, "Hypnosis," Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling (2nd ed.), D. G. Benner & P. C. Hill.

3397 Pg. 90, *Counterfeit Revival* [Hank Hanegraaff, *Counterfeit Revival* (Dallas: Word, 1997)]: *A Review Article*, David J. MacLeod. *Emmaus Journal* 7:1 (Sum 98) 71-100.

3398 E. g., pg. 12, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

3399 "Hypnosis and Health Care," David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, October 1, 2008, an excerpt from *The New Age Tower of Babel*, by David Cloud. Elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*.

3400 Cf. *Soul & Spirit*, Chapter 8.

3401 Chapter 9, *Soul & Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Watchman Nee follows Penn-Lewis' argument that Ezekiel 36:26 is proof that only the human spirit is regenerated (pgs. 42-43, *The Latent Power of the Soul*,

new spirit" also mention "a new heart," and thus newness in the entirety of man's inner being, including the soul, explain her slackness in giving actual verse references (Ezekiel 11:19; 18:31; 36:26); nor does she explain why her argument from her uncited Old Testament is not the elementary and obvious logical fallacy of concluding that *only* the spirit, not the soul or the entire man, is made new because of a text that refers to a new spirit but never states or hints at her conclusion concerning the soul and body; nor does she try to explain texts such as 2 Corinthians 5:17 which prove that in the believer "all things are become new" (2 Corinthians 5:17)—such verses are simply ignored, as perhaps the force that moved her to write by inspiration did not inspire her to offer an explanation of why she was contradicting plain passages of the Bible. While she did not have the Bible, at least she had Andrew Murray on her side;[3402] in any case, it was necessary that only the spirit be regenerated, for without this doctrine central ideas in her spiritual warfare theories are obliterated,[3403] and the experiences she wrote so profusely about would need to bow before the higher authority of the infallible and all-sufficient Word of God.

Penn-Lewis was influenced to her concept of soul-force, as well as her date-setting about the end of the world, from an obscure and odd theological writer named Mrs. E. McHardie. Penn-Lewis wrote: "There is no writer who appears to have given such full information on the dispensational aspect of . . . 'soul-force' . . . as the late Mrs. McHardie [in] her valuable books."[3404] However, Mrs. McHardie richly deserves her obscurity. Reviews of her works, such as *The Midnight Cry: An Inquiry into the Evidence of the Near Approach of the Second Advent*, have described her writing:

> [Mrs. McHardie wrote] much . . . that is strained, fantastic, and absurd [to set forth] special signs that the end draweth nigh. . . . [S]he constructs a table of way-marks which leads up to the conclusion that three years hence [after 1883, thus, in 1886] 'the times of the Gentiles' will end, while seven years after the personal Anti-christ will be revealed and destroyed.' . . . [She discusses] the significance of the Great Pyramid . . . [for] the great Pyramid of Egypt . . . is accepted as a witness to Jehovah, and is held to enshrine evidence of when 'the appointed times' will befall. . . . [She interprets] [t]he vision of Ezekiel . . . [as teaching that the] cherubim are . . . counterfeits of the seraphim—really representing the evil powers, the unclean spirits in the children of disobedience. . . . [T]he wheels . . . [and the rest of the vision of Ezekiel 1, 10 prophesy of the] ['electric batteries [of the nineteenth century] . . . [and give] a symbolic representation of the forces of heaven and the batteries of hell.' . . . At great length this idea is supported by the

---

Nee), and E. W. Kenyon and the Word of Faith movement after him does likewise (e. g., pg. 74, *The Hidden Man*, E. W. Kenyon), with both Nee, Kenyon, the Church of the Recovery, and the Word of Faith movement deriving the doctrine of deification from the alleged regeneration of the human spirit alone—another doctrine of Jessie Penn-Lewis, who herself also affirmed that believers become "one nature, and one life and position with the Son of God" (Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis).

[3402] E. g., pgs. 332-338, *The Spirit of Christ*, Murray.

[3403] E. g., her doctrine that believers can be demon-possessed, as expounded in *War on the Saints*, relies heavily upon her false view of regeneration only affecting the spirit.

[3404] Chapter 8, *Soul & Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

> vagaries connected with modern spiritualism, which is assigned a very prominent place in connection with the phenomena that betoken 'the coming of the end.' . . . [By] the closing . . . of the book . . . [o]ne almost begins to lose patience . . . when she proceeds to cull from obscure journals . . . accounts of remarkable sights in heaven and earth, in the sun, the moon, and the stars, which she insists upon regarding as signs and portents. Nobody will attach any weight to this portion of the treatise; and the general verdict upon it as a whole will be that . . . by a slight extension and exaggeration of its method, [one] might succeed in proving, after a fashion as satisfactory as it attains, positions very unlike those which it advances.[3405]

It is unfortunate that Penn-Lewis wasted her time studying works by Mrs. McHardie, Guyon, and Hannah W. Smith, instead of studying the Bible and the works of those who carefully and accurately expounded and explained Scripture.

Furthermore, Penn-Lewis's extreme lack of discernment about Satan and his ways is clear in that she reproduced in print and accepted as truth what "the great plot of Satan, the Master Strategist," really was, not by exegesis of Scripture alone, but by means of what "was made known by a medium under the direction of the evil spirits controlling her,"[3406] as though evil spirits would not lie about Satan's strategies through a medium to get Penn-Lewis to print and distribute in Christendom the ideas of the devil. Nevertheless, it is appropriate that Mrs. Penn-Lewis published what were confessedly the affirmations of evil spirits, as so much of her writings were, though unconfessedly, the product of such beings.

The writings of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis have very large doses of heresy, Satanic influence, false prophecy, fanaticism, and plain foolishness. They should be avoided and warned against. Nonetheless, they were very influential in the unfolding trajectory of Keswick theology into Pentecostalism and the Word-Faith movement.

Applications from the Lives and Teachings of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis

Beware of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis. They are two dangerous and very influential false teachers and exponents of grievous Keswick, continuationistic, and demonological errors. Their works should be avoided and their influence in the preaching, writing, and theologizing of others should be detected, warned about, and rejected. Their strong imprint upon the Keswick theology, and upon the Pentecostalism that arose from it, blackens these movements and provides all the more evidence that they

---

[3405] Pgs. 250-251, *The Literary World: Choice Readings from the Best new Books, and Critical Reviews*. #703, vol. 28, new series. London: April 20, 1883, reviewing *The Midnight Cry: An Inquiry into the Evidence of the Near Approach of the Second Advent*, by E. McHardie. (London: S. W. Partridge & Co, n. d). Then again, since Mrs. Penn-Lewis joined Mrs. McHardie in writing much that is "strained, fantastic, and absurd," Mrs. Penn-Lewis's high esteem of Mrs. McHardie's works is not especially surprising.

[3406] Chapter 8, *Soul & Spirit*.

are corruptions of Biblical Christianity. They plainly stated that they had endured demon possession, and claimed that being possessed was key to the content of their writings on demonology. Will you follow and learn from those possessed by demons? Or will you reject the doctrines of demons and cleave to the Bible, the perfect and sufficient revelation of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?

Beware of revisionist history. All historians are fallible, and even their most accurate histories have no authority for Biblical faith and practice—the Bible alone is sufficient to make "the man of God perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Timothy 3:16-17). How much the less should historical errors influence the faith and practice of God's people? But, unfortunately, writers who are more interested in hagiography than truth exercise a great influence over the saints, leading the Lord's sheep to look up to and pattern themselves after wolves and devourers rather than fleeing from them. Following the writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis and patterning church practice after the person and methods of Evan Roberts will destroy sound Baptist churches and expose individual believers to extremely dangerous demonic deceptions, yet vast numbers of Christians have been exposed to this pair and spiritually weakened by them because of a mythical revision of events in Wales in 1904-1905. Recognize the truth—Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis were powerful instruments in the hands of Satan to destroy a true work of revival in Wales, bring to an end many years of growth among the true churches of that land, inaugurate decades of decay and desolation, and hatch the fanaticism and demonism that fills the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements and has contributed to the spiritual destruction of innumerable souls worldwide. Do not allow true revival to be corrupted to false revivalism in your own life and congregation because of the influence of these two demon-possessed fanatics. Do not perpetuate the revisionist history that makes them into great servants of God and the center of a true work of revival in Wales, and if you have perpetuated this lie in the past, immediately repent of it and then confess your error to those you have misled. It is high time that the truth about the real revival in Wales, and the Keswick continuationism and fanaticism of Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis that so widely infiltrated and destroyed it, replace the distortions of reality that find their place in the hearts of too many of the precious people of God. If you love and long for true revival, be discerning, cleave to the Spirit-breathed Word with all your heart and soul, and reject and reprove the theology, praxis, and historical revisionism surrounding peddlers of Satanic revivalism like Evan Roberts, Jessie Penn-Lewis, and other Keswick and Pentecostal continuationists and fanatics.

One can glean numerous spiritual lessons from the negative examples of Mr. Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis. They illustrate what spiritual dangers and destruction

Keswick continuationism can lead to, and how important it is to reject it with all of its demonic delusions for a Scriptural cessationism. Evan Roberts also illustrates the danger of confusing true conversion and God-wrought regeneration with mere experiences of the supernatural (cf. Matthew 7:21-23). An unconverted Judas performed miracles (Matthew 10:4-8), an unconverted high priest Caiaphas prophesied (John 11:49-52; 18:14), nine unconverted lepers were miraculously healed by Christ (Luke 17:11-19), idolatrous Egyptian magicians performed miracles (Exodus 7:11, 22), an unconverted sorcerer named Simon did marvels and convinced many that he was the great power of God (Acts 8:9-10), unconverted men had supernatural dreams (Genesis 31:24; 41:7), and Evan Roberts experienced many visions, dreams, voices, and other marvels, but had no clear testimony of conversion and died with barely a glimmer of Christian piety. And if many genuinely supernatural occurrences—even those that are truly from God, not from Satan—are less than true conversion and regeneration, how much less than the new birth is simply having an emotionally charged experience—and how far, far less than the new birth is standing up or coming to the front of a church building? Such soul-damning acceptance of substitutes for regeneration filled the work of Evan Roberts in the Welsh holiness revival, causing immeasurable spiritual harm. Christians and spiritual leaders must learn from this disaster the extreme importance of clearly and without confusion preaching the gospel, recognizing true conversion, and cleaving to Biblical methods of evangelism rather than adopting methodology that, although it may appear effective in the short term, actually contributes to the everlasting damnation of eternal souls by confusing the nature and fruits of real salvation. Scripture is sufficient for both the doctrine and practice of evangelism. Your church should be preaching regularly in public places and seeking to reach large groups of people at once, while also preaching Christ house to house to systematically reach everyone in your community (Acts 5:42). You should be preaching the good news of Christ's substitutionary death, His burial, and His resurrection, and salvation through repentant faith in Him. You should not be employing worldly promotion and marketing techniques or seeking to draw people to your church services with sensationalism. While providing people with spiritual counsel immediately after preaching is Biblically justifiable (Acts 2:37-38), including, for example, in an "inquiry room," the elements of worship in the Lord's church do not include the modern invitation system invented by Charles Finney. Furthermore, while Roman Catholic and liturgical Protestant religious organizations have altars at the front of their meeting places, true churches have no such altars, and so "altar calls" should be dispensed with. There is absolutely nothing sacred about the front of a church building, and there is no reason to conclude that because someone walks to the front of a church building, or is led

to repeat the words of a "sinner's prayer" after walking to the front of a church building, that he has been born again of the Holy Spirit of God. The replacement of true conversion with decisionism was central to bringing the time of Baptist church growth in Wales to an end as a result of the methods employed in the holiness revival under Evan Roberts, and its consequences have been inconceivably disastrous world-wide whenever they have been adopted. Nonetheless, there is hope—a rejection of unbiblical and nonbiblical doctrines and practices in evangelism, a recognition of the foundational importance of the Regulative Principle of worship, a wholehearted repentance for neglecting Biblical doctrine and praxis, and a return to Biblical and Spirit-empowered evangelism and preaching, both outside of and within the context of the instituted worship of the church, could be, in the hands of the sovereign God, the instrumentality for glorious and widespread true revival.

Furthermore, learn from Evan Roberts's destruction of true revival the fallacy of his practice of only preaching on God's love. Reject this practice of Roberts, and instead preach boldly, pointedly, and with uncompromising conviction on specific sins, on hell with its fire and brimstone, on the wrath of God, and on the absolute necessity of the propitiatory work of Christ and the new birth to escape everlasting torment, as well as on God's glorious love. If you truly love unconverted sinners, you will follow the practice of Christ and His Apostles in preaching the law and judgment as well as grace and love. It will not be easy to do so—if you preach so, you will need a true love for and trust in God, and a real love for the unconverted. Preaching that pricks and cuts men to the heart may, instead of seeing three thousand true conversions as did Peter (Acts 2), lead men to become so angry with you that they gnash on you with their teeth and seek to kill you, as they did Stephen (Acts 7), and as they sought to do to the Prophet of prophets and the perfect Pattern for all preachers, the Lord of love, Jesus Christ (Luke 4:29).

Consider also that marvels are no substitute for Spirit-empowered preaching of the entire Word. The visions and ecstasy of the Welsh holiness revival did not produce revival, but destroyed it. It certainly is possible that searching preaching is used by the Holy Ghost to bring people under such tremendous conviction of sin that powerful emotional responses follow. However, the preacher must never aim only for emotional response, nor must such responses be allowed to overturn the apostolic command that all things be done "decently and in order" (1 Corinthians 14:40). Furthermore, someone who is truly filled with the Spirit will not see visions, pretend to the gift of prophecy, or adopt other continuationist errors. Rather, he will manifest the fruit of the Spirit in a Christ-like life and in great progress in that true Christian sanctification that is impossible without the supernatural efficacy of the Spirit of God.

Consider also the great importance of following Scripture alone in successfully resisting the devil and causing him to flee. Literal exegesis of the Bible will teach you all you need to know to overcome the wicked one, and its teachings are not to be changed in the least degree because of someone's testimony to victory over Satan or experiences fighting demons. Your sufficient offensive weapon in your spiritual armor is the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God (Ephesians 6:10-18); no uninspired book is necessary for successful wrestling with Satanic principalities and powers. With a grasp of God's Word, apart from any uninspired book on demonology, you can say with first century Christians, "we are not ignorant of [Satan's] devices" (2 Corinthians 2:11). Indeed, you should recognize that a frightful proportion of modern literature on demonology is not an exposition of Biblical teaching on withstanding demons, but has actually come from the devils themselves through extra-Biblical revelations or experiences where devils deluded people into thinking that they were gaining the victory over the powers of darkness while they were, in truth, falling to the cunning trickery of the devil. Lucifer and his fallen angels are too smart, and too powerful, for you to figure out on your own how to fight them and win. Only in the strength and with the guidance of Jehovah, wearing the whole armor He has provided His saints, can you successfully withstand demonic wiles. The battle-plan for victory is plainly set forth in the pages of His infallible Word—nowhere else.

Since Scripture is sufficient for successful Christian resistance of Satan, accept the truths of Biblical demonology. Find the passages that speak of Satan or of demons in a concordance and study them in their context so that you can know how to successfully resist the wicked one. Spend your time studying God's Word on how to deal with devils, rather than wasting your time and filling your mind with error by reading continuationist and experience-based demonology. The Scripture will lead you to truths such as the following. You should examine yourself to be sure you are in the faith (2 Corinthians 13:5), for if you have not been converted, you are still in Satan's kingdom, not God's, and are under the power of the devil, not under the protective power of Jesus Christ (Ephesians 2:1-9). You must submit to God and resist the devil, and he will flee from you (James 4:7). Be sober and vigilant in your resistance, and resist in faith (1 Peter 5:8-9), for through faith and God's enabling grace, not through your own self-dependent might, you will defeat his temptations (Ephesians 6:16). Use the Word in your resistance (Matthew 4; Ephesians 6:17). Pray regularly for deliverance from temptation and the tempter (Matthew 6:13); watch and pray constantly (Ephesians 6:18), guard yourself (1 John 5:18), and fill yourself up with the evil of sin, the love of Christ, and the mercies of God to you, so that temptations lose their power (2 Corinthians 5:14; Genesis 39:9).

Serve God in an assembly that both faithfully practices church discipline and lovingly restores disciplined members who repent (1 Corinthians 5; 2 Corinthians 2). Rejoice that Jesus Christ, your High Priest, effectually prays that you will be kept from evil and the evil one (John 17:15). Do not give an occasion, scope, or place for the devil to be active and tempt you by nursing sinful anger or other sins (Ephesians 4:26-27). Be honest and obey the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:3). If you are married, regularly render to your spouse due physical benevolence (1 Corinthians 7:3-5). Forgive (2 Corinthians 4:10-11). Take to yourself righteousness and truth, fill yourself up with the knowledge of an assured salvation, and be devoted to proclaiming the gospel (Ephesians 6:10-18). Walk closely with God. Oh for greater fellowship with Him! And consider how spiritually refreshing, straight-forward, practical, and easily understood are Biblical instructions for dealing with demons. What a blessed contrast they form with the strange, obscure, and spiritually oppressive practices contended for in *War on the Saints!* Rejoice that by practicing what God has revealed about resisting the devil, you will be successful, for the Lord has not revealed the truth to His beloved people in vain.

Since Scripture is sufficient for Christian resistance to Satan, do not adopt unbiblical ideas of the sort that fill books such as *War on the Saints* and the many later handbooks on demonology that rely on extra-biblical ideas and revelations, and flee in horror from all misinterpretations of Scripture. Do not try to bind Satan, and do not pray that Satan will be bound in this age. He will not be bound until the Millennium. If you pray that an entire country or region of the world will be freed from Satanic influence because of an alleged binding, you are self-deceived, for it is not God's will that wicked people who reject the gospel and hate Him will be free from demonic control—Satan's rule over them is a righteous judgment from He who is truly Sovereign over all nations. Only at the point of the new birth are any truly delivered from the power of darkness, for then, and only then, are they transferred into the kingdom of God's dear Son (Colossians 1:13); indeed, Scripture is so far from indicating that an entire country or region of unconverted people can be free from Satan's control that it records an inspired prayer, which is to be sung by the people of God (Ephesians 5:19) and which indicates the will of God, that Satan be at the right hand of the wicked (Psalm 109:6). Do not rail on or rebuke the devil—if even Michael the Archangel did not (Jude 9), why should you? Do not seek for a post-conversion Spirit baptism that will give you special powers against the forces of darkness—Spirit baptism was a completed historical event that took place in the first century and is not going to happen again in the church age. Do not think that the devil has the ability to make you sin—your flesh is sufficient for that, and all your sins are your own fault, not the devil's. If you are a child of God, reject the idea that the devil

has the ability to inject thoughts into your head—the Bible only indicates that demons have such abilities with the unregenerate. We cannot know exactly what powers demons can exert externally upon saints, by God's permission—and we do not need to know, because Scripture does not declare it—but we can surmise that if parents of ordinary intelligence can become very familiar with their children and know them very well without direct access to their minds, extremely intelligent fallen angels can watch and know with a high degree of accuracy what mortal men are thinking without direct access to their minds. Nevertheless, they do not have the knowledge and the ability to exert internal power upon the people of God that is possessed by the Almighty and all-knowing Father of the children of God. Throw away books by continuationists that corrupt the teaching of the Bible on demonology by examining the subject based on experience-based hermeneutics or that in any other way deny *sola Scriptura* in practice. Do not adopt any ideas about Satan or the occult from any sources other than the Bible. Satan appears like an angel of light, not like a red creature with horns and a red forked tail, and witches do not fly around on brooms. For that matter, no angels in Scripture look like cute, baby-faced creatures—they all looked like men. The only possible exception is certain demonic creatures that have the faces of men and the hair of women (Revelation 9:7-8). Nor do angels have a pair of wings coming out of their back; only the cherubim and seraphim have wings. Do not seek for signs and wonders after the fashion of an evil and adulterous generation (Matthew 12:39). Do not practice charismatic "warfare prayer" or "territorial mapping." Do not follow Jessie Penn-Lewis and Pentecostalism in attempting to use "throne power" to defeat Satan in prayer, but follow Jesus Christ and pray the way He told you to pray (Matthew 6:9-13). If, out of the many hundreds of prayers recorded in Scripture, not even one example of the sort of prayer you wish to engage in can be found, your type of prayer cannot possibly be key to spiritual victory, to defeating Satan, or to any other Christian goal whatsoever. The devil has sowed vast amounts of confusion concerning his character and workings, and the only way you can be free from the lies he has filled the world with, and filled largely unregenerate Christendom with, is by careful study of and submission to the sole authority of the Word of God. You cannot successfully resist the devil without the power of God, but you will not have His power if you are employing your own devices rather than the means and methods of successful spiritual wrestling He has revealed.

Do not pretend that you have the sign gift of exorcism. Do not go around trying to cast out demons as if you were an Apostle. God did not record any procedure for normal Christians to practice exorcism in the New Testament epistles because the Lord's people and churches were not to practice this sign gift. If an unconverted person appears to be

possessed, you should pray and fast (Matthew 17:21), and preach the gospel to him so that he can be regenerated and freed from the control of the devil (Ephesians 2:1-4). Reject the idea that a regenerate person can be possessed—the temple of the Holy Spirit cannot be the dwelling place of devils, so the saints of God cannot be demon possessed, although they must certainly resist the devil and his temptations, looking to Christ in faith. Trying to do what the Lord Jesus did in validating His Messiahship by exorcising demons will lead you to give place to the devil in a terrible way. You should have no communication with demons whatsoever—only the Almighty and omniscient God (Job 1:8; Mark 5:9), or the head of the host of good angels, Michael the Archangel (Jude 9), is ever recorded as speaking to or conversing with Satan or devils in Scripture—no godly man is ever recorded as doing so. If not even the Apostles, who had the sign gift of exorcism, conversed with demons, how much the less should you? Indeed, even the Lord Jesus only spoke to demons in Scripture on very rare occasions and for very special purposes—the large majority of the time He "suffered not the devils to speak" (Mark 1:34), using His Divine power to force them to be silent and stop speaking (Mark 1:25; 3:11-12; Luke 4:35, 41). Recognize that the conversations with demons Keswick continuationists, Pentecostals, and other modern miracle-mongers engage in during their exorcism sessions and reproduce in their periodicals and books are nothing other than disobedience to Scripture and awful occasions to be both personally deceived by fallen angels and to spread demonic lies under the guise of Christian truth through the printed page. The demons are smarter than you are. Every time you converse with them you will lose, for God has told you, "I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils" (1 Corinthians 10:20).

Beware of, avoid, and warn against "deliverance" ministries and modern exorcists. The techniques of Jessie Penn-Lewis, Evan Roberts, and Pentecostalism to deal with demons flourish in environments where the gospel is corrupted, as it was in the Quakerism of Mrs. Penn-Lewis, the Anglicanism of the Keswick Convention, and in other continuationist paedobaptist groups. When many professing Christians are unconverted and are consequently liable to being possessed by demons, and continuationism is adopted, exorcism ministries have room to flourish, while when people are truly converted, have the special protection Christ gives to the church He purchased with His own blood, and in fellowship with Him and His faithful people, they will be able to discern and reject the unbiblical heresies that permeate modern continuationistic demonology. What is more, people who are demon possessed, and then are "delivered" through unbiblical techniques by false teachers, as the sons of the Pharisees cast out demons (Luke 11:19), are in extreme danger of falling into even

greater spiritual darkness, in accordance with the goals of the demons themselves. Such persons, even if the demons have decided to leave their bodies for a time to convince them to follow the religious delusions advocated by their wonder-working exorcist, will still be eternally damned unless they are born again—yet the supernatural wonder that they themselves have experienced is a tremendous roadblock to their coming to the knowledge of the truth and being truly converted. Truly, Satan has laid his deceit very deep, and the unraveling of his wiles and deliverance from his power is a work far above the strength of mere mortal men. Nevertheless, the believer has no grounds for despair; with the God of Jacob as his refuge, victory over the forces of hell is indubitably obtainable: "With men *it is* impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible" (Mark 10:27).

Rejoice in true worship in the house of God—the holy angels rejoice in it (1 Corinthians 11:10). Recognize the glorious promise that the gates of hell cannot prevail against the church (Matthew 16:18). Christ exercises a special care over the members of His assemblies and over His congregations, protecting them from enemies as a man cares for and protects his bride. The church is Christ's holy temple, but being removed from His house is being delivered to Satan (1 Corinthians 5:4-5). Special protection from the powers of the wicked one is therefore found in the assemblies of the saints that Christ started in the first century, and which have existed to this present time under many names, but are now found among historic Baptist churches. Godly worship and praise brings the special presence of Jehovah (cf. 2 Chronicles 5:13-14), and godly music makes evil spirits depart (1 Samuel 16:23). Let such worship, and such music, be found in your church and in your home. God's saints should sing His inspired psalms, and uninspired hymns should be patterned after the Biblical content found in the psalter, as they regularly were in the age of hymnists from Faucett to Doddridge to Toplady. They should hold fast to the Regulative Principle of worship as the sole solid defense against the introduction of humanly or demonically designed corruptions in worship. On the other hand, false religious organizations are Satan's hunting-ground (Revelation 18:2). God is not the source of all religious experience. The worship of all pagan and non-Christian religions is the realm of the devil (1 Corinthians 10:20). The gatherings of the church of Rome are filled with demons, demons that work through the idols, demons that work supernaturally to bring the unregenerate into ever greater darkness as bread is allegedly transubstantiated over altars that have occult relics of "saints" in them, demons that rejoice in their extrabiblical festival days, demons that are attracted to their unholy and Spirit-quenching liturgy, and all sorts of other demons. Assemblies of Protestant religious organizations that preach a corrupt gospel are likewise places where demons

and demonic influence abounds. When charismatics turn off their minds and engage in ecstatic religious phenomena, they are often having a genuinely supernatural experience, but one that shares its source with that of the ecstatic worship of demonized idolaters in first century Corinth (1 Corinthians 12:2).[3407] When neo-evangelicals bring rock music

---

[3407] Commenting on the cessation of miraculous gifts, the fact that the Biblical sign gift of tongues was an ability to speak in real, known, earthly languages, and on the contrast between mindless and out-of-control pagan and demonic ecstasy and the use of the mind and in-control state involved in Biblical prophecy, the patristic writer Chrysostom noted:

> This whole place [1 Corinthians 12-14 and its discussion of the sign gifts] is very obscure: but the obscurity is produced by our ignorance of the facts referred to and by their cessation, being such as then used to occur but now no longer take place. . . . [F]or the present let us state what things were occurring then. . . . [People] spake with tongues and not with tongues only, but many also prophesied, and some also performed many other wonderful works. . . . And one straightway spake in the Persian, another in the Roman, another in the Indian, another in some other such tongue: and this made manifest to them that were without that it is the Spirit in the very person speaking. Wherefore also he so calls it, saying, "But to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given to profit withal;" (v. 7) calling the gifts "a manifestation of the Spirit." For as the Apostles themselves had received this sign first, so also the faithful went on receiving it, I mean, the gift of tongues; yet not this only but also many others: inasmuch as many used even to raise the dead and to cast out devils and to perform many other such wonders: and they had gifts too, some less, and some more. But more abundant than all was the gift of tongues among them: and this became to them a cause of division; not from its own nature but from the perverseness of them that had received it: in that on the one hand the possessors of the greater gifts were lifted up against them that had the lesser: and these again were grieved, and envied the owners of the greater. . . . And this was not the only thing to disturb them, but there were also in the place many soothsayers, inasmuch as the city was more than usually addicted to Grecian customs, and this with the rest was tending to offence and disturbance among them. This is the reason why he begins by first stating the difference between soothsaying and prophecy. For this cause also they received discerning of spirits, so as to discern and know which is he that speaketh by a pure spirit, and which by an impure.
>
> For because it was not possible to supply the evidence of the things uttered from within themselves at the moment; (for prophecy supplies the proof of its own truth not at the time when it is spoken, but at the time of the event;) and it was not easy to distinguish the true prophesier from the pretender; (for the devil himself, accursed as he is, had entered into them that prophesied, [See 1 Kings 22:23.] bringing in false prophets, as if forsooth they also could foretell things to come;) and further, men were easily deceived, because the things spoken could not for the present be brought to trial, ere yet the events had come to pass concerning which the prophecy was; (for it was the end that proved the false prophet and the true:)—in order that the hearers might not be deceived before the end, he gives them a sign which even before the event served to indicate the one and the other. And hence taking his order and beginning, he thus goes on also to the discourse concerning the gifts and corrects the contentiousness that arose from hence likewise. For the present however he begins the discourse concerning the soothsayers, thus saying,
>
> [2.] "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant;" calling the signs "spiritual," because they are the works of the Spirit alone, human effort contributing nothing to the working such wonders. And intending to discourse concerning them, first, as I said, he lays down the difference between soothsaying and prophecy, thus saying,
>
> "Ye know that when ye were Gentiles, ye were led away [ἀπαγόμενοι, properly "dragged to prison or execution."] unto those dumb idols, howsoever ye might be led." Now what he means is this: "In the idol-temples," saith he, "if any were at any time possessed by an unclean spirit and began to divine, even as one dragged away, so was he drawn by that spirit in chains: knowing nothing of the things which he utters. For this is peculiar to the soothsayer, to be beside himself, to be under compulsion, to be pushed, to be dragged, to be haled as a madman. But the prophet not so, but with sober mind and composed temper and knowing what he is saying, he uttereth all things. Therefore even before the event do thou from this distinguish the soothsayer and the prophet. And consider how he frees his discourse of all suspicion; calling themselves to witness who had made trial of the matter. As if he had said, "that I lie not nor rashly traduce the religion of the Gentiles, feigning like an enemy, do ye yourselves bear me witness: knowing as ye do, when ye were Gentiles, how ye were pulled and dragged away then."
>
> But if any should say that these too are suspected as believers, come, even from them that are without will I make this manifest to you. Hear, for example, Plato saying thus: (*Apol. Soc*. c. 7.) "Even as they who deliver oracles and the soothsayers say many and excellent things, but know nothing of what they utter." Hear again another, a poet, giving the same intimation. For whereas by certain mystical rites and witchcrafts

or the rock beat into their assemblies, they are bringing in music that attracts demons, rather than leading them to leave.[3408] Do you, then, wish to avoid the presence of devils?

---

a certain person had imprisoned a demon in a man, and the man divined, and in his divination was thrown down and torn, and was unable to endure the violence of the demon, but was on the point of perishing in that convulsion; he saith to the persons who were practicing such mystical arts [These verses are taken from an old Oracle, quoted among others by Porphyry in a Treatise *of the Philosophy of Oracles*, and from him again by Theodoret, on *the Remedies for Gentile Errors*, Disp. x. t. iv. p. 957.],

Loose me, I pray you:
The mighty God no longer mortal flesh
Can hold.

And again,

Unbind my wreaths, and bathe my feet in drops
From the pure stream; erase these mystic lines,
And let me go. [Porphyry's note on this verse, as quoted by Hales from Eusebius (Evang. Præp. v.) in Savile's Chrysostom, viii. pt. ii. p. 278, is as follows: "You see, he bids them erase the lines that he may depart: as though these detained him, and not only these, but the other things too about their apparel: because they wore certain portraitures of the deities who were invoked."]

For these and such like things, (for one might mention many more,) point out to us both of these facts which follow; the compulsion which holds down the demons and makes them slaves; and the violence to which they submit who have once given themselves up to them, so as to swerve even from their natural reason. And the Pythoness too [See Strabo, ix. 5.]: (for I am compelled now to bring forward and expose another disgraceful custom of theirs, which it were well to pass by, because it is unseemly for us to mention such things; but that you may more clearly know their shame it is necessary to mention it, that hence at least ye may come to know the madness and exceeding mockery of those that make use of the soothsayers:) this same Pythoness then is said, being a female, to sit at times upon the tripod of Apollo astride, and thus the evil spirit ascending from beneath and entering the lower part of her body, fills the woman with madness, and she with disheveled hair begins to play the bacchanal and to foam at the mouth, and thus being in a frenzy to utter the words of her madness. I know that you are ashamed and blush when you hear these things: but they glory both in the disgrace and in the madness which I have described. These then and all such things Paul was bringing forward when he said, "Ye know that when ye were Gentiles, ye were led away unto those dumb idols, howsoever ye might be led."

And because he was discoursing with those who knew well, he states not all things with exact care, not wishing to be troublesome to them, but having reminded them only and brought all into their recollection, he soon quits the point, hastening to the subject before him.

But what is, "unto those dumb idols?" These soothsayers used to be led and dragged unto them.

But if they be themselves dumb, how did they give responses to others? And wherefore did the demon lead them to the images? As men taken in war, and in chains, and rendering at the same time his deceit plausible. Thus, to keep men from the notion that it was just a dumb stone, they were earnest to rivet the people to the idols that their own style and title might be inscribed upon them. But our rites are not such. He did not however state ours, I mean the prophesyings. For it was well known to them all, and prophecy was exercised among them, as was meet for their condition, with understanding and with entire freedom. Therefore, you see, they had power either to speak or to refrain from speaking. For they were not bound by necessity, but were honored with a privilege. For this cause Jonah fled; (Jonah. 1:3) for this cause Ezekiel delayed; (Ezek. 3:15) for this cause Jeremiah excused himself. (Jer. 1:6) And God thrusts them not on by compulsion, but advising, exhorting, threatening; not darkening their mind; for to cause distraction and madness and great darkness, is the proper work of a demon: but it is God's work to illuminate and with consideration to teach things needful. . . . This then is the first difference between a soothsayer and a prophet[.] (John Chrysostom, *Homily 29*, on 1 Corinthians 12:1-2, pgs. 168-170 in *Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the First Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* John Chrysostom, trans. H. K. Cornish, J. Medley & T. B. Chambers, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series, Volume XII: Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, ed. Philip Schaff. Reproducing this quotation is by no means an endorsement of Chrysostom's doctrine of baptismal regeneration or his other errors.)

3408 This fact is recognized by the rock performers themselves; e. g.: "Rock 'n' Roll . . . is . . . demonic. . . . A lot of the beats in music today are taken from voodoo, from the voodoo drums. If you study music in rhythms, like I have, you'll see that is true . . . I believe that kind of music is driving people from Christ. It is contagious" (Little Richard). "[T]he sudden mingling of so many different tribes produced new

Unite yourself to and worship faithfully in a historic Baptist church that cleaves to and contends for Biblical worship, including an uncompromised stand for traditional, classical-styled music that follows Biblical principles. Such a church can assault the gates of hell in the strength of Jesus Christ. Flee all other religious organizations—unholy angels, rather than holy ones, gather in them.

Remember that the church is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Timothy 3:15)—the church, the local, visible, Baptist congregation, is the place of God's special presence, His special protection from Satan and his kingdom, and His promises of perpetuity and blessing until the return of Jesus Christ (Matthew 16:18). No promises of Christ's special presence or protection are made to the mythical universal, invisible church, Para church institutions, human denominations, or inter-denominational movements such as evangelicalism. Do you claim to be a fundamentalist? If, by this term, you mean that you seek to militantly defend all the truths of the Christian faith, and militantly stand against and separate from all error, well and good—you will then, if your confession is true, be a servant of Christ in a historic Baptist church. Do you think that such a line is too strict, for "historic fundamentalism" was a parachurch movement that only recognized a handful of "fundamentals" that were worthy of separation? If that is truly "historic fundamentalism," then you should reject such fundamentalism for the God-honoring true separatism only possible within a Biblical Baptist church that is unaffiliated with denominationalism, associationism, and all other humanly devised denominational structures. However, you should also consider that there never was a unified "historic fundamentalism." *The Fundamentals*, for example, printed an essay by George Sales Bishop, who believed in the dictation of the *autographa* and its perfect preservation—including the perfect preservation of not the Hebrew consonants alone, but also the vowels that were originally given by inspiration—in the *Textus Receptus*.[3409] Yet *The*

---

variations [of music] like candomble, santeria, and vodun [demonic religion] . . . and out of this severing came jazz, the blues, the backbeat, rhythm and blues, and rock and roll—some of the most powerful rhythms on the planet. . . . It is hard to pinpoint the exact moment when I awoke to the fact that my tradition—rock and roll—did have a spirit side, that there was a branch of the family that had maintained the ancient connection between the drum and the gods [demons]" (Mickey Hart, drummer for *The Grateful Dead)*. See "The Character of Rock and Roll Music," "Is There a Connection Between Rock Music and Voodoo or African Paganism?" and related articles on music in the *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library,* ed. David Cloud. London, Ontario: Bethel Baptist Church/Way of Life Literature, 2003.

[3409] See the "Inspiration of the Hebrew Letters and Vowel Points," pgs. 43-59 of *The Doctrines of Grace and Kindred Themes,* George Sayles Bishop (New York, NY: Gospel Publishing House, 1919; note as well his "Relative Value of the Old Testament" (pgs. 88-100) and "The Testimony of Scripture To Itself," pgs. 19-42). The KJV-only, Landmark Baptist periodical *The Plains Baptist Challenger,* a ministry of Tabernacle Baptist Church of Lubbock, TX, on pgs. 3-8 of its July 1991 edition, reprinted George Sayles Bishop's defense, based on Matthew 5:18, of the coevality of the vowel points and the consonants. Bishop was a contributor to the epoch-making volumes *The Fundamentals* ("The Testimony of the Scriptures to

Fundamentals also reprinted articles by Edwin J. Orr, who "was unconcerned to defend a literal interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis, and [who] took the view that an insistence on biblical inerrancy was actually 'suicidal.'"[3410] So who represents "historic fundamentalism"—Bishop or Orr? Does "historic fundamentalism" defend an inerrant *autographa*, an inerrant *autographa* that is perfectly preserved in the Received Texts of Scripture, or errant autographs and apographs? Indeed, while cessationists are amply represented in early fundamentalism, the writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis appear also in *The Fundamentals*[3411]—so does "historic fundamentalism" follow Scriptural cessationism and the sole authority of Scripture, or Mrs. Penn-Lewis's fanaticism, radical demonology, Quakerism, date-setting for Christ's return, and allegedly "inspired" extra-Biblical writings—one of which is condensed in *The Fundamentals*? A unified "historic fundamentalism" is a chimera, and even if it had existed, it would possess no independent authority—the Christian's sole authority is the Bible alone, and the Bible teaches that every religious organization on earth in this dispensation, if it wants to have the special presence of Jesus Christ, must be under the authority of one of His churches. Fundamentalist parachurch institutions are not churches. Do you value the Lord's church in the way that One does who bought her with His blood (Ephesians 5:25)?[3412] If you do

---

Themselves," pgs. 80-97, vol. 2, *The Fundamentals,* eds. R. A. Torrey, A. C. Dixon, etc., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1970, reprint of the original 1917 ed. of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles), writing: "We take the ground that on the original parchment . . . every sentence, word, line, mark, point, pen-stroke, jot, tittle was put there by God" (pg. 92, *The Fundamentals,* vol. 2.).

[3410] Pg. 492, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, "Orr, James," ed. Timothy Larsen, referencing Orr's *Revelation and Inspiration* [1910], p. 198. See, e. g., "The Holy Scriptures and Modern Negations," "The Early Narratives of Genesis" (Chapters 5 & 11 *The Fundamentals*, ed. Torrey, vol. 1; Orr wrote other articles also).

[3411] Pgs. 183-199, Chapter 13, "Satan and his Kingdom," *The Fundamentals*, ed. Torrey, vol. 4. Her chapter is condensed from *The Warfare with Satan and the Way of Victory*.

[3412] Ephesians 5, and the rest of the book of Ephesians and the New Testament, refers to the church as a local, visible institution, not something universal and invisible. For example, consider Ephesians 5:23: "the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body" (ὅτι ὁ ἀνήρ ἐστι κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ αὐτός ἐστι σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος). In this verse, "the husband," "the wife," and "the church" are generic nouns. There is no universal husband or universal, invisible wife, and there is no universal, invisible church specified either. Each husband is the head of his own wife, and Christ is the head of each church (cf. pgs. 253-254, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace). Ephesians 5:23, and related texts such as Colossians 1:18, do not teach the doctrine of a universal, invisible church. They simply state that Christ is the head of the church generically, that is, of every particular local, visible church. Each particular church is identified as the body of Christ in Ephesians 5 (cf. 1 Corinthians 12:27, where the particular church at Corinth is called the body of Christ). The body metaphor emphasizes that each member of the assembly, as a different and important body part, needs to minister to the other members of his particular congregation in accordance with his God-given gifting, while each church has Christ as her head. "The husband is the head of the wife" hardly means that all the husbands in the world are one universal, invisible husband who is the head of one universal, invisible wife. "Where *is* the wise? where *is* the scribe? where *is* the disputer of this world?" (1 Corinthians 1:20, ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεύς; ποῦ συζητητὴς τοῦ

αἰῶνος τούτου;) hardly means that all the wise men in the world are one universal, invisible wise man, nor that there is one universal, invisible scribe or disputer. No more does "Christ is the head of the church" affirm that Christ is the head of a universal, invisible church; the text teaches that Christ is the head of each particular church, just as the particular husband is the head of his particular wife.

A comparison of Ephesians 5:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:3 is instructive:

> Ephesians 5:23: ὅτι **ὁ ἀνήρ ἐστι κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός**, ὡς καὶ **ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας**, καὶ αὐτός ἐστι σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. For **the husband is the head of the wife**, even as **Christ is the head of the church**: and he is the saviour of the body,
>
> 1Corinthians 11:3: θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι, ὅτι **παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστι· κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικός, ὁ ἀνήρ**· κεφαλὴ δὲ Χριστοῦ, ὁ Θεός. But I would have you know, that **the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman *is* the man**; and the head of Christ *is* God.

The singular nouns "the husband" "the wife" "the woman" "the man" imply nothing about a universal, invisible husband, wife, woman, or man. Absolutely nothing affirms the existence of a universal church in the phrase "Christ is the head of the church." The Lord Jesus is the head of every particular local, visible congregation.

Compare also the evidence in the LXX:

> καὶ ἔγραψεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς βιβλίον δεύτερον λέγων εἰ ἐμοὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ὑμεῖς εἰσακούετε λάβετε **τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνδρῶν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν** καὶ ἐνέγκατε πρός με ὡς ἡ ὥρα αὔριον εἰς Ιεζραελ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἦσαν ἑβδομήκοντα ἄνδρες οὗτοι ἀδροὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐξέτρεφον αὐτούς And Ju wrote them a second letter, saying, If ye *are* for me, and hearken to my voice, **take the heads [**Gk. singular, "head"] **of the men your master's sons**, and bring *them* to me at this time to-morrow in Jezrael. Now the sons of the king were seventy men; these great men of the city brought them up. (2 Kings 10:6; Brenton's LXX translation—also below).

Nothing at all is implied about anything universal or invisible with the singular. Each son had his own particular head (until he lost it!). "The head of the sons" is teaches nothing other than that each son had his own head. So "Christ is the head of the church" teaches that Christ is the head of each particular church. Compare 2 Kings 10: 8, where the plural is used:

> καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν λέγων ἤνεγκαν **τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ βασιλέως** καὶ εἶπεν θέτε αὐτὰς βουνοὺς δύο παρὰ τὴν θύραν τῆς πύλης εἰς πρωί. And a messenger came and told *him*, saying, They have brought **the heads of the king's sons**. And he said, Lay them *in* two heaps by the door of the gate until the morning.

Note also Psalm 139:10, LXX (Eng. 140:9):

> **ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ κυκλώματος** αὐτῶν κόπος τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν καλύψει αὐτούς. *As for* **the head of them that compass me**, the mischief of their lips shall cover them.

Both the Greek translated "them that compass" and "the head" contain singular nouns, just as in "Christ is the head of the church." Each particular head of each particular enemy surrounding David would be judged.

Lamentations 2:15, LXX:

> ἐκρότησαν ἐπὶ σὲ χεῖρας πάντες οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ὁδόν **ἐσύρισαν καὶ ἐκίνησαν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν** ἐπὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Ιερουσαλημ ἥ αὕτη ἡ πόλις ἣν ἐροῦσιν στέφανος δόξης εὐφροσύνη πάσης τῆς γῆς. All that go by the way have clapped their hands at thee; **they have hissed and shaken their head** at the daughter of Jerusalem. Is this the city, they say, the crown of joy of all the earth?

Note that the plurality, the "all" shake the singular "head." There was no universal, invisible head or universal, invisible person opposing Jerusalem. Each person shook his own particular head at Jerusalem.

Ezekiel 1:22, LXX:

> καὶ **ὁμοίωμα ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῖς τῶν ζῴων** ὡσεὶ στερέωμα ὡς ὅρασις κρυστάλλου ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐπάνωθεν. And **the likeness over the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

"The head of the living creatures" meant that each particular living creature had its own particular head.

Ezekiel 10:1, LXX:

καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ ὑπὲρ **κεφαλῆς τῶν χερουβιν** ὡς λίθος σαπφείρου ὁμοίωμα θρόνου ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν. And the likeness over **the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

"The head of the living creatures," again, means each living creature had its own particular head.

This usage of the generic noun also finds clear support in extra-biblical literature. Consider the following examples:

Καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα τοῦ θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ἥκει πρὸς Βάλακον δεξαμένου δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκπρεπῶς ἠξίου προαχθεὶς ἐπί τι τῶν ὀρῶν σκέψασθαι πῶς τὸ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἔχοι στρατόπεδον Βάλακος δ᾽ αὐτὸς ἀφικνεῖται τὸν μάντιν σὺν βασιλικῇ θεραπείᾳ φιλοτίμως ἀγόμενος εἰς **ὄρος ὅπερ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν** ἔκειτο τοῦ στρατοπέδου σταδίους ἀπέχον ἑξήκοντα. When God had given him this charge, he came to Balak; and when the king had entertained him in a magnificent manner, he desired him to go to one of the mountains to take a view of the state of the camp of the Hebrews. Balak himself also came to the mountain, and brought the prophet along with him, with a royal attendance. **This mountain lay over their heads** [Gk. singular], and was distant sixty furlongs from the camp (Josephus, *Antiquities* 4:112 (4.6.4.112)

The singular mountain was over each person, each of whom had his own particular head.

καὶ **τῶν μὲν δύο τὴν κεφαλὴν χωροῦσαν μέχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ**, τοῦ δὲ χειραγωγουμένου ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὑπερβαίνουσαν τοὺς οὐρανούς. **[A]nd the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the two reaching to heaven**, but that of him who was led by them by the hand overpassing the heavens. (*Gospel of Peter* 10:40)

Each particular individual here had his own particular head.

ὥσπερ οὖν **κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον τοῦ ζῴου καὶ ἀνωτάτω μέρος ἐστί**, For as **the head is the principle and uppermost part of the animal**, (Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 1:71)

Each singular animal had its own singular head. There was no universal head of a universal, invisible animal.

θαυμάσια μὲν οὖν ταῦτα· θαυμασιώτατον δὲ καὶ τὸ τέλος τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὃ καθάπερ **ἐν τῷ ζῴῳ κεφαλὴ** τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐστίν. These things, therefore, are wonderful; and most wonderful of all is the end of his sacred writings, which is to the whole book of the law what **the head is to an animal**. (Philo, *On The Life of Moses* 2:290)

Likewise here, each animal had its own head.

ταῦτα δ᾽ ἀλληγορεῖται τροπικῶς ἐξενεχθέντα· καθάπερ γὰρ **ἐν ζῴῳ κεφαλὴ** μὲν πρῶτον καὶ ἄριστον, οὐρὰ δ᾽ ὕστατον καὶ φαυλότατον, οὐ μέρος συνεκπληροῦν τὸν τῶν μελῶν ἀριθμόν, ἀλλὰ σόβησις τῶν ἐπιποτωμένων, **τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κεφαλὴν μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ἔσεσθαί φησι τὸν σπουδαῖον εἴτε ἄνδρα εἴτε λαόν**, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἅπαντας οἷον μέρη σώματος ψυχούμενα ταῖς ἐν κεφαλῇ καὶ ὑπεράνω δυνάμεσιν. But all these statements are uttered in a metaphorical form, and contain an allegorical meaning. For **as** in **an animal the head** is the first and best part, and the tail the last and worst part, or rather no part at all, inasmuch as it does not complete the number of the limbs, being only a broom to sweep away what flies against it; so in the same manner what is said here is that **the virtuous man shall be the head of the human race whether he be a single man or a whole people**. And that all others, being as it were parts of the body, are only vivified by the powers existing in the head and superior portions of the body. (Philo, *On Rewards and Punishments* 125)

This very interesting reference by Philo shows that, as in a single animal there is a single head, so "the virtuous man," a generic noun, not one particular man named X, is "the head of the human race," and this is whether he "be a single man or the whole people." The others are as "parts of the body," are only "vivified" because of "the head" that is "the virtuous man." The parallel to Christ as the head of the church is very clear. Nobody would think of saying that there is literally one universal, invisible virtuous man, nor that there is one universal, invisible body of people, since Philo's point is that whether one speaks of a single man, or a group of any size, in both situations the [generic] virtuous man is the [generic] head.

Ephesians 5:23 is the capstone of the very small number of New Testament texts that advocates of a universal church believe provide support for their doctrine. However, the verse teaches nothing of the kind.

not, but are following some movement, whether evangelical, fundamental, or by any other name, your organization does not possess the promises Christ makes to His church alone. Beware lest Christ say to you, and to your organization, "cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" (Luke 13:7).

Furthermore, beware other settings that are naturally the haunts of Satan. If Paul warns about the places where idol worship takes place as the haunt of devils and a setting to avoid (1 Corinthians 10:14, 20), places that are haunts of devils today should be avoided also. Since idols are attractive to demons, do not bring any idols into your house, whether as symbols of foreign "culture," or mementos of past tourism, or for any other reason. If you have such objects in your house, whether of an openly pagan god or an allegedly Christian semi-deity such as the allegedly perpetual Virgin Mary, destroy such idols immediately. Destroy other demonic objects, such as Ouija boards, and abhor the symbols of idolatry, whether crucifixes or Christmas trees. Avoid the places where the medium and the psychic ply their trade. Do not seek to contact the dead. Do not let the practitioners of demonic and New Age alternative "medicine" deceive you, whether through the occult water of homeopathy, the traditional chiropractic of D. D. Palmer, or some other form of pagan energy medicine. Expect the modernist theological seminary, as a place of blasphemy against Jehovah, to be infested with demons. Assume that demons will delight themselves and congregate in the movie theater as its wide screens vomit forth violence, filthiness, occultism, and all kinds of ungodliness, just as they would at the rock concert or the bar. What concord is there between Christ and Belial?

Maintain a Biblical balance in recognizing the power of Satan. First, while recognizing the real power of the devil and the unquestionable spiritual danger he poses to you, do not deify him or treat him as if he were God—do not displease and dishonor the only God by treating his creature and angel, Lucifer, as if he truly were like the Most High. Satan is not omnipotent, omniscient, or omnipresent. His power is not equal to that of God—indeed, it is infinitely inferior to that of El Shaddai. While a very powerful creature, he is nonetheless a defeated and doomed foe. Remember that he is so. Second,

---

It simply affirms that Christ is the head of every particular church, just as each particular husband is the head of his particular wife. There are no verses in the Bible where the noun *ekklesia*, church/assembly/congregation, refers to all believers as an already existing group.

Advocates of the universal, invisible church must find one or more indisputably clear references where *ekklesia* does not specify a particular congregation and is not employed as a generic noun, or they cannot affirm that their doctrine is Biblical. Since they are the ones who are affirming that *ekklesia* assumes a sense it does not have in any pre-Christian literature, they bear the burden of proof in demonstrating that their doctrine is clearly in the New Testament. The attempt fails in Ephesians 5:23, and in every other text in the Scripture—consequently the New Testament does not teach the existence of a universal, invisible church.

do not react against the fanaticism of works such as *War on the Saints* by turning to a rationalism that denies or denigrates the reality of the demonic. Doubtless many pagan marvels are simple impostures with as much reality to them as the body of Mary Baker Eddy's Mind Cures or the fake healings of a Word of Faith wonder-peddler. However, in our Bibles we can hold infallible evidence in our hands that, although they cannot equal the miraculous power of the Almighty (Exodus 8:18-19; 9:11; Daniel 2:27-28), demons can perform real miracles (Revelation 16:14). Neither fear the devil as if he were God—reserve that reverential awe for your Creator and Redeemer alone—nor diminish the power of that roaring lion, who ferociously roams about seeking whom he may devour, as if he were a de-fanged and de-clawed pussycat.

V. A. B. Simpson

Albert B. Simpson (1843-1919), founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA) denomination, "an ecumenical and evangelical fellowship dedicated to promoting the deeper Christian life,"[3413] like so many other advocates of Keswick theology, believed that physical "healing [is] a great redemption right that we simply claim as our purchased inheritance through the blood of the cross,"[3414] just as, in the Keswick doctrine, the Higher spiritual Life is simply claimed by faith.[3415] He associated with Jessie Penn-Lewis, so that, for example, she preached at Simpson's Gospel Tabernacle in New York and addressed the students at the CMA Missionary Training Institute at Nyack, which was founded by Simpson.[3416] His fellowship with Mrs. Penn-Lewis led him to adopt many of her doctrinal positions, such as a favorable view of woman preachers[3417] and the view that believers could be possessed by demons—indeed, according to Simpson, everyone who does not enter into the Higher Life will be demon possessed: "the Devil

---

3413 Pg. 615, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen.

3414 Pg. 4, "Principles of Divine Healing," by A. B. Simpson, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*, ed. Stephen Adams & K. Neill Foster. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2000.

3415 The Alliance firmly maintained the Keswick teaching that sanctification is achieved by faith alone through a crisis experience and the corresponding Keswick de-emphasis upon progressive sanctification, preaching that "holiness does not come by growth . . . [it] implies a crisis . . . [and it] comes not by works but by faith" (pg. 371, *Alliance Weekly*, 72:24, June 12, 1937).

3416 Pg. 265, *A Believer With Authority*, King.

3417 "Simpson's conviction that God desired [t]o emphasize and utilize . . . the ministry of women . . . both in the home and foreign field[s] represented one of the driving motivations behind his initial call for . . . the Alliance . . . A large number of . . . early Alliance missionaries . . . were women . . . [including many who] were unmarried" (pgs. 188-189, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis).

will surely possess every heart that is not constantly yielded to God."[3418] Thus CMA was "[f]ounded by A. B. Simpson in 1887 as an . . . organization emphasizing missions, holiness, and healing."[3419] "Simpson is considered by modern church historians to be one of the foremost leaders in the 'faith cure' movement, second only to Dr. Charles Cullis."[3420] Indeed, "Dr. Simpson was a disciple of Dr. Cullis."[3421] "There is a spiritual law of choosing, believing, abiding, and holding steady in our walk with God, which is essential to the working of the Holy Ghost either in our sanctification or healing,"[3422] he taught. Thus, we "may expect to be 'in health' and prosper 'even as our soul prospereth.'"[3423] "Simpson . . . in pre-Pentecostal days encouraged restoration of the supernatural gifts probably more than any other of his time"[3424]—he was a clear precursor of the charismatic movement. Indeed, shortly before engineering the outbreak of tongues, Pentecostal founder Charles Parham visited Simpson's Bible Institute in Nyack.[3425] In light of Simpson's commanding influence as the CMA's first director, and his passionate advocacy of Keswick and Faith Cure theology, the Higher Life for the soul and for the body, it is not surprising that the "single most significant influence from the Keswick world which came upon the embryonic pentecostal revival was that of the Christian and Missionary Alliance."[3426] Writing against cessationism in 1888, before the origin of the modern Pentecostal movement yet in preparation for it, and commenting on Mark 16:17-19, Simpson wrote:

> A common objection is urged in this way: Christ's last promise in Mark embraces much more than healing; but if you claim one, you must claim all. If you expect the healing of the sick, you must also include the gift of tongues and the power to overcome malignant poisons; and if the gift of

---

[3418] Pg. 117, "The Gospel of Healing: Divine Healing and Demonism Not Identical," A. B. Simpson. *Word, Work, and World*, 114-122.

[3419] Pg. 2, *A Believer With Authority*, Paul L. King. The founding officers of the CMA are listed on pg. 188, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis.

[3420] "A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement," Paul King, *Alliance Academic Review*, ed. Elio Cuccaro. (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1996). Elec. acc. http://allianceacademicreview.com. See also pg. 128, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

[3421] Pg. 19, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham; pg. 127, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

[3422] Pg. 318, *Days of Heaven Upon Earth: A Year Book of Scripture Texts and Living Truths*, A. B. Simpson. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1897. Entry for November 8.

[3423] Chapters 2, 4, *The Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson. 3 John 2 is not a promise that one will be physically healthy in direct proportion to one's spiritual health.

[3424] Pg. 79, *Only Believe*, Paul L. King. "[W]hen Pentecostalism did emerge, some observers thought it a split within the Christian and Missionary Alliance" (pg. 176, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

[3425] Pg. 50, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. Agnes N. Ozman, the first person who spoke in tongues under Parham's leadership, had also attended Simpson's Nyack institute (pg. 51, *ibid*).

[3426] Pgs. 87-88, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

> tongues has ceased, so in the same way has the power over disease. We cheerfully accept the severe logic, we cannot afford to give up one of the promises. We admit our belief in the presence of the Healer in all the charismata of the Pentecostal Church. We see no reason why an humble servant of Christ, engaged in the Master's work, may not claim in simple faith the power to resist malaria and other poisons and malignant dangers; and we believe the gift of tongues . . . will be repeated as soon as the Church will humbly claim it for the universal diffusion of the Gospel. Indeed, instances are not wanting now of its apparent restoration in missionary labors, both in India and Africa.[3427]

Contemporary believers were receiving "inward visions and revelations" and new "messsage[s],"[3428] Simpson knew, and tongues were sure to come: "We are to witness before the Lord's return real missionary 'tongues' like those of Pentecost, through which the heathen world shall hear in their own language 'the wonderful works of God,' and this perhaps on a scale of whose vastness we have scarcely dreamed."[3429] "Feeling increasingly dissatisfied with his own spiritual life, Simpson was drawn to the teachings of the holiness movement. After reading William Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, he underwent a powerful experience, which he regarded as one of sanctification. . . . [Then,] Simpson, [who] never possessed of a sturdy constitution, experienced healing and soon became one of the leading exponents of the divine healing movement."[3430] Based on the eisegesis of Scripture, Simpson avowed that Christians are healed by "receiving the personal life of Christ to be in [them] as the supernatural strength of [their] body, and the supply of [their] life."[3431] Indeed, Simpson wrote: "There is no need that we should die of disease."[3432] Simpson, in addition to promulgating his healing doctrine in books such as *The Gospel of Healing* and *Lord for the Body*, established a healing center[3433] for those who were healed but still needed to recover from their sicknesses, following the pattern of William Boardman, the earlier Higher Life agitator and major Keswick precursor. Simpson, therefore, naturally followed the pattern set by Boardman in establishing a Faith-Cure home, Berachah,[3434] in New York. Simpson wrote: "[In] the

---

3427 Chapter 3, *The Gospel of Healing*, Simpson. Orig. pub. 1888.

3428 6:374-375, *Christ in the Bible Commentary* (1992), A. B. Simpson.

3429 Pg. 66, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. As evidenced by Bartleman, early Pentecostals loved to quote statements such as this one by Simpson to show their continuity with him.

3430 Pg. 615, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen.

3431 *Triumphs of Faith,* A. B. Simpson, November 1922, 252, **cited pg. 298 of *Only Believe;* verify quote.**

3432 *The Lord for the Body, With Questions and Answers on Divine Healing*, A. B. Simpson. New York, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1925. Compare the early Pentecostal position: "We do not need to die of disease or sickness" (pg. 3, *The Apostolic Faith* I:5 (Los Angeles, January 1907), reprinted on pg. 19, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

3433 Pg. 12, *Only Believe*, Paul L. King.

3434 "Faith Cure and Healing Homes List," http://healingandrevival.com/Faith%20Homes.htm.

resurrection of our Lord . . . the gospel of healing finds the fountain of its deepest life. . . . Not for Himself alone did Jesus receive the power of an endless life. He received it as our life. . . . This is the great, vital, precious principle of physical healing in the name of Jesus."[3435] Healing is guaranteed for believers:

> The Word of God is for evermore the standard of [God's] will, and that Word has declared immutably that it is God's greatest desire and unalterable principle of action and will to render to every man according as he will believe, and especially to save all who will receive Christ by faith, and to heal all who will receive healing by similar faith. No one thinks of asking for forgiveness "if the Lord will." Nor should we throw any stronger doubt on His promise of physical redemption.[3436]

After all, "if God had wanted to guard us against the fanaticism of divine healing," Scripture would have made it evident that the Faith Cure was false, which, Simpson averred, was not the case—on the contrary, "God's Word does . . . not . . . prescribe . . . medicine . . . [or any other] human remedies."[3437]

Furthermore, there was no need to fear that one will not be able to exercise faith for a miraculous healing, since Christ actually believes for the believer,[3438] just as Christ lives the believer's spiritual and physical life for him. It is necessary to take Christ's body for healing, just as it is necessary to take His holiness for sanctification—one who,

---

[3435] Pgs. 4-5, "Principles of Divine Healing," by A. B. Simpson, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*, ed. Stephen Adams & K. Neill Foster. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2000.

[3436] Chapter 2, *The Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson. Likewise, Pentecostalism affirms: "We ought to claim perfect health through the atonement of Jesus" (pg. 3, *The Apostolic Faith* I:11 (Los Angeles, October-January 1908), reprinted on pg. 47, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

[3437] Pg. 340, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work and World*, December 1886. Compare the early Pentecostal teachings: "Do you teach that it is wrong to take medicine? Yes, for saints to take medicine. Medicine is for unbelievers" (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:11 (Los Angeles, January 1908), reprinted on pg. 45, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove). Consequently, "medicine" should be "thrown aside," for there is no "need to keep an old crutch or medicine bottle of any kind around after God heals you. Some, in keeping some such appliance as a souvenir, have been tempted to use them again and have lost their healing" (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:1 (Los Angeles, September 1906), reprinted on pg. 2, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove). "We do not need a doctor to help Christ heal His body" (pg. 6, *The Apostolic Faith* I:6 (Los Angeles, February-March 1907), reprinted on pg. 26, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove; cf. pg. 3, *The Apostolic Faith* I:7 (April 1907), reprinted on pg. 31, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

[3438] "We can take Christ for our faith as we took Him for our justification, for our victories over temptation, for our sanctification. We may thus sweetly rest in the assurance that our faith has not failed to meet the demands of the promise, for it has been Christ's own faith" (Chapter 2, *The Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson). See also pg. 342, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work and World*, December 1886.

recalling the prayer of the Apostle Paul recorded by inspiration in 2 Corinthians 7:9-11, consequently prayed for healing and "believed that I should be healed if it was His good pleasure" yet thought, "and if not, I am willing to have it otherwise," was not submitting to the Lord's sovereign good pleasure, but was engaged in "vexation and a mockery" of God.[3439] Galatians 2:20, after all, required both physical and spiritual healing. Simpson's healing doctrine, based on his view of Galatians 2:20, can be summarized as follows:

> [W]e . . . have Christ . . . in such a sense . . . that whatever Christ is becomes quite literally ours. Not only does Christ's righteousness become our righteousness, and Christ's holiness our holiness, and Christ's wisdom our wisdom, and Christ's strength our strength, but Christ's spirit becomes our spirit, Christ's mind our mind, Christ's body our body . . . having Christ, we have bodily wholeness, not merely freedom from disease, but perfect bodily wholeness—for is not Christ's body whole? . . . Christ [must be taken] for [the Christian's] mind, for his memory, for his will also; and . . . he therefore no longer makes mistakes, no longer forgets things, and no longer is irresolute or stubborn at the wrong places. "Christ in him" has become the real agent in all his mental and moral activities. Even his faith is not his own, but Christ's . . . [although] we must "take" Christ for all these things or else we do not get them, and . . . this "taking" is our own act, Christ becoming our life only subsequently and consequently to it. . . .You have to take His faith as well as His life and healing, and have simply to say, 'I live by the faith of the Son of God.' . . . It is simply Christ, Christ alone." Christ thus does our very believing for us, and we live not by faith in Him but by His faith in us. We have, indeed, "to take His faith," just as we have to take His life, and we do not quite understand what this "taking" is, if it is not already faith. As now, however, we take His faith and it becomes our faith, so we "take" His body and it becomes our body, and—as His body is now our body we are in a bodily sense, of course, whole. . . .You can "receive Christ" for your body's welfare as well as for your soul's; and when you do this, His body becomes your body. "His spirit is all that your spirit needs, and He just gives us Himself. His body possesses all that your body needs. He has a heart beating with the strength that your heart needs. He has organs and functions redundant with life, not for Himself but for humanity. He does not need strength for Himself. The energy which enabled Him to rise and ascend from the tomb, above all the forces of nature, was not for Himself. That marvelous body belongs to your body. You are a member of His body. Your heart has a right to draw from His heart all that it needs. Your physical life has a right to draw from His physical life its support and strength, and so it is not you, but it is just the precious life of the Son of God." "Will you take Him thus to-day?" . . . Simpson . . . therefore pleads. And he promises: "And then you will not be merely healed, but you will have a new life for all you need, a flood of life that will sweep disease away, and then remain a fountain of life for all your future need." . . . "Christ in you" . . . [is] for His bodily health too—and [one gets] not merely relief from suffering, not merely "simple healing," but Christ "so gave me Himself [when I took Him for this] that I lost the painful consciousness of physical organs." This is what "letting go and letting Christ" means, when it is taken "literally."[3440]

Further paralleling the Keswick message of sanctification, Simpson affirmed that "physical redemption . . . is only kept by constant abiding in Jesus and receiving from Him. It is not a permanent deposit but a constant dependence . . . and continues only

---

3439 Chapter 2, *The Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson.

3440 "The Victorious Life," Chapter 5 in *Perfectionism*, vol. 2, B. B. Warfield, summarizing Simpson's tract "Himself," an address delivered at Bethshan, London. The complete text of "Himself" may be accessed at http://www.biblebelievers.com/simpson-ab_himself.html.

while we dwell in Him."[3441] Thus, Simpson affirms that healing can be lost if one fails to abide—a doctrine contrary to all the examples of healing by the Lord Jesus and the Apostles, where no "relapses" took place, and all were healed, both unconverted and converted, and both strong believers and weak ones.

Contrary to the examples in Scripture, where healings were immediately perfect, Simpson also writes: "healing will often be gradual."[3442] Indeed, as Charles Cullis, Andrew Murray, and other Faith Cure leaders taught, in common with Mary Baker Eddy and the Mind Cure,[3443] one who is "healed" may still have symptoms of his disease—it may appear in every way like his disease is still present, just the same way that it was before being healed—but when such difficulties appear to be the case, one "must ignore all symptoms"[3444] and recognize that symptoms may be from Satan, for "he has power even to simulate all symptoms,"[3445] affirmations that parallel Word-Faith doctrine.[3446]

[3441] Pg. 6, "Principles of Divine Healing," by A. B. Simpson, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*, ed. Stephen Adams & K. Neill Foster. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2000. Compare the Pentecostal position that "we must abide in Christ for health" (pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:5 (Los Angeles, January 1907), reprinted on pg. 17, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove; cf. pg. 4, *The Apostolic Faith* I:12 (January 1908), reprinted on pg. 52, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

[3442] Pg. 11, "Principles of Divine Healing," by A. B. Simpson, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*, ed. Stephen Adams & K. Neill Foster. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2000.

[3443] "Be no more willing to suffer the illusion that you are sick, or that some disease is developing in the system, than you are to permit a sinful temptation . . . dispute the testimony of the senses with Divine Science. . . . Realize that the evidence of the senses is not to be accepted in the case of sickness, any more than it is in the case of sin" (pgs. 308, 322, *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*, Mary Baker Eddy. Bedford, MA: 1st ed. 1875).

[3444] Chapter 2, *The Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson. Compare the affirmations of Charles Cullis on pg. 90, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis, and the statements of Andrew Murray recorded on pgs. 339-345 of *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis.

[3445] Pg. 342, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work and World*, December 1886. Indeed, Simpson continued, Satan often and especially makes the symptoms of disease appear to one who has given testimony to being healed. The fact that symptoms of not being healed appear so frequently to those practicing Simpson's doctrine is not evidence that his "healings" are a fraud—rather, it is evidence that Satan is making one who is healed have all the symptoms of not being healed, so that the person feels and acts in every way just like someone who has not been healed, although, Simpson affirms, perfect healing has taken place.

[3446] In the words of Kenneth Copeland:

> Your body has symptoms of sickness; it is screaming with pain. . . . Your faith is looking beyond the symptoms in your body. Then you say . . . [']The Word says that I am healed. I say that I am healed. Sickness, I speak to you in the name of Jesus, and I command you to leave my body.' That did it. . . . [S]ymptoms . . . [will] not always . . . leave immediately . . . hold fast to this Word concerning healing, regardless of symptoms or pain[.] . . . You must believe that you are healed before you see the results in your body. . . . Confess with your mouth that it is yours, and by your actions show that it is yours. You must talk

Simpson makes a stirring exhortation to those who have been healed to ignore, not his doctrine as a failure, but the still present and unchanged symptoms of their diseases, based on the accepted presupposition of the Keswick doctrine of sanctification, through which one is perfect, but one's indwelling sin remains present and entirely unchanged:

> Do not look always for the immediate removal of the symptoms. Do not think of them. Simply ignore them and press forward, claiming the reality, at the back of and below all symptoms. Remember the health you have claimed is not your own natural strength, but the life of Jesus manifested in your mortal flesh, and therefore the old natural life may still be encompassed with many infirmities, but at the back of it, beside it, and over against it, is the all-sufficient life of Christ to sustain your body. "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." But "Christ is your life;" and the life you now live in the flesh you live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved you and gave Himself for you. Do not, then, wonder if nature still will often fail you. His healing is not nature, it is grace, it is Christ, it is the bodily life of the risen Lord. It is the vital energy of the body that went up to the right hand of God; and it never faints and it never fails those who trust it. IT IS CHRIST WHO IS YOUR LIFE; Christ's body for your body as His Spirit was for your spirit. Therefore do not wonder if there should be trials. . . . [T]o put on His strength in . . . weakness, and live in it moment by moment, is perfect healing . . . be the symptoms what they may . . . though our outward man perish.[3447]

Simpson likewise answered the following questions, posed by those who were perplexed by the fact that they were healed, but nothing in their bodies had changed:

> 31. *If we are not immediately conscious of actual healing, after anointing, how should we act?*
> Keep your eyes off your symptoms and on Christ. He is your life. Your body must be reckoned as good as dead, and He depended upon for strength, moment by moment. Therefore look to Him, draw your strength from Him, and be not discouraged at any testing or seeming delay. . . .
> 32. *How can I consider and call myself healed when there is no sign of it in my body? . . .*
> The healing is not in our own body at first—we consider it as good as dead, but in Christ's body, and as we look to it, its strength keeps coming into ours, and we "wax strong through faith."
> 33. *But have we a right to call that real which is not real?*

> healing, and you must act healing . . . until the last symptom leaves your body" (pgs. 27-28, *The Force of Faith*, Copeland).

Similarly, Kenneth Hagin received a "revelation" when he was sick, teaching him that "I've got to believe that my paralysis is gone while I'm still lying here on this bed, and while my heart is not beating right. I've got to believe that my paralysis is gone while I'm still lying here flat on my back and helpless" (pgs. 27-28, *I Believe*, Hagin, cited pg. 57, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell). Hagin then "began to thank God for his healing in spite of the fact that he was still seemingly paralyzed. . . . Hagin then pushed himself up and holding on to various stationary objects succeeded in circling the room. He practiced thus for several days and then asked for clothes to join his family for breakfast." He thus was "apparently healed," although "he would experience periodic symptoms for years afterward" (pg. 57, McConnell). E. W. Kenyon taught: "[T]he witness of pain in the body . . . declares that [you] are not healed. The pain is severe and the sick person can hear nothing but pain. . . . You [must] pay no attention to the pain. You ignore the symptoms because you know in the Father's mind you are healed" (pgs. 41-43, *The Two Kinds of Knowledge*, E. W. Kenyon). Word-Faith practitioners "practice the denial of physical symptoms[.] . . . Many have practiced such denial to the point of death. The practice of sensory denial also characterizes the metaphysical cults" (pgs. 104-105, 149-151, McConnell). See also pgs. 62-64, "Why People Lose Their Healing" in *The Believer's Authority*, 3rd. ed., Kenneth Hagin.

[3447] Chapter 2, *Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson. Capitalization in the original. Compare also pg. 341, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work and World*, December 1886.

> If God calls it so, we can echo His declaration. . . . And if we have not the faith to do this for Divine Healing, perhaps we have not the faith for anything.[3448]

Thus, Simpson writes, although writhing in pain from symptoms of disease, although one's body is filled with infirmities and weaknesses, although nature fails, although without any natural strength, although one's outward man perishes, indeed, even though people can say "ye are dead" and one's body is as good as dead, although there is no sign of healing whatsoever—nonetheless, the truth is one has received "perfect healing"—perfect healing, not absolute and fantastic delusion, is the reality at the back of and below all these ravaging symptoms of disease and death. After all, is one not truly sanctified in the same manner, with a sanctification that likewise leaves the body of sin untouched? Is not the healing that leaves the physical body unchanged just as real as the sanctification that leaves indwelling sin unchanged? Does one not take Christ's body for one's own body, as one takes Christ's holiness for one's own holiness? Do not the same sorts of testimonials and allegorical exegesis of Scripture provide support for both? Yet somehow one suspects that the evidential value of the miracles of Christ and the Apostles would have been not a little decreased if they had healed in the manner described by Simpson, so that, for instance, those healed of leprosy (Matthew 11:5) were still leprous, those healed of blindness still had the symptom of not being able to see (John 9), and those whose body parts were reattached (Luke 22:50-51) still had the symptom of missing members—although since the CMA specializes in miraculous healings that are not evidently miraculous, but can be explained from natural causes, unlike reattached limbs,[3449] the problem of present symptoms in those healed is at least a little less obviously detached from reality. Perhaps the fact that those who were healed still so often had the symptoms of not being healed explains why "Dr. Simpson['s] . . . co-pastor . . for years . . . and one of the leading officials of the Alliance . . . could furnish abundant evidence of the utter failure of the leaders of the movement to maintain their theories of healing."[3450]

Simpson explained to those who trusted in the Faith Cure but were not yet healed[3451] the message of moment-by-moment bodily healing that did not heal the body

---

3448 *The Lord for the Body, With Questions and Answers on Divine Healing*, A. B. Simpson. New York, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1925; pgs. 341-342, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work and World*, December 1886.

3449 Simpson's roundabout answer to one who asks not even about a missing or amputated limb, but about a broken arm, illustrates the failure of his doctrine of the Higher Life for the body to heal organic disease; see pgs. 340-341, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work and World*, December 1886.

3450 Pg. 103, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.

3451 "Himself," A. B. Simpson. All further quotes in this paragraph are from Simpson's sermon.

but accessed Christ's body, by faith alone. He gave testimony to his taking Christ's body for his own health just like he took Christ's holiness for his sanctification, explaining that he discovered this alleged truth through a direct revelation of what was allegedly Christ speaking to him directly, rather than through careful exegesis of Scripture, as Simpson's doctrine is certainly nowhere to be found in the actual speech of God in the holy Bible. Nonetheless, by testimonial to the wonderful effects of taking Christ moment by moment for sanctification and healing, Simpson surely convinced countless others to similarly take Christ for their health as they had earlier taken him for sanctification. Simpson testified: "I had to learn . . . every second, to breathe Himself in as I breathed, and breathe myself out. So, moment by moment for the spirit, and moment by moment for the body[.]"[3452] As Simpson breathed in Christ and breathed out himself, he experienced, moment by moment, the secret of spiritual and physical health. At the Broadlands Conference the Higher Life had a number of stages,[3453] and for Simpson the first blessing was justification, the second blessing was sanctification, and the third blessing healing.[3454] However, the blessings did not stop there. He testified:

> Years ago I came to Him burdened with guilt and fear; I tried that simple secret, and it took away all my fear and sin. Years passed on, and I found sin overcoming me and my temptations too strong for me. I came to Him a second time, and He whispered to me, "Christ in you," and I had victory, rest and blessing. Then the body broke away in every sort of way. . . . I heard of the

---

[3452] Compare the words of F. B. Meyer, rooted in his nature mysticism: "Father, as I breathe in this breath of the evening air, so I breathe in Thy gift of the Holy Spirit" (pg. 47, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

[3453] Pgs. 191-193, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

[3454] In this view, as in so much else, the CMA followed Simpson's doctrine. For example, in *The Full Gospel Adult Sunday School Quarterly* for November 26, 1939, ed. MacMillan, one reads, in conjunction with an affirmation of "healing in the atonement," the following: "The believer receives salvation [which apparently does not include sanctification] through taking Christ as Saviour; he is sanctified through receiving Christ as Sanctifier; he is healed through Christ the Healer; and, in like manner, every one of the spiritual blessings, wherewith the Father has blessed us . . . must be appropriated by an individual and personal act of faith" (pg. 27). One does not receive the whole, undivided Christ with all His blessings at the moment of union with Him and regeneration; rather, Christ is divided, and every single individual blessing from Him must be appropriated specifically with an act of faith that pertains to that particular blessing, and when such faith is exercised, that aspect of blessing is received completely; entire sanctification is received by a specific act of faith, followed by entire healing through a specific act of faith for healing; blessings such as the bodily resurrection with the righteous, however, are left unmentioned, since it would be very difficult for the dead to exercise a specific act of faith to obtain this blessing, and Scripture does not seem to indicate that only those dead who so exercise a specific act of faith will be resurrected, while the rest of the saved dead will stay in their graves until they also believe to receive Christ as their Resurrection. The progressive and gradual nature of blessings such as sanctification, in contrast to the all-or-nothing nature of justification, is also passed by.

The partial-Rapture view of many Keswick leaders follows naturally from this Keswick continuationistic doctrine of dividing Christ and His blessings. Jessie Penn-Lewis' and Evan Roberts' doctrine that only those believers who exercise specific faith to get Raptured will rise, while the rest will be left behind until they gain faith to be Raptured also, and then they will then rise in little groups, fits perfectly.

> Lord's healing, but I struggled against it. I was afraid of it. I had been taught in theological seminaries that the age of the supernatural was past, and I could not go back from my early training. My head was in my way, but at last when I was brought to attend "the funeral of my dogmatics," as Mr. Schrenck says, "the Lord whispered to me the little secret, 'Christ in you'"; and from that hour I received Him for my body as I had done for my soul. I was made so strong and well . . . [i]t was more than simple healing. He so gave me Himself that I lost the painful consciousness of physical organs.[3455]

However, Simpson went yet further. Having taken Christ for justification, the first blessing, and then taken Christ for sanctification, the second blessing, and then taken Christ for healing, the third blessing, he was ready to go on even further. Simpson explained that he went on to take Christ's mind, the fourth blessing. Simpson recognized that he "had a poor sort of mind." After taking Christ's mind, however, the time when he "was always making mistakes" was over; now "the brain and head [was] right . . . [a]nd since then I have been kept free from . . . mental disability." After all, Christ was not just perfectly holy and perfectly healthy, but perfectly wise. Having taken Christ's mind for his own mind, perhaps Simpson did not feel like grammatical-historical exegesis of his doctrine was necessary to support his doctrine—he was no longer capable of making mistakes, and, besides, his further steps were simply good and necessary consequences of his broad and bright foundation of sand in the Keswick theology of sanctification. But the fourth blessing also was not enough. Having been justified, sanctified, healed, and now gone out of his mind to take Christ's mind, Simpson went on to the fifth blessing—taking Christ's will. "I asked, 'Cannot you be a will to me?' He said, 'Yes, my child[.'"] As the second blessing of Keswick sanctification had left Simpson's will entirely unaffected, the fifth blessing of taking Christ's will hopefully would enable Simpson to will the right as fully as Christ did. However, there were surely more such takings yet to come. Simpson enjoined: "I feel I have only begun to learn how well it works. . . . May you make better use of it than I! . . . Take it and go on working it out[.]"[3456] And, truly, it was difficult to know where those who adopted Simpson's doctrine from such a testimonial would take it next,[3457] although the antecedent teaching of Hannah W. Smith

---

3455 "Himself," A. B. Simpson.

3456 "Himself," A. B. Simpson.

3457 In a good number of other ways it was similarly difficult to know how bizarre ideas held by Simpson could possibly be justified Scripturally. For example, Simpson denied that believers could know that demons were fallen angels that were created during the creation week of Genesis 1, proposing instead that demons might be the spirits of men from a pre-Adamic race who died in the nonexistent gap proposed by the Gap Theory between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2: "There are supernatural beings inhabiting the realms of evil, and permitted to have access to the hearts and minds of men. The origin of these beings, we do not know . . . [but it has been] suggested that they may be the spirits of a former human race before the fall of Adam" (*Christ in the Bible Commentary* 6:374, Simpson). Simpson set forth this "suggestion" after learning it from a "distinguished writer who has become familiar with the subject of demonology by much contact with it," (*ibid*); that is, the idea did not come from the sole authority for Christian faith and practice, the Bible, but was an idea gleaned from extensive work and experiences with demons.

at the Broadlands Conferences provided some possibilities.[3458] At least it was difficult for those Christians who still had their own minds, and were not now free from all sin, all sickness, all mistakes, and all errors of the mind and will, as Simpson testified he now was. Such individuals, as they had not yet entered into the Higher Life, the Higher Body, the Higher Mind, and the Higher Will, would likely be best off going the old route of searching the Scriptures daily instead of following Simpson and passing out of their minds.

Simpson dangerously drew the parallel to the Keswick doctrine of sanctification by faith apart from works to conclude, as did Andrew Murray, early Pentecostalism, and the Word of Faith movement, that one who fully relies on the Lord for healing should not use doctors and other human means. While Christ or the Apostles never counseled people to reject medicine or avoid doctors, Simpson wrote:

> There can be no works mingled with justifying faith. So our healing must be wholly of God, or not of grace at all. If Christ heals, He must do it alone. This principle ought to settle the question of using "means" in connection with faith for healing. The natural and the spiritual, the earthly and the heavenly, the works of man and the grace of God cannot be mixed any more than a person could expect to harness a tortoise with a locomotive. They cannot work together. . . . We must venture on Him wholly. If healing is to be sought by natural means, let us obtain all the best results of skill and experience. But if it is to be received through the name of Jesus, it must be by grace alone. . . . Is it an optional matter with us how we shall be healed—whether we shall trust God or look to man? . . . Is this not . . . a matter of simple obedience? . . . [I]s not the gospel of healing of equal authority . . . [to] the gospel of salvation[?] . . . Surely these questions answer themselves. They leave but one course open to every child of God.[3459]

Indeed, from the "moment [faith for healing is obtained] doubt should be regarded as absolutely out of the question, and even the very thought of retreating or resorting to old 'means' inadmissible. Of course, such a person will at once abandon all remedies and medical treatment."[3460] Simpson made sure to answer the objections of those who believed that Scripture taught that medicine was appropriate for Christians, from the weakest to the strongest. In response to the question, "Why has God made all the remedies we find in nature if He does not intend us to use them?" Simpson responded:

3458 That is, Hannah Smith was not satisfied with only the Higher and the Lower Life—she also "knew" the "experience" of "the bird life, spreading wings in a country all sunshine and song, rising up to the blue of an unfathomable sky" (pg. 196, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). If one can experience Christ's Life for the Body, then for the Mind, then for the Will, and so on, and also add the Bird Life to the Higher Life, it appears that one can take such ideas wherever one wishes—with the sole exception of taking them to a literally interpreted Scripture, for such a procedure would require one to throw out the whole lot as unbiblical nonsense.

3459 Pgs. 8, 10-11, "Principles of Divine Healing," by A. B. Simpson, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*, ed. Stephen Adams & K. Neill Foster. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2000; cf. chapter 4, *The Gospel of Healing*, Simpson.

3460 Chapter 2, *The Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson.

> Perhaps He did not make them any more than He made beer and whiskey. God made the barley, man made the alcohol. . . . [N]atural remedies . . . are not His way for His children. . . . They are not to be combined in the scriptures with divine healing. . . . All Christ's redemption purchases must be free gifts, by grace without works, and so if divine healing be through Christ's blood, it must be a gift of grace alone. We cannot mix our works with it [by using medicine] any more than our justification. . . . To combine the omnipotence of Jesus with a dose of mercury [or other medicine] is like trying to go up stairs by the elevator and the stairs at the same moment or harnessing an ox with a locomotive. . . . But cannot we ask God to bless the means? . . . [T]hat is not divine healing through the name of Jesus alone, as He has prescribed. That is Esau's blessing.[3461]

Furthermore, faithful members of the CMA, Simpson taught, should withhold medicine from their own children—such was not ungodliness and poor stewardship of needy little lives, but godliness:

> What should we do in the case of children? We may act for them [in withholding medicine] if they are our own, or if they are substantially laid upon us by the Lord, so that we are responsible for them. . . . But . . . [i]n the case of the children of others we should be most careful in assuming responsibility . . . in view of the law of the state requiring the care of an attending physician.[3462]

Simpson preached, as did the charismatic and Word of Faith movements, which succeeded him, that physical healing[3463] was guaranteed in Christ's atonement.[3464] Since physical healing is in the atonement, "is a gift of grace, as all that Christ's blood has purchased will ever be, and therefore cannot be mixed up with our own works or the use of human means," such as the use of doctors and medicine; healing "must be by faith,"[3465] and as a convinced advocate of the Keswick theology, Simpson knew that

---

[3461] Pgs. 339-340, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work, and World*, December 1886.

[3462] Pg. 341, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson. *The Word, Work, and World*, December 1886.

[3463] While, at their glorification, all believers will be free forever from all bodily sickness, Scripture never teaches anywhere that sickness is, like sin, something that deserves God's wrath, or that Christ's work on the cross guarantees physical healing in this life. It is noteworthy that in Isaiah 53:5 the word "healed" (רָפָא) is used by Isaiah only of spiritual healing from sin, not of physical healing (see Isaiah 6:10; 19:22; 30:26; 57:18-19; see also 58:8).

[3464] Simpson wrote: "Have we not then in . . . Scripture . . . a sure foundation for the simple, glorious statement on which faith may stand, nay, may lie down in everlasting rest, that the atonement of Jesus Christ covers our sicknesses, and furnishes solid ground for claiming, in His name, divine healing through simple faith, and when we are walking in holy obedience, which, of course, is the indispensable element within which we can continue to receive any of the blessings of the Gospel?" (*Divine Healing in the Atonement*, A. B. Simpson.

[3465] Thus, Simpson affirmed that the following as necessary consequences of his "great truth" that physical healing in this life is guaranteed in Christ's atonement:

> 1. If our healing is provided for by Jesus Christ, then it is a redemption right which we may humbly yet boldly claim while walking obediently with the Lord.
>
> 2. That it is a gift of grace, as all that Christ's blood has purchased will ever be, and therefore cannot be mixed up with our own works or the use of human means [such as the use of medical doctors], but must be received wholly in His name, and in such a manner that He shall have all the glory.
>
> 3. That it must be by faith, through which alone all the blessings of the Gospel can be claimed.
>
> 4. That it is not the exceptional privilege of a few favored ones, the occasional special and sovereign gift of God where He is pleased to manifest His healing power for some exceptional cause or special end, but that it

healing by faith, just as sanctification by faith, was a healing and sanctification by faith alone, one that excluded all works and effort. One must simply "take Christ as your Healer" as "we took Him for our justification" and then "for our sanctification,"[3466] and, lo, the healing is accomplished, as the work of sanctification was earlier accomplished.

While Simpson successfully prepared the way for the Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements and also led many to an unnecessary and premature death, at least he sought to practice his beliefs himself. He "never resorted to medical care (except for cough drops and eyeglasses)[3467] for nearly forty years . . . even in the last two years of his life after suffering a stroke and depression."[3468] Simpson taught and sought to convince himself that all those who seek healing by faith alone are promised "fullness of life and health and strength up to the measure of our natural life and until our life work is done,"[3469] despite the fact that such a view appears to have been rather different than what Paul taught and first century saints like Trophimus experienced (2 Timothy 4:20). Simpson, nonetheless, held "'Friday Meetings' on divine healing . . . for many years . . . [and had] made a written covenant that he would advance the gospel of healing as a part of his ministry from th[e] . . . time [when he experienced a] dramatic personal healing . . . forward."[3470] Thus, Simpson adopted his healing doctrine because of an experience of alleged or real healing, not because of careful exegesis of Scripture. Simpson and his denomination continued to preach "the gospel of healing" at its "missionary and deeper

---

is the heritage of all the children of faith and holy obedience. (*Divine Healing in the Atonement*, A. B. Simpson)

[3466] Chapter 2*, Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson.

[3467] One does wonder why, on Simpson's principles, cough drops would be necessary, or why his eyesight was never healed. Simpson "wore spectacles to the day of his death," and in "a conversation with a friend, he frankly admitted that he could not understand why the Lord had withheld this element of healing" (pg. vii, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham). Thus:

> [W]hen his eyesight began to fail, we remember observing him, at succeeding conventions, bringing his New Testament closer and closer up to read its large type; then still later he would take a little magnifying glass out of his vest pocket when he needed its aid; still later he put on glasses. . . . [T]his growing infirmity was a matter of much prayer, and . . . Dr. Simpson sought to claim deliverance from it. However, none came . . . it [also became necessary, by advocates of his theory of healing], to apologize for his presence in a sanatorium in his last year" (pgs. 97-98, *The Bible and the Body*).

[3468] Pg. 292, *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary Word of Faith Theologies*, Paul King. Dr. King mentions that it is possible that Simpson did seek medical care in some setting unknown to him when he wrote his book, and it is true that it is not possible to be absolutely certain about what Simpson did or did not do medically.

[3469] Pg. 12, "Principles of Divine Healing," by A. B. Simpson, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*, ed. Stephen Adams & K. Neill Foster. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2000.

[3470] Pg. 199, "A. B. Simpson and the 'Friday Meetings,' by K. Neill Foster, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*.

life conventions,"[3471] and the Christian and Missionary Alliance joins Keswick sanctification, physical healing, and allegedly restored sign gifts in its doctrine and practice to the present day, leading many who could have been healed by God through the providential instrumentality of doctors and medicine to poor stewardship of their lives and early death through a form of unintentional suicide by their false healing doctrine.[3472]

In the early twentieth century "many prominent members of the [Christian and Missionary] Alliance . . . provide[d] crucial early leadership for the newly emerging Pentecostal movement,"[3473] as the CMA doctrine that all the apostolic gifts were still for today was identical with the Pentecostal doctrine, with the sole substantial exception that Pentecostalism proper usually believed[3474] that tongues were the necessary initial evidence of Spirit baptism, while the CMA thought various sign gifts, including but not exclusively tongues, accompanied Spirit baptism.[3475] "As much as any other single body

---

[3471] Pg. 200, "A. B. Simpson and the 'Friday Meetings,' by K. Neill Foster, in *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*.

[3472] One could likewise call to mind the unnumbered deaths that have taken place because of the false healing doctrine of the Word of Faith movement; for example, "the number of preventable deaths associated with Faith Assembly . . . [in] Wilmot, Indiana . . . are as high as 90" for that congregation alone (pg. 77, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell).

[3473] Pg. 616, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen.

[3474] This view, while very common in Pentecostalism, was not universal: "Holiness and Pentecostal people were in substantial agreement on all important points of doctrine, including the Baptism in the Spirit. True, many Pentecostals insisted that speaking in tongues was the one and indispensable sign of Spirit baptism . . . but that teaching was not universal among Pentecostals, and many Holiness people acknowledged speaking in tongues to be a legitimate evidence of 'the Baptism,' though not the only one" (pg. 150, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). Indeed, prominent Pentecostal leaders such as F. F. Bosworth, "a founder and presbyter of the Assemblies [of God] and one of the most sought-after healer-evangelists in the entire Pentecostal movement, rejected as dogmatic and unscriptural the view that all who were Spirit-baptized must speak in tongues. He maintained that any of the nine gifts of the Spirit listed in 1 Corinthians was a valid sign of Baptism in the Spirit." The view of Bosworth and many others was officially repudiated by the Assemblies of God in 1918, however, when the Assemblies adopted the "only evidence" position in conjunction with a newly invented distinction between the "sign of tongues" and "the gift of tongues," a distinction that did not exist in the earliest Pentecostalism, but which was invented as an attempt to relieve some of the severe hermeneutical difficulties of the "only evidence" doctrine (see pgs. 161-164, *ibid*). While the Assemblies of God officially adopted the "only evidence" position, the "'only evidence' doctrine is rejected by the Elim Pentecostal Churches in England, the Pentecostal Mission in Switzerland, the Apostolic Faith Mission in South Africa, and nearly all German and Chilean Pentecostals. . . . It is also rejected by the Apostolic Church in England, some Scandinavian and many 'independent' American Pentecostals" (pg. 277, *ibid*). See also pgs. 76-77, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner.

[3475] The steps are small from Spirit baptism as an enduement of power, as taught by many at Keswick and those Keswick influenced, such as the Christian and Missionary Alliance, and the view of Pentecostalism: "D. L. Moody, R. A. Torrey, A. J. Gordon, A. B. Simpson, J. Wilbur Chapman and others who participated in the Keswick conventions brought back to the United States the Keswick teaching about a baptism in the Holy Spirit . . . empowering for Christian service. Here one can see the contours of Pentecostal teaching, particularly the non-Wesleyan strand of Pentecostalism. All that remained was the

of American Christians, the Christian and Missionary Alliance nurtured a spirituality that made participants responsive to Pentecostal teaching."[3476] Because of the preparatory advocacy of the Higher Life by Simpson, after the rise of the Azuza Street revivalism Pentecostalism spread like wildfire through CMA congregations, camp meetings, healing homes, and colleges, many of which became dominated by Pentecostals.[3477] "[A]t the Alliance's Bible and Missionary Training Institute at Nyack, New York, when news of the Azusa Street revival was first received[,] [r]eports of people speaking in tongues . . . seemed a fulfillment of the promised restoration of the gifts of the Spirit which Simpson and the faculty at Nyack had led the students to expect. . . . A. B. Simpson, in a cover editorial for the Alliance's official organ, rejoiced that the gift of tongues was apparently being restored to the Church."[3478] After a number of students at the CMA training institute in Nyack, NY spoke in tongues, along with other workers and leaders such as his Superintendent for Canada, Simpson met with British Pentecostal champion Alexander

---

sign of being filled with the Spirit, speaking in other tongues, what Pentecostals understood to be the biblical norm" ("Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm). "R. A. Torrey" wrote "[t]he most acceptable non-pentecostal treatise on pentecostal doctrine[.] . . . Torrey must be credited with a scriptural rationale for pentecostal theology" (pgs. 108-109, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan); Indeed, "Dr. Torrey['s] . . . visi[t] to Berlin, and his preaching there of the Baptism of the Spirit[,] sowed seeds that undoubtedly flourished a few years later when the Pentecostal Movement broke out in Germany" (pgs. 4-5, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee). "[T]he preoccupation of the Holiness movement with the doctrine of Baptism in the Spirit . . . was redefined by the Keswick wing of Holiness as a baptism of power . . . once external physical evidence of it was sought, the stage was set for focusing on tongues" (pg. 233, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). It is not surprising that Pentecostals such as Bartleman were able to participate in Moody's Conventions at Northfield (e. g., pg. 110, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan). While Torrey rejected Pentecostalism, at one point he was willing to have John Dowie pray for his daughter (cf. pg. 141, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton), and historians have affirmed that he was more sympathetic to the Faith Cure than the general body of the fundamentalist movement (pg. 202, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis). Thus, "R. A. Torrey is cited by Pentecostals and is of unusual significance to Pentecostalism in connection with the Spirit's baptism. . . . [he] served as a kind of John the Baptist figure for later international Pentecostalism. . . . judging from the movement's literature, Torrey was, after Wesley and Finney, the most influential figure in the pre-history of Pentecostalism . . . in specific connection with the spiritual baptism [doctrine, although in other doctrines his influence was far less] discernable" (pg. 45, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970). Torrey's doctrine of post-conversion Spirit baptism was itself influenced by Finney (cf. pg. 94, *ibid*).

[3476] Pg. 102, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*, ed. Edith L. Blumhofer.

[3477] Cf. pgs. 74ff, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; also pg. 80. Further evidence of the tremendous continuity between the CMA and Pentecostalism appears on pgs. 130-131, 142-146, 172, 183.

[3478] Pg. 144, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. It is not surprising, therefore, that in various places in the early years after Azuza Street at times the CMA would lose, in various locations, half of its membership to Pentecostalism, as Pentecostals had a number of years in which they perpetuated their message from within the CMA (cf. pgs. 143, 146, *ibid*).

Boddy and invited him to preach at Simpson's famous Alliance Tabernacle.[3479] Prominent early Pentecostal leaders preached at countless CMA congregations and institutions, spreading the tongues doctrine to their sympathetic continuationist audiences:[3480]

> The most influential [Pentecostal precursor] with Keswick leanings was A.B. Simpson . . . Simpson's fourfold gospel of Christ as Saviour, Healer, Sanctifier and Coming King . . . [was] accepted wholeheartedly by the Pentecostal movement. . . . Simpson defined sanctification along Keswick lines. . . . Nearly forty-five early Pentecostal leaders came out of the Christian and Missionary Alliance church. Early Pentecostal Thomas B. Barrat had . . . met . . . Simpson in 1905-6 when they toured throughout the United States. Early Pentecostal George N. Elderidge had known Simpson personally and both Canadian Pentecostal A.H. Argue and Stanley H. Frodsham's wife were healed through Simpson's ministry. Agnes Ozman, the woman first credited with speaking in tongues at Parham's watchnight service, was once a student at Simpson's Bible School in Nyack, New York.[3481]
>
> Nineteen hundred and seven was the year of crisis for the Christian and Missionary Alliance and its relationship with the pentecostal movement. Entire congregations, some large and important, became pentecostal. Members of the Alliance across the nation, and particularly in the midwest and east, received the pentecostal experience in great numbers. . . . [While] Simpson . . . denied . . . that the Baptism of the Holy Spirit is always accompanied by speaking in tongues . . . Simpson . . . advised Alliance leaders and members . . . no[t] to forbid . . . speaking in tongues . . . [he] refuse[d] to excommunicate pentecostals. . . . [The Alliance] provide[d] a fresh infusion of qualified leadership into the burgeoning pentecostal assemblies. . . . [M]en like Frank Boyd, William Evans, D. W. Kerr, J. Roswell Flower, Noel Perkin, A. G. Ward, and D. W. Myland, all former members of the Alliance, figure importantly in shaping the theology of the Assemblies of God. It is no happenstance [that] the Alliance doctrinal statement was adopted wholesale by the Assemblies—nor that the polity of the new pentecostal denomination showed a heavy reliance on Alliance structure and procedures, even to the extent of calling their places of worship by the same name, 'Gospel Tabernacles."[3482]

3479 Pg. 56, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

3480 E. g., see the many instances where Frank Bartleman described his preaching at CMA settings, from congregations, to camp meetings, to colleges, including settings where A. B. Simpson himself was present, on pgs. 105-129, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. The Pentecostal baptism, with its associated tongues-speech, even penetrated the faculty of the CMA Bible College at Nyack.

3481 "Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements," Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. Ozman was also engaged in the demonic practice of automatic writing at the time period when she first fell under the power of the spirit world and spoke in tongues (pg. 255, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; cf. pgs. 52-60 for the account of Ozman and Parham's speaking in tongues and Pentecostal embellishments of the events, as well as the defections from Parham, the affirmations by witnesses that the tongues were "fake," Ozman's own renunciation of tongues, and the passing of the mantle from Parham to Seymour, leader of the Azuza Street Mission.). "[T]he experience of Agnes Ozman is designated as the beginning of the Modern Pentecostal Revival . . . [because] she was the first known person to have received [glossolalia] as a result of specifically seeking a baptism of the Holy Spirit with the expectation of speaking in tongues. From this time Pentecostal believers were to teach that the 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' should be sought and that it would be received with the evidence of 'tongues'" (pgs. 119-120, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner; cf. pgs. 48-53, *The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement*, Klaude Kendrick).

3482 Pg. 89, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

Indeed, "Simpson . . . sought a tongues experience for several years . . . [and] many Alliance people spoke in tongues."[3483] "Paul Rader, who succeeded A. B. Simpson as president of the CMA, himself spoke in tongues and preached in Pentecostal circles."[3484] "Simpson . . . had been vocal about the reality and validity of supernatural gifts today, including tongues . . . [just] not [as] the evidence of the baptism of the Spirit."[3485] "The position of Simpson and the CMA is that . . . God is still bestowing all the gifts of the Spirit today and the baptism . . . of the Spirit is subsequent to conversion . . . [differing from Pentecostalism only in affirming that] the gift of tongues is not the evidence of the baptism with the Spirit."[3486] The founder of the strongly charismatic International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, divorced[3487] woman preacher Aimee Semple McPherson (1890-1944), modeled her "Foursquare Gospel" of Christ as Savior, Baptizer, Healer, and Coming King after Simpson's "higher life message of the fourfold gospel—Jesus Christ as Savior, Sanctifier, Healer, and Coming King,"[3488] while a variety of CMA leaders preached for her in her church. In Britain, the "Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance" arose around the same "Foursquare Gospel" as preached by McPherson.[3489] "The origins of the Foursquare Gospel seem traceable through the Assemblies of God and at least as far back as A. B. Simpson."[3490] Simpson's false doctrine that God Himself has faith[3491] and that the believer's faith has a creative force comparable to that which

---

[3483] Pg. 102, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*, ed. Edith L. Blumhofer.

[3484] Pg. 253, *A Believer with Authority*, Paul L. King.

[3485] Pgs. 234-235, *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary Word of Faith Theologies*, Paul L. King.

[3486] Pg. 2, *A Believer With Authority*, Paul L. King.

[3487] "Aimee Semple McPherson . . . receive[d] a 'revelation' that he marriage was 'not in the Lord' and that she should enter another union" (pg. 23, *Tongues in Biblical Perspective*, Charles R. Smith. Winona Lake, IN: BMH, 1972.).

[3488] Pg. 17, *A Believer With Authority*, King. "Aimee Semple McPherson's Foursquare Gospel, allegedly revealed to her in a vision, was little more than Simpson's Four-Fold Gospel of Christ as Savior, Healer, Baptizer in the Holy Spirit, and Coming King, with Baptism in the Spirit redefined to specify [the necessity of] speaking in tongues" (pgs. 112, 147, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). The Four-Square Gospel idea of Simpson also found other prominent advocates in the Pentecostal movement, such as George Jeffries, and had antecedents in writers such as R. A. Torrey, Andrew Murray, and A. J. Gordon (cf. pgs. 31-32, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

[3489] Pgs. 121-122, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee. McPherson did not start the Elim movement; the Foursquare idea was taken over by both denominations from Keswick continuationist antecedents such as A. B. Simpson.

[3490] Pg. 96, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

[3491] While Simpson's doctrine is not in the Bible, it is found on pg. 153 of Hannah W. Smith's book *Every-Day Religion* (Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1893); Mrs. Smith also says that "we . . . are . . . to speak, and it shall be done" in the same way God spoke and it was done when He created the universe.

God exercised in the creation of the universe also anticipates these beliefs of the Word-Faith heresy,[3492] and Simpson was likewise a precursor of the Word-Faith doctrine of the power of positive thinking to create positive reality and negative thinking to create negative reality.[3493] The "prime influences upon . . . E. W. Kenyon . . . the chief originator" of the Word-Faith or Health and Wealth gospel movement by means of Kenneth Hagin,[3494] were "leaders of the Higher Life and Keswick movements, such as . . . A. B. Simpson,"[3495] as well as "metaphysical cults . . . in the tradition of Mary Baker

---

[3492] Thus, Simpson wrote: "Faith is an actual spiritual force. It is no doubt one of the attributes of God Himself" (Chapter 1, *A Larger Christian Life*, A. B. Simpson). Consequently, Simpson exhorts: "Have the faith of God. . . . God's faith is all sufficient, and we can have and use it" to do miracles (Chapter 2, *Gospel of Healing*, A. B. Simpson). As believers have the kind of faith that God Himself allegedly exercises, they too can exert creative power. Simpson informs members of the CMA:

> [You can] be well assured that the very act of believing . . . is an actual creative force and produces effects and operations of the most important character. Indeed it seems that faith is the very principle upon which God Himself acts, and the secret of His power in creating matter and in commanding the events of providence. . . . When the disciples wondered at the withering of the fig tree, Jesus simply said it was an act of divine faith. It was the faith of God that produced it . . . [t]he faith of God must mean the faith which God Himself exercises. . . . Abraham acted like . . . He [who] commands that which is not and expects it and believes in the efficacy of His own command without a shadow of hesitation, and He sees it instantly or ultimately accomplished. . . . [T]his faith [is] a resistless force, a divine power that actually move[s] upon second causes and compel[s] their obedience; and if that faith of God be in us, it will be a corresponding force. (Chapter 4, *The Life of Prayer*)

These blasphemies are distinctive Word of Faith heresies, for the idea of faith as a creative power is a Word of Faith doctrinal distinctive: "Through 'creative faith,' man becomes not only a god. He becomes a creator" (pgs. 138-139, *Another Gospel*, McConnell; cf. pg. 187, *God's Laws of Success*, Robert Tilton. Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1986). They are built by reading into the objective genitive πίστιν Θεοῦ in Mark 11:22, "faith in God," what the passage simply does not mean. Compare the parallel passage Matthew 21:20-21; also "faith in the operation of God," τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, Colossians 2:12; "faith in His name," τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, Acts 3:16; τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, "faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," James 2:1; cf. "faith in God," πίστιν Θεοῦ, *Ignatius to the Ephesians* 16:2; "faith in God," θεοῦ πίστιν, Josephus, *Contra Apion* 2:169. Compare pg. 75, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Watchman Nee, for another instance of the abuse of Mark 11:22-24.

[3493] "Fear is dangerous. It turns into fact the things we fear. It creates the evil just as faith creates the good" (3:485, *Christ in the Bible Commentary*, Simpson). Simpson proves this notion from an astonishing misinterpretation of Job 3:25, which is alleged to be "the solemn warning of Job" that fear creates negative reality—Job's sin in not knowing Word of Faith secrets and allowing fear to create negative reality was the cause of the troubles of that most righteous man upon the earth in his day, it appears, as Simpson dutifully follows the radical misinterpretation of the book of Job of his Higher Life predecessors like William Boardman and Andrew Murray. (Compare also pg. 341, "Divine Healing: Inquiries and Answers," A. B. Simpson, *The Word, Work, and World*, December 1886). Simpson also taught, in a manner similar to the Word of Faith movement although without quite the same extreme character, but with certain wholesome qualifications, that God is limited by and bound to act based on human faith. The CMA founder wrote: "God is . . . bound to act according to our faith . . . God has really put into our hands one of His own implements of omnipotence" (*A Larger Christian Life*, A. B. Simpson).

[3494] "Hagin . . . plagiarized Kenyon both repeatedly and extensively," so that "it would not be overstated to say that the very doctrines that have made Kenneth Hagin and the [Word of] Faith movement such a distinctive and powerful force within the independent charismatic movement are all plagiarized from E. W. Kenyon" (pg. 7, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell; see pgs. 8-11 for extensive examples of Hagin's plagiarism.).

[3495] Pg. 64, *Only Believe*, Paul L. King.

Eddy . . . Christian Science, Swedenborgianism, Theosophy, Science of Mind, and New Thought," which were themselves influential in the development of the Higher Life and Faith-Cure theology.[3496] Kenyon, to explain the abysmal failure of Pentecostal and

[3496] Pg. 352, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur. Writers such as D. R. McConnell, a "confirmed, unapologetic advocate of and participant in the charismatic renewal" (pg. xviii, *A Different Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995 (updated ed.)), seek to make a sharp distinction between Higher Life, Keswick, and Faith Cure theology and the Mind Cure of Christian Science, and affirm that the Word of Faith movement derives only from the latter. While charismatics may view such distinctions as helpful for apologetic purposes, they are in error both on their derivation of the Word of Faith theology only from Christian Science and in their sharp distinction between the two healing trajectories, which not only *appear* to be similar, as McConnell admits, but indeed *are* similar and are not historically isolated from each other but historically intertwined, and form the common root of Pentecostalism and the Word of Faith movement. McConnell must admit that E. W. Kenyon, who Kenneth Hagin so extensively plagiarized, "was on friendly terms with many classical Pentecostals and often ministered in their circles . . . [and] preached healing and prosperity[.] . . . Kenyon . . . greatly influenced the charismatic movement at large" (pgs. 184, 196 *A Different Gospel*, McConnell), so attempting to separate Kenyon from classical Pentecostalism is vain. It is also vain to deny that in "the early stages . . . American Spiritualism [was] closely connected with Faith Healing and Higher Thought" alike (pg. 98, *Religious Fanaticism*), and formed the common seed-bed out of which the Higher Life, Faith Cure, New Thought, and Mind Cure developed. For example, Henry Foster, "the doctor of the New York Sanatorium where those strange secrets of union with Christ" as bringing physical and sexual thrills (pg. 162-164, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey), whose doctrine Keswick originators Robert P. Smith and Hannah W. Smith adopted and Robert promulgated during the entirety of his career as a Higher Life evangelist, practiced "homeopathy, hydropathy [that is, "water cure"] . . . mental therapy, and pastoral and spiritual care all under the same roof" (pg. 516, *Naturopathic Physical Medicine: Theory and Practice of Manual Therapists and Naturopaths*, auth. & ed. Leon Chaitow. Philadelphia, PA: Elseveir, 2008). The Water Cure or hydropathy was closely connected to the demonic practices of spiritualism. The demonic ideas of healing associated with homeopathy thus were influential in the background of the Higher Life, Keswick, and Faith Cure doctrines of healing, as they were with Mind Cure. Jessie Penn-Lewis, whose family also employed hydropathy (see pg. vi, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. London: R. W. Simpson, 1905), promulgated the reality of both Keswick Faith Cure ideas and the reality of animal magnetism, associated with the Mind Cure and Mary Baker Eddy. Hannah Whitall Smith, the doctrinal founder of the Keswick theology, writing out of "a great deal of experience" with "Faith Healing," and having "investigated every phase of this kind of thing: Faith Cure, Divine Healing, Mental Science, Christian Science, [and] Mind Cure," concluded that "all these different phases of faith cure, mind cure, etc.," share in the common idea, held also by the Word of Faith movement, that "Spirit controls matter, and that if we were spiritually enough developed we should be able to control matter according to our measure as God does in His measure." Faith and Mind Cure also possess in common with the Word of Faith theology the idea that positive thinking can create reality, that "there is no more certain way of catching a disease than being afraid of it; and equally no more certain way of being preserved from a disease than to have no fear," as "[o]ur mental conditions are far more powerful to affect material things than we know, and . . . there is here a secret for enormous power." Thus, there is a "Divine law," also known and practiced by "occultist[s]" who "had been through all the phases of occult teaching in India," that "[a]ll things . . . come to him who knows how to will and to be silent." "[W]hat have seemed to us like miracles are really the outcome of laws." In sum, "every form of Faith-healing, or Divine Healing, or Christian Science" shares this common "truth," come from a common root, and "both faith and mind cure both lead sooner or later into spiritualism" (pgs. 262-267, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey). Hannah W. Smith concluded: "As far as I can understand the mind cure, it is only the science by which the faith cure works . . . it is simply doing on the plane of physical health what we did on the plane of sin when we reckoned ourselves dead to it and alive only to God" (Letter to Anna, Steamer "Eider," July 1, 1885, cited entry for December 28, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life: The unpublished personal writings of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. M. E. Dieter). McConnell is correct when he recognizes that the Word of Faith doctrine is pagan and rooted in the spiritualism and demonism of nineteenth century Mind Cure; he is incorrect when he attempts, because of his own charismatic position, to disassociate the Word of Faith

Word-Faith ministers to actually heal people, appealed to Simpson's doctrine that healing by faith alone, like sanctification by faith alone, could be lost by a decision to stop believing. Kenyon failed to heal people, not because he was a false teacher and his Word of Faith doctrine was a delusion and a heresy—rather, it was the fault of the "healed" people who were not healed:

> For many years . . . I could not understand why people who had received their healing . . . should have the disease come back again. . . . They are instantly healed. In a little while they come back again and say, "I can't understand it. That healing did not stand up. All the symptoms are back again." Where was the difficulty? It lay in this: They had no faith in the Word of God. . . . They lost their healing[.] . . . I can pray for them again and again, but I get no results because they witness against the Word of God.[3497]

---

movement and Pentecostalism, and to separate the healing doctrine of the Keswick movement and classical Pentecostalism from the same spiritualism and demonism that undergird the Word of Faith theology, both because the Word of Faith movement did indeed have very heavy influence from classical Pentecostalism and because the nineteenth century Faith and Mind Cure share spiritualist and demonic origins and constitute the common background to the Keswick and the Pentecostal healing theology.

McConnell is correct, however, when he writes that "many in the present charismatic renewal preach and practice a different gospel . . . the major branch of the charismatic movement is cultic in nature" (pgs. xviii, 65-66, *A Different Gospel*).

It is also noteworthy that nineteenth century cults like the Shakers believed that they could attain "control over physical disease," and their religious rites included "outbursts of gibberish, believed to be inspired utterances"—like the modern Pentecostal gibberish that is falsely called "tongues." The Shakers also anticipated many Pentecostals in, "when there were seasons of revival, or outbursts of spiritualistic fever . . . roll[ing] violently upon the ground, and sh[aking] and quiver[ing] with the inrush of the spirit" (pg. 46, *Religious Fanaticism*, Strachey), as the same demons inspired the Shakers that work in many modern charismatics. After all, "Mother Ann Lee, founder of the Shakers . . . demonstrated pentecostal tendencies" (pg. 126, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan).

[3497] Pgs. 40-43, *The Two Kinds of Knowledge*, Kenyon. Fullerton, CA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing, 1942. Kenyon not only escaped from responsibility for failures in healing in general, but counseled specific people that they were not healed because they failed to believe and confess their healing and so lost it; for example, after he prayed and a lady was "perfectly healed," her "symptoms" came right back again, not because Kenyon was a false teacher who actually did not heal her, of course, but because she failed to tell her husband that very night that she had been healed, but waited a little while: "Had she made her confession to her husband, the thing would never have come back" (pg. 37, *In His Presence*, Kenyon, 1944 ed.) Similarly, Hagin wrote: "When people are in a place where faith is high—where there's a mass faith . . . it's comparatively easy for them to receive healing. This is what happens in big meetings[.] . . . However, when these people get back on their own, the devil comes along with lying symptoms. The people don't have a foundation of faith in them, and the devil puts the same thing back on them. . . . [T]he next time you see them, they're right back where they were" (pgs. 62-63, *The Believer's Authority*, Hagin).

Pentecostals who do not follow the Word of Faith heresy also accept the idea that healing is lost by a loss of faith:

> Stanley H. Frodsham, editor of the *Pentecostal Evangel*, explained that healing, like salvation and other acts of grace, could be lost, and acknowledged the very small number of those who 'kept' their healing. . . . [For example], Frodsham reported that a mail survey of one thousand persons 'healed' in Pentecostal meetings produced only one respondent. Looking back on nearly forty years of acquaintance with the movement's healing activities, Donald Gee noted with sadness "the small number of definite miracles of healing compared to the great number who were prayed for."

Gee continues, "It is foolish to ignore the facts" (pg. 94, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson & pg. 148, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee. London: Elim Publishing, 1949 &, pg. 4 *Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God*, 448-449, June 10, 1922). Frodsham claimed that only one out of the 1,000 could expect to keep his healing because only one was willing to attend a Pentecostal service after the "healing" took place. The problem

The Word-Faith woman preacher Kathryn Kuhlman (1907-1976)[3498] attended the CMA's Simpson Bible Institute and McPherson's college while also supporting the CMA denomination with funds from her healing crusades. She died at age sixty-nine from a heart condition contracted as a child through rheumatic fever, which grew progressively worse, unhealed, for years, her funeral being preached by her compatriot Word-Faith preacher, healer, and heretic, Oral Roberts, who himself had an unhealed heart condition, as did Word-Faith healer Kenneth Hagin. Thus, A. B. Simpson was a key advocate of Keswick or Higher Life theology and a significant link in the theological trajectory from Keswick healing doctrine and continuationism to the charismatic and Word-Faith errors associated closely with Simpson's denomination.

Applications from the Life and Teachings of A. B. Simpson

The writings of A. B. Simpson contain many dangerous spiritual errors and heresies. Historic Baptist churches should reject, reprove the errors in, and warn about Simpson's writings, have no fellowship with the Christian and Missionary Alliance that he founded, and call truly converted people in the organization to separate from Simpson's denomination. Nor should they have anything to do with the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith apostasy that arose in such a large part from the CMA. Furthermore, they should recognize that Keswick continuationism is the root from which all these subsequent and enhanced corruptions have arisen, and reject the Higher Life root of all these subsequent errors for the spiritual safety and God-glorifying truth of the historic Baptist doctrine of sanctification and the cessationism associated with it.

The tragic and unnecessary early death of many in the Christian and Missionary Alliance because of their rejection of medicine illustrates in a practical way the devastating consequences of the adoption of a corrupt theology. While Satan, who was a murderer from the beginning, was certainly delighted, as far as that infernal being can experience delight, in deceiving Christians to suffer such a form of unintended suicide, the name of Jesus Christ was dishonored and exposed to reproach because of the supposed failure of Christ's promises and healing power. Twisting Scripture is a serious

---

was not, Frodsham knew, that the Pentecostal "healings" were a delusion so people were unwilling to attend their services after it was evident that they were not healed—on the contrary, the problem was that people were unwilling to attend Pentecostal services, and so they lost their healings (pg. 4).

If 999 out of 1,000 lose their healing because of a lack of faith, just as salvation can be lost by a lack of faith, one wonders if 999 out of 1,000 that Pentecostals lead to salvation lose it, so that, on their own Arminian assumptions, only 0.1% of those they bring to conversion go to heaven.

[3498] Mrs. Kuhlman's husband divorced his wife to marry her. They also ended up filing for divorce.

thing—let the weeping orphans and widows testify. But—alas! Such witnesses are generally excluded from the volumes of testimonials to nineteenth century Faith Cures and twentieth century Pentecostal healings. But when the witness of Scripture is not carefully weighed, is there cause for surprise if the witness of men is likewise weighed in unjust balances?

Indeed, the historical trajectory from the nineteenth century Higher Life and Keswick continuationism, through the Christian and Missionary Alliance, into the modern tongues and Word of Faith movements illustrates how eisegesis and exegetical sloppiness, compounded over time, leads to an ever-expanding mass of infernal error. The Keswick doctrines that the believer uses God, and that God is helpless to work without the assistance of the human will, become the Word of Faith doctrines that Christians are themselves gods. Keswick's downplaying of *sola Scriptura*, exaltation of experience, and openness to the restoration of the sign gifts becomes charismatic and Word of Faith ministers claiming to have revelations they can set alongside Scripture. Higher Life openness to deriving demonology from observation and experience, rather than from the Bible alone, leads to the Satanic playground of modern charismatic deliverance ministry. Only genuine and thorough repentance will prevent a slide into ever deeper apostasy—and for a true and effective deliverance, not particular branches only, but the Higher Life and continuationist root of all must be rent out and replaced with a vibrant Trinitarian spirituality truly based on Scripture alone.

Only through profound inconsistency can one defend Scriptural cessationism and maintain Keswick theories of sanctification. Simpson, along with the concurrent loud and general testimony of the leading lights of the Higher Life make it clear that the Higher Life of the soul and body are deeply intertwined. Are you a cessationist who follows a Keswick doctrine of sanctification? Your position cannot long stand. Choose, then, this day, the one path or the other. Go all the way with your Higher Life position, abandon *sola Scriptura* and its corollaries, become a charismatic and continuationist fanatic, babble nonsense and flop around on the ground under the influence of demons, and incur the wrath of the Holy One of Israel for your indulgence in strange fire—or keep your cessationism, cleave to the Bible, reject your Keswick and Higher Life innovation for the orthodox Baptist doctrine of sanctification, and worship the Father in spirit and in truth, loving him with your actively involved mind along with all your soul and your strength. Choose this day whom you will serve.

You should also take warning from Simpson's life on the ease with which sincere men, and, indeed, Christians with a desire to follow God, can be deceived. A. B. Simpson's theory of healing was contradicted by the very spectacles on his nose, yet he

continued not only to maintain the theory himself but was able to build and lead an entire Christian denomination that emphasized his doctrine of healing and spiritual gifts while wearing those very same spectacles. Christian reader, you do not have an immunity against deception, even ones as foolish and evidently false as those that Mr. Simpson adopted. Only by continually nourishing your soul on the Bible, in the fellowship of a true church, and with the protection of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, can you escape from falling into a comparable or worse deception yourself.

Learn also that it is not enough to be zealous for missions—only if true doctrine and practice are wedded to zeal for worldwide evangelistic zeal will any good be truly accomplished. The scribes and Pharisees compassed land and sea to make one proselyte, only to make him a twofold child of hell (Matthew 23:15). Many in heathen lands are deeply confused about who Jesus Christ is because of the spiritual tares sown by zealous missionaries in Christendom who spread much leaven with their light. Ecumenical missionary organizations, from the Christian and Missionary Alliance to the China Inland Mission, cannot long stand without their light becoming eclipsed. Zealous Keswick missionaries in the nineteenth century, through their continuationism and ecumenicalism, contributed greatly to the fact that Africa today is filled with charismatic religious organizations whose members are almost to a man unconverted. Only true and faithful congregations, sending out their own missionaries (Acts 13) without the entanglement of nonbiblical denominational structures, parachurch mission boards, and all other trappings devoid of authority from the Head of the church can expect to see their labor not be in vain in the long term—but such can rejoice in the hope that, by the grace of their Redeemer and His special presence with them and by His empowerment of them, a harvest of souls and new self-supporting, indigenous churches can be planted and continue to multiply until the Lord comes. Do you wish to stand before Christ's judgment seat with such continuing fruit, or in shame, your labor counting for nothing because the seeds of compromise you tolerated blossomed into tares that choked out God's good wheat? Then fellowship with a faithful and separated Baptist church that enjoys true unity in its body around all the truth (1 Corinthians 1:10), that fellowships only with likeminded congregations that allow "no other doctrine" (1 Timothy 1:3), and that zealously sends forth and supports with prayer and finances worldwide evangelists of such a caliber. You do not need a great ecumenical missionary alliance. All you need—and all that Jesus Christ will recognize on that great Day—is the church.

VI. John A. MacMillan

The writings of Christian and Missionary Alliance minister John A. MacMillan (1873-1956), among which his book *The Authority of the Believer*[3499] was a key and very influential work,[3500] form an important link in the trajectory from Keswick theology and the development of the theme of "throne life, which permeated the Keswick, Higher Life,

---

[3499] See *The Authority of the Believer* (repub. 3 vol. in 1 of *The Authority of the Believer, The Authority of the Intercessor, & Encounter with Darkness*), John A. MacMillan. Camp Hill, PA: Wing Spread Publishers, 1981; orig. pub. 1932). MacMillan wrote the book after allegedly being involved in a healing miracle and a separate defeat of demons. First, demonically-induced heart problems from which a pastor's wife was suffering were cured by the exercise of throne power (pgs. 117-118, *A Believer with Authority*, King). The woman "was receiving medical treatment" (pg. 117, *ibid*), but the problem was cured by miracle, Macmillan knew. It was not the medical treatment, but the exercise of throne power over the demons, that was truly effective. Secondly, a depressed lady was delivered from demonic depression when after "definitely asserting in prayer . . . the believer's throne union" the lady "t[ook] audibly" by a sort of positive confession her place of authority, and then no longer was depressed (pgs. 122-123, *ibid*). MacMillan, who had been preaching the doctrines set out in his later book for quite some time already, went on to write an eight-part series of articles in *The Alliance Weekly* in early 1932 entitled "The Authority of the Believer" ("The Authority of the Believer," *Alliance Weekly*, January 9, 16, 23, 30; February 6, 13, 20, 27, 1932). The articles, which were reprinted in booklet form in 1934, were commended in the preface to the 1933 printing (and subsequent printings) of *War on the Saints* by Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts. The preface indicated that "*The Alliance Weekly* of America . . . [had] fe[lt] it necessary to publish some very able articles by . . . J. A. MacMillan dealing with demon possession" (cf. pgs. 123-124, *A Believer with Authority*, King). MacMillan wrote the additional material that made it into book form as *The Authority of the Intercessor* and *Encounter with Darkness* for the *Alliance Weekly* in 1936, 1940, and 1948 (John A. MacMillan, "The Authority of the Intercessor," *Alliance Weekly*, May 1936, 334; "The Authority of the Rod," May 18, 1940, 309-311, 314; "Modern Demon Possession," July 24, 31, September 4, 11, 18, 1948), which were combined with material from MacMillan's lecture notes at Nyack college to form the edition referenced at the beginning of this note.

MacMillan also edited for decades the continuationist periodical *The Full Gospel Adult Quarterly*, contributed regularly to and became the chief editorial writer for the CMA *Alliance Weekly*, and thus "his name . . . beca[ame] well-known and established in CMA circles, and his teaching through writing . . . authoritative and popular" (pg. 127, *ibid*; cf. pgs. 129ff.). He also contributed to the *Alliance Weekly* by reprinting material from authors such as Andrew Murray, George H. Pember, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Charles Finney, A. B. Simpson, and others, and helped "shape the spiritual life of the Christian and Missionary Alliance for more than two decades" by his writings and editorial work (pg. 143, *A Believer with Authority*, King).

[3500] MacMillan's influence has "powerfully shaped the theology and ministry of the CMA"; his book *The Authority of the Believer* has been "used on the mission field" in a variety of locations and "translated into several languages as well" (pgs. 203-207, *A Believer with Authority: The Life and Message of John A. MacMillan*, Paul L. King). The material in *The Authority of the Believer* was endorsed and quoted at length in the seventh and subseqent editions of *War on the Saints* by Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts; *The Overcomer* magazine, founded by Penn-Lewis, published various articles by MacMillan; the "popular interdenominational evangelical newspaper *Herald of His Coming* . . . reprinted in full . . . *The Authority of the Believer*" (pgs. 208-209, *ibid*), while the Wesleyan holiness tradition was filled with MacMillan's doctrine after Paul Billheimer, "Bible college president . . . radio preacher . . . [and] leading holiness proponent of the overcoming Christian life" (pg. 209, *ibid*) plagarized *The Authority of the Believer* in a variety of his own influential works (cf. pg. 282, *A Believer with Authority*, King). Merrill Unger, graduate of the CMA training institute in Nyack, minister in Aimee Semple McPhereson's International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, and professor at Dallas Seminary, spread MacMillan's ideas in his books on demonology, which also influenced Unger's colleague at Dallas Seminary, J. Dwight Pentecost. Wayne Grudem references MacMillan's *The Authority of the Believer* in his systematic theology (cf. pgs. 203-214, *A Believer with Authority*, King). MacMillan's influence was the greatest in the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word-Faith movements, as will be noted below.

and overcomer movements"[3501] as expounded especially by Jessie Penn-Lewis and A. B. Simpson,[3502] although with other earlier Higher Life antecedents,[3503] to both Pentecostalism and the Word-Faith movement.[3504] "MacMillan's teaching on the authority of the believer is . . . [a] compilation and expansion of the teachings of . . . holiness leaders, especially A. B. Simpson, A. T. Pierson, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Andrew Murray, and George Watson."[3505] Paul King notes:

> As a young man, John MacMillan would have had the opportunity to drink deeply of the preaching and teaching ministry of well-known [Keswick] leaders of his day . . . [such as] Andrew Murray and Presbyterian Keswick leader A. T. Pierson[.][3506] . . . MacMillan was actively involved with Presbyterian churches advocating higher-life teaching . . . he had been immersed in teaching about the believer's redemption rights taught by A. B. Simpson[3507] and others in the CMA and the

---

3501 Pg. 220, *A Believer with Authority*, King. See *Throne Life of Victory*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

3502 Thus, at "a China Inland Mission conference in 1897 Jessie Penn-Lewis taught on the believer's position in Christ according to Ephesians 1 and 2" (pg. 218, *A Believer with Authority*, King; see the preface to *The Warfare with Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis) and how that position gave the believer "authority over all the power of the enemy . . . [and] power to deliver and loose others from the bonds of the evil one" (pg. 65, *The Warfare with Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. (Dorset, England: Overcomer Literature Trust, 1963). See also Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*, Roberts & Penn-Lewis. Simpson also taught about "throne life" around 1897 in his *Christ in the Bible Commentary*, 5:413-414, affirming that the believer "takes the place of accomplished victory and conceded right," until "all our enemies are made our footstool," despite the fact that the subjection of all enemies under Christ as His footstool is an indication of His unique exaltation as the Divine Messiah, and despite the fact that such an image of enemies under a footstool is solely the perogative of Deity in Scripture (Psalm 99:5; 110:1; 132:7; Isaiah 66:1; Lamentations 2:1; Matthew 5:35; 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:43; Acts 2:35; 7:49; Hebrews 10:13), so that Christ is specifically contrasted with the created order by the fact that all enemies are going to be made His footstool (Hebrews 1:13). Simpson's "throne life" doctrine thus takes from the Triune God and the incarnate Christ one of the privileges of Deity, and ascribes it to mortal men. "MacMillan's book *The Authority of the Believer* is a more thorough exposition . . . expanding on the germinal thought of both Penn-Lewis and Simpson" (pg. 219, *A Believer with Authority*, King), and the Word of Faith movement proceeds to recognize the implications of the Throne Life with its doctrine that believers are "little gods."

3503 E. g., Asa Mahan, at the Oxford Convention, preached to those who had entered into the Higher Life: "[Y]ou share the same power before the throne which Christ has" (pg. 82, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

3504 In addition to the powerful Keswick influence that pervaded the CMA as A. B. Simpson's denomination, MacMillan had a variety of other connections to Keswick; for instance, from his early days as a Christian publisher, he was "acqainted with . . . Dr. R. V. Bingham" (pg. 9, *A Believer With Authority*, Paul L. King), who "established . . . Canadian Keswick" (pg. 53, "Binghham, Rowland V.," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen), and read the periodical Bingham edited, *The Evangelical Christian* (see pg. 141, *A Believer with Authority*, King).

3505 Pg. 238, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3506 MacMillan preached, in 1937 and 1941, at the Missionary Convention at the New York City Gospel Tabernacle founded by Simpson (pg. 161, *A Believer with Authority*, King).

3507 "MacMillan's concept of the believer's authority was taught in germinal form by A. B. Simpson" (pg. 216, *A Believer with Authority*, King). See Simpson's compositions "The Authority of Faith" (*Alliance Weekly*, April 23, 1938, 263); "Spiritual Talismans" (*Alliance Weekly*, June 14, 1919, 178-179), and also *Christ in the Bible*, 4:338. Thus, each believer "speaks the word of authority and command, and puts [his] foot without fear upon the head of [his] conquered foes, [and] lo, their power is disarmed, and all the forces of the heavenly world are there to make the victory complete," since, Simpson believed, the

> Higher Life movement . . . [he] recommended Murray's writings along with A. B. Simpson's as 'among the best' . . . [and] published articles by Murray on healing[.] . . . One of the strongest spiritual influences on MacMillan's life was Jessie Penn-Lewis,[3508] a leader in the British Keswick movement and subsequently the overcomer movement . . . who had influenced his theology and practice of spiritual authority.[3509]

MacMillan, when associate editor of *The Alliance Weekly*, was "so impressed with . . . Penn-Lewis['] . . . expl[anation of] how to exercise the authority of binding and loosing [demons] . . . [in her] booklet entitled *Prayer and Evangelism*[3510] . . . that twice . . . (1937 and 1941) he reproduced a portion of this booklet as articles [in the paper]. . . . Binding and loosing, taught and practiced by A. B. Simpson, Jessie Penn-Lewis . . . and others,[3511] was practiced on the mission field"[3512] by MacMillan,[3513] who also read *The Overcomer*, the magazine founded by Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts.[3514] Through Penn-Lewis's influence "binding and loosing became a foundational understanding for . . . The Christian and Missionary Alliance."[3515] MacMillan taught that the Christian can "fearlessly bin[d] the forces of darkness in any part of the world" since "all the powers of the air . . . are in subjection to" him,[3516] and consequently, as a continuationist minister, he maintained a "deliverance ministry . . . [and] frequently engaged in exorcism."[3517] He was also "acquainted with the . . . healing ministry of CMA evangelists F. F. and B. B.

---

promise of Luke 10:19 is not just for the "seventy" (v. 17), as the context of Luke 10 would indicate, but for all believers (*Alliance Weekly*, April 23, 1938, 263).

3508 MacMillan was "strongly influenced by Penn-Lewis" and even "made note . . . in his journal . . . [of] the death of Jessie Penn-Lewis in August 1927 . . . a strong indication of the extent of Penn-Lewis' influence on his life and ministry" (pgs. 280, 89-90, *A Believer with Authority*, King).

3509 Pgs. 14-15, 44, 124, *A Believer with Authority*, King. King notes the precursors to MacMillan's teaching on throne power in the writings of Methodist holiness leader George B. Watson, as well as Penn-Lewis, and A. B. Simpson. He also notes that MacMillan "was also strongly influenced by the writings of . . . George Pember" (pg. 25, *ibid*.), as were Penn-Lewis and Watchman Nee.

3510 This work of Penn-Lewis also "includes binding the strong man" (pg. 318, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

3511 For example, Andrew Murray believed that the "Church may . . . by the power of united prayer . . . bind and loose in heaven . . . [and] cast out . . . Satan" (pg. 62, Chapter 15, *With Christ in the School of Prayer*, Andrew Murray).

3512 Pgs. 39, 65, 134, *A Believer with Authority*, King. Thus, for example, CMA "missionaries would claim land from demonic control in Tibet and bind the powers of darkness . . . MacMillan records in his journal that they were 'binding here and loosing there,'" (pgs. 64-65, *ibid*), yet somehow the demons got unbound again and Tibet remained, and remains to this day, a stronghold of paganism, not of the CMA denomination.

3513 Thus, MacMillan wrote that Christians can, "even today . . . according to the measure of their entire surrender . . . like Elijah . . . say: 'There shall not . . according to my word' . . . [and] bind and loose in definite power" (pg. 65, *A Believer with Authority*, King).

3514 Pg. 141, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3515 Pg. 135, *Binding and Loosing*, Foster & King.

3516 Pg. 35, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan. Elec. acc. http://hopefaithprayer.com/books/The_Authority_of_the_Believer_John_MacMillan.pdf.

3517 Pgs. 96-97, 173, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

Bosworth[3518] . . . [who] revitalized the floundering CMA work [where MacMillan lived in] Toronto,"[3519] while also demonstrating "a fondness for Finney," writing a preface to one of that perfectionist's books that was republished by the CMA.[3520] In addition to accepting the practice of the sign gifts of modern tongues and healing[3521] and engaging in "power encounters" comparable to those of third-wave charismatics,[3522] MacMillan

---

[3518] The "Bosworth Brothers" held to the strange heresy that "healing is partaken of in the Eucharist, and that the failure to recognize at the Lord's table that He atoned for sickness is responsible for the sickness and death of many" (pg. 22, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham).

[3519] Pg. 40, *A Believer with Authority*, King. Bosworth may have revitalized a CMA work, but he did not heal, as he claimed to do, after the manner of Christ and the Apostles. One of Bosworth's "best friends stated" that frequently "nothing moved" and nobody was healed at all, while on Bosworth's very best nights of healing meetings "ten per cent of those that came for healing were 'helped'"—note, not "healed" like those whom Christ and the Apostles cured, but "helped" in some unspecified way, while ninety per cent were not even "helped" (pg. 110, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham). One of Bosworth's co-workers, out of "hundreds and thousands that were anointed whose history of healing could be investigated," could not "publish the account of a score of whom an unbiased Christian examination" would affirm that supernatural healing had taken place, and those employed by Bosworth in his "follow up" campaigns, examining those who were allegedly healed, found the results "utterly disappointing" (pg. 115, *ibid*.). Indeed, the "one who was mainly instrumental in [Bosworth's] coming to Toronto was stricken before [Bosworth's] meetings were over. Mr. Bosworth visited him and left him as sick as he found him" (pg. 115, *ibid*.). God could certainly have healed some people whom earnest Christians prayed for and who also attended Bosworth's meetings, in the same manner that He answers the prayers for healing made by godly pastors and Christians in historic Baptist and cessationist churches that reject healing meetings, but Bosworth's practice radically contradicted his claims to Apostolic healing gifts, and adulatory coverage by the *Alliance Weekly* claiming that Bosworth performed all sorts of miracles (cf. pg. 50, *Alliance Weekly* 59:3, July 19, 1924) is fulsome in light of the sober realities.

[3520] Pg. 132, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

[3521] E. g., even today "God still gives tongues to some" (pg. 6, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, January 8, 1950; see also pgs. 254-255; 358-359, *A Case Study of a Believer with Authority*, Paul L. King. Pg. 235, *Only Believe*, King.

[3522] The charismatic "'third wave' . . . heralded by individuals like John Wimber (1931–1997) and Fuller Seminary professor C. Peter Wagner (b. 1930) . . . identified 'the signs and wonders' of the New Testament book of Acts as legitimate demonstrations of God's power today. These signs were seen as authenticating Christ's ambassadors. Hence, proponents speak of 'power evangelism' and 'power encounters' [in the] 'Signs and Wonders' movement" (*Exploring Church History,* J. P. Eckman. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1992). Wimber, who was ordained in 1970 by the California Society of Friends, that is, by the Quakers, and who "embraces the Roman Catholic teaching on the efficacy of relics" (pg. 172, *Charismatic Chaos*), has made statements that deny Christ's omniscience ("There are many times in the Gospels when Jesus doesn't know, and he has to ask questions," Wimber, "Healing Seminar" tapes, 1981, cited on pg. 173, *Charismatic Chaos*) and affirms other blasphemies (for example, stating "I believe there were times when Jesus had little or no faith for the healing of the individual," *ibid*). Consider an example of a "power encounter":

> According to John Wimber the first great "power encounter" took place at his church on Mother's Day, 1979. A visiting speaker had been invited because Wimber sensed his congregation needed some refreshing by the Holy Spirit. Wimber was aghast and furious . . . when people began to fall to the floor and speak in tongues. . . . The young people were shaking and falling over. People were weeping and wailing, and one young man had the mike next to his mouth as he spoke in tongues. Before long the floor looked like a battlefield scene—bodies everywhere . . . the situation was out of control[.] . . .The young preacher shouted, "More, Lord, More!" Wimber's wife could feel the power . . . Carol Wimber [c]ould feel the power like heat or electricity, radiating off of [t]he bodies of the fallen young peopl[e] . . . At an earlier meeting John Wimber says, "There was this sense of the presence of something in the room." He concluded that this "presence" was "God" . . . [yet] Wimber wondered if [the "power encounter"] was from God or from Satan[.] (pgs. 89-90, "*Counterfeit*

taught,[3523] with Penn-Lewis and the modern charismatic movement, that believers can be demon possessed. Indeed, as Penn-Lewis affirmed that even consecrated believers can be possessed, so MacMillan affirmed that "[m]any earnest souls, who have been urged to entire surrender to God, open their beings with the utmost abandon to whatever spiritual power approached them . . . provid[ing] a channel for entrance of demons."[3524] Thus, MacMillan recounts the story of "a sincere Christian [he says] . . . [out of whom] eighteen separate demons left the body of their victim. . . . At intervals covering a period of two months [further] spirits . . . revealed themselves. . . . The trouble was . . . attended by a sexual mania . . . [finally MacMillan's techniques had] perhaps thirty . . . demons . . . expelled."[3525] MacMillan would ask the demons what their names were, then ask them if Jesus Christ came in the flesh, based on 1 John 4:1-3, and then command the evil spirits to leave when the demons said that Christ did not come in the flesh.[3526] Devils want to possess people, MacMillan affirmed, because "demons . . . are disembodied spirits" who would rather have a body, but "the [holy] angels are clothed with spiritual bodies similar to those which the saints shall have after the resurrection."[3527] Macmillan taught that believers could with an "authoritative rebuke . . . as servants and fellow-servants of Christ . . . [make] Satan . . . always flee. . . . [since] demon powers . . . all must yield to us as we take our place with Christ in the heavenlies (Ephesians 2:4-6) and exercise the

---

Revival [Hank Hanegraaff (Dallas: Word, 1997)], A Review Article," by David J. MacLeod. *Emmaus Journal* 7:1 (Summer 1998) 71-99).

MacMillan engaged in "strong demonstration[s] of what we would call a 'power encounter' today" (pg. 96, *A Believer with Authority*, Paul L. King) and throughout his ministry continued to allegedly work cures and "exercise power encounters for the glory of God" (pg. 109, *ibid*.).

[3523] It is noteworthy that MacMillan was not a Zionist; while he believed Israel had a future in the coming kingdom, he also wrote that, in the dispensation of grace, "the Jews have no right to Palestine by inheritance . . . and, since Calvary, the whole people are out of covenant with God," and thus have no current claim on Canaan—on the contrary, "by all standards of international law . . . the Arabs are justified in their opposition to the possessing of the land by those whom they consider as aliens," that is, by the Jews ("Stern Justice," *Alliance Weekly*, July 23, 1938, 466). Nor was he a separatist, so "[t]oday he would be classified as an evangelical, because he did not advocate separatism, as many later fundamentalists did in opposition to evangelicals" (pg. 139, *A Believer with Authority*, King).

[3524] Pg. 112, *The Authority of the Believer;* cf. pg. 139.

[3525] Pgs. 89-92, *The Authority of the Believer*. This incident is described in detail and put in some context on pgs. 178-181 of *A Believer with Authority*, King; MacMillan testified: "The writer has seen as many as thirty demons cast out of a single person," for "[o]ver . . . demons . . . the Lord exercised absolute authority, and His followers have the same authority through His name," just as they also "see . . . today . . . healings that are as miraculous as any recorded in the Gospels" (pg. 18, *The Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, February 6, 1949, MacMillan), the sign gifts of miraculous healing and exorcism being connected.

[3526] MacMillan's exorcisms emphasized obtaining the specific names of the demons, so that "a trademark of MacMillan's deliverance ministry . . . [involved] ask[ing] [the demon,] 'What is your name?'" (pg. 181, *A Believer with Authority*, King). Another "trademark in . . . MacMillan['s] . . . deliverance ministry . . . [was using] 1 John 4:1-3" (pg. 247, *ibid*).

[3527] Pg. 113, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

authority of His throne which He shares with His believing and obedient people."[3528] MacMillan explained what, in his view, provided Biblical support for his throne-power doctrine; explaining Ephesians 2:4-6, he wrote:

> [T]he verb *hath he quickened* . . . [i]n the first verse of [Ephesians] chapter 2 . . . is not in the original . . . the verb that controls this passage is seen in verses 19 and 20 of chapter 1, [thus meaning]: "According to that working of the strength of His might *when* He *raised HIM from the dead . . . and YOU when ye were dead[."]*. . . The same verb [in Ephesians 1:20] which expresses the reviving of Christ expresses also the reviving of His people. . . . the very act of God which raised the Lord from among the dead, raised also His body . . . the [universal, invisible] Church. . . . [Therefore, the] "elevation of His people with [Christ] to the heavenlies has no other meaning than that they are made sharers . . . of the authority which is His . . . they share His throne . . . [which] means without question to partake of the authority which it represents. Indeed, they have been thus elevated in the plan of God, for this very purpose, that they may even now exercise, to the extent of their spiritual apprehension, authority over the powers of the air and over the conditions which those powers have brought about on the earth."[3529]

Consequently, the "completeness of His authority" has been given to believers so that they can exercise "this same authority . . . day by day."[3530] Despite the fact that the universal, invisible church has the same authority as Christ, "more manifest progress" has not come because "a head is wholly dependent upon its body for the carrying out of its plan,"[3531] and the universal church has not recognized MacMillan's doctrine, hindering Christ from working through the universal church, on which He is allegedly "wholly dependent." Spiritual work will go forward when believers, "immersed in the omnipotence of God," in "humble faith . . . take [their] seat in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus . . . [and find that] all the powers of the air . . . are in subjection to [them] . . . [so that they can] fearlessly bin[d] the forces of darkness in any part of the world" and "reac[h] out strong hands to bind and to restrain all that is contrary to Him."[3532] God "share[s] with human hands the throttle of infinite power."[3533] Moses held a rod when he led Israel through the Promised Land, and this "rod symbolizes the authority of God committed to human hands. By it the holder is made a co-ruler with his Lord, sharing His throne-power and reigning with Him."[3534] This truth about "the rod of the authority of the Lord against the unseen powers of darkness . . . directing the throne power of Christ against Satan and his hosts" is confirmed by the Hebrew of Exodus 17:16,[3535] which is

---

3528 Pg. 99, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3529 Pgs. 7-9, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3530 Pg. 15, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3531 Pgs. 21-22, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3532 Pgs. 26-28, 30, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3533 Pg. 47, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3534 Pg. 76, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3535 "MacMillan expanded upon the concept of throne life from Watson's book *Bridehood Saints* . . . [and] [e]laborat[ed] on Watson's application of Exodus 17" (pg. 122, *Only Believe*, Paul L. King). The book in question is *Bridehood Saints*, by George D. Watson. Cincinnati: God's Revivalist, n. d. It is not

mistranslated and unclear in the Authorized Version so that MacMillan's doctrine is not evident in the English,[3536] although it is in continuity with earlier Higher Life and Keswick proclamations.[3537] Believers must "abid[e] steadfastly by faith in this location"[3538] on Christ's throne, or Satan can get them. Christians do "not have to fight against the foe but simply . . . hold over him an already accomplished triumph."[3539] Without fighting the devil, but holding triumph over him, they can "bind the strong man,"[3540] Satan. Tyrannical governments can be made to allow missionaries into their nations when "in the Church believing groups . . . 'agree' that this state of affairs" will take place.[3541] Believers can "gain spiritual control . . . by . . . binding, by directed prayer, the powers of evil," and, because of "Luke 10:17, 19 . . . [and] Mark 16:17 . . . he who believes and obeys [has] . . . 'even the demons . . . subject unto [him] in [Christ's] name.'"[3542] This ability to cast out devils will continue "throughout the age" until Christ returns.[3543]

---

certain where Mr. Watson got the concept from, as it is not contained in the text of Exodus 17. However, influence from Jessie Penn-Lewis's *Hill-Top Prayer*, which is about the "power of the uplifted rod" (pg. 318, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones), and Mrs. Penn-Lewis's discussion in *War on the Saints* ("There are many aspects of the war by prayer against the powers of darkness . . . such as lessons from the act of Moses, lifting up his hands on the hill-top, which was an outward expression of a spiritual DEED," etc., Chapter 11), is almost certain, and since Mrs. Penn-Lewis wrote *War on the Saints* out of her experiences with evil spirits, and her other inspired books came from the same source, MacMillan's doctrine came from the fountain of revelation from evil spirits.

3536 Pgs. 78-79, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3537 Compare the discussion of Boardman's proof for the Faith Cure from Moses' alleged rod-authority on pgs. 28, 49, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. E. Boardman; at the Brighton Convention H. W. Webb-Peploe taugth that "the uplifed hands of Moses" were "hands of authority and power; and thus victory was obtained over the Amalekites" in Exodus 17 (pg. 155, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

3538 Pg. 31, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3539 Pg. 34, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3540 Pg. 41, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan. MacMillan probably adopted his idea of "binding the strong man" from *War on the Saints*.

3541 Pg. 42, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan. Those with the power to change governments are "those, who know the experience of sitting in heavenly places with the risen Lord, to hold the rod of His authority over the blocked roads before His people that all hinderances may be removed . . . the rod . . . symbol[izes] . . . divine authority[,] not prayer" (pg. 290, "Go Forward!" John A. MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, 81:19, May 11, 1946). That is, MacMillan is not asserting that the people of God can pray and God can, in accordance with His sovereign will, then change what happens in government—a non-controversial assertion for all Bible-believing people—but that believers can exercise authority over governments themselves and change them by agreeing that such change will take place.

Similarly, Watchman Nee reported that some people in England controlled political change in this sort of way (pg. 76, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Nee).

3542 Pgs. 120, 124, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3543 Pgs. 166-167, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

Although MacMillan affirms that believers have the same authority to cast out demons that the Lord Jesus has, and "all . . . demon powers . . . must yield to us,"[3544] nevertheless "there are frequent cases . . . of demon possession . . . [where it] has been found impossible to [cast out the demon], the spirit apparently paying no attention to the prayers or commands" of the Alliance minister or other wonder-worker.[3545] While the Lord Jesus always immediately cast out demons, when Alliance ministers sought to do so "the work of freeing the sufferer . . . [from] the possessing spirit . . . may be protracted"[3546] even when it does not entirely fail.[3547] For example, MacMillan in "his book *Encounter with Darkness* . . . describes in great detail an extensive ministry of deliverance over several weeks in 1947 . . . at one point continuing for seven consecutive nights. . . . On another occasion in 1951, a series of exorcism sessions on behalf of a Nyack student [MacMillan taught at the CMA Bible college in Nyack, New York] lasted at least three months and involved more than 170 demons."[3548] In this latter episode, a "woman who was [MacMillan affirms] converted when nineteen years of age" but did not begin to "seriously follow the Lord . . . for a number of years; in fact, not until she had begun to attend a Bible school" began to be "seriously trouble[d] . . . [by] spirits . . . [a]fter . . . she . . . was baptized."[3549] Exorcism "sessions lasted late into the night," accompanied with "cries and wailing," as "MacMillan . . . gave students on-the-job training in the ministry of deliverance . . . [and] taught students how to pray and plead the blood according to Revelation 12:11."[3550] One exorcism session was "a struggle which

---

3544 Pg. 99, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3545 Pg. 148, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3546 Pg. 170, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3547 Pg. 148, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3548 Pg. 148, *A Believer with Authority*, King, referencing *Encounter with Darkness*, pgs. 17-22. See Chapters 1 & 7, "Demon Possession" & "Modern Demon Possession," on pgs. 89ff. & 145-146 of the combined edition of *The Authority of the Believer, The Authority of the Intercessor,* and *Encounter with Darkness.*

3549 This episode is detailed on see Chapter 7, "Modern Demon Possession," on pgs. 145-146 of the combined edition of *The Authority of the Believer, The Authority of the Intercessor,* and *Encounter with Darkness.* Pgs. 182-183, *A Believer with Authority*, King, gives background.

3550 Pgs. 184-185, *A Believer with Authority*, King. Revelation 12:11 has nothing to do with pleading Christ's blood during exorcism sessions, any more than it does with pleading one's testimony during exorcism sessions. It is another passage dangerously misused and misinterpreted by MacMillan. Compare the misuse of Revelation 12:11 earlier by Hannah W. Smith in a way that suits the Word of Faith idea of positive confession (Letter to a Friend, May 31, 1874 & Letter to Priscilla, January 14, 1882, reproduced in entries for July 15 & November 7 of *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter), and the similar abuse of the verse in Chapter 10 of *War on the Saints*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Mrs. Penn-Lewis even notes "the strange fact which has perplexed so many, that abnormal experiences manifestly contrary to the character of God, have taken place when the person was earnestly repeating words about the 'Blood'" ("Believe Not Every Spirit," pg. 71, *Overcomer* 1912). Pleading the blood for the Higher Life, for post-conversion Spirit-baptism and the ability to speak in tongues, and for power over Satan, became a

lasted unbroken for eighteen hours . . . often artifical respiration had to be used . . . nurses feared for her life."[3551] The "deliverance actually took about three months to accomplish . . . for the demons would stubbornly refuse to cooperate and would hide over and over again . . . it was a long and torturous process . . . groups of demons were expelled, the number totalling 171."[3552] MacMillan considered this a great spiritual victory, and he "learned more from this case than [from] any other . . . in the past,"[3553] thus making this event a key episode in the development of his spiritual warfare doctrine. Indeed, "as a result of the exorcism on the Nyack campus in 1951, MacMillan initiated a course in the next school year on demonology and spiritual warfare—possibly the first of its kind in Christian higher education,"[3554] although "[n]ot all students viewed this [1951 exorcism, this] . . . drawn-out deliverance . . . as a positive experience . . . [considering it, rather, as] a ruse of Satan."[3555] For example, Albert Runge, an Alliance pastor who was student at Nyack at the time, wrote about this exorcism process that MacMillan found more helpful than any other, and which he made key to his system of demonology and throne-power:

> [M]any exorcisms are far more detrimental than beneficial. . . . Many power confrontations between Christians and demons are actually engineered by the demons themselves. As a student in Bible college I was informed that a fellow student was demon possessed, and that there was an exorcism going on. Being of a curious nature, I went to see what was happening. . . . Climbing the stairs . . . I could hear an eerie scream echoing down the hall[.] . . . When I got there the exorcist [John MacMillan] was praising God for the deliverance of the victim. Just after he said Amen, a second demon made himself known. After some time of struggling, arguing and pleading the blood, that demon screamed his way out of the room. Everyone was relieved until another demon made himself known. This process seemed to go on endlessly for days, weeks and months with the same results. There is serious question in my mind that the victim was every completely delivered.
>
> What went wrong? I have spent many years reflecting over that particular exorcism and researching God's word, and I have become convinced that many exorcisms are power play setups by the demons themselves. . . . They choose an exorcist . . . [t]hey choose the timing as well as the audience. The whole process is under their control from the beginning to the end.
>
> One of the things that happened during the exorcism convinced me this is true. When I arrived at the scene of the exorcism, I bgan to pray out loud for the deliverance of the woman. . . . Suddenly the demons cried out from the victim, "Stop him from praying, stop him from praying." The exorcist shouted to the students, "Stop him from praying." The students around me told me to be quiet. . . . I am convinced the demons were controlling the exorcist, a good man who lacked understanding of the confrontation. . . . Another incident during that exorcism indicated that the demons were pulling the strings. A theological professor brought his agnostic daughter into the room so that she could see for herself that there was a supernatural realm. As a trained psychiatrist, she was convinced that we were all suffering some kind of mass delusion. While she

---

standard doctrine of Pentecostalism (cf. pgs. 3-6, *Confidence: A Pentecostal Paper for Great Britain*, 5 (August 15, 1908) and the Word of Faith movement.

[3551] Pgs. 106-108, *What Demons Can Do To Saints*, Merril F. Unger.

[3552] Pgs. 183-188, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

[3553] Pg. 108, *What Demons Can Do To Saints*, Unger.

[3554] Pg. 192, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

[3555] Pg. 281, *A Believer with Authority*, King; see also "Exorcism: A Satanic Ploy?" Albert Runge. *His Dominion*, 14:4 (Summer 1987) 13-18.

was in the room the demons did not manifest themselves in any way no matter what the exorcist did to arouse them. However, as soon as she left, they acted up. I believe demons rarely manifest themselves in our culture unless they have a devious reason to do it.

What did the demons accomplish through this demonstration? . . . They left . . . future missionaries and pastors . . . with a feeling of futility and helplessness before the power of the kingdom of darkness . . . [and made them] question their . . . spiritual authority.[3556] . . . Whatever demons say during an exorcism is completely unreliable. Therefore, holding a dialogue with them is not only unproductive, it is dangerous. The demons will attempt to intimidate, manipulate, disorientate and confuse the spectators of an exorcism to accomplish their own ends. All experience within the supernatural realm must be evaluated in light of the Scripture to avoid becoming excessively superstitious. . . . There are no magical formulas, incantations, or rituals by which demons can be controlled or exorcised. Thinking back on my experience at Bible college, it became apparent to me that the person doing the exorcism had developed a systematic ritual to expel demons, and it had proven ineffective. First, when the demon manifested itself through the glassy eyes of its victim, the exorcist asked the question, "Did Jesus Christ come in the flesh?" When the spirit answered "No!" the exorcist declared it a demon. The exorcist later admitted to me privately that he was greatly confused, because at subsequent exorcism attempts, when the students were not present, the demons were saying that Jesus Christ did come in the flesh. What was happening? Once the demons had lost their audience of curious and confused theological students they had no need to carry on their charade.

Secondly, if the demon said, "no, Jesus Christ did not come in the flesh," the exorcist would then proceed to ask the name of the demon. Interestingly, this procedure comes from an ancient pagan belief:

> The Sumerians and the Semites of Babylon laid great stress on the belief in the magical power of names. If a demon was to be expelled properly it was necessary for the exorcist priest to know its name and use it properly in a spell . . .[3557]

To make matters more confusing to the exorcist, the demons could call themselves Jesus and the Holy Spirit and then laugh. . . . Asking the name of a demon serves only to open up dangerous and unnecessary dialogues with them. I have witnessed demons calling themselves by vicious names such as Hate, Fear, Murder, etc., that sent terror into the hearts of the spectators.

Thirdly, once the name of the demon was given, the exorcist would then command the demon in the name of Jesus Christ to leave the victim. A struggle ensued that seesawed back and forth. Finally there would be a scream. Then what appeared to be a moment of true victory was followed by the manifestation of another demon in the victim. It should have been obvious to us all that as long as one demon possessed the victim they all had access to her. The approach of casting out one demon at a time is futile. . . . [T]he demons rarely manifest themselves unless it is to their advantage. They prefer to work secretly behind the scenes.[3558]

[3556] Runge does not recognize that not only did the demons accomplish many immediate ends that advanced the kingdom of darkness, but that through this episode they influenced MacMillan and countless multitudes that have been influenced by him to adopt false doctrines in demonology. The main success of the demons in this episode was their effectiveness in spreading "doctrines of devils" to MacMillan and those who learned from him.

[3557] R. K. Harrison, "Demon, Demonic, Demonology," in *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, ed. Merrill C. Tenney, 5 vols. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: The Zondervan Corp., 1976), 2:93.

[3558] "Exorcism: A Satanic Ploy?" Albert Runge. *His Dominion*, 14:4 (Summer 1987) 13-18. While Runge makes many fine points, he still maintains significant errors. For example, he is in error in continuing to believe and practice the continuationism of the CMA. Furthermore, his affirmation that "we do not build our doctrinal understanding of demons from experience alone," but from Scripture also (pg. 14), is very dangerously insufficient—true demonology comes from Scripture alone, without any authoritative consideration of experience whatsoever. What is more, while critiquing MacMillan's procdure of exorcism as unscriptural, Runge himself advocates a different procedure which is itself still unscriptural.

Despite the concerns of Runge and others like him, MacMillan was certain that he was truly exercising the supernatural gifts of the first century, that he was not deceived by Satan, and that deriving demonology from what the demons themselves taught and did in exorcism sessions was not "giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils" (1 Timothy 4:1). However, when MacMillan engaged in exorcisms, it "never seemed to be 'quick and easy,' for the demons would stubbornly refuse to cooperate and would hide over and over again. There were times in which he questioned why it took so long at times to see deliverance."[3559] For that matter, "[n]ot all of MacMillan's endeavors in exorcism were successful," but at times, despite his throne power doctrine, exorcism simply failed entirely.[3560] While MacMillan's exorcisms were radically different, and far, far more protracted affairs, even when he was not simply a failure, than those of the Lord Jesus and the Apostles, and nothing in the Bible supports his practices, he nevertheless was convinced that they were evidence of the miraculous power of God through the believer's exercise of throne power, not a deceit of Satan.

MacMillan was also certain that the true children of God could be possessed by demons. As for those who say that "a true child of God cannot be brought under the power of the enemy," MacMillan follows Jessie Penn-Lewis and replies: "Experience disproves this,"[3561] for many minsters and workers in MacMillan's denomination and others in Christiandom fall under Satan's power and "never com[e] to the place of complete deliverance."[3562] Not only can "doubts [be] injected into the mind by lying spirits,"[3563] but it is an "important fact . . . that believers may become possessed,"[3564] although no Scripture whatsoever affirms such a doctrine; the experience of "actual cases of demon possession, where the evil spirits were in full control" prove that "sincere

---

3559 Pgs. 195-196, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3560 Pgs. 195-196, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3561 Pg. 127, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan. MacMillan's argument from experience, not Scripture, mirrors Jessie Penn-Lewis's argument in *War on the Saints*: "Evidences are now available, proving that . . . possession in its fullest degree, has taken place in believers . . . such cases having all the symptoms and manifestations described in the gospel records. . . . The fact of the demon possession of Christians destroys the theory that only . . . persons deep in sin, can be 'possessed' by evil spirits . . . the veil is being stripped off the eyes of the children of God by the hard path of experience" (Chapter 5). No Scripture is cited, or examples given from Scripture, of believers being possessed—rather, notwithstanding Biblical testimony to the contrary (1 John 4:4), "experience" and "evidences" outside of the Bible are sufficient to "destroy the theory" that Christians cannot be possessed. Penn-Lewis and MacMillan will not accept the evidence of God in Scripture, preferring the evidence they can obtain from the workings of demons.

3562 Pg. 127, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3563 Pg. 117, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3564 Pg. 143, 172, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

Christians" can be "possessed."[3565] Devils can be defeated only by those "so few Christians . . . [who enter into] the victorious life of the 'overcomer' . . . Revelation 2-3 . . . [and by] an appropriation by faith . . . [bring Christ's] 'throne power' into the earthly ministry of the believer."[3566] Receving a post-conversion Spirit baptism also helps, since by it comes "a supreme confidence in the wisdom and omnipotence of the Lord of the harvest, and an inward assurance of the sharing of His authority over all the power of the enemy."[3567]

Many of MacMillan's teachings—and those of the Pentecostal and radical charismatic Word-Faith movement that adopted them—are unscriptural and dangerous. MacMillan gives no Scripture to prove that believers can be demon possessed, nor does he attempt to refute the verses employed by those who reject his position—he simply gives "experience" as evidence. Experience is the best argument he has, since Scripture states concerning all who are "of God" that "greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4). The Holy Spirit is in the believer, and evil spirits are not—they are outside the believer in the world. This single sentence from the lips of the Almighty Jehovah has infinitely more doctrinal value than all of MacMillan's experiences. Rather than concluding that true Christians can be demon possessed because, MacMillan affirms, various ministers and church members in his denomination have been possessed, from members of the CMA on world mission fields to students at CMA Bible colleges,[3568] he would have done well to consider whether demon possession in his denomination was a sign of its dangerous confusion about the work and power of the devil and evidence of the presence of large numbers of unregenerate church members and leaders, a product not only of CMA errors on demonology but of CMA confusion and weakness on the nature of the gospel itself, such as Arminianism,[3569] confusion on the

---

3565 Pg. 144ff., *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3566 Pgs. 167-168, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3567 "Love at Its Flood," *Alliance Weekly*, December 11, 1943, 786. After all, "[i]t was thus with Dr. A. B. Simpson," and the "Christian and Missionary Alliance looks back to him alone as its honored and God-directed founder" (*ibid*).

3568 For example, MacMillan claimed to have cast out a demon that was speaking through a female college girl in a male voice at the Missionary Training Institute in Nyack, New York (pg. 97, *A Believer with Authority*, Paul King). Similarly, the wife of one of MacMillan's coworkers "began suffering from strange hallucinations" and thought "herself to be lost" (pg. 97, *ibid*.).

3569 For example, when MacMillan, in one of the college courses he taught, was asked, "'What about eternal security?' Answer was made: . . . ['']All of the divine promises are given to us in the way of faith and obedience. If we go aside out of that way, there is no promise that applies to us . . . the only place of security is when walking in the way of holiness['']" (pg. 25, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, February 21, 1943; cf. pg. 156, *A Believer with Authority*, King), an Arminian response contrary to 1 Corinthians 3:11-15 and many other passages of Scripture.

nature of repentance,[3570] and acceptance of dangerously weak evangelistic methodology.[3571]

MacMillan also misinterprets and reads into too many of the passages of Scripture which he does not ignore. The reason that "there is very little grasp of [his doctrine] by the majority of even spiritual believers"[3572] is because it is not taught in the Bible. MacMillan never proves that fallen angels are disembodied but holy angels are embodied. He never proves that Satan or fallen angels have direct access to the mind and can directly inject thoughts into the regenerate—an affirmation that would be difficult to prove in light of the fact that only the Triune God can see the heart and mind[3573] and the entire absence of such an affirmation in Scripture.[3574] He never proves that believers need to adopt the pagan practice of asking demons what their names are as part of an exorcism process, or, for that matter, that believers should ever converse with demons at all.[3575] He never explains why 1 John 4:1-3, which when interpreted grammatically and

---

[3570] For instance, contrary to Luke 13:3, on one occasion MacMillan was kneeling at an altar with a young farmer, attempting to lead him to salvation. The man bemoaned his condition, saying "I can't repent." MacMillan replied, "I am not asking you to repent; I want you to accept Jesus." MacMillan stated that one first "accept[s] Him" and then later "comes to the place of real repentance" (pg. 7, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, January 8, 1950; cf. pgs. 162-163, *A Believer with Authority*, MacMillan); recounting that same story elsewhere, MacMillan used it to teach others in the Christian and Missionary Alliance to counsel people who say they cannot repent: "I am not asking you to repent; what you need is to wholeheartedly accept Christ," for "repentance unto salvation . . . followed the acceptance of the Risen Lord, and the yielding of the heart to Him," which, it seems, is somehow possible without repenting. At least Macmillan seems to believe that after one somehow accepts Christ without repenting one will end up repenting afterwards ("The Necessity of Repentance, *Alliance Weekly*, May 25, 1935, 322; cf. "Heart Trouble," *Alliance Weekly*, July 20, 1946, 451, for another account of the same incident.).

[3571] For example, when "a man past middle age was brought into the evening service. At the close an invitation was given to come to the Saviour. The man indicated his desire for salvation, and [MacMillan] knelt beside him. The man was slow in perception, and it was hard for him to grasp simple truths. John 5:24 was [read, and] . . . [MacMillan] asked, 'You have heard the Word of the Lord?' 'Yes.' 'And you believe on Him?' 'Yes.' 'Now what have you received?' He looked puzzled, and the verse ws again read. Then the questions were repeated. Suddenly he cried . . . 'Why! I have eternal life!' 'Yes,' [MacMillan] answer[ed]." (pg. 6 *The Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, October 8, 1950) The fact that a man who was recognized as having difficulty understanding simple truths and who was slow in perception could answer "Yes" to two leading questions MacMillan asked him is not at all a good reason to give him assurance of salvation, and methodology of this nature is a recipe for filling congregations with unregenerate members who are able to be possessed by demons. MacMillan would have done well to study and recognize the error of Sandemanianism that still appears in various circles in Christiandom (cf. pgs. 170-190, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, D. M. Lloyd-Jones).

[3572] Pgs. 1-2, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

[3573] 1 Kings 8:39; Proverbs 15:11; Jeremiah 11:20; 17:10; John 2:24-25; Revelation 2:23.

[3574] For example, Satan does a great deal to Job, but that suffering saint never complains about Satan injecting thoughts into his head. Satan can, however, directly affect the heart and mind of unregenerate men (John 13:2), just as he can possess them (John 13:27).

[3575] MacMillan's practice of asking devils their names in order to cast them out is something not taught in Scripture, but is a common pagan practice. In the Bible, the names of a few good angels are clearly mentioned, but devils almost universally remain unnamed (cf. the contrast in Daniel 10:13,

historically has nothing whatsoever to do with asking demons questions in an exorcism ceremony,[3576] should be used in such a fashion, and overlooks the fact that demons themselves had spread this misinterpretation of 1 John 4 to further their deception of men and advance their Satanic purposes.[3577] MacMillan never proves that believers "do not

---

"Michael" versus the unnamed "prince of the kingdom of Persia."). Mark 5:9 records the only event in Scripture that could be employed in an attempt to provide exegetical support for MacMillan's practice of asking individual demons their names and then trying to cast them out one by one. However, the verse does not record Christ's asking the name of evil spirits because He did not know who they were or because He needed to get their names in order to cast them out. On the contrary, in Mark 5:9 Christ asked the devils their name to get greater glory to Himself. Since the man in Mark's Gospel was possessed by many devils, the Lord's power was more greatly glorified when, by a single command, He cast out a "Legion" of devils, the number of which would have remained unknown to the people witnessing the event had Christ not required the devils reveal it. Neither Mark 5 nor the rest of the Bible provides a tittle of support for asking devils their names as a prerequisite in an exorcism procedure.

However, in contrast with Scripture, countless "magical papyri" evidence "that to know and declare the name of a . . . spirit was believed to give power over [it]" (pg. 228, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, R. T. France), and in "heathen nature-religions" exorcists "know the names of the demons in their native tongue" so that "by invoking these they cure the ailments" caused by the demons (pg. 152, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, vol. 5, E. Schürer. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1890). Compare pgs. 759ff., *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Alfred Edersheim, vol. 2.

[3576] The pericope of 1 John 4:1-6 is about human false prophets who deny the true humanity of Christ under the influence of devils (cf. 2 John 7). It has nothing to do with seeking to ask devils questions directly. The devil's work is done when Scripture is twisted and deceit about spiritual warfare is propogated. Perhaps MacMillan should have actually studied the passage before trying to use it in spiritual warfare—or if he did not think of doing that, he should have done so after he found that the devils would, at times, tell him during exorcism sessions that Christ did indeed come in the flesh (pg. 14, "Exorcism: A Satanic Ploy?" Albert Runge. *His Dominion*, 14:4 (Summer 1987) 13-18).

[3577] The first known historical use of 1 John 4:1-3 in this manner was by the demonically energized heretic Edward Irving, founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church, who predicted the end of the world in 1868 and affirmed that Christ had adopted man's fallen nature. The *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals* notes:

> [B]elief in the [continuation of the sign] gifts was a natural consequence of his Christological views (to which the gifts testified): if Christ performed his miracles as a human anointed by the Holy Spirit, then believers might do likewise. In October 1831 the gifts were first manifested at a Sunday service in Irving's church. . . . For six months during 1831 and 1832 the solicitor Robert Baxter . . . exercised an immense influence on Irving and his congregation as a prophet, before rejecting the manifestations. Irving remained convinced that Baxter's gift had been genuine, and with his flock he continued to look for the fulfilment of his prophecies through the new movement, especially those concerning the raising up of apostles and prophets to lead the church. (pgs. 327-328, "Irving, Edward," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen)

Demons convinced Irving and his followers that the gifts that ceased in the first century had been restored. Soon demon possession was taking place:

> Palpable cases of [supernatural] . . . power . . . soon came to light, and were referred to Satanic agency. A very painful instance was the following:—A country clergyman had two twin children, who, whilst their father and mother were away from home, from some unexplained cause began to speak, as was supposed, in prophecy, though they were only seven years old. The parents, upon the receipt of the intelligence, immediately returned, and after observation became fully convinced that the Holy Spirit of God was speaking through their children. What they said at first "was of a very heavenly character." But by degrees this wore off, and they gave utterance to many strange and extravagant orders, and at last forbade a marriage which was going to take place. This brought matters to a crisis, and the passage in the Bible occurred to the parents: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God." The father and his curate happened to discuss the mode of doing this in the presence of the children, when the boy cried out, "Ye may try the spirits in men, but ye may not try them in babes and sucklings." This speech had the effect of postponing the trial till the next morning, when the father determined to pursue it. The boy again cried out in a loud voice, "Ye

shall not try the spirit." The father said, "I will try the spirit by the Word of the living God." The boy answered, "If ye try the spirit, ye shall be chastised." The father then read the third verse of the fourth chapter of the first Epistle of St. John, adding that it was God's Word, and that he would not be prevented, and then broke down under the stress of feeling. On this the curate, after reading the same verse, put his hand on the boy's head, and said, "Thou spirit which possesseth this child, wilt thou not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh?" The boy answered loudly, "I will not." When his sister was questioned she said nothing. The evil spirit was then commanded to depart. The boy looked pale, and was quite cold, and said he felt something like a cold fluttering, and then it left him. After a short time he cried out that it was coming again. He was told, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." They all prayed together, and the spirit never more returned.

This was the first notable instance, and set Irving at once upon an examination of every spirit, and only those were allowed to prophesy who had been before approved. The following question was put to the prophet who claimed possession of the "gift": "O thou spirit, dost thou believe that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh?" Other cases occurred, where the arrogated gift of prophecy was so evidently inconsistent with what is right and good, that the conclusion was come to that Satan and his angels were engaged in marring the good work of God. This conclusion, and the care exercised in examining and controlling the "spirits" according to scriptural directions, only confirmed in their belief the believers in the supposed spiritual manifestations. (pgs. 100-102 of *The History and Doctrines of Irvingism*, E. Miller, 2 vol. London: Thynne and Jarvis, 1878).

Thus, devils, who were obviously controlling the entire situation, deluded Irving and his followers into adopting a misinterpretation of 1 John 4:1-3 by apparently leaving the bodies of two unconverted children who had been possessed, in a manner similar to that in which the false doctrines of the Pharisees were advanced and many were deluded to their eternal damnation because devils allowed the sons of the Pharisees to exorcise them (Luke 11:19). By means of this delusion Satan led the Irvingites to misuse 1 John 4, believe that prophecy and exorcism were gifts for today, confirmed the Irvingites in their false religion, and spread Irvingite errors to other denominations and into Christiandom. This method of exorcism, adopted because of a rejection of *sola Scriptura* for what seems to "work" according to the demons themselves, was then passed down to Jessie Penn-Lewis, John MacMillan, and others.

Jessie Penn-Lewis picked up the 1 John 4:1-3 exorcism technique, reporting in *The Overcomer* (pg. 9, January, 1910) an instance of its use; a demon was "tested" in Germany, and "answered through a child of God, in 'tongues': 'Cursed, be Jesus Christ.'" (quoted by Panton, "Testing the Supernatural," *The Dawn: An Evangelical Magazine*, May 15, 1925 p. 64). By answering in this manner, the demon was able to deceive many who would hear about the use of 1 John 4:1-3 as a test in Christiandom and spread the lie that believers can be possessed. Penn-Lewis also gave an example of the 1 John 4:1-3 technique receiving support from demons by printing an example of a 15 year old girl who was demon possessed but had the demon say, "Now I am found out," when the technique was applied ("The Working of Evil Spirits in Christian Gatherings," in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis). It is consequently very probable that "the source of MacMillan's use of the First John 4:1-3 methodology [was] Penn-Lewis' influence" (pgs. 271-272, *A Believer with Authority*, King). The practice was likewise adopted and commended by partial-Rapturist D. M. Panton and the woman missionary Margaret E. Barber, who was sent out from Panton's congregation and was a mentor to Watchman Nee (pg. 252, *A Believer with Authority*, King; Pg. 50, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear; when Nee traveled to England to attend the Keswick convention, "he sought out Margaret Barber's friend . . . D. M. Panton, whose writings he had valued and . . . demonstrate[d] his appreciation," pg. 153, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear). Panton taught:

[I]t is the direct command of God "**PROVE THE SPIRITS**" (1 John 4:1): thus we have no option: ***no spirit-movement or spirit-action must ever be accepted without submission to, and authentication by, the Divine Tests***. . . . "**EVERY SPIRIT WHICH CONFESSETH THAT JESUS CHRIST IS COME IN THE FLESH IS OF GOD: AND EVERY SPIRIT WHICH CONFESSETH NOT JESUS IS NOT OF GOD**" (1 John 4:2—[Panton quotes the corrupt critical Greek text]). . . . For an adequate use of the tests, it must be proved, by supernatural phenomena, that a spirit-being is present; he must, to be tested, so appear that he can be isolated, in conversation, spoken or written, from the human agent; it must be certain that ***he*** answers - not suddenly falling silent, or withdrawing, so leaving (possibly) a Christian to give the correct answer, nor must any assumption of any kind be made, in confronting (as we do) the oldest and subtlest evil intelligences in the universe. ***I have myself discovered a demon by the test,*** and ***so I know that it works***. . . . Tested, [a demon] may . . . answe[r] through a child of God . . . 'Cursed, be Jesus Christ.' " [—*The Overcomer,* Jan., 1910] . . . In Irving's day, a spirit challenged with: "Wilt thou not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh?" replied loudly, "I will not!" and after being expelled, says the narrator, it never returned. Miller's "*Irvingism*," vol. 1, p. 94.] . . . . [A] Christian victim . . . [can be] fully under the influence of the spirit . . .

have to fight against the [Satanic] foe" because of the truth that Christ has already defeated Satan on the cross and will bring to pass the devil's final and ultimate defeat in the eschaton. MacMillan's drawing of conclusions about throne power against Satan and his hosts from the fact that Moses had a rod and from a Hebrew idiom about lifting the hand in Exodus 17:16 is severe eisegesis. He must affirm that Exodus 17:16 was not only poorly rendered in the Authorized Version but also misunderstood by all the Jewish Targumim, which support the KJV. The verse must also have been misunderstood and mistranslated by the LXX, the Vulgate, and all other ancient witnesses, not a one of which support MacMillan's position.[3578] Nor do Revelation 2-3 identify as overcomers only those "so few Christians . . . [which enter into] the victorious life of the 'overcomer.'" The chapters identify as overcomers all true believers, all who will "eat of the tree of life," who will "not be hurt of the second death," who will be "clothed in white raiment" and be found "in the book of life,"[3579] who are the sons of God (Revelation 21:7), and who are born of God and believe in Jesus Christ (1 John 5:4-5). The Lord Jesus Christ binds the strong man, Satan, by casting out devils (Matthew 12:28-29)—believers are never said to bind Satan or any other demons, and Satan will not be ultimately bound and his power removed from the earth until the Millennial kingdom (Revelation 20:1-3). Luke 10:17-19 refers specifically to "the seventy," not to all believers living in the first century—the overwhelming majority of whom were not given supernatural powers to heal everyone (10:9) and cast out demons that the seventy

---

> The idea that no believer can experience the on-fall of an evil spirit is not only in itself deeply erroneous, and contrary to actual cases unnumbered[.] . . . [For example, a Christian woman was possessed, and when exorcism was attempted, the demon said] he did not intend to go, we had better depart. Then the spirit began threatening the sister in 'Tongues.' He was furious with her that she had betrayed him, and he threatened to destroy her. The more we prayed, the more he raged, and cursed and swore, and threatened us. I am not at all an emotional man, but I had the impression that the room was full of demons. The spirit flung the sister about the room, tore and bit her body in a fearful way; we ourselves heard the spirit cursing and swearing in 'Tongues.' The words used were so awful that I cannot write them down. I understood a good deal without the sister's interpretation, for at times the spirit spoke in Latin, Italian, and some French. Unfortunately, I could only understand fragments without interpretation, as the spirit spoke very rapidly. . . . [But] an evil spirit . . . when confronted with this specific challenge [of 1 John 4:1-3] by the disciple of Christ, strategy or hate or Divine embargo compels a self-revelation. (pg. 64, "Testing the Supernatural," by D. M. Panton. *The Dawn: An Evangelical Magazine*, May 15, 1925. Bold print, italics, and capitalization have been retained from the source document. Compare. pg. 9, *The Overcomer*, January 1910)

MacMillan had these antecedents in what demons convinced Irvingites, Jessie Penn-Lewis, and partial-Rapturists to believe, and the validation of how demons responded to eisegesis of 1 John 4:1-3 when they were done flinging around rooms alleged Christians whom they had possessed. However, MacMillan had no support from Scripture—and thus, in practice, he was repudiating *sola Scriptura*—when he adopted his three-step exorcism process of first asking the devil its name, then asking it if Jesus Christ came in the flesh, and then telling the demon to leave, exercising throne-power to make it happen, and hoping that it worked.

[3578] Compare also the oath as "lifting up the hand" in Genesis 14:22; Deuteronomy 32:40.

[3579] Revelation 2:7, 11, 16; 2:26; 3:5, 12, 21.

received from Christ.[3580] Much less does Luke 10:17-19 refer to all believers today. Mark 16:17 demonstrates that certain believers would do miracles, but it does not promise that all church members or all believers would do all the signs listed in 16:17-18; the gift of tongues is mentioned in 16:17-18, but the Bible elsewhere specifically affirms that even before the sign gifts ceased (1 Corinthians 13:8-13) not everyone had the power to heal or speak in tongues (1 Corinthians 12:30). Nor does Mark 16:17 indicate that the signs would follow Christians until the return of Christ. Furthermore, ministers in MacMillan's denomination do not actually have the power to perform miracles like Christ and the Apostles did. Christ told the seventy in Luke 10:17-19, "Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you," while Mark 16:17-18 states: "They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." However, neither Mr. MacMillan in particular, nor Christian and Missionary Alliance ministers and church members in general, can tread on or handle snakes with impunity, and they get hurt if they drink poison. They cannot do the kind of miracles that the Lord Jesus did when He was authenticating Himself as the Messiah (Luke 7:19-23) or the Apostles did in validating their office (2 Corinthians 12:12). Every single person on whom CMA ministers lay hands does not get healed, but perfect and certain healing was promised in the sign gift of Mark 16:18. CMA members get sick and die, but Christ promised the seventy during the mission of Luke 10:17-19 that "nothing shall by any means hurt you." These facts devastate MacMillan's demonology for adherents of *Sola Scriptura*.

MacMillan also held to the Faith Cure, Keswick, and Pentecostal doctrine of healing through the Higher Life of the body. That is, he taught that "divine healing [is] not a mere privilege but a command,"[3581] since Christ lives both the spiritual Higher Life of the believer for him and lives the bodily life of the believer also. Christians "should claim this gracious relationship . . . [of being] members of [Christ's] body [in the universal, invisible church, as allegedly taught in Ephesians 5:30] for their own flesh and bones, and refuse the sicknesses that seek to fasten upon their physical frames,"[3582] and

---

[3580] Luke 10:17-19 clearly establishes that exorcism is a sign gift; the Lord Jesus gave the seventy power to cast out demons which they did not possess before that time and which distinguished them from the rest of God's people, who were not given supernatural ability to exorcise.

[3581] Pg. 26, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, January 23, 1938. MacMillan taught that "healing . . . is . . . His will . . . unless there is something between . . . [the believer] and Him, and that if such an obstacle exists, it may be removed," so healing is to be expected whenever one is right with God (pg. 162 of *A Believer with Authority,* King).

[3582] Pg. 25, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, November 22, 1942.

thus, by refusing to be sick, not get sick. As "the Atonement has made healing by divine power one of the abiding privileges of the redeemed," MacMillan discovered and "shared with his students . . . [at the] Missionary Training Institute . . . one of his secrets[3583] of receiving healing and maintaing health[,] [namely, to] daily . . . lay hands on various parts of his body, praying for divine healing and health in each part."[3584] Nonetheless, MacMillan had to "battl[e] physical illness,"[3585] which, indeed, "frequently and severely plagued him in China"[3586] on the mission field. "After visiting a colony of lepers" in China, MacMillan restated his belief that "healing power should not pass away, but rather that greater [healing] power should be manifest[3587] because [Christ] had ascended," yet he had to admit, "[w]e do not see it."[3588] Not a single leper was healed, the exact opposite effect of Christ's genuine miraculous power which "healed all."[3589] During a cholera epidemic, MacMillan and other CMA missionaries "claimed Psalm 91:3" for victory over "sickness and depression," which were "satanic oppression requiring warfare," but, nonetheless, "they endured . . . oppression of body and depression of mind."[3590] MacMillan, his wife, and their son "were all prostrated by a serious influenza."[3591] MacMillan had to endure the "slow and painful death . . . [of] his sister Lid[e]."[3592] Isabel MacMillan, his wife and co-preacher,[3593] suffered from tragic illnesses:

3583 Since nothing in the Bible says anything about MacMillan's practice, it would certainly be a secret to those who consider God's Word their sole authority on the doctrine of Divine healing.

3584 Pgs. 89, 161, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3585 Pg. 43, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3586 Pg. 89, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3587 John 14:12 does not teach that greater healing power than Christ's would be exercised throughout the dispensation of grace. David Cloud explains:

> [The verse] cannot mean that believers through the centuries would be able to do greater sign miracles than Jesus. That would be impossible. What could be greater than turning water into wine, feeding multitudes, walking on the water, and raising the dead? Jesus did not say that the disciples would do greater miracles; He said they would do greater works. Though the word "works" [ἔργον] is sometimes used to describe Jesus' miracles, it is not limited to that. Whereas Jesus ministered only in Palestine and saw only a relatively few souls saved under His direct ministry, His disciples have ministered throughout the world and have seen multitudes of souls saved. Whereas Jesus wrote no books, the apostles completed the canon of Scripture. God's people have enjoyed the power to live holy lives in the face of a godless generation, to withstand the most searing persecution, and to preach the gospel to the ends of the earth. God's people have continued to experience miracles and have done great works, but they have not done the Messianic sign miracles [after the sign gifts ceased with the completion of the canon and the passing of the Apostles.] (Pg. 107, "Charismatic Movement," *Way of Life Encyclopedia of the Bible and Christianity*, David Cloud. Elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*)

3588 Pgs. 56-57, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3589 Matthew 8:16; 10:1; 12:15; Luke 4:40; 6:17, 19; Acts 10:38.

3590 Pg. 63, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3591 Pg. 100, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3592 Pg. 88, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

> [She] contracted Dengue fever and malaria in 1926 and never fully recovered. It left her in a weakened condition and susceptible to other diseases. . . . [In] the last year of Isabel's life . . . 1927 . . . [she] suffered the symptoms of appendicitis . . . an unusual skin problem that developed into an abcess on her leg . . . boils . . . a painful carbuncle on her face . . . flu . . . irregular and rapid heartbeat . . . intense headaches . . . nausea . . . weak[ness] . . . too [great] . . . to undergo [needed] . . . surgury . . . [until finally she became] comatose . . . [and] died.[3594]

During this painful time, MacMillan "prayed much for Divine [intervention] . . . [concluded that] ['']What the Father is doing, I do['] . . . [and wrote,] ['']I am further sure that . . . the condition of my wife is a . . . maifestation of . . . demoniacal . . . power['] . . . an ['']infernal fiat['] . . . because they were dislodging the spirits that held the territories of the Philippines in darkness."[3595] Despite all night prayer vigils for her at the local CMA Bible college, Isabel's pleading with her husband that "unless [he] broke the chains [of Satan] she would not last long,"[3596] and MacMillan's regular and repeated exercise of his doctrine of throne-power over all evil spirits, his wife was not healed and the spirits allegedly causing the disease were not defeated, but she suffered a sad, drawn out, and

---

[3593] Thus, Isabel "assisted in the [church] services, sometimes preaching when John was ministering elsewhere" (pg. 75, *A Believer with Authority*, King), since "John believed that a woman could be called to preach or prophesy" (pg. 270, *ibid*.), for, in Mr. MacMillan's view, "1 Corinthians 14:34, 35 . . . was a Jewish ordinance," and the quotation of Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2 validated women preachers (pg. 251, "Inquirer's Corner," *Alliance Weekly*, 70:16, April 20, 1935), as it had to Jessie Penn-Lewis.

[3594] Pgs. 99-104, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

[3595] Pgs. 99-105, 112, *A Believer with Authority*, King. Dr. King affirms that MacMillan anticipated the charismatic concept of "territorial spirits." He also affirmed that MacMillan "could have been a forerunner of the . . . contemporary [charismatic] concepts of spiritual mapping and breaking the strongholds of territorial spirits . . . [through] such concepts as 'praying geographically'" (pg. 140, *A Believer with Authority*, King; citing "Praying Geographically," *Alliance Weekly*, September 14, 1946, 579). MacMillan did indeed write: "[E]very [pagan, demonic] god is confined to definite territorial limits, outside of which his influence does not extend" ("Our Most Stubborn Foe," *Alliance Weekly*, June 27, 1942, 402); however, he was talking only of the non-monotheistic ancient pagan religions, and in this particular passage he does not make it absolutely clear that he accepted their view of their deities—he contrasted this view with that of Islam, which he considered equally Satanic, but not confined to national or territorial boundaries. Furthermore, the reference to MacMillan's article "Praying Geographically" is not absolutely clear. It is very possible that Dr. King is correct about MacMillan, but the support King provides is not definitive. In any case, it is apparent that Jessie Penn-Lewis had affirmed some years earlier, in 1897 at a China Inland Mission conference, that Daniel 10 evidenced that specific devils rule various territories (see pg. 20, *The Warfare with Satan*, Penn-Lewis), and she employed the related tool of "warfare prayer" to oppose these territorial spirits, spreading the warfare prayer doctrine through conventions for Keswick and Overcomer theology (pgs. 279-281, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard). In light of her profound influence upon his thought in other areas, it is very likely that MacMillan adopted her doctrine, even if Paul King's biography of MacMillan does not supply conclusive evidence.

In contrast to Penn-Lewis and MacMillan, Scripture does not teach the territorial spirit concept—indeed, it is a pagan error (cf. 1 Kings 20:23; "Daniel 10 and the Notion of Territorial Spirits," David E. Stevens. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 157:628 (Oct 00) 410-431; *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation?* by Chuck Lowe, Sevenoaks, Kent: Mentor/OMF, 1998, and the review of the book by David J. MacLeod, *Emmaus Journal*, 7:2 (Winter 1998) 254-267).

[3596] Pg. 103, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

painful sickness and death.[3597] MacMillan himself was not healed, but died from "cancer of the spine" after a significant period of "constant pain."[3598] MacMillan also admits that "there are frequent cases . . . of demon possession" where CMA ministers find it "impossible" to cast out demons. MacMillan's missionary ministry included many such failures, such as "a boy in the [CMA] school [who] manifested signs of demonization" yet for some time "defied deliverance,"[3599] or a woman who MacMillan and others "were not able to set . . . free."[3600] Luke 10:17-19 and Mark 16:17-18 leave no room for such abject failures to heal and cast out devils. It is an abuse of Scripture to take passages that do not refer to all believers today and read into them what they do not promise. What is more, when CMA members claim they can work apostolic sign miracles but are then unable to do what God never promised, His holy name is blasphemed by those who do not recognize the CMA's abuse of the Bible and consequently conclude that God can fail to keep His promises.[3601]

David Cloud effectively refutes MacMillan's doctrine of the continuation of signs gifts and miracles throughout the church age:

> The gift of healing was associated with the apostolic age, and God gave the apostles sign gifts to authenticate their calling (2 Cor. 12:12). See Mark 3:14-15; Acts 2:43; 4:33; 5:12, 15; 19:12. The apostles laid the foundation for the church (Eph. 2:20), and when they died their sign gifts ceased. If the sign miracles were operative throughout the church age, they could not have been effective as apostolic sign gifts. Even in the early churches, all Christians could not do the sign miracles of the apostles. The only exceptions were a few men upon whom the apostles had laid hands. There was no general miracle-working experience among the first churches. If there had been, Paul could not have pointed to his miracle-working ability as a special sign. His would have been just another miracle-working Christian ministry if all could have performed such things; but all could not. If all could have performed miracles as a matter of course, the Christians would not have called for Peter to come and raise Dorcas from the dead (Acts 9:36-42). Peter's miracle that day was the "sign of an apostle." . . . God does not always heal sicknesses. Timothy was not healed supernaturally of his often infirmities (1 Tim. 5:23). Trophimus was not healed when he was sick in Miletum (2 Tim. 4:20). Paul was not healed of the sickness described in 2 Corinthians 12:7-10.

[3597] Such an event would be difficult enough to deal with for one who held to a Scriptural view of healing; for one with MacMillan's doctrine, it would be much worse.

Much sickness of other sorts remained unhealed around MacMillan; for example, a student at Nyack college who had polio lived in the MacMillan home for four years, but remained unhealed (pg. 148, *A Believer with Authority*, King).

[3598] Pg. 197, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

[3599] Pg. 55, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

[3600] Pg. 196, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

[3601] Compare Pentecostal historian Donald Gee's downgrade of Biblical healings and miracles to explain away the utter failure of Pentecostal healers to heal everyone: "A sadder criticism may reflect upon the small number of definite miracles of healing compared to the great numbers who were prayed for . . . in the [healing] campaigns. . . . It is foolish to ignore the facts. Various answers may be suggested . . . the Bible makes it clear to the candid reader that, generally speaking, many were still left sick even after great displays of healing power . . . [by] our Lord" (pgs. 148-149, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee). Pentecostal healers cannot heal everyone—so the Lord Jesus Christ's healing ability is blasphemously downgraded.

> The Greek word for "infirmities" (2 Cor. 12:10) is elsewhere translated "sickness" (Jn. 11:4) and "disease" (Acts 28:9; 1 Tim. 6:20). Three times Paul asked God to take away this affliction, but the Bible says He refused to do so. Paul was told that this infirmity was something God wanted him to have for his spiritual well-being. Upon learning this, Paul surrendered to God's will and wisely said: "*Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong*" (2 Cor. 12:10). This is a perfect example for Christians today. We should pray for healing and release from other kinds of trials, but when God does not heal and does not release us, we must bow to His will and accept that situation as something from the hand of God. This is not lack of faith; it is wise obedience to the sovereignty of Almighty God.[3602]

MacMillan would have done well to embrace historic Baptist cessationism and reject as dangerous and unscriptural the Keswick doctrine that the sign gifts continue throughout the church age.

MacMillan also misinterprets Ephesians 1-2, the central passage for his throne-power concept that allegedly establishes his doctrine that Christians have all of Christ's authority over evil spirits. His conclusions about Ephesians 1:19-20; 2:1 are erroneous. It is obvious that the "hath he quickened" in the Authorized Version of Ephesians 2:1 is properly supplied from the "quickened us together" in 2:5, as the parallelism and the continuity of 2:1-7 makes clear.[3603] Nothing is supplied in 2:1 because of a "verb" that is "seen in verses 19 and 20 [of chapter 1] . . . which expresses the reviving of Christ,"[3604] even apart from the fact that Ephesians 1:19 and 1:20 do not even share a verb, and the word rendered "raised" in v. 20[3605] is not a verb but a participle, a verbal adjective, with no related grammatical form in v. 19.[3606] In fact, Ephesians chapter two begins a new

---

3602 "Praying for the Sick," Fundamental Baptist Information Service, February 4, 2008; repr. from *Advanced Bible Study Series—James*, by David Cloud. Elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, vers. 5.1. Port Huron, WA: Way of Life Literature, 2009.

3603 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι, v. 1; καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι συνεζωοποίησε, v. 5. The main verbs of the sentence of 2:1-7 are found in v. 5-6, and v. 1 looks forward to this subsequent portion of the sentence.

3604 Pgs. 7-9, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3605 ἐγείρας.

3606 It is possible that MacMillan's linguistic and exegetical errors are a product, in part, of the fact that he "never formally completed high school or attended college" (pg. 8, *A Believer With Authority*, Paul L. King), and his "self-instruction" to compensate for his "limited education" (pg. 8, *ibid*) may have been not a little less then what it ought to have been. Nevertheless, while "today his lack of formal education would disqualify him from most academic teaching . . . MacMillan taught classes at the Missionary Training Institute at Nyack . . for nineteen years, from 1934 to 1953" (pg. 151, *A Believer with Authority*), and he also taught at CMA institutions on foreign mission fields. His book "*The Authority of the Believer* was a required textbook in MacMillan's 'Principles of Missions' course, which included training in exercising spiritual authority and casting out demons. In on-the-job training, he had students assist him in exorcisms," by, for example, delivering classmates who were "demonically afflicted" in the college during a period of revivalism there (pg. 154, *A Believer with Authority*, King) as described by Runge above ("Exorcism: A Satanic Ploy?" Albert Runge. *His Dominion*, 14:4 (Summer 1987) 13-18). Since all believers, even in the first century, never had the miraculous ability to cast out demons, and the Bible records no examples of training anyone in exorcism methodology, on-the-job training was important, since MacMillan's doctrine was impossible to derive from Scripture alone.

section of Paul's epistle.[3607] Furthermore, Ephesians never states that believers can "exercise the authority of [Christ's] throne"[3608] or that God "share[s] with human hands the throttle of infinite power."[3609] Paul taught the members of the church at Ephesus that they were "in heavenly places"[3610] by virtue of their union with Christ. God dwells "in heavenly places" (1:3), Christ ascended to such heavenly places (1:20), and believers are, because of the marvelous grace and love of God, in union with Christ in them (1:20). However, MacMillan makes the dangerous error of equating the functions of being "at the right hand" of God and being "in heavenly places." The former is a symbol of sovereignty (cf. Psalm 110:1) and is affirmed of Christ only, while the latter phrase is employed, not for believers only (Ephesians 2:6), but even for Satanic forces (6:12). Satan's hosts are in the heavenlies, but they are certainly not at the right hand of God—that position is reserved only for Christ.[3611] If "in the heavenlies" proves that believers are at the right hand of God, in the position reserved only for the Messiah, the God-Man and Head of His mediatorial kingdom, then Satan's forces are there, too, and they also can exercise all of God's authority. Their longed-for goal of usurping God's unique authority (cf. Isaiah 14; Genesis 3:5) would in such a situation have been achieved. Believers "sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (2:6) because they are in union with that Christ who sits at the Father's right hand, with all things under His feet, but

---

[3607] The fact that Ephesians 2:1 begins with καί does not establish that chapter two is continuing a series from Ephesians 1:20-23 that is controlled by the ἐνήργησεν . . . καὶ ἐκάθισεν in 1:20, continued into 1:22 with the καί . . . καί, and then continued into chapter two with the καί of 2:1 and 2:5. First, the relevant uses of καί in 1:20-23 are followed by a main verb (καὶ ἐκάθισεν . . . καὶ . . . ὑπέταξεν . . . καὶ . . . ἔδωκε) while the new section in 2:1 has an entirely different structure; the καί followed by a pronoun, participle, adjective, (articular) noun, and then another καί followed by another articular noun is not at all the same as the structure of 1:20-23 or a continuation of that sentence. Rather, 1:23 is the end of its own sentence, and the καί of 2:1 transitions to a new section of the epistle, which, while it certainly builds upon the glorious truths of chapter one, proves nothing at all like what MacMillan and the charismatic and Word-Faith heretics that follow him allege. "It would be inappropriate to conclude that 2:1-10 is simply a continuation of 1:20-23. Verse 23 forms a natural conclusion to 1:20-23 and the parallels are insufficient to justify a one-to-one application of the truths mentioned in 1:20-23" (pg. 104, "Exaltation and Solidarity with Christ: Ephesians 1:20 and 2:6," Thomas G. Allen. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (1986) 103-120).

[3608] Pg. 99, *Authority of the Believer,* MacMillan.

[3609] Pg. 47, *Authority of the Believer,* MacMillan.

[3610] The phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is unique to Ephesians, appearing in 1:3, 20; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12.

[3611] While Revelation 3:21 might be (inappropriately) advanced as a support for confusing Christ's sovereign rule with the rule of believers, the verse cannot possibly provide support for MacMillan's position, as the rule promised is specifically said to not take place during the Christian's lifetime, but after the return of Christ and the establishment of the Millennial kingdom. The rule mentioned in Revelation 3:21 relates to believers holding various positions of authority in the Millennium (cf. Revelation 1:6; 2:26-27; Daniel 7:18, 22, 27; Matthew 19:28; 1 Corinthians 6:2-3; 2 Timothy 2:12) and has nothing to do with a Christian and Missionary Alliance, Pentecostal, or Word-Faith doctrine of throne-power in the dispensation of grace.

Ephesians never states that they are themselves at the right hand of God and exercising Christ's authority.[3612] Not only does Paul never make such a statement, but this idea would change the affirmation of the latter portion of Ephesians 1 from Christ's exercising His Divine authority over and ruling the church to the church exercising Divine authority and ruling over herself (1:22). God's power works gloriously in believers through Christ by the Holy Spirit, but it is *God's* power, and remains His power, not the believer's own power, and *He* exercises it, not the Christian. It is blessedly true that the Father's supernatural power is working in the elect, but that is radically different from saying that believers can do everything that Christ did. Thus, none of MacMillan's proof-texts for the doctrine that believers can exercise all of Christ's power actually make such an assertion; on the contrary, the book of Ephesians refutes such a notion.

Furthermore, neither individual believers, nor the mythical universal, invisible church, are ever exhorted because of the truths in Ephesians 1-2 to "take [their] seat in the heavenly places" or "take [their] place with Christ" and then "authoritative[ly] rebuke" Satan. Believers are all already in the heavenly places in union with Christ;[3613] while they should grow in spiritual wisdom and understanding, see the greatness of God's power towards them, and rejoice in the riches of the glory of His inheritance in them (Ephesians 1:17-20), there is no position mentioned in Ephesians 1-2 that only an elite minority of believers recognize and "take." What is more, even when God willed the existence of the sign gifts, certain kinds of demons were only cast out, Christ stated, "by prayer and fasting."[3614] The Lord Jesus never breathed a syllable (as Moses never dreamed of MacMillan's doctrine because of his rod in Exodus 17) about an ability to cast out all demons by exercising throne-power, but, on the contrary, the Son of God specifically taught a method for casting out devils, when directly asked about how to

---

3612 "God's exalting the believer with Christ should not be considered as a separate act from exalting Christ. On the other hand, Christ's own exaltation remains unique. Christ is united to believers precisely in his distinctive and unique role as Lord and source of new life. . . . [His] uniqueness is reflected in [Ephesians 2:6] by omitting ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ and ὑπεράνω πάσης κτλ. [1:20-23] and by including ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ" (pgs. 106, 116, "Exaltation and Solidarity with Christ: Ephesians 1:20 and 2:6," Thomas G. Allen. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (1986) 103-120).

3613 Keswick neglect of this fact ties into the characteristic of Broadlands Conference and earlier Catholic and pagan mysticism that made union with God the endpoint of spiritual life; thus, at the Broadlands Conference, "[t]he highest life is to be one with God" (pg. 194, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910), while in Scripture union with God in Christ takes place at the very commencement of spiritual life (cf. Romans 8:1; 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 Corinthians 5:17; Ephesians 1:3; 1 Thessalonians 1:1; etc.)

3614 Matthew 17:21; Mark 9:29. Luke 9:37-42 is a parallel passage; note that in Matthew 17:21 the *TR* follows 99.5% of Greek MSS, all the ancient versions except the Coptic, and scores of patristic writers; in Mark 9:29, καὶ νηστείᾳ is found in c. 99.8% of Greek MSS and all the ancient versions; cf. *Textual and Translational Notes on the Gospels*, J. P. Green.

perform this miracle (Matthew 17:19; Mark 9:28), that directly contradicts MacMillan's position—and the Lord said that His prescribed method was the "only" one that worked for at least certain devils. Furthermore, the Son of God specifically gave the "twelve [apostles] . . . power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils,"[3615] which would be unnecessary if all believers throughout time already had such abilities and simply needed to claim throne-authority to exercise them. While MacMillan's key verse, Ephesians 2:6, does indeed assert that Christians (all believers, not only a select few that "take" a seat) are in union with Christ and thus "sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus," Paul does not draw MacMillan's conclusion from the wonderful truth of Ephesians 2:6. The inspired consequence drawn from Ephesians 2:6 is not a matter of speculation, but is stated in Ephesians 2:7: "That[3616] in the ages to come[3617] he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in *his* kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." Similarly, the Apostle's conclusion in Colossians 3:1-5 from the fact that saints are "risen with Christ" and their "life is hid with Christ in God" is that believers must "seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God[,] [s]et [their] affection on things above, not on things on the earth," and "[m]ortify . . . [their] members which are upon the earth." Scripture simply never draws from the blessed truth of the Christian's union with Christ in His death, burial, resurrection, and ascension MacMillan's conclusions that believers can exercise all the authority of the Lord Jesus over demons when they employ proper techniques of accessing Christ's "throne power."[3618] Scripture concludes from the

---

[3615] Mark 3:14-15; 6:7; Luke 9:1; Matthew 10:1.

[3616] ἵνα indicating purpose; believers were made alive, raised, and seated with Christ "in order that" or for the purpose of manifesting the exceeding riches of the Father's grace in the ages to come.

[3617] The phrase seems to refer specifically to the future eschaton rather than to something that begins in this dispensation; cf. Ephesians 2:7's ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις, "in the ages/worlds to come," with the only other similar texts in the NT: "But he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come [ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ] eternal life" (Mark 10:30); "Who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come [ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ] life everlasting" (Luke 18:30). Note also Ephesians 1:21, "not only in this world, but also in that which is to come," οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, and Ephesians 2:2; 3:9, 11, 21; 6:12. The plural αἰῶσι, "ages," of Ephesians 2:7 is comparable to the ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, "from the beginning of the world/ages," and κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων, "eternal purpose/purpose of the ages" of Ephesians 3:9, 11.

[3618] Indeed, Ephesians 1-2 specifically speaks of God the Father's power in exercise, not that of Christ. While the Father does give Christ authority in 1:20-23, nowhere in Ephesians 1:1-2:10 is there any record of Christ actively doing anything at all—certainly no record of His exercising authority appears. Rather, the chapters describe the Father's power exercised towards the elect and towards Christ. The Father blesses, elects, predestinates, accepts believers for Christ's sake, makes known His will, gathers together in one all things, seals with the Spirit, gives spiritual wisdom and understanding, enlightens eyes, works powerfully towards the elect, raises and exalts Christ, loves and raises the elect from spiritual death to life and exaltation, displays His grace towards the elect to eternity, gives them the gift of eternal life, ordains them to good works as His workmanship by the working of His great power, and so on. All this is done to

union of believers with Christ in His ascension that God will demonstrate His grace in them for all eternity to come, and also exhorts them to live holy lives, enabled by the Father's mighty power that works in them.[3619] The inspired conclusion Paul draws in 2:7 (cf. 2:10) from the believer's union with Christ of 2:6, that the Father's empowerment sanctifies and eternally secures every Christian, and such a demonstration of saving grace and love redounds to the everlasting glory of the God of love and grace, is an infinitely more glorious conclusion than if the Apostle had merely averred that ability of the sort MacMillan claimed was bestowed on him and others who had discovered his spiritual secret, so that one could in this life follow CMA practices, cast out some demons here and there, and perform other marvels. MacMillan's conclusion is a tragic disappointment when compared to the Apostle Paul's. Thankfully, one cannot build doctrine from conclusions not made in Scripture, so Paul's conclusions are true, and MacMillan's are not. MacMillan's position has about as much support in Ephesians 1-2 as the idea that believers can fly in the air by flapping their arms because they are in union with One who has ascended to heaven.

MacMillan's affirmations that believers are "immersed in the omnipotence of God" and that "human hands [share] the throttle of infinite power" prepare the way for the Word-Faith heresy that Christians are "little gods." After all, Christ does not just exercise authority over evil spirits—He sustains the entire universe and exercises

---

the praise of the Father's glory. It would be invalid to argue that believers exercise the Father's power because of Christ's exaltation, and MacMillan does not frame his case so—"throne power" is allegedly exercised, not because of the Father's omnipotence, but because of Christ's exaltation. Indeed, the Father's power was working in believers even before their regeneration, for the Father raised them to life while they were still in a state of spiritual death (2:1-7), but few would wish to say that even the unregenerate elect can exercise "throne power" because the Father has purposed to work in them and has worked mightily towards them even starting in eternity past. MacMillan does well to not take this approach, which is even worse exegetically than the one he adopts, namely, that believers exercise Christ's authority because Christ is given authority. However, since Christ is not pictured as active or as exercising authority in Ephesians 1:1-2:10, how much less, then, does Ephesians 1:1-2:10 present believers as actively exercising Christ's authority? Such a conclusion is not only unstated in Ephesians 1-2 and different from the inspired and stated consequences of union with the exalted Christ in 2:7, 10, but also is contrary to the flow of the Apostle's argument, which speaks of the Father's power in exercise, not the Son's.

[3619] Note also the development of 1:19-20 ("And what *is* the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward [καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς] who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set *him* at his own right hand in the heavenly *places*") through 2:5-6 and on to 3:20 ("Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us [κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν]"), rounding out the doctrinal section of Ephesians, chapters 1-3, in preparation for the practical section, chapters 4-6. God was exercising ominipotent power, the same kind of power that raised and exalted Christ, within the Ephesians to secure their sanctification and ultimate redemption (1:19-20; 2:5-10; 3:20)—"therefore . . . walk worthy" (4:1, οὖν . . . ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι) by living in the holy manner described in chapters 4-6. Again, Paul's conclusion is not, "therefore, exercise throne-power to perform Keswick continuationist, Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith miracles," but "therefore be holy."

authority over absolutely everything. MacMillan himself, in other writings, taught that believers can control "the fierce disturbance of nature" in storms and otherwise control the weather,[3620] exercise authority to make both domesticated and wild animals submit to their will,[3621] stop their houses from catching on fire,[3622] prevent diseases from infecting groups of people,[3623] change the actions of national governments,[3624] exercise authority over demons that cause anger and other sinful emotions,[3625] and exercise authority over the world to control the events that take place in it and prevent wars,[3626] a "belief [MacMillan] inherited from the Overcomer Movement in which Jessie Penn-Lewis . . .

[3620] Thus, Christ allegedly exercised throne-power as the representative Man in Matthew 8:26 to make a storm cease, as "the powers of the air (Eph. 2:2) . . . were behind the fierce distubrance of nature," MacMillan affirmed (pg. 28, *The Full Gospel Adult Sunday School Quarterly*, John A. MacMillan, Nov. 26, 1939), although Psalm 107:24-30 (cf. a cf. Psalm 18:15; 104:7; 106:9; Isaiah 50:2; Nahum 1:4), which is alluded to in Christ's causing the storm to cease in Matthew 8, actually affirms that Jehovah, not fallen angels, makes storms to both arise and cease, so Matthew ascribes to God what MacMillan ascribes to fallen angels, confusing the Apostle's point, that Christ is Jehovah, because He can make storms to cease in this manner (cf. Matthew 14:24-34), with an affirmation that men can exercise throne-power over evil spirits that allegedly control the weather, one entirely absent from the text of Matthew 8 and the rest of the Bible. However, while MacMillan does not have the Bible on his side, he does have Jessie Penn-Lewis, who misinterpreted the passage as MacMillan did (pg. 374, "How to Pray for Missionaries," *The Alliance Weekly*, 72:24, June 12, 1937).

[3621] Compare pg. 770, "Divine Protection," *The Alliance Weekly*, John A. MacMillan, 82:49, December 6, 1947 & pg. 9, *The Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, October 15, 1939. Of course, God can deliver His people from beasts if He pleases (cf. Daniel 6), but no text says that the believer exercises throne-power to cause such deliverances to take place.

[3622] Pg. 124, *Only Believe*, Paul King.

[3623] Pgs. 62-63, 88, *A Believer with Authority: The Life and Message of John A. MacMillan*, Paul King.

[3624] Pg. 42, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan; pg. 290, "Go Forward!" John A. MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, 81:19, May 11, 1946.

[3625] Thus, in *"The Authority of the Believer* [MacMillan] recounted [certain] incidents in which he exercised spiritual authority over demonically inspired anger . . . [such as when two] Christian workers, a husband and wife, had been quarrelling . . . [and] yelling at each other, John and Isabel [MacMillan] [q]uietly but firmly . . . took authority over the spirits of evil . . . and commanded their withdrawal. Almost immediately, the quarrelling stopped . . . [and as] the authority was day by day held and renewed, the spirits were kept in check" (Pgs. 93-95, *A Believer with Authority*, King; King recounts how MacMillan also exercised authority over demons of fear, etc.). However, "eventually . . . the two separated" (pg. 94, *ibid*.), but perhaps, since MacMillan had driven out and kept away the demons of anger, the two did not divorce in anger, but the couple were full of love for each other and sweetness of spirit and engaged in the awful sin of divorce (Malachi 2:16) on that account.

[3626] The "church . . . administer[s] . . . principalities after . . . rebelliou[s] and now usurping powers . . . have been unseated and cast down" by her authority (pg. 20, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan). Thus, "in world matters . . . groups of instructed believers, uniting . . . against the working of the powers of the air . . . have seen the problem . . . clear up . . . when war seemed inevitable[.] . . . Christians . . . [must] realiz[e] . . . their . . . great task of world authority . . . with Christ" (pg. 10, *The Full Gospel Adult Sunday School Quarterly*, MacMillan, October 15, 1939). "Devastating wars might at times be held back if the Church of Christ realized its authority and privilege" (pg. 743, "The Goodness of God," MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, November 20, 1948).

was involved."[3627] Indeed, one who holds MacMillan's doctrine becomes "a partner with his Lord in the government of the universe," releasing "divine power" for "the control of the activities of the rulers of mankind" so that at the Christian's "word . . . wars are hindered or delayed, calamities are averted, and national and individual blessings are bestowed"[3628] and by the "command of faith" a disciple of MacMillan can move "mountain[s] in the name of Christ . . .put[ting] his hand on the dynamic force that controls the universe . . . [h]eavenly energy is released, and his behest is obeyed,"[3629] for "the power and authority of the risen Head will come in due time to full development in the body . . . overcoming saints[.]"[3630] Indeed, MacMillan and his followers even claimed to exercise authority to "command [God] concerning the work of His hands" since "the Almighty . . . share[s] with human hands the throttle of divine power. . . . As . . . authoritative intercessors . . . speak the word of command, God obeys."[3631] Scripture teaches that Christians must obey God, but MacMillan teaches that God must obey Christians. This is wretched and blasphemous idolatry.

MacMillan states that "cults have departed from the faith [by] . . . accept[ing] human guesses, which have been enlarged into more or less elaborated doctrines. There is in many of them a foundation of scriptural truth, to which has been added a

---

3627 Pgs. 225-226, *A Believer with Authority*, King. Note also that both the Word of Faith movement and nineteenth century metaphysical cults promulgated the doctrine that the believer could control his environment after the manner of MacMillan (cf. pgs. 105-106, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell).

3628 Pg. 787, "Broadening Sympathies," John A. MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, December 10, 1938.

3629 Pgs. 53-54, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3630 Pg. 626, "The Authority of Christ," *Alliance Weekly*, October 2, 1948.

3631 Pgs. 47, 58, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan. The apparent blasphemy of a Christian telling God what to do notwithstanding, MacMillan wrote: "We need have no fear in accepting the fullest implications of the words above referred to," namely, to "command" God and wield "the dynamic force that controls the universe" so that as believers with throne-power "speak the word, God obeys" (pgs. 326-327, 334, "The Authority of the Intercessor," MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, 71:21, October 7, 1939; see also "The God of Nature," MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, October 7, 1939, 626-627).

MacMillan affirms that Isaiah 45:11 teaches this doctrine of commanding God, although not a solitary example anywhere in Scripture is found, from the time Isaiah wrote until the close of the canon, of such commands by mortals to the Almighty. It is clear in Isaiah 45:11 that "ask" and "command" are in parallel clauses, and the reference is to the children of Israel as Jehovah's "sons" (Isaiah 54:13) and as the work of His hands (cf. Isaiah 60:21). The Lord commands Israel in Isaiah 45:11 to seek and supplicate Him and obtain His wisdom about His future purposes with their nation, in particular, contextually, with the deliverance that was to be brought to them by king Cyrus. The text is not addressed to Gentile members of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, Pentecostals, or members of the Word-Faith movement, and has nothing to do with the way the entire universe is run, but is rather about God's purposes with Israel; it certainly has nothing whatever to do with such blasphemous folly as ordering God about how He ought to run His universe. The doctrine of MacMillan astonishingly makes the clay of Isaiah 45:9-11 give orders to the Potter.

Watchman Nee also adopted the heresy that the believer can command God (cf. pgs. 72-77, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*), and the idea of commanding God is a well-known Word of Faith blasphemy.

superstructure of human reason, which adds to or takes away from the divine original."[3632] Unfortunately, from the truths of the believer's union with Christ, the fact that God works powerfully to sanctify and secure the believer, the reality of the evil work of Satan and his demons, and the fact that if Christians "resist the devil, he will flee" (James 4:7), MacMillan's own superstructure adds and takes away from the truth of Scripture by affirming, among numbers of other grievous errors, that Keswick continuationism is true and so the sign gifts are operative today, that believers can be demon possessed, that believers can command God, and that believers have the same authority as Jesus Christ over evil spirits and over the world. His doctrine is cultic on his own definition, a ripe soil for the abominable heresies the Word-Faith cult[3633] and the charismatic movement in general developed from his works.[3634]

The Word-Faith or Health and Wealth Gospel movement has as its spiritual "'father' . . . the late Kenneth E. Hagin . . . [and its] leading living proponent [is] . . . Kenneth Copeland."[3635] The "founding faither of the Faith movement," through the influence of E. W. Kenyon[3636] on many doctrines and John A. MacMillan on others, "is commonly held to be Kenneth Erwin Hagin."[3637] "Hagin's influence is omnipresent in Faith circles. His mark is printed indeliby upon his countless disciples, such as Copeland, Price, and Capps . . . All of the major ministers of the Faith movement readily admit Hagin's tutelage. He is universally recognized in the movement as both a teacher and a prophet."[3638] "[C]ultic ideas . . . syncretized from metaphysics, of healing, positive

---

3632 Pg. 159, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3633 "[A]ll the elements that are common to the cults exist within the [Word-Faith] movement: a distorted Christology, an exalted view of man, a theology based on human works, a belief that new revelation from within the group is unlocking 'secrets' that have been hidden from the church for years, extrabiblical human writings that are deemed inspired and authoritative, the use and abuse of evangelical terminology, and an exclusivity that compels adherents to shun any criticism. . . . [T]he movement is well on its way to being established as a false cult in every sense of the term" (pg. 327, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur).

3634 The fact that the charismatic and Word-Faith movements developed, in significant measure, in assocation with doctrines and practices of MacMillan does not mean that he would have endorsed everything practiced by charismatic and Word-Faith teachers today; indeed, some of what the Word-Faith movement teaches is so repulsive and pagan that it is very likely that MacMillan would have denounced it, even though it grew out of his own teaching.

3635 "Spirit, Soul and Body: The Trichotomy of Kenyon, Hagin and Copeland," by William Atkinson. Elec. acc. http://www.tffps.org/docs/Spirit,%20Soul%20and%20Body,%20The%20Trichotomy%20of%20Kenyon,%20Hagin%20and%20Copeland.pdf.

3636 Kenyon also adopted and preached the throne power doctrine that MacMillan derived from his misinterpretation of Ephesians 1-2; see, e. g., pgs. 79ff., 162-163, *In His Presence*, Kenyon.

3637 Pg. 3, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

3638 Pgs. 12, 55, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

confession, and prosperity . . . account for the success of the [Word-Faith] movement . . . distinguish it most, cause its amazing growth, and occupy center stage[.] . . . These cultic ideas are widely accepted in the independent charismatic movement and are even proclaimed to be a key to the progressive revelation of God being poured out in the end times."[3639] Indeed, the Word of Faith system is "becom[ing] (if it is not already) [a] permanent fixtur[e] in the independent charismatic movement."[3640] While Jesus is God and people must be born again, the Word of Faith heresy teaches "that Jesus was born again so that we might become little gods."[3641] Word-Faith teachers also claim that the believer uses God, rather than God using the believer. "In the Word Faith system God is not Lord of all; he is not able to work until we release him to do so. He is dependent on human instruments, human faith, and above all human words to get his work done."[3642] Since believers have God's authority, "we are little gods and we [must] begin to act like little gods."[3643] Indeed, as Hagin affirmed, believers "are Christ. That's who they are. They are Christ."[3644] Word-Faith teachers also affirm the idolatrous blasphemy that "Jesus gave up his deity and even took on Satan's nature to die for our sins."[3645] They adopt grossly heretical ideas of the atonement:[3646]

> Christ's death was a ransom paid to Satan . . . [Christ] accepted the sin nature of Satan into his own spirit . . . [and He] was dragged into hell by Satan and tormented for three days and three nights. . . . Jesus made himself [o]bedient to Satan . . . [and took on] his nature . . . allowed the devil to drag Him into the depths of hell . . . [Thus, Christ] need[ed] to be . . . born [again] [b]ecause He became like we were: separated from God. . . . Jesus is the first person that was ever born again. . . His spirit need[ed] to be born again . . . [b]ecause it was estranged from God.[3647]

Word-Faith teaching also denies the true gospel by affirming that one personally receives Christ's righteousness, not by imputation, but by impartation, so that one is actually and personally as righteous as Christ (cf. 1 John 1:8, 10), denies very plain texts of Scripture by teaching that everyone is supposed to be rich and that being poor is a sin, claims that whatever one speaks out loud in faith one will receive (positive confession or "name it

---

3639 Pgs. 49-50, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

3640 Pg. 91, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

3641 Pg. 325, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur.

3642 Pg. 329, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3643 Pg. 170, *God's Laws of Success*, Robert Tilton. Dallas, TX: Word of Faith, 1983, cited on pg. 333, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3644 "As Christ Is—So Are We," Kenneth E. Hagin. (Tulsa, OK: Rhema), cassette tape #44H06, cited pg. 334, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3645 Pg. 336, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur.

3646 Contrast the teaching of the following quotation with that of 1 Peter 2:24; Colossians 2:13-14, and many other passages.

3647 Pgs. 338-341, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur, citing Kenneth Copeland, Kenneth Hagin, and Fred Price.

and claim it" doctrine),[3648] because of the creative power of one's faith (as a little god, after all), and teaches many other abominable heresies. "Those in the Faith movement are now, and have been for years, preaching a different gospel."[3649] David Cloud wrote:

> The Word-Faith movement is a very influential part of the Pentecostal-Charismatic movement today. It is also known as "Positive Confession" or simply the "Faith" movement. It has no organizational or denominational structure or hierarchy but it is promoted by many prominent Pentecostal leaders who have large and prosperous ministries. The Word-Faith movement is powered by massive amounts of money that its teachers raise through their promise of healing and prosperity and power. It is represented by the Trinity Broadcasting Network, a half-billion dollar corporation that beams Word-Faith teaching throughout the world. In general it holds that healing is guaranteed to those who have faith, that Jesus was rich and that He desires for His followers to be financially prosperous, that faith is a creative force that can be used to shape one's world, that when Adam fell he forfeited the nature of God and took the nature of Satan and that salvation requires removing Satan's nature from mankind, that Jesus did not make the atonement for sin by His death and blood but by taking upon Himself the nature of Satan on the cross then going to hell and overcoming the devil there and being born again and thus erasing Satan's nature from man, that Jesus is establishing a new race of little Christs that are equal to Him and that can do what He did.
>
> While the Word-Faith teachers hold certain things in common and while all of them hold to most of the aforementioned doctrines, they are highly individualistic and do not necessarily hold to every single one. Some of the proponents of the Word-Faith doctrine are Kenneth Hagin, Sr., Kenneth Hagin, Jr., Kenneth Copeland, Benny Hinn, David Yonggi Cho, Paul Crouch, John Avanzini, Robert Tilton, R.W. Shambach, Rod Parsley, Fred Price, Joel Osteen, Creflo Dollar, Marilyn Hickey, Charles Capps, Peter Popoff, Morris Cerullo, John Bevere, Markus Bishop, Juanita Bynum, Kim Clement, Paula White, and Rodney Howard-Browne. At its heart is the doctrine that whatever a believer claims by faith, he will have. The late Kenneth Hagin, Sr., said, "Your confession of faith in God's Word will bring healing or whatever it is you need from God into the present tense and make it a reality in your life!" (Hagin, The Word of Faith, Dec. 1992).[3650]

Ken Sarles summarizes the doctrines of the Word-Faith movement:

> Advocates of the prosperity gospel claim that it is God's will for every believer to be prosperous. . . . Prosperity theology . . . seems to be a blending of the positive thinking emphasis of a Norman Vincent Peale or a Robert Schuller and the faith healing ministry of an Oral Roberts. It certainly has a charismatic flavoring to it but is by no means limited to Pentecostalism. . . . Some of the prominent personalities of prosperity include Kenneth Hagin, pastor of the Rhema Bible Church in Tulsa, Oklahoma; Kenneth and Gloria Copeland, founders of Kenneth Copeland Ministries in Fort Worth, Texas; Bob and Marte Tilton, founding pastors of the Word of Faith Church, Farmers Branch, Texas; John Osteen, pastor of the Lakewood Church, Houston, Texas; Jerry Savelle, evangelist and former associate of Kenneth Copeland; Charles and Frances Hunter, faith healers and founders of the City of Light, Kingwood, Texas; and Charles Capps, an Oklahoma pastor. . . . [T]he good news of the prosperity gospel is how to be healthy, wealthy, and demon-free. . . . The *provision* of healing, according to the prosperity gospel, is found in the Atonement . . . it is never God's will for anyone to be sick. . . . The *possession* of healing is through the exercise of faith. The approach to faith can best be understood by the phrases "name it and claim it" or "believe and receive." . . . [As] succinctly put by Hagin: "*Faith's confessions create reality*.[3651] . . The confession of faith, it is believed, will cure any disease or physical handicap, since healing is always the will of God and has been provided for in the Atonement. . . .

3648 Pgs. 342-350, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3649 Pg. xviii, *A Different Gospel*, D. R. McConnell.

3650 Pg. 101, "Charismatic Movement," *Way of Life Encyclopedia of the Bible and Christianity*, David Cloud. Elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*.

3651 Pg. 23, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, Hagin.

The *purpose* of wealth is philanthropic. . . . When one gives to others, whether money or something else, more will be given by God in return. Soon a prosperity cycle begins, in which one gives and receives more in return, allowing him to give even more, meaning he will receive yet more in return; and so the cycle continues. . . . . The *promise* of wealth [is] the basis for the whole prosperity movement[.] . . .The *provision* of wealth centers on the application of the Abrahamic Covenant. The personal blessings God bestowed on Abraham by the covenant He made with him are extrapolated as benefits for believers today. . . . [T]he Law of Moses was given so that Abraham's descendants could possess the same degree of prosperity Abraham enjoyed. *Possession* of the wealth provided through the Abrabamic Covenant is achieved by knowing, obeying, and believing. First there must be knowledge of the promise before the promise can be claimed. . . . Obedience is a second key to becoming prosperous. . . . The third element, faith, is exercised in the same way as in achieving divine health. Faith amounts to claiming authority over the financial resources already guaranteed by God. . . . No one need live in poverty. Wealth and riches are there for the asking—in faith. All that stands between a person and financial blessing is his decision to demand what he wants. . . . The *prospects* of wealth, according to some prosperity leaders, are truly astounding. The hundredfold return of Mark 10:30 is claimed as the basis of God's financial dealings with His servants. "You give $1 for the gospel's sake and $100 belongs to you, give $10 and receive $1,000; give $1,000 and receive $100,000…. Give one house and receive one hundred houses or one house worth one hundred times as much…. In short, Mark 10:30 is a very good deal."[3652] . . . No wonder the motto of the prosperity movement is, "You can have what you say!" . . . The *presence* of demonic activity in the lives of Christians is an important plank in the prosperity platform. . . . [A]ll incurable diseases are caused by evil spirits. Demons inhabit not only people, but also homes, cars, and other mechanical devices. . . . The *process* of casting out demons solves the believer's "demonic dilemma." . . . Jesus has given him authority to cast out unclean spirits (Matt 10:1). This gives the individual believer authority over the world of evil spirits. . . . In the *procedure* for casting out demons Satan is bound by the authority of Jesus so that he cannot render aid to his evil associates. Then the demon is addressed, commanded to name himself, and cast out. Since demons can do such things as planting seeds of disease and stopping the flow of financial wealth, the casting out of demons is necessary to insure continued health and prosperity. . . .

According to those in the movement, special, verbal revelation did not cease with the closing of the New Testament canon but continues today. Leaders frequently support their teachings with revelations, prophecies, dreams, and visions. The implication is that they share the same status with Old Testament prophets and New Testament apostles as dispensers of progressively revealed truth. . . . Prosperity hermeneutics also leaves much to be desired. The method of interpreting the biblical text is highly subjective and arbitrary. Bible verses are quoted in abundance without attention to grammatical indicators, semantic nuances, or literary and historical context. The result is a set of ideas and principles based on distortion of textual meaning. . . . The proponents of prosperity have gone astray concerning the doctrine of God . . . [t]he sovereignty of God is . . . greatly undermined in the outworking of the prosperity gospel. Indeed what emerges is a new view of God. First, even God Himself has failed. "God hoped for things. He had a plan. He had desires. He hoped they would come to pass, but they failed."[3653] . . . . Second, not only can God inspire man but man can inspire God. "When . . . you start believing it, God starts believing it . . . and things happen, praise God."[3654] Third, God is bound by His own laws, such as the law of compensation, and man becomes the initiator, forcing God to comply by holding up His end of the bargain. . . . In the prosperity scheme of things what God's sovereignty lacks human sovereignty supplies. Believers are considered to be "God-like creatures" and "supermen."[3655] . . . The believer's authority is delegated by God Himself, and not even God will interfere with it: "God is not going to override your authority . . . He has given you authority in the earth."[3656] The absurd

---

3652 Pg. 48, *God's Will Is Prosperity*, Copeland.

3653 Pg. 113, *God's Laws of Success*, Tilton.

3654 Pg. 109, *Ibid*.

3655 Pgs. 26, 28, *Ibid*.

3656 Pg. 72, *God's Will Is Prosperity*, Copeland.

conclusion of this view of human authority is that a believer should be able to live perpetually in health and presumably youthfulness, and never die! Is it not strange that none of the prosperity leaders themselves have yet exercised their authority to that extent? Nonetheless these same leaders instruct others how to exercise their authority. Each Christian is considered a king in God's kingdom. This means he can decide what he wants and then decree it just as a monarch would. . . . In the prosperity movement man has become the ruler and God the servant. In its shift away from theocentrism the prosperity gospel has reached the deadend of anthropocentrism, the deification of humanity. A striking illustration of deification at work can be found in the simple act of saying grace at mealtime. . . . According to Kenneth Copeland the human will "is actually a godlike will because man has the right to choose his own eternal destiny. Only a god has that kind of choice!"[3657] . . . In the prosperity gospel little is said about the curse of the Fall, the noetic effects of sin, or man's constitutional depravity . . . the corruption of fallen human nature that remains even in the redeemed is totally ignored. By contrast the total freedom of the will is everywhere asserted, not only in salvation but also in claiming miracles leading to a healthy, wealthy lifestyle. The ability to decide what one wants and then to demand it from God goes beyond the most radical form of Pelagianism. Human sin has been replaced with human sovereignty. . . . The only sin given attention is doubt or unbelief that prevents the achievement of one's full potential. Doubting of any kind is anathema to the person seeking prosperity because it produces "the power of negative thinking." . . . In other words negative thinking creates a negative reality. . . .

Without question the prosperity movement is characterized by an obsession with the demonic. The reality of God's use of secondary means in the physical realm has been replaced with a sensational concept of demonic causation. . . . The prosperity movement seems to have reverted to a form of animism, which holds that evil spirits inhabit and control both animate and inanimate objects. Faith healers in the movement have more in common with witch doctors than medical doctors. . . . The archenemy in the prosperity pantheon of demons is Satan himself. He is virtually omnipresent, as he is considered the ultimate cause of all poverty and sickness. However, even Satan is limited in his activities by the believer's authority. As Gloria Copeland has expressed it, "Satan can *only* do what you say. . . . He is bound by the law of God that says *you* can have whatsoever you say."[3658] Satan can only work when the individual believer is ignorant of the Christian's authority to bind him. The ignorant convert can experience satanic control of his thoughts and words so that he will believe and speak what the devil wants to come to pass. By contrast, the believer armed with prosperity teaching will bind Satan so that he can speak into existence whatever he wants. . . .

The biblical doctrine of Satan presents him as a far more crafty and subtle being than those in the prosperity movement admit. Since Satan is the great deceiver and the father of lies (John 8:44), he is probably promoting the prosperity caricature of his limitations. It is likely that those who believe they can demand financial success and that Satan is the only obstacle are themselves under satanic delusion. The prosperity belief that Satan can be easily bound actually gives the devil greater leverage and increases his opportunity to deceive. . . . The angelology of these "prophets of profit," like the other divisions of theology studied thus far, rests more on wishful thinking than on accurate exegesis. . . .

Perhaps the most difficult concept in the prosperity gospel to understand is human faith. It has been divested of its biblical foundation and given an entirely new meaning. Faith is defined as a positive force. . . . Faith becomes a power exerted by individuals . . . [Also,] [b]elief of the heart is tied to confession of the mouth to create a new reality . . . faith is a form of magic, with the spoken word as the incantation. The interior logic of prosperity thought argues that since man is a godlike creature, his words, when spoken in faith, have the same intrinsic creative power as God's.[3659]

3657 Pg. 15, *The Laws of Prosperity*, Copeland

3658 Pg. 106, *God's Will Is Prosperity*, Copeland; italics hers.

3659 "A Theological Evaluation of the Prosperity Gospel," Ken L. Sarles. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 143:572 (Oct 86) 329-353.

Truly, the "Word Faith movement may be the most dangerous false system that has grown out of the charismatic movement so far."[3660]

"[U]ndoubtedly the Pentecostal movement picked up the concept of the authority of the believer from MacMillan's material,"[3661] as MacMillan's doctrine of authority is just about identical to that of Pentecostalism and the Word of Faith movement.[3662] MacMillan also influenced the supporters of the anti-Trinitarian modalist heretic and faith-healer William Branham.[3663] MacMillan's teaching that demons want to possess people because they are disembodied,[3664] which is related to Jessie Penn-Lewis's earlier doctrine in *War on the Saints*, has been picked up by the charismatic Third Wave and other continuationist fanatics.[3665] MacMillan's practice of naming demons as a prerequisite to casting them out mirrors Word-Faith practice,[3666] as does his belief that

---

[3660] Pg. 352, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur. Further analysis and critique of Word-Faith doctrine are found in "Enjoying God Forever: An Historical/Sociological Profile Of The Health And Wealth Gospel," Dennis Hollinger*, Trinity Journal* 9:2 (Fall 1988) 131–149; and *Christianity In Crisis*, Hank Hanegraaff. (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1993), among many other works.

[3661] "John A. MacMillan's Teaching Regarding the Authority of the Believer and its Impact on the Evangelical, Pentecostal, and Charismatic Movements," Paul L. King. SPS History Interest Group, Oral Roberts University. Presented at the 30th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies. Elec. acc. http://www.pneumafoundation.org/article.jsp?article=/article_0027.xml.

[3662] Compare pgs. 139-140, *Another Gospel,* McConnell.

[3663] "John A. MacMillan's Teaching Regarding the Authority of the Believer and its Impact on the Evangelical, Pentecostal, and Charismatic Movements," Paul L. King. SPS History Interest Group, Oral Roberts University. Presented at the 30th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies. Elec. acc. http://www.pneumafoundation.org/article.jsp?article=/article_0027.xml. Branham "denied the doctrine of the Trinity, teaching instead the 'Jesus only' doctrine. He taught that he was the prophet Elijah, whose ministry would result in the return of Jesus. . . . [P]ockets of his followers . . . believed that he was not just a prophet, but also the incarnation of Jesus himself" (pgs. 165-166, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell). McConnell notes that Branham was able to do miracles that "remain unparalleled" by "modern [Pentecostal] healing evangelists" (pg. 165, *ibid.*) despite the fact that he was an idolator who was eternally damned. The supernatural lights that were present in the Welsh holiness revival, and were claimed in India in the tongues-speech associated with Mrs. Ramabai, and likewise in the origination of Pentecostalism at Azuza Street in Los Angeles, were also present with Branham.

[3664] Pg. 113, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

[3665] "There are many demons that don't have a body. Having a body [for a demon] is like having a car. They want to have a car so they can get around. If they don't have a body, they're a second-class demon. They're not first class. I'm not kidding you. That's the way it works. And so [to them] having a body is a big deal. That's why they don't want to give it up" (John Wimber, "Healing Seminar," 1981, acc. pg. 172, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur).

[3666] "In the *procedure* for casting out demons [in Word-Faith theology] Satan is bound . . . the demon is addressed, commanded to name himself, and cast out. Since demons can do such things as planting seeds of disease and stopping the flow of financial wealth, the casting out of demons is necessary to insure continued health and prosperity" (pg. 336, "A Theological Evaluation of the Prosperity Gospel," Ken L. Sarles. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 143:572 (Oct 86) 329-352). Other segments of Pentecostalism likewise employ the naming technique, which is rooted in paganism.

"doubts [can be] injected into the [Christian's] mind by lying spirits"[3667] and his practice of "plead[ing] the blood according to Revelation 12:11"[3668] as a way to work miracles.[3669] MacMillan also anticipated a "favorite term in the Word Faith movement . . . positive confession . . . the teaching that words have creative power . . . [so that] [w]hat you say . . . determines everything that happens to you."[3670] Indeed, "[p]ositive confession is, undoubtedly, the most distinctive doctrine of the [Word of] Faith movement[.] . . . The secret to confession is to know the nature and extent of the perfect redemption in Christ, to know one's 'identity' and 'rights' in Christ, and to confess verbally the provision of Christ in every need and problem of life."[3671] However, "those who began the practices of positive mental attitude and positive confession [as practiced in the Word of Faith movement] attributed their ability" to receive things from their positive confessions "to psychic and occult power."[3672] MacMillan, nevertheless, affirmed the Word of Faith concept that words have creative power. He wrote:

> The apostles [in Luke 17] . . . were stirred to ask the Lord . . . ["]Give us the power and . . . the same authority which thou dost manifest.["] . . . [Such authority is exercised] by the word of the believer. It is a good exercise to "*say*" aloud to our difficulties, as we kneel in prayer, "Be thou removed." The *saying*, if in faith in the name of the Lord, will cause a stirring at the roots . . .

3667 Pg. 117, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan. Similarly, Kenneth Hagin taught: "the devil can put all kinds of thoughts into [a believer's] mind" ("Words," Kenneth Hagin. (Tulsa, OK: Faith Library, 1979), pgs. 20-21, cited pg. 346, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur). In this notion they followed Jessie Penn-Lewis: "Countless 'thoughts' and 'beliefs,' which are opposed to the truth of God, are injected into the minds of Christians by teaching spirits, rendering them ineffective in the warfare with sin and Satan, and subject to the power of evil spirits, although they are saved for eternity through their faith in Christ, and accept the authority of the Scriptures, and know the power of the Cross" (Chapter 1, *War on the Saints,* Jessie Penn-Lewis; cf. pg. 40, *The Overcomer* March 1910). Indeed, not thoughts only, but even demonic doctrines are directly injected into the mind of believers, thought Mrs. Penn-Lewis: "[D]eceiving spirits . . . insert their 'doctrines' into the *minds* of Christians, as well as heathen, and make them think they are coming to their own conclusions. They give 'beautiful thoughts,' and 'wonderful openings,' of 'texts' to men's natural minds. . . . The teaching spirits have succeeded in inserting into the minds of those who truly accept the authority of the Scriptures, and know the power fo the Cross, countless 'thoughts' and 'beliefs' which are opposed to the Truth of God and render them powerless in the warfare with sin and Satan, and subject to the power of evil spirits. These subtle thoughts from Satan [are] inserted into the minds of Christians of all classes and degrees [and] are too many to enumerate" (pgs. 71-72, "Believe not every spirit," *Overcomer* 1912. Italics in original).

3668 Pgs. 184-185, *A Believer with Authority*, King.

3669 Thus, Hagin "picked up that phrase, 'In the Name of Jesus, I plead the blood.' . . . and all through these years I've always pled the blood in the Name of Jesus" ("The Precious Blood of Jesus, Kenneth E. Hagin. Tulsa, OK: Faith Library, 1984, 30-31, cited pg. 396, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur. MacArthur correctly comments: "The notion that repeating a phrase can work miracles is pure superstition (cf. Matthew 6:7)." Many other Pentecostals practiced MacMillan's doctrine of pleading the blood; cf. pgs. 58-59, *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee.

3670 Pg. 342, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3671 Pg. 135, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

3672 Pg. 172, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

> authority over the opposing powers . . . heal[ing] the sick . . . the accomplishment of impossibilities."[3673]

From MacMillan's doctrine that believers can "exercise the authority of [Christ's] throne"[3674] because in Ephesians 1-2 "[t]he same verb . . . expresses the reviving of Christ [and allegedly] expresses also the reviving of His people. . . . the very act of God which raised the Lord from among the dead, raised also His body . . . the Church,"[3675] Word-Faith teachers have concluded that believers could have defeated Satan and done just what Jesus did in His life and redemptive work on earth. As Kenneth Copeland blaspemously affirmed: "The Spirit of God spoke to me, and He said . . . A twice-born man [Jesus Christ] whipped Satan in his own domain. . . . A born-again man defeated Satan. . . . And I said, 'Well, now You don't mean—You couldn't *dare* mean that I could've done the same thing.' He said, 'Oh yeah! If you'd known that—had the knowledge of the Word of God that he did, you could've done the same thing. Because you're a reborn man too. . . . The same power that I used to raise [Christ] from the dead I used to raise you from your death in trespasses and sins."[3676] MacMillan's doctrine that Christ is "wholly dependent" on the church, like a head needs a body to carry out its plans,[3677] matches the fact that in the Word-Faith movement "God is . . . not able to work until we release him to do so. He is dependent on human instruments, human faith, and above all human words to get his work done,"[3678] for "Jesus, according to Word-Faith theology, has no authority on earth, having delegated it all to the church. . . . [as] Kenneth E. Hagin develops . . . in his book *The Authority of the Believer*, long sections of which were taken verbatim"[3679] from MacMillan.[3680] Thus, the Word-Faith movement "makes wide use of the writings of . . . leaders affiliated with the Christian and Missionary Alliance, a twentieth-century denomination which grew out of the nineteenth-century

---

3673 Pgs. 16-17, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly*, May 3, 1936; Italics in original. cf. pg. 19, *The Adult Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly,* May 13, 1934, MacMillan.

3674 Pg. 99, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3675 Pgs. 7-8, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3676 "Substitution and Identification," Kenneth Copeland (Fort Worth, TX: Kenneth Copeland Minnistries, n. d.; cassette tape #00-0202), cited pg. 337, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3677 Pgs. 21-22, *The Authority of the Believer*, MacMillan.

3678 Pg. 329, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3679 Pgs. 328-329, 393, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3680 E. g., Hagin relates how, in a vision, "Jesus" appeared to him and said that He was not able to cast out a demon because, as the spirit being called "Jesus" that appeared to Hagin affirmed: "I immediately delegated my authority on earth to the Church, and I can work only *through* the Church . . . Your head cannot exercise any authority anywhere except through your body." MacMillan's teaching in *The Authority of the Believer* is then set forth, as eisegeted from Ephesians 1-2, and Hagin concludes: "In Ephesians we also saw . . . that the Head is totally dependent on the Body for carrying out His plans (pgs. 27-37, 47-48, *The Believer's Authority*, Hagin).

Higher Life holiness movement . . . [in particular] *The Authority of the Believer* by J. A. MacMillan."[3681] The "original source of" the charismatic and Word-Faith authority doctrine is "John A. MacMillan and his classic holiness roots in the Higher Life and Keswick movements."[3682] Indeed:

> By far the greatest popular dissemination of [Macmillan's] teaching on the authority of the believer has been through the charismatic movement. . . . the influence of MacMillan's writings . . . has [in fact] become *the* major impact on the charismatic movement . . . [through] the writings of Kenneth Hagin. . . . other Word of Faith leaders such as Kenneth Copeland and Charles Capps have further expanded upon Hagin's teachings on the authority of the believer. . . . MacMillan's basic principles furnish the foundation of contemporary charismatic understanding and practice of the concept.[3683]

Thus, "Kenneth E. Hagin . . . the most extensive propogator of [Word-Faith] teaching . . . [received his] teaching on the authority of the believer . . . most directly from CMA leader John MacMillan. He also acknowledges the influence of . . . Higher Life leaders . . . [such as] Simpson."[3684] "In 1967 Hagin began teaching on the authority of the believer in churches and on radio. Also in that year, his booklet *Authority of the Believer*[3685] was published. Hagin quoted MacMillan's writing [without citation, so] extensively so that some have accused him of plagiarism[.]"[3686] Indeed, it is obvious that "Hagin plagarized the writings of . . . Christian and Missionary Alliance minister . . . John A. MacMillan" since "Hagin lifted at least three-quarters of his book *The Authority of the Believer* from MacMillan's . . . article[s] of the same title."[3687] Hagin's *The Authority of the Believer* has been "one of his best selling" works, and was "taken word-for-word from . . . John A. MacMillan[.] . . . In the content of *Authority of the Believer*, Hagin's plagarism of MacMillan is word-for-word and where it is not word-for-word, it is thought-for-thought.[3688] Since "nearly every major figure in . . . the Word Faith . . . movement was

---

3681 Pg. 16, *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary Word of Faith Theologies*, Paul L. King. Tulsa, OK: Word and Spirit Press, 2008.

3682 Pg. 1, *A Believer With Authority: The Life and Message of John A. MacMillan*, Paul L. King.

3683 "John A. MacMillan's Teaching Regarding the Authority of the Believer and its Impact on the Evangelical, Pentecostal, and Charismatic Movements," Paul L. King.

3684 Pgs. 65-66, *Only Believe*, Paul L. King.

3685 *Authority of the Believer*, Kenneth Hagin. Tulsa, OK: Faith Library Publications, 1967; revised and reprinted as *The Believer's Authority*, Kenneth Hagin. Tulsa, OK: Rhema Bible Church, 1984.

3686 "John A. MacMillan's Teaching Regarding the Authority of the Believer and its Impact on the Evangelical, Pentecostal, and Charismatic Movements," Paul L. King.

3687 Pgs. 397-398, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur. Hagin also for other purposes "plagiari[zed] . . . Finis Jennings Dak[e's] [book], *God's Plan for Man*" (pg. 398, *ibid*), and also "repeatedly plagiarized long sections of his writings word-for-word from . . . [E. W.] Kenyon's material" (pgs. 351-352, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur).

3688 Pgs. 67-69, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell. Hagin's explanation for his plagiarism is that "the Holy Spirit inspired both MacMillan's and Hagin's version of *The Authority of the Believer* three-and-a-half decades apart" (pg. 69, *ibid*.), so inspiration, not plagiarism, explains why 75% or more of the content of the two compositions is identical.

mentored by Kenneth Hagin or one of his disciples[,] [and] [e]very doctrinal distinctive of the movement is traceable to Hagin,"[3689] but Hagin himself was very strongly impacted by MacMillan, John MacMillan's influence is central to the development of the Word-Faith movement. It is consequently of no surprise that "Kenneth Copeland has [also] taught on the authority of the believer from the same passage of Scripture of MacMillan's exposition, Ephesians 1. He also used the same police officer illustration used by MacMillan.[3690] . . . Charles Capps wrote a booklet *Authority in Three Worlds*[3691] on the authority of the believer."[3692] MacMillan did not influence only Word-Faith heavyweights such as Hagin, Copeland, and Capps, but others also, in vast numbers:

> [O]ther charismatic leaders have made use of MacMillan's concepts and/or writings on the authority of the believer and spiritual warfare as well, including Michael Harper, Don Basham, Dick Leggatt, and *New Wine* magazine. In addition to [direct influence from] MacMillan's writings . . . other . . . writers influenced by MacMillan have also impacted the charismatic movement. Paul Billheimer's books and teachings, which . . . are founded in large part by MacMillan's principles, have been popular among charismatics. Oral Roberts University has used [Billheimer's] *Destined for the Throne*[3693] in a course on prayer for several years. Billheimer [has] also appeared . . . on the charismati[c] Trinity Broadcasting Network—TBN. Wayne Grudem, now associated with the [charismatic] Vineyard movement, has also been consulted by serious-minded charismatics. Because of the proliferation of current teaching on spiritual warfare, additional leaders could be cited *ad infinitum*."[3694]

Hagin, Copeland, and other Word of Faith charismatics "extend teaching on the believer's authority to include such doctrines as transfer and/or abdication of God's authority, authority to be 'little gods,' and authority to command God."[3695] Clearly, through the mediation of John A. MacMillan and the Christian and Missionary Alliance, Keswick continuationism in large part brought forth the Word of Faith theology.

Applications from the Life and Teachings of John A. MacMillan

The writings of John A. MacMillan contain toxic levels of Scripture twisting and dangerous false doctrine, and they undergird numerous charismatic heresies and the soul-

---

3689 Pg. 351, *Charismatic Chaos*, MacArthur.

3690 See Kenneth Copeland, "Prayer of Binding and Loosing," Ft. Worth, TX: Kenneth Copeland Ministries, sound recording, 1987. MacMillan appears to have obtained the policeman illustration from A. B. Simpson ("Spiritual Talismans," *Alliance Weekly*, June 14, 1919, 178).

3691 *Authority in Three Worlds*, Charles Capps. Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1982.

3692 "John A. MacMillan's Teaching Regarding the Authority of the Believer and its Impact on the Evangelical, Pentecostal, and Charismatic Movements," Paul L. King.

3693 *Destined for the Throne*, Paul E. Billheimer. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1975.

3694 "John A. MacMillan's Teaching Regarding the Authority of the Believer and its Impact on the Evangelical, Pentecostal, and Charismatic Movements," Paul L. King.

3695 Pg. 117, *ibid*.

damning doctrines of demons in the Word-Faith movement. Members of historic Baptist churches, which properly embrace the truth that sign gifts have ceased, abhor idolatry, and reject fanaticism for a Biblically Spirit-produced spirituality must avoid MacMillan's writings, beware of his pernicious influence in the works of others, and mark, reprove, and avoid those who propogate his heresies. Reject MacMillan's throne-power doctrine. Reject and abhor Word of Faith abominations. Reject the Keswick idea that all the blessings of sanctification are solely positional until they are specifically recognized and claimed. Reject the Higher Life for the soul and the body. Repent, humble yourself, and cry mightily to the Lord for mercy if you have adopted, practiced, or recommended to others the blasphemy that you can command God, either verbally or through the recommendation of literature that teaches this abomination. Submit to God instead of commanding Him, and submit to the Scriptural theocentrism and Bibliocentrism of genuine Christian spirituality—and in so doing reject the shackles that anthropocentric Keswick continuationism seeks to place on the Almighty. Reject MacMillan's false ideas about spiritual warfare, from the idea of territorial spirits, to the idea that demons can directly place thoughts in your mind, to his dangerous and spiritually detrimental exorcism procedures, and embrace the whole armor of God revealed clearly and sufficiently in Scripture alone, so that you can stand in faith against the devil and his hosts.

The importance of recognizing and exposing MacMillan's errors is made the more necessary from the fact that, while his influence is greatest in his tutelage of the charismatic and Word of Faith movements, it nevertheless casts its dark shadow far beyond the charismatic sphere. Many evangelicals, some fundamentalists, and some independent Baptists are propogating ideas derived from John A. MacMillan,[3696] although many of those spreading his errors have never read anything written by him and would not even recognize his name if asked about it. Misunderstanding and ignorance of Biblical spiritual warfare and Biblical demonology abounds, creating room for the false

[3696] For example, the 2011 "Enthroned Christ" Conference, the 17th annual Holiness Conference at Falls Baptist Church in Menomonee Falls, pastored by Wayne VanGelderen, who is on the board of the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship, a church that runs the Baptist College of Ministry and Theological Seminary, despite being avowedly and strongly anti-charismatic, highly recommended John A. MacMillan and essentially designed its entire conference around MacMillan's theme of throne-life. The conference included the recounting of an exorcism, utilizing the techniques of MacMillan by conversing with and getting the names of sundry demons, by Pastor Rick Savage (message, "Recognizing the Hiss of the Serpent"), himself the pastor of a different fundamental Baptist church that has its own Bible college. From such a conference pastors from around the United States, the vast majority of them entirely ignorant of the theology of the man whose ideas they have imbibed, returned to their churches to spread MacMillan's ideas and books with their misinterpretations of Scripture, corrupt demonology, and charismatic philosophies into large numbers of separatist Baptist congregations.

ideas of men such as MacMillan to take root. Scripture is clear that Satan is very subtle and a master-spreader of deceit. It is incumbent upon faithful under-shepherds to protect their flocks from the depredations of false teachers and the hellish fountain of their doctrines by both plainly warning of error and positively teaching all the truths of the absolutely sufficient Word.

Reject all unbiblical and extra-Scriptural demonology. MacMillan's writings are teeming with such, since he deviated even further from the truth than his mother in error, Jessie Penn-Lewis. God's Word is your sole offensive weapon against demons (Ephesians 6:17)—ideas derived from men or from the demons themselves, such as Keswick continuationistic throne-power, are not true offensive weapons, but Trojan horses. Indeed, the Triune God alone sits on His throne and exercises power from thence, so when you usurp His authority and seek to exercise it, you are guilty of idolatry and are doing Satan's work. Do not employ MacMillan's techniques of exorcism, or any continuationistic technique of exorcism. Do not ask demons for their names. Do not ask them for anything at all or commune with them in any way whatsoever. Scripture alone is sufficient to perfectly equip you to stand against Satan and his hosts (2 Timothy 3:16-17), so listen to and practice the Bible.

Reject all accounts of missionaries in exotic places, and of all others in what places soever, who allegedly defeated devils utilizing methods that contradict Scriptural cessationistic demonology. The demons are actually in control of these situations, and they want you to adopt the errors they themselves have hatched and propogated through their faked defeat. From John MacMillan's self-testimony in easily available resources, such as his book *The Authority of the Believer*, one would conclude that his throne-power teaching "works"—only by digging further, in a manner which the overwhelming majority of MacMillan's readers will not do, does the practical failure of his doctrine and practice come to light. The simple in the flock of God, if exposed to a book by MacMillan, especially if recommended to them by a trusted source, will proceed to read him devotionally, hear him testify to the effectiveness of his techniques against demons, not even stop to wonder who the man is that they are reading, and adopt many of his errors—yet another reason why it is imperative to reject him and his writings and separate from those who unrepentantly promote his errors. If your only source of information about an encounter with demons is a hagiographical missionary biography, you should recognize that you have no idea what actually happened in the situation—a description by a MacMillan may in fact be the opposite of reality. What is more, you do not need to know, because Scripture is totally sufficient for a true demonology.

Uninspired narratives have no authority whatsoever and must not affect your doctrine and practice of spiritual warfare in any way.

Do not follow the CMA in its confusion on the doctrine and praxis of gospel preaching, lest you cross sea and land to make a prosylete who becomes simply a two-fold child of hell. Embrace the blessed truth of the eternal security of the believer and reject the CMA's Arminianism and the perversion of the gospel that comes with Arminian error. Furthermore, rather than following MacMillan's example and telling lost people that you are not asking them to repent, but to accept Jesus, follow the example of the Apostles and tell lost people that they need to repent and believe, while leaving out the "accept Jesus" terminology and related nonbiblical language, such as asking Jesus to come into one's heart, and the equation of the repetition of a sinner's prayer with conversion that only confuses the gospel. Do not assume that a lost person understands the gospel or is saved simply because he can answer "yes" to some leading questions that you ask him. Poor doctrine and careless personal work with unconverted seekers has filled evangelicalism with unregenerate people who have confused making an outward decision with the supernatural new birth. Do not perpetuate this tragedy yourself, and determine, with God's help, that you would rather die than allow it to corrupt your church. Let there not be vast numbers of unregenerate people, people who would have been saved had you clearly preached the gospel, who will rise up against you in judgment when you stand before God—rather let those who the Father has saved through the blood of His Son, the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit, and your concurrent faithful witness, be a crown of rejoicing to you in the presence of Jesus Christ at His coming (1 Thessalonians 2:19).

Recognize that there are vast numbers of unconverted religious people in evangelical Higher Life and continuationist circles, in the fanaticism of "deliverance ministries," in the Christian and Missionary Alliance, and in Pentecostalism. This fact explains the presence of widespread demon possession among "Christians" in such circles. Therefore, you must evangelize such people, giving them the true gospel in a clear and convicting way, and then call on them to repent, believe, be born again, and then separate from their false religion to be baptized into a true church of Jesus Christ—a historic Baptist church. By no means should you either endorse their doctrine and practice or be in fellowship with them. Do you want Christ to continue to reign as king over your congregation—a congregation of genuine saints, of those truly born of the Spirit—until He comes again, or do you want unconverted and demon possessed people filling your church also?

You would do well to refrain from criticizing the Authorized Version, recognizing instead that it is a faithful translation of the perfectly preserved Greek and Hebrew *Textus Receptus*. However, if you really feel that you must criticize the KJV, beware lest you find out at the Judgment Seat, if not before, that you really had no idea what you were talking about, and that you not only were in error yourself, but that you led others who listened to you away from the truth conveyed in the holy oracles of God. Furthermore, while it is entirely appropriate to refer to the original languages of Scripture, as Christ authorized (Matthew 5:18) and the KJV itself does,[3697] if you refer to Greek and Hebrew you ought to know the languages well enough to avoid the commission of the hosts of exegetical fallacies so frequently and painfully committed by those who know just enough to be dangerous, but not enough to actually grasp the language. A greater respect for the Authorized Version might have prevented MacMillan from claiming that the Hebrew text describing Moses lifting his rod in Exodus 17 taught something that is by no means present in the chapter, and a greater knowledge of the original languages could have prevented him from claiming what was actually entirely imaginary support for throne-power from the Greek of Ephesians 1-2. Indeed, without these distortions of Scripture, it is possible that MacMillan's throne-power error would never have arisen to corrupt countless unwary ones in Christendom, as it has done and is continuing to do today. Do not think that exegetical fallacies are a small matter—when you make them, you are sinning grievously against your Lord by perverting His Word. What is more, you have no idea how far your corruption of Scripture may spread and deceive others. Always exercise great care that your exposition of Scripture is in line with the mind of the Holy Ghost who dictated it. Such care will lead you to tremendous respect for the Authorized Version and to great diligence in the proper use of the original languages.

Recognize that the true exercise of Divine power towards and in the believer is far superior to MacMillan's doctrine of throne-power. A holy life is far better than the gift of exorcism—Judas had the latter, while the vast majority of saints do not—but how infinitely blessed the holy people of God are on the day of judgment! Christ specifically told those to whom He had given miraculous gifts: "Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you. Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven" (Luke 10:19-20). Christ has not given you miraculous sign gifts—but what need are they, if your name is written in heaven? "All things work together for good to them that love God" (Romans

---

[3697] Compare the marginal notes in Mark 13:8; Luke 16:6-7, etc.

8:28)—so all the works of God towards you, both His withholding of miraculous gifts and His positive providential guidance in your life, are for His glory and your good. What more can you desire than that your loving heavenly Father works everything together for your good? Has He not given you the greatest good of all—the very Son of His love—and with Him will He not surely give you all things? Will it not be your glory to all eternity to be conformed to the image of His Son? After billions of years in the New Jerusalem, after Satan has been cast into the lake of fire forever, it will not matter whether or not you had the gift of exorcism, but your use of the gifts God did give you in your earthly pilgrimage will have continuing, indeed, eternal value. You will have more or less reward to cast at Jesus' feet, more or less glory you can return to your infinitely blessed and precious Redeemer, based on your faithfulness as a steward now. What, then, are the sign gifts in comparison to the inestimable blessing—and absolutely supernatural gift of grace—of holiness?

Consider also Paul's blessed words in his first epistle to the Corinthians:

> Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become *as* sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have *the gift of* prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed *the poor*, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. . . . Charity never faileth: but whether *there be* prophecies, they shall fail; whether *there be* tongues, they shall cease; whether *there be* knowledge, it shall vanish away. . . . And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these *is* charity. (1 Corinthians 13:1-3, 8, 13)

Rather than seeking to be filled with miraculous gifts that passed away in the first century, be filled with love, for love is greater than all the sign gifts. If you are full of love to God and man, you are infinitely better off than if you are filled with continuationist doctrines and go around babbling and trying to predict the future. Rather than seeking after gifts that God has never promised you, behold in the Word the eternal love of your Father, the love of the Son as your Mediator, and the love of the Spirit in revealing and applying to your heart the infinite Divine love of the Trinity. After all, a comlete Word is better than all sign gifts—they are the imperfect which passes away when the perfect has come, the childish things that are unneeded now that maturity and a completed canon has come (1 Corinthians 13:8-13). Sign gifts, alleged throne-power, and exorcism sessions may be more flashy and startling than day-by-day gradual growth in holiness through a complete Word, but the latter is indubitably superior—far, far superior—to the former. The supernatural efficacy of the Spirit in progressively eradicating indwelling sin and transforming you into the image of the Son of the Father's love is a greater work, and one with vastly more eternal value, than the temporary benefits that accrue to one from his body being healed or some other temporal miracle

taking place. Manifest, then, your love in practical acts of charity to the brethren and in sweet and intimate communion with your God. Show your love for the lost by proclaiming the dying love of Christ to them and passionately urging them to be reconciled to God. In so doing you will not only glorify God in a far greater way than you would by performing miraculous signs, but you will also be kept from temptation and the power of the devil in a way that a Keswick or charismatic doctrine of throne-power cannot—for if you are filled up with the love of Christ, your heart will be sweetly constrained towards Him and consecrated to Him, and you will walk in His ways, the wiles of the Tempter having but little power.

Behold and rejoice in the glory of the God in the defeat of Satan and his hosts, and trust in He who has this victory so certainly in His hands. The destruction of the devil and his demons has been decreed by God from eternity, and is as certain as Jehovah is the Almighty—indeed, God always ultimately overrules the purposes of the devil to bring about His greater glory and the greater good. The defeat of Satan and the sin that entered the world through his temptation was proclaimed in the first promise of the Redeemer in the *protoevangelium* (Genesis 3:15). Every animal sacrifice offered in the Old Testament pointed forward to the cross and the victory over sin and Satan accomplished there. The book of Job demonstrates that whatever evil the Tempter wreaks is under the sovereign control and limitation of the Almighty and is to accomplish His ultimate purposes (Job 1:8, 12; 2:3, 6)—the creation belongs to Jehovah, not to Satan, and the rage of the prince of rebels is constrained within the bounds set by the Sovereign One. Whenever Satan tempts you, or his devils rage against you, remember that the worst of their actions is within the permitting providence of your heavenly Father, and, clad in the armor of God, trust in Him and stand fast against the evil one.

See the victory over the devil wrought out by the Son of God. See Jesus Christ overcoming temptation in the wilderness, the second Adam spotlessly overcoming temptations far more severe than those which brought the fall of the first. See Him casting out devils, demonstrating His Messiahship and His absolute and utter sovereignty over the kingdom of darkness as a stronger than that demonic strong man. See Satan's hour and the power of darkness turned into glorious victory as you view the cross in light of the empty tomb. See Christ's ascension into heaven, far above all the principalities and powers of darkness, and His rule over the church and the world from the Father's right hand. See His tender care throughout the dispensation of grace for His bride, the church, and His protection of His spouse from the raging of that roaring lion who wishes, but in vain, to devour her. See His second coming to catch all His saints up to be with Him at the commencement of the seventieth week of Daniel—neither Satan, nor that last

enemy, death, can stop the resurrection of even the least of Christ's precious blood-bought ones. See His enactment of the judgments of the Tribulation period upon the wicked who are left behind, and recognize that the rise of the Antichrist and the False Prophet, and the rule invested in these paragons of Satanic power, are only a result of the opening of the scroll of judgment by the crucified, risen, and reigning Lamb. See the return of Christ in glory upon a white horse to establish His Millennial kingdom, destroy the armies of the Antichrist, cast that wicked one into the lake of fire, and bind Satan and his hosts. Anticipate and savor the glory of the Millennial reign of Christ over a world free from the influence of fallen angels—a world where Satan is bound in truth. See Satan's defeat at the time of his final loosing and gathering of the unregenerate against God, and Christ's casting the devil and all his seed into the lake of fire to be tormented for ever and ever, and say in your heart, "Amen—even so, come, Lord Jesus!" From the perspective of the New Jerusalem, survey the entirety of redemptive history and see your God using the devil for His own ultimate good purpose, so that through it all He receives the more glory, and sing the praises of that glorious Victor over all the might of that fallen angel and his armies. Finally, rejoice also that the Triune Jehovah is your very own God, and as a perfectly strong refuge and Rock, He can, and will, keep His own ultimately safe from Satan's power, as He is able to, without the least exertion or weariness, ultimately rout the strongest efforts of all the devils and their tyrannical king together. Recognize and hide all these things in your heart, oh child of God—and live for your Lord, fighting the good fight against sin and Satan, in light of these blessed, glorious, and exceedingly comforting realities.

VII. Watchman Nee

Watchman Nee[3698] was born on November 4, 1903, and died on c. June 1, 1972 in a Chinese communist prison camp. He founded the Little Flock, Local Church, or

[3698] The most substantial biographies of Nee in English are *Against the Tide*, by Angus Kinnear (Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1973), and *Watchman Nee: A Seer of Divine Revelation in the Present Age* (Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1991), by Witness Lee. Kinnear came to know Nee in England in 1938 (pgs. ix, 151, *Against the Tide*). He "edited the first work by Nee to become widely known in English, *The Normal Christian Life* . . . [and] also edited five other volumes of Nee's writings" (pg. 140, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155). Witness Lee was Nee's denominational successor. Both Kinnear and Lee are very sympathetic to Nee; Lee's work is hagiographical. A sympathetic but more critical work is *Secrets of Watchman Nee* by Dana Roberts (Gainesville, FL: Bridge-Logos, 2005). Roberts' perspective is seen in his affirmation that Nee, upon his death, was "'transferred' to the church triumphant," and that Roberts, had he met him personally, would have said: "Thanks. Thanks for helping us in our faith. Now, my Brother Nee, I want to

Church of the Recovery denomination[3699] and was an influential proponent of Keswick theology in China.[3700] His "name has become a household word among Christians all over the world"[3701] as millions have read his books, which have been translated into many languages,[3702] and he is among "the most influential Chinese Christians" that have ever lived.[3703] Nee learned most of his doctrine from woman preachers and authors of his day and earlier, since "close association with women evangelists and teachers was characteristic of his early career."[3704] Nee's professed conversion took place through the preaching of the "famous woman evangelist . . . Dora Yu,"[3705] after Miss Yu's preaching in the Methodist Tien-An Chapel had led Nee's mother, Nee Ho-P'ing, to conviction of sin about her failure in parenting him in a particular area. Nee's mother went on to become "a well-known Methodist preacher, whose speaking tours included her native China" and abroad;[3706] Nee's wife was the daughter of a Chinese Christian and Missionary Alliance pastor. Nee publicly proclaimed his profession of Christianity at one of Miss Yu's services by going forward at the invitation. He then "longed to be trained by Dora Yu in Shanghai. His mother agreed, and Dora Yu accepted him into her

---

share with you some of the words and blessings of God that you may have missed" (pg. xi, *Secrets of Watchman Nee*).

Nee was originally named Nga Shu-jeo or Ni Shu-tsu. Later he called himself Ching-fu, but then, adopting an idea of his mother, he became Ni To-sheng, which in English is "Watchman Nee" (pg. 21, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear).

3699 Nee's religious organization, by absorbing into itself those who had joined other Christian groups, by some estimates became the largest Protestant denomination in China (pg. 264, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear).

3700 Earling mentions only Keswick writers for Nee's devotional reading, namely, "Andrew Murray, F. B. Meyer, Otto Stockmayer, and Jessie Penn-Lewis." Devotional works by non-Keswick writers, at least for the period of Nee's life discussed by Earling at that point, are entirely absent. For "accounts of . . . revivals," only "Charles G. Finney and Evan Roberts" are mentioned (pg. 142, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155).

3701 Pg. ix, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. However, this spread of his writings took place largely after the Communist Party imprisoned him, so that his name became a rallying point for prayer for persecuted Chinese Christians in general. He was not, in all probability, aware of the translation and widespread multiplication of his works (cf. pgs. 232, 239, *ibid*). The "spread of his devotional writings in the West . . . during the [1960's] . . . was quite new . . . [and was] disconcerting [when] compare[d] with the suspicion he had earlier aroused in those mission circles" in China where ministers had actually interacted with his denomination (pg. 239, *ibid*).

3702 cf. pg. 140, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155.

3703 Pg. 241, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3704 "Nee, Watchman," *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

3705 Pgs. 11-16, 94, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee; pgs. 28, 41-48, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3706 Pg. 9, *Understanding Watchman Nee*, Dana Roberts; pgs. 52, 83, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

Bible school,"[3707] since Miss Yu not only "traveled widely among missions in northern China and Korea" but, as a Methodist minister, had "establish[ed] her own Bible seminary in Shanghai."[3708] He consequently attended the Bible school led by Miss Yu in Shanghai in 1920-21, although he was expelled because of disobedience to the school's discipline. At Miss Yu's suggestion, he then went to Miss Margaret E. Barber. She, along with Miss L. S. Ballord and the Chinese woman preacher Li Ai-ming, had a center where they preached to men and women and taught and prepared Chinese natives for church leadership.[3709] Nee there learned Keswick theology and was influenced by the literature of the Welsh holiness revival, writing to and reading the writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis[3710] and the *Overcomer* magazine which she edited, and through which Nee became familiar with Roman Catholic mystical quietists such as Madame Guyon, who "deeply influenced" and "greatly moved" Nee and "was to have a strong influence on his future thinking."[3711] "The mystical leanings in . . . Lee [and] Nee . . . are traceable to . . . teachers such as Jessie Penn-Lewis . . . and Madame Guyon."[3712] Keswick and mystical influences such as these were the more important in light of Nee's "self-imposed limitation [on] formal studies."[3713] Nee "testified publicly that he had learned many important spiritual truths from the Overcomer Movement via Jessie Penn-Lewis's teachings. . . . Miss Barber . . . took back to China Jessie's permission to publish the most useful *Overcomer* essays. The work was undertaken by Watchman Nee, who printed them in his *Rising Again* magazine, and expounded them and presented their essential teachings in his later books."[3714] Indeed, "the format of . . . [the] four different Christian magazines . . . Nee edited . . . was by and large modeled after Jessie Penn-Lewis's *The Overcomer* and T. Austin Sparks's *A Witness and A Testimony*."[3715] Nee quoted Penn-Lewis with some frequency;[3716] indeed, "*The Spiritual Man* was based mainly upon the

---

[3707] Pg. 15, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

[3708] Pg. 41, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3709] Pg. 50, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3710] Pg. 65, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3711] "Watchman Nee (1903-1972): A Biographical Study," by Huelon Mountfort. Elec. acc. http://thirdmill.org/watchman-nee-1903-1972-a-biographical-study; pgs. 62, 242, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3712] Pg. 13, "We Were Wrong: A Reassessment of the 'Local Church' Movement of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee,'" *Christian Research Journal* 32:06 (2009).

[3713] Pg. 156, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3714] Pg. 240-243, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

[3715] Pgs. 53-54, *Secrets of Watchman Nee,* Dana Roberts. Sparks himself was influenced by Penn-Lewis (pg. 105, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear).

[3716] For examples, see *The Spiritual Man*, Watchman Nee, comb. ed., pgs. 588, 589, 601, 609, 610, 630, etc.

writings and experience of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis," whose works Nee had devoured when he wrote *The Spiritual Man* at the age of twenty-four,[3717] although Madame Guyon was also influential.[3718] Nee's book, rejecting *sola Scriptura* for truth based on both "the Word and experience,"[3719] leans heavily upon Penn-Lewis and Roberts[3720] for its views on spiritual warfare and other topics,[3721] as he "delved into . . . Jessie Penn-Lewis on the questions of soul and spirit and of triumph over Satanic power."[3722] The book Nee's "Little Flock" denomination was thus birthed in connection with the ministry of Miss Barber, her students, and theology learned from other women.[3723] Nee continued to seek Miss Barber's advice and counsel until shortly before her death in 1930, and he acknowledged her as a powerful influence in his own life. Her affection for him was evident in her leaving him her most prized possession, her Bible.[3724] "No single person is more responsible for the development of Nee's theology than Miss Barber."[3725] "[T]he main influences upon [Nee were] so often . . . women—Dora Yu, his mother, Margaret Barber, Ruth Lee, [and] Elizabeth Fischbacher[.]"[3726] In summary:

> Whenever [Nee] had a problem or needed spiritual instruction or strengthening, he would go to . . . Margaret E. Barber . . . an Anglican missionary[.] . . . [He testified that] [e]very Saturday [he] went to Ma-Kiang, Fukien, to listen to Miss Margaret Barber's preaching. . . . [H]e said that he scarcely found one person in the Western world who could compare with Margaret Barber. It was through this sister that he obtained the foundation of the spiritual life. He frequently told others that it was through a sister [Dora Yu] that he was saved and that it was also through a sister [Margaret Barber] that he was edified. . . . Through Margaret Barber he became familiar with the books of [writers such as] Jessie Penn-Lewis . . . [who taught him about] the subjective aspect of Christ's death[,] . . . spiritual warfare[,] . . . [and] the three parts of man. . . . Watchman Nee

---

3717 Pgs. 102-103, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. It is noteworthy that *The Spiritual Man* was "the first and last book [Nee] ever sat down and wrote, the rest of his publications all being transcriptions of his preaching and teaching," and that Nee also thought his book "will not be reprinted," a view he affirmed at various times to his coworkers (pgs. 103, 251-252, *ibid*.).

3718 Pg. 149, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155. A few other Keswick writers are also mentioned.

3719 Pg. 149, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155. "[E]very point of" *The Spiritual Man* could "be experimentally proven," even if it could not be proven from the Bible (pg. 149, *ibid*; cf. *The Spiritual Man* 1:7-20).

3720 Evan Roberts himself was profoundly influenced by Jessie Penn-Lewis.

3721 Pg. 255, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3722 Pg. 86, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3723 Interestingly, by the 1940s Nee's "spiritual emphasis . . . catered . . . to a taste among the dedicated women missionaries who had rejoined him from the West and who . . . constituted a growing body of foreign sympathizers. Some . . . resigned from their missions to attach themselves to Nee's work . . . [certain] ladies were unquestionably carried away with adulation of Nee as . . . the only person in China through whom they might discover God's will" (pgs. 161-162, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear).

3724 Pg. 113, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3725 Pg. 15, *Secrets of Watchman Nee*, Roberts.

3726 Pg. 156, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

> received a clear vision of what it means to be an overcomer by . . . reading the writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis. . . . Madame Guyon's biography . . . and the writings of other mystics helped him in the matter of life. . . . Mary McDonough's book . . . was a great help . . . [c]oncerning God's plan of redemption.[3727]

Under the influence of his mother and with the assistance of Miss Barber and Dora Yu, Nee rejected infant baptism for believer's immersion.[3728] He consequently sought out Miss Barber to be baptized, receiving a heavenly sign at the time of the ceremony that indicated the smile of supernatural power upon these proceedings.[3729] Nee learned his evangelistic practices from "Miss Groves[,] Margaret Barber's co-worker."[3730] Women taught Nee his doctrines of Spirit filling, applying the blood of Christ, living without financial support, crucifixion with Christ, overcoming, spiritual life, and many of his other distinctive beliefs.[3731] "Four sisters were vital to Watchman Nee in his life and work. He was saved through the preaching of Dora Yu, perfected under Margaret Barber, and sustained by two elderly co-workers, Ruth Lee and Peace Wang,"[3732] who were themselves important woman preachers.[3733] Nee accepted the unscriptural[3734] ministry of the woman evangelist Ruth Lee because of a dream,[3735] and she became the acting editor of newsletters, papers, and books that Nee's denomination put out.[3736] She also edited and prepared for the press works by Nee such as his *The Spiritual Man*, composed under Ruth Lee's "literary tutelage."[3737] As Nee's new denomination was being born, the ordinance of communion was celebrated for the first time in Peace Wang's home with Wang, Nee, Ruth Lee, and one other person present.[3738] Witness Lee also ascribed the greatest influence upon his life, after Nee, to Peace Wang, the woman

---

3727 Pgs. 11-18, 25-26, 70, 81, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3728 Pg. 36, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3729 Pgs. 54-55, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3730 Pg. 45, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3731 See pgs. 45-46, 55-56, 59-60, 69-70, 73, 75, 81, 85, 127, 138, 141, 143, 148, 310-311, etc., *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3732 Pg. 101, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3733 Ruth Lee's "fiery preaching" to men and women influenced many, and her one-time pupil, Peace Wang, was also an "independent evangelist." (pgs. 57, 101-102, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear). After Nee's coming to a conviction that was less than favorable to such matters, "the existence of gifted women preachers seems to have created a problem." One attempt at a solution took place in a "Canonton meeting [where] . . . men suspend[ed] a large white sheet across the width of the hall. . . . Ruth Lee and Peace Wang were visiting the local church. Since they must not preach to men, the brothers would therefore sit behind the sheet and listen to their messages from there!" (pg. 179, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.).

3734 1 Corinthians 14:34-37; 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

3735 Pgs. 103-104, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3736 Pg. 300, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee; pg. 148, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3737 Pgs. 98-99, 101, 210, 262-263, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3738 Pg. 102, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

minister whose "preaching was so convincing and prevailing that many denominations invited her to hold meetings."[3739] Although Nee eventually came to a position that did not endorse women preachers of this sort,[3740] he continued to believe that women should sometimes lead the congregation in prayer in prayer meetings.[3741] Nee translated works by Jessie Penn-Lewis into Chinese, and had his co-workers translate works by Madame Guyon, Mrs. C. A. McDonough and Mrs. C. E. Cowman.[3742] In particular, Miss Barber not only "tutored Nee in the Keswick approach to spiritual dynamics, [but also] assuredly taught him a partial rapture theory,"[3743] since Miss Barber was sent out as an independent missionary from Surry Chapel, Norwich, England, where the founder of the partial Rapture theory, Robert Govett (1813-1901),[3744] was the minister. Nee admits that his exposition of the book of Revelation, *Come Lord Jesus*, is dependent upon Govett's *The Apocalypse Expounded* (1920).[3745] Nee was teaching the partial Rapture error by at least 1924, confirmed not only by Miss Barber, but also by the *Overcomer* literature of Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts.[3746] He wrote:

> There is evidence in the Bible to show that . . . believers will be Raptured after the Tribulation, [but] that does not mean that all believers will be Raptured after the Tribulation . . . some will be Raptured before the Tribulation. . . . [O]nly a small number (one-seventh) can be raptured before the tribulation[.] . . . [N]ot all, but only a portion, of the church will be raptured before the

---

3739 Pgs. 109-110, 113 *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3740 Pgs. 104-105, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3741 Pg. 179, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3742 Pgs. 261-262, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3743 Pg. 162, *Secrets of Watchman Nee*, by Dana Roberts.

3744 "The modern theory of partial rapture seems to have originated in the writings of Robert Govett who published a book setting forth the theory as early as 1853. In this work he expounds his view that participation in the kingdom is conditional and depends upon worthy conduct. . . . Others have made a significant contribution to the propagation of the theory. D. M. Panton, as editor of *The Dawn* (London), uses his publication to promote this teaching. Such writers as Ira E. David, Sarah Foulkes Moore, William Leask, and C. G. A. Gibson-Smith contribute to *The Dawn* articles in support of this theory. For the most part, however, the view is limited to a few adherents who are generally treated as heterodox by other pretribulationists" (pgs. 193-194, "Premillennialism and the Tribulation, Part V: Partial Rapture Theory," John F. Walvoord. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 112:447 (Jul 55) 193-209).

3745 "This study [*Come, Lord Jesus*] was given by Mr. Watchman Nee in the early years of his ministry. . . . In the study of prophecy our brother followed the approach of such people as G. H. Pember, Robert Govett and D. M. Panton[.]" ("Translator's Preface," in *Come Lord Jesus: A Study of the Book of Revelation*, Watchman Nee. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1976). "Robert Govett, D. M. Panton, and G. H. Pember . . . [a]ll . . . hold to a 'selective rapture' position, that only the faithful believer will be resurrected or raptured to enter the millennial kingdom" (pg. 77, *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 1:1 (Autumn 1988)). Nee thus clearly leaned upon earlier partial-Rapturists, although, of course, he also added in his own ideas to the doctrinal mix.

3746 Thus, Nee spoke of the "rapture of the overcomers," who in his mind were only an elite subset of all believers, already in his preaching in that year (pgs. 34 & preface, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee). See also pgs. 199-200, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee; cf. pg. 83, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Nee, as an example of the partial Rapture theology Nee held in 1934 (preface, *ibid*). See also "Rapture," by Watchman Nee, elec. acc. http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/Partial_rapture.htm.

> tribulation. . . . Not all those who are regenerated can be raptured. One must pray always. . . . Some believers will be raptured before the tribulation, and another group of believers will remain until after the tribulation. The latter will suffer the trial of the tribulation.[3747]

In 1935 Nee became involved with Pentecostalism through Miss Elizabeth Fischbacher of the China Inland Mission.[3748] He had "overcome his reservations about women preachers sufficiently to attend her meetings," and, in line with his Keswick continuationism, "acknowledged the Holy Spirit's . . . gifts to the church of healing and of speaking with and interpretation of tongues."[3749] Nee "found peace and spiritual blessing in her message and some experiences associated with her Pentecostal theology."[3750] Miss Fischbacher, who translated various items for the Little Flock into English,[3751] accompanied Nee to the 1938 Keswick convention;[3752] the addresses in Nee's *The Normal Christian Life* were delivered on this trip to the West.[3753] On this trip Nee taught, after the manner of Pentecostalism, that "we must *expect* God to seal His Word with signs and wonders" such as "the gift of healing" and exorcism—indeed, Christians who do "not know how to cast out demons . . . avail . . .nothing," Nee

---

[3747] Chapter 25, *Study on Matthew*, in *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, Set 1 Vol. 15, Watchman Nee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, n. d. ISBN: 0-87083-589-0. Part of the above quotation is the title to the chapter; capitalization has been changed for that portion of the quotation. See also "Rapture," by Watchman Nee, elec. acc. http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/Partial_rapture.htm.

[3748] In light of the heavy Keswick influence (pg. 85, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck) and the interdenominationalism of Hudson Taylor's China Inland Mission, it is not surprising that Pentecostalism permeated the organization almost immediately after the inception of the tongues movement. Cecil Polhill, one of the "Cambridge Seven," is a clear example. In 1909, he was elected president of the Pentecostal Missionary Union, a position he retained until the Union merged with the Assemblies of God in 1925. "Mr. Polhill had visited the [Pentecostal] outpouring of the Spirit at Los Angeles, and had received the baptism of the Holy Ghost with signs following . . . there. He quickly became friendly with Alexander Boddy, and for the first ten years of the Pentecostal Movement in the British Isles these two men were the most outstanding figures." At the same time, already before 1909 Polhill was on the Council of the China Inland Mission, a leadership position he held until his death in 1938. The fact he could lead both the China Inland Mission and the Pentecostal Missionary Union clearly illustrates the openness of the CIM to the charismatic movement (pgs. 46-49; *The Pentecostal Movement,* Donald Gee; pgs. 252-253, *The Making of the Modern Church*, Worrall).

[3749] Pg. 145, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155.

[3750] Pg. 25, *Secrets of Watchman Nee*.

[3751] Cf. pgs. 137, 152-154, 254, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear; Nee's book *Rethinking the Work* was translated by her, as an example.

[3752] Pgs. 148-149, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3753] Pgs. 151-152, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. The title of Nee's book echoes the teaching of Robert P. Smith at the Oxford Convention: "The *Higher* Christian Life . . . [which] so few were living . . . should be called . . . *the only normal Christian life*" (pg. 54, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Mr. Smith's terminology of Higher Life victory as the "normal Christian life" became common in Keswick circles and was adopted by Nee.

proclaimed.[3754] Watchman Nee was warmly received at Keswick, so that his leading the Convention in prayer was considered "the crowning moment of vision" for those present,[3755] although at various periods up to this time sundry Chinese missionaries had rather bluntly declared that Nee was "a devil and a deceiver of many."[3756] Nee was not only already publicly promulgating the continuation of the Apostolic sign gifts, but also such errors as opposition to the classical doctrine of the Trinity and a rejection of the eternal generation of the Son of God.[3757] Into later periods Nee continued to be assaulted for "serious error."[3758] Miss Fischbacher also recorded and translated into English Nee's messages,[3759] as she made "gifted versions and transcriptions . . . of the best of his preaching and writing."[3760] Moved by women preachers, Nee adopted his partial Rapture and pro-Pentecostal errors, as well as errors on sanctification, other corruptions of soteriology, and further false doctrines. Nevertheless, Keswick welcomed him with open arms.

While Nee's doctrine and practice were most heavily influenced by women preachers and teachers, he also, naturally, was influenced by some men. For example, Nee had compositions translated into Chinese of the Roman Catholic mystic Fenélon, the Catholic Carmelite hermit and mystic Brother Lawrence, and partial-Rapture promulgator Robert Govett.[3761] He "read . . . all he could of Charles G. Finney, and of Evan Roberts

---

[3754] Pgs. 178-182, *What Shall This Man Do*? Watchman Nee. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1973. Italics in original.

[3755] Pg. 256, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

[3756] Pg. 74, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3757] Thus, in 1934 Nee could teach: "From eternity past up to the resurrection the Lord is the only begotten Son. . . . before death He is the only begotten Son." Thus, Nee was already teaching that Jesus Christ was not the only begotten Son of God after His resurrection—"after He is raised from the dead He becomes the firstborn Son" (pg. 12, 24, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Nee), an error that is related to Nee's modalistic affirmation that the Son became the Holy Spirit after the resurrection. Watchman Nee by no means would agree with classical Trinitarianism as set forth in Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan, Chalcedonian, or Athanasian creeds, nor with a statement such as *The London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689*: "The Lord our God is but one only living and true God . . . in this divine and infinite Being there are three subsistences, the Father, the Word (or Son), and the Holy Spirit, of one substance, power, and eternity, each having the whole divine essence, yet the essence undivided: the Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son; all infinite, without beginning, therefore but one God, who is not to be divided in nature and being, but distinguished by several peculiar relative properties and personal relations; which doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of all our communion with God, and comfortable dependence on Him" (2:1, 3).

[3758] Pg. 164, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3759] Pg. 54, *Secrets of Watchman Nee*.

[3760] Pg. xii, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3761] Pg. 261, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*.

and the Welsh spiritual awakening of 1904-5."[3762] Nee was also influenced by men such as Andrew Murray and F. B. Meyer, as well as John Darby and various other writers among the Plymouth Brethren, particularly a group of Brethren writers that held to serious Christological heresies.[3763] He did not sit at the feet of women alone to learn his distinctive errors.

Nee taught, following Jessie Penn-Lewis, that only the human spirit is regenerated, and many have been influenced towards this error by his writings. Nee wrote:

> After Adam fell, his spirit became dead. . . . The death of Adam began from his spirit. . . . The death in the spirit of the first man gradually spread to the realm of the body. . . . It continued to work in him until his spirit, soul, and body all became dead. . . . From that time on the spirit of Adam (as well as that of all his descendants) was suppressed by the soul. Soon after, through the soul's suppression, the spirit was merged into the soul, and the two parts became closely knit together. . . . Since the spirit became so closely knit to the soul, man began . . . to act according to his intellect or his feelings. At that time, the spirit had lost all its power and senses, and had become dormant . . . [that is, it had] fallen unconscious. Although it was still there, it was as if it

---

[3762] Pg. 85, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3763] A group known as the London Brethren, who were Exclusive, as opposed to the Open Brethren, invited Nee to England in 1933. Watchman Nee was "fully accredited as in fellowship" with them (pgs. 216-217, *The Recovery and Maintenance of the Truth*, A. J. Gardiner. Kingston on Thames, England: Stow Hill Bible and Tract Depot, 1951). Nee was happy to fellowship with them despite the fact that they believed in severe errors on the nature of God and Christ. The London Brethren denied the eternal Sonship of Christ: "When the Son of God is mentioned in Scripture . . . it . . . is . . . always in manhood . . . there is . . . not . . . eternal sonship . . . in Scripture . . . His sonship [is spoken of] only *after* He is said to have become flesh . . . it is only as having become incarnate that the Lord is spoken of as Son" (pgs. 202-206, *ibid;* italics in original). They rejected Biblical and Chalcedonian Christology; Christ as "'perfect God and perfect Man' is not scripture . . . [it] is derogatory and dishonoring the Son . . . [it is] contrary to the teaching of Scripture . . . [to affirm that] the truth of His Person consists in the union in Him of God and man" (pgs. 139, 145-146 *ibid*). Affirmations that smacked of modalism were also made: "[A]ll the Persons of the Trinity were expressed by the Man Christ Jesus" (pg. 145, *ibid*). Errors in soteriology were also held, such as that one does not receive eternal life as soon as one is born again, but only upon being sealed by the Spirit: "A man is born again, is enlightened by the gospel and is then sealed by the Spirit, and it is then that by the Spirit he enters into eternal life" (pg. 132, *ibid*). Nonetheless, Nee was happy to be influenced by these men and take the Lord's Supper with them, carry on correspondence with them from China to learn of them, receive visits from them to China, and visit England to fellowship with and learn from them (pg. 216ff., *ibid*).

However, fellowship between Nee and the London Brethren was eventually broken—not because Nee rejected their heresies, but because Nee held to false doctrines beyond those which the Brethren supported. Nee was willing to take the Lord's Supper with advocates of the partial Rapture error and held to it himself (pg. 217, 221, *ibid*). Nee taught: "We must distinguish between 'sins' (either morally or doctrinally) that hinder fellowship with God, and 'sins' which do not," to which the London Brethren properly replied: "To suggest, as yo[u] . . . d[o], that there are sins which do not hinder, as you put it, 'fellowship with God,' is an affront to His holiness. Not only are the expressions you use in this connection quite unscriptural, but they disclose grave ignorance of the truth as to the presence and service of the Holy Spirit" (pgs. 218, 220, *ibid*.). Furthermore, the Brethren affirmed: "[Y]ou prefer to substitute for the plain teaching of Scripture, your own professed experimental knowledge" (pgs. 220-221, *ibid*). Both the London Brethren and Watchman Nee were fine with severe errors on the doctrine of God and Christ, but the Brethren were not willing to join Nee in advocating a partial Rapture, open communion, sins that "do not hinder fellowship with God," and replacement of *sola Scriptura* for a priority upon mystical experience.

were not there anymore. . . . The soul becomes subject to the demand of the senses and becomes their slave[.] . . . The flesh in the Bible refers to the life and nature of the soul and body of the unregenerated man. More often it refers to the sinful nature within the body. This flesh is the common nature which man shares with other animals. . . . The soul has replaced the spirit as the ruling [principle], and everything is independent and self-centered. . . . Not only are all the descendants of Adam dead in their spirits, but they are . . . fully under the control of the flesh and walk according to the soulish life and the carnal nature. Such people cannot have fellowship with God. . . . Now the spirit that was the highest, that ought to be joined to God, and that ought to rule over the soul and the body has become surrounded by the soul, whose motive and purpose are totally earthy. . . . This is why the Bible says that [the unregenerate] have no spirit. The result of such a fully soulish condition is to mock, to go on according to one's own lusts, and to make divisions. . . . Such persons are controlled by their souls and are suppressing their spirits. They are the opposite to [*sic*] the spiritual man. . . . [W]hen man is fleshly, not only is he under the rule of the soul, but his soul is actually joined to his body. Many times, the soul is even directed by the body to commit the vilest sins. . . . The authority of this body is so great that it causes the soul to become powerless to withstand it[;] [it can] only be its obedient slave. Man is divided into three parts: the spirit, the soul, and the body. God's original intention is that the spirit remain [*sic*] on top to rule over the soul. After man became soulish, the spirit was suppressed and became a servant to the soul. After man became carnal, the flesh, which occupied the lowest place, became the king. Man was changed from spirit-ruled to soul-ruled, and from soul-ruled to body-ruled. Step by step he became fallen, and the flesh took control. . . . Sin has killed the spirit, and now spiritual death has come to all men so that all men die in sin and transgressions. Sin has also caused the soul to become independent so that the soulish life now becomes an independent and selfish life. Furthermore, sin has empowered the body so that now the sinful nature reigns through the body. . . . Before man is regenerated, his spirit is far away from God and is dead. . . . The soul controls the whole man so that he lives either in his ideas or in excitement. The lusts and desires of the body bring the soul into subjection. Man's spirit became deadened; therefore, there is the need for the spirit to be resurrected. The rebirth which the Lord Jesus spoke about to Nicodemus is the rebirth of the spirit. To be born again is not a matter related to our body . . . nor is it a matter related to our soul[.] . . . We ought to especially emphasize that regeneration is the impartation of God's life into man's spirit. . . . Our being one with Christ's death and our initial step of obtaining His resurrection life are in our spirit. To be born again is completely a matter in the spirit; it has no relationship with the soul or the body. . . . According to the Bible, man's soul alone cannot form any relationship with God. Man's relationship with God is in his spirit. God is Spirit, and those who worship Him must use their spirit. . . . only spirit can serve Spirit. . . . The regeneration in the Bible takes place in a part deeper than man's body and soul. It is in his spirit that the Holy Spirit imparts God's life to him. . . . Before regeneration, man's soul ruled over his spirit. His "self" dominated his soul. His lust governed his body. The soul became the life of the spirit, the "self" became the life of the soul, and the lust became the life of the body. After man's regeneration, the Holy Spirit rules his spirit, causing his spirit to govern his soul then through the soul to rule over his body. Now the Holy Spirit becomes the life of the spirit, and the spirit becomes the life of the entire being. At the time of regeneration the Holy Spirit revives the human spirit and renews it.[3764]

Both our body and our spirit were originally dead. But after we believed in the Lord Jesus, we received Him within us to be our life. Christ, by means of the Holy Spirit, now dwells within the believers. . . . This is the very Christ who is our life. At the moment He entered into our inward part, He enlivened our spirit. . . . Originally our body and spirit were dead. Because we have received the indwelling Christ, our spirit is alive. The spirit and body were previously dead, but now the spirit is revived; only the body remains dead. This is the common condition of *every* believer—the spirit is alive and the body is dead. . . . Although sin has been cast out from the spirit and the will, the redemption of the body is still something in the future. Therefore, sin has not

---

[3764] Pgs. 36-40, 47-49, 52, *The Spiritual Man,* Watchman Nee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1992.

been cast out from the body. Since sin is still in the body, the body is dead. . . . In the meantime, our spirit is living, or more accurately stated, our spirit is life[.][3765]

If a man's spirit is dead before God, he is totally useless in the eyes of God. The spirit must be regenerated. Thank the Lord that our spirit today is a new spirit, a regenerated spirit. This regenerated spirit is our inner man. Every Christian has received the same life from God in his spirit; there is no difference between him and others. The same Spirit who dwells in a weak brother also dwelt in Paul. As long as we are the Lord's, the new creation in our spirit is the same as in others. . . . The mind, emotion, and will are the original and natural faculties of man. The Holy Spirit is within him, and his regenerated spirit has become the new man, the inner man. Yet he still has an outward man, the old man, the original man outside of him. This outward man belongs to sin. The old man has been dealt with on the cross, but the life of the old creation still remains. . . . In order for a saved and regenerated believer to live out the Lord's life, there are two steps that he has to take. The first is believing, which is receiving the new life. The second is consecrating himself, which means committing his outward man to the Lord to allow the new life within to be expressed. . . . Many believers . . . are saved, but their outward man has never been dealt with.[3766]

Throughout the ages God has been trying to give man His Spirit. However, man's spirit was defiled, sin-ridden, dead, and fallen in the old creation. . . . Man has to receive a new spirit through regeneration before he can be in the position to receive God's Spirit and before God can dwell in him. Once a new believer has a new spirit, the Spirit of God dwells in him.[3767]

Paul said, "He who is joined to the Lord is one spirit" (1 Cor 6:17), not one soul. The resurrected Lord is the life-giving Spirit (15:45); therefore, his union with the believers is His union with the believers' spirit. The soul is only the personality of a man and is natural; it should only be used as a vessel to express the results of the union between the Lord and the spirit of the believer. In the believers' soul there is nothing that matches the nature of the Lord's life; only the spirit can have such union. Since the union is a union of the spirit, there is no place for the soul. If the soul and the spirit are still mixed, it will make the union impure. As long as our living has any trace of walking according to our own thoughts, of having our own opinion in anything, or of having our emotion stirred in any way, it is enough to weaken this union in our experience. . . . Mixture will not do. . . . This is a union of the spirit; anything of the soul cannot be allowed to be mixed in.[3768]

In addition to other errors evident in these quotations, such as erroneous views of the depravity of man and of the Fall, Quietism, and many doctrinal affirmations that are simply entirely absent from the Bible, Nee's view that sanctification pertains only to the human spirit, that "new birth is something which happens entirely within the spirit; it has no relation to soul or body,"[3769] is connected with Nee's adoption of anti-Trinitarian modalist idolatry. As at the Broadlands Conferences it was acceptable to preach that "Jesus Christ is . . . the Holy Spirit, Who will dwell in us,"[3770] likewise Nee affirmed that

---

3765 pg. 660, *The Spiritual Man,* Watchman Nee.

3766 pgs. 3-5, *How To Know God's Will*, Watchman Nee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1998.

3767 pg. 5, *Seeking God's Will*, Watchman Nee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 2001.

3768 pgs. 236-237, *The Spiritual Man*, Watchman Nee.

3769 Pg. 61, *The Spiritual Man,* vol. 1.

3770 Pg. 170, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences,* Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

1 Corinthians 15:45 teaches that the Lord Jesus Christ became the Holy Spirit, who then regenerates the human spirit.[3771] He wrote:

> This is the ascension life. The believer is joined to the Lord who is at the right hand of God. . . . Just as a water hose connected to a fountain flows out living water, the believer's spirit, which is joined to the Spirit of the Lord, also gushes out life. This is because the Lord [that is, He who is at the right hand of God, Jesus Christ] is not only the Spirit but the "life-giving Spirit."[3772]
>
> Not only is He the very Creator, He was also the Christ that put on the flesh. And now He is in us as the Holy Spirit. The Christ in the flesh is over! The Christ in the Spirit lives forever in us. . . . God has accomplished everything in Christ. He died and was resurrected, and He has been transformed into the Holy Spirit. He is now ready to come into you. All you need to do is believe. . . . After the Son of God passed through death and resurrection and became the Holy Spirit, He is no longer limited by time and space.[3773] 1 Corinthians 15:45b says, "The last Adam became a life-giving Spirit." This enables all those who have received Christ to obtain a new life. . . . God . . . put Christ into the Holy Spirit[.][3774]
>
> Thou, Lord, the Father once wast called, [b]ut now the Holy Spirit art.[3775]

Thus, Nee believed, Jesus Christ became the Holy Spirit at the time of the resurrection, when He ceased to be the only begotten Son of God.[3776] Eyewitnesses and hearers of Watchman Nee made statements such as:

> At the beginning of 1938 . . . [t]he word the Lord spoke to me through Watchman Nee made a revolutionary impact on my life. The evening I heard him say that Jesus became the Spirit to dwell in us . . . the Holy Spirit . . . light dawned.[3777]

3771 Note, in addition to the quotations below, the already quoted statement by Nee from pgs. 236-237 of *The Spiritual Man* that "The resurrected Lord is the life-giving Spirit."

3772 pg. 238, *The Spiritual Man*.

3773 If, somehow, Nee did not affirm modalism with this statement, as it certainly appears he did, his words still involve a very aberrant Christology. The Divine Person of the Son of God has from all eternity unchangeably and immutably been omnipresent, and the human nature that He assumed in the incarnation has from the moment of Christ's conception been at one particular position in space. Since the Lord Jesus is truly human after His ascension, as He was before that time, His real human body is still not omnipresent; it is locally present in heaven, where He ascended, and from whence He will come again. To affirm that Christ's humanity became omnipresent is to destroy the reality of His human nature, because a true human nature cannot possess the incommunicable Divine attribute of omnipresence. First John 4:3 states: "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh [ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα—perfect tense; He took to Himself a human nature in the point action of the incarnation, and the results of that assumption of humanity continue, a truth also taught in many other passages of Scripture] is not of God: and this is that *spirit* of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." Denying that the Lord Jesus has a true human nature, both before and after His ascension to heaven, is very serious antichristian heresy. Watchman Nee's Christological statement about Christ becoming the Holy Spirit and no longer being limited by time and space thus appears to teach both the idolatry of modalism and also the heresy of antichrist that the Lord Jesus no longer has a true human nature.

3774 Pgs. 137-138, 141, 145, 155, *The Normal Christian Faith,* Watchman Nee (2nd ed.). Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1997.

3775 *Hymns*, #490, by Watchman Nee, cited on pg. 17, *Concerning the Triune God: The Father, the Son, and the Spirit*, Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1973. The *Little Flock Hymnal* was put together when Nee was twenty-eight from hymns already being circulated in pamphlet form in his denomination (pg. 115, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear).

3776 Pgs. 12, 24, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Nee.

> Brother Watchman Nee . . . in Shanghai . . . was explaining . . . John 14:16-20 . . . to us, [and] he pointed out emphatically that "he" (the Holy Spirit) in verse 17 is the "I" (the Lord) in verse 18. The Lord said in effect, "When He comes I come. He is I; I am He." The Holy Spirit is the Lord Jesus, and the Lord Jesus is the Holy Spirit. . . . the Son is the Father, and the Son is also the Spirit.[3778]

Nee's teachings were summarized as including the following:

> The crucified, resurrected, and ascended Christ is now . . . the Spirit of life . . [t]he Holy Spirit is . . . the Spirit of life . . . Christ is life . . . and this life is the Spirit of life . . . [t]he Son [is] the embodiment of the Father . . . [t]he Spirit is the realization of the Son . . . [t]he resurrection of Christ . . . ma[de] Christ the life-giving Spirit . . . [t]he [Holy] Spirit [is] [t]he consummation of the Triune God . . . [t]he . . . Spirit [is the] . . . application of the Father in the Son . . . [t]he incarnation [was] of the Triune God [that is, not of the Person of the Son alone, but of] . . . God the Father . . . God the Son . . . [and] God the Spirit . . . believers [are] transformed . . . by Christ as the Spirit."[3779]

One would like to hope that Nee was simply sinfully and very dangerously careless in such modalistic language, or that he just didn't know what he was talking about. One might perhaps also hope that Nee did not really believe or intend to teach that Jesus Christ was "transformed into the Holy Spirit" or that "the Son of God . . . became the Holy Spirit" and hope that those who heard him, including those closest to him, with whom he spent years, did not understand that Nee really did not mean what he said when they adopted modalist idolatry based on Nee's teachings. Alternatively, one could perhaps hope that his writings have been severely altered or mistranslated.[3780] However,

---

[3777] The testimony of "Elizabeth P. Rademacher, A Western Missionary," to Watchman Nee. http://www.watchmannee.org/others-testimonies.html. Further details about her, and this same modalist testimony to Nee, are found on pgs. 145ff. of *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation* by Lee.

[3778] Pgs. 16-17, *Concerning the Triune God: The Father, the Son, and the Spirit*, Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1973.

[3779] Pgs. 158-161, 279-281, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation,* Lee. Note that modalism was included among the teachings of even Nee's earliest period, from 1920-1932. The lack of spiritual discernment about Nee in the Western Keswick movement is evident in that even while Nee was making modalistic statements and requiring everyone to leave their churches to join his new denomination, he still was welcomed with open arms at the 1938 Keswick convention:

> [T]he chairman [of the Keswick Convention], who was also the chairman of the China Inland Mission . . . agreed with [Nee]. He told Brother Nee that what the Lord had commissioned him to do in China was exactly the burden of . . . the founder of the CIM, and that their missionaries in China were wrong in opposing him. Eventually, the chairman of the mission went to China and called all the missionaries of the CIM together in Shanghai and told them that they were wrong in opposing the work of Watchman Nee. He told them that what Watchman Nee was doing was exactly what they should be doing. He advised them never to do anything from that day forth to oppose him. (pgs. 176, 204, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee)

[3780] This possibility, which would save Nee personally from damnation as an idolater, involves the supposition that Lee and others in Nee's movement interpolated Nee's writings with their own modalist heresy while Nee never spoke out against or condemned Lee for his modalist idolatry or for corrupting his own writings. One should note that even if this very unlikely hypothesis is indulged, it still leaves Nee's writings, as presently extant, corrupted with damnable idolatry and thus very dangerous and unreliable. However, it is far more likely that the Christian Research Institute is correct: "[T]here have always been some who have denied legitimacy to Lee's leadership and who have, in fact, disagreed strongly with Lee's understanding of Nee's teachings. We have examined these alternative interpretations and developments of Nee's teachings and do not believe that there is significant difference between Nee and Lee, nor any compelling evidence that Nee and Lee represent different teachings or different expressions of the church"

such suppositions are extremely unlikely, making it morally certain that the damnable heresy of modalist idolatry was Nee's doctrine. It is certain that Watchman Nee's "most faithful co-worker,"[3781] "senior worker in Shanghai and Taiwan,"[3782] and successor[3783] in the Little Flock movement, Witness Lee, did indeed reject Biblical Trinitarianism for a form of modalism that affirmed that the second Person in the Godhead became the third Person.[3784] Lee wrote: "Hence, to say that the Lord Jesus is also the Holy Spirit is according to the Bible's clear revelation. Therefore, it is clear. The Lord Jesus is the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, the very God and the Lord."[3785] Lee's position is advocated by the Church of Recovery/Local Church cult that publishes and zealously promulgates both modalism and the writings of both Nee and Lee through its publishing arm, Living Stream Ministry. Tying sanctification in with the human spirit alone is also related to the strange error of Nee and Lee, developed from a trajectory of Jessie Penn-

---

(pg. 5, "We Were Wrong: A Reassessment of the 'Local Church' Movement of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee,'" *Christian Research Journal* 32:06 [2009]).

3781 Pg. 156, *Secrets of Watchman Nee,* by Dana Roberts. Gainesville, FL: Bridge-Logos, 2005.

3782 Pg. xv, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3783 Lee knew Nee for decades; their first interaction took place in 1925. At the time of their first personal meeting, Lee baptized someone into Nee's new denomination (pg. 289, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation,* Lee). Lee testified: "Those days with Watchman affected my pathway in the Lord throughout all the following fifty-nine years" (pg. 288, *ibid*.) Lee became convinced that Nee was "a person wholly with the Lord . . . [and] a man of God" so that he "had to follow him and work with him," not because of Scripture, but because of an experience Nee had where he felt burdened about Lee and wrote him a letter (pg. 292, *ibid*). Lee thus became Nee's full-time coworker in 1933. He was the best man at Nee's wedding (pgs. 307, 343, *ibid*. See pgs. 283-344 for a detailed discussion of Nee and Lee's work together). Lee also spearheaded the restoration of Nee to eldership after the elders at Shanghai had removed him for a time (pgs. 182, 187, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear). The Local Church cult received its name from Nee's doctrine, perpetuated by Lee, that each city could have only one church within it and all Christians must join that one "Local Church." Nee, when he decided to remain in China despite the invasion of Mao's communist armies, appointed Witness Lee over the work outside China in the late 1940s as the communists were advancing on the Chinese mainland (pgs. 193ff., *Against the Tide*, Kinnear). Nee was imprisoned by the communists in 1952 and would not oversee his denomination again. He died in 1972. Lee wrote:

> I feel no shame whatsoever in saying that I followed a man [Watchman Nee]—a man that was the unique gift and the seer of the divine visions in this age. I am more than grateful to the Lord that immediately after being saved I was brought into such a profitable relationship with Watchman Nee and put into the closest relationship with him in the work of His recovery through so many events over a long period of time. The revelations concerning Christ, the church, the spirit, and life which I saw through Watchman Nee, the infusions of life which I received from him, and the things concerning the work and the church which I learned from him will require eternity to evaluate their true worth. (http://www.watchmannee.org/others-testimonies.html)

Witness Lee, whose modalism is blatant and undeniable, thus claimed very strongly to have received his doctrines from Watchman Nee. There is no evidence to the contrary. See also pg. 117, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3784 Lee also affirms many other dangerous and damnable heresies and errors.

3785 pgs. 8-9, *The Truth Concerning The Trinity: Two Answers By Witness Lee*. Anaheim: Living Stream Ministry, 1976. Lee affirms such blasphemy and idolatry many times in many of his writings. Representative examples are found in *Witness Lee and the Local Church*, by Cal Beisner & Robert & Gretchen Passantino. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Christian Research Institute, 1978.

Lewis's thought,[3786] that the Holy Spirit "mingles" with and so becomes indistinguishable from the human spirit,[3787] a false doctrine that is related to Lee's heretical confusion

---

[3786] Penn-Lewis, as a precursor to Nee and Lee's doctrines of the mingled spirit and of the breaking of the outer man, wrote:

> The believer must not only apprehend the negative side of God's dealing as depicted in Hebrews 4:12—the dividing of "soul" from "spirit"—but the positive side . . . as the God of Peace . . . taking possession of and working through the spirit, and seeing that the soul and body fulfil their proper functions. "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" (1 Corinthians 6:7), wrote the Apostle. "Ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to Him Who was raised from the dead" (Romans 7:4, R.V.). Here is set forth clearly the "joining" or union with Christ in the spirit, which is the purpose and outcome of the work of the Cross. This union with the Risen and Ascended Lord can be only in spirit, and EXPERIMENTALLY REALIZED as the SPIRIT OF THE BELIEVER IS SEPARATED FROM THE ENWRAPPING OF THE SOUL; for, as Stockmayer observes, the Risen Lord cannot be said to be the Bridegroom of the soul; the soul—the personality of the man—can only be the vessel through which the Lord manifests His own life, bringing forth, in union with the believer's spirit, "fruit unto God." The "spiritual" man, therefore, is one in whom, through the dividing of soul and spirit by the Word of God, the SPIRIT HAS BEEN FREED from the entanglement of the "soul" . . . raised out of its "embrace" and joined to the Lord in union of essence—spirit with spirit—one spirit—so that the soul and body may serve as vehicles for the expression of the will, and life, and love of the Lord Himself through the believer. (Chapter 5, *Soul & Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Capitalization present in the original. Note the rest of the chapter as well.)

Consider also that Penn-Lewis, in line with earlier heretical mystical writers, states that the believer has a "union of essence" with God, an affirmation that also provides background for the deification heresy Nee and Lee developed out of their mingled spirit doctrine, and which is also a precursor of the Word-Faith "little gods" doctrine. Penn-Lewis's affirmation of a union of essence with God was not simply a dangerous and idolatrous but mistaken slip of her pen; for example, she stated elsewhere:

> The spiritual man . . . is perfected into one spirit with others in Christ. . . . John 17 . . . [states] . . . "As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us . . . that they may be one, even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one[.]" . . . The essential union which exists between Father and Son[,] the Union of essence in spirit with spirit—is the union of the believer each with the other who is IN God. The language of the Lord is unmistakable. He said, "That they may be one, even as WE are ONE!" This means Father and Son, dwelling in the spirit of the believer, by the Holy Ghost, in perfect—or complete—union; and of necessity it means also the same union of spirit with other believers. The "spiritual" man is therefore . . . one with Christ in God. (*Soul & Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Chapter 5; cf. Chapter 8, "[T]he gilded bait offered to Eve in the temptation in Eden was 'Ye shall be as God'—-which was the very purpose in the heart of God in His creation of man.")

Penn-Lewis is idolatrous and greatly mistaken exegetically, although well within her Keswick and Quaker theological trajectory, when she affirms that the union of essence in the Trinity between the Divine Person of the Father and of the Son is shared by men (an error she is followed in by Word-Faith teachers who also misuse John 17:21-23; e. g., Paul Crouch; see pg. 333, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur). John 17:21-23 speaks of the union of the elect with Christ as the Divine-human Mediator, as *Theanthropos*, and of their union with God through Christ by the Spirit. The union of the incarnate Son of Man with the Godhead and the union of the elect with the incarnate Son are not the same as the ontological and absolutely incommunicable unity of the three Persons of the Trinity, even apart from the exegetical point that the "even as" (καθώς) of John 17:22 can well be understood as an affirmation concerning the equal truth of the union of the elect with Christ and of Christ with the Father, rather than an affirmation that both unions are of the same kind or nature (cf. Section 1.70, "Of the Union Between Christ and the Saints," in Treatise 1, *Of Domestic Duties*, William Gouge, elec. acc. *Encyclopedia Puritannica Project*, CD Version 3.0.). Nee took seriously and developed Penn-Lewis's error, and Lee expanded Nee's mystical doctrine of deification and developed all its vile and idolatrous implications.

[3787] "One rather remarkable thing is that God does not mean to distinguish between His Spirit and our spirit. . . . It is simply impossible to distinguish. When in regeneration we receive our new spirit, we receive God's Spirit too. The moment our human spirit is raised from the state of death, we receive the Holy Spirit. We often say that the Holy Spirit dwells in our spirit, but we find it hard to discern which is the Holy Spirit and which is our own spirit. The Holy Spirit and our spirit have become so mingled; while each is unique they are not easily distinguished. . . . Since the Holy Spirit and our spirit are joined into one (1 Cor. 6.17),

about the fact that in the incarnation[3788] Jesus Christ united His true and distinct Divine nature with a true and distinct human nature in the unity of His single Person.[3789] Lee's spirit-mingling heresy also lends itself to the heresy of deification—the Satanic blasphemy that man becomes God (Genesis 3:5)—strenuously promulgated by Lee and the Church of the Recovery cult as a legitimate trajectory of the teaching of Watchman Nee[3790] and in accordance with the position of the spiritualist originator of the Keswick movement, Lord Mount Temple.[3791] Watchman taught that the Church is Christ, and Christ is God, so the church is deified. Nee proclaimed:

---

they can be distinguished only in name, not in fact" (pgs. 20-21, *The Release of the Spirit,* Watchman Nee. Sure Foundation: 1965).

[3788] Lee evidenced further severe incarnational confusion and heresy by affirming that as "Christ is the embodiment of God . . . sin is the embodiment of Satan . . . Satan wrought himself into man . . . [so] God became incarnated as a man" (pgs. 114-115 *The Economy of God*, by Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministries, 2005). Satan is a real, personal being, not an impersonal entity like sin, nor did Satan ever become embodied or incarnate in man like the Lord Jesus Christ did.

[3789] The Biblical doctrine of the natures of Christ, taught in passages such as Philippians 2:6-7, was expounded by the Council of Chalcedon:

> We unanimously teach one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, complete as to his Godhead, and complete as to his manhood; truly God, and truly man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; consubstantial with the Father as to his Godhead, and consubstantial also with us as to his manhood; like unto us in all things, yet without sin; as to his Godhead begotten of the Father before all worlds, but as to his manhood, in these last days born, for us men and for our salvation, of the virgin Mary, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, known in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without severance, and without division; the distinction of the natures being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained, and both concurring in one person and hupostasis. We confess not a Son divided and sundered into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-begotten, and God the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, even as the prophets had before proclaimed concerning him, and he himself hath taught us.

Rather than affirming this foundational Christological truth, Lee affirms that the Divine and human were "mingled" in Christ: "Christ's incarnation was the mingling of His divine nature with the human nature" (pg. 13, *The Economy of God*, Witness Lee). In "the incarnation a dispensation began in which God and man, man and God were blended into one. . . . What took place at Bethlehem was the birth of One who had a dual nature" (pgs. 4-5, *The God of Resurrection*, by Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1997). Lee's doctrine is aberrant Christology, despite a subsequent reference to "two natures" on pg. 5; however, his error here may be motivated more by his mysticism and rejection of Bible study than a definite and deliberate rejection of Biblical and Chalcedonian Christology.

[3790] Of course, Word-Faith theology likewise teaches that man becomes god. Watchman Nee probably adopted his concept of deification out of the pantheistic mysticism and Faith and Mind Cure background that undergirds Higher Life theology, a background that led, for example, E. W. Kenyon similarly to affirm: "God impart[s] His own nature to the human spirit . . . . God becomes a part of our very consciousness" (pgs. 74, 137, *The Hidden Man: An Unveiling of the Subconscious Mind*, Kenyon; note that Kenyon employs in context the same sort of argumentation as Nee and Penn-Lewis about only the spirit being regenerated) in this manner "espousing deification . . . the metaphysical view that salvation entails man becoming a god" (pg. 44, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell, commenting on these very quotes from Kenyon). However, deification is a false doctrine that Satan has doubtlessly conveyed to many unregenerate people directly throughout the course of history (cf. Genesis 3:5).

[3791] Mr. Mount-Temple prayed: "My Lord Jesus, as Thou didst take my humanity, I pray Thee impart to me Thy Divinity," and he stated that, as with the confession of Christ as one Person with a true Divine and a true human nature at Chalcedon: "I have to record my thanks . . . for deep Churchism at our Conferences . . . [and] for the knowledge that we are all two in one—two natures in one person . . . the

> [T]he church as the Body of Christ was simply the enlargement, expansion, and expression of the resurrected Christ. . . . Christ in resurrection was the . . . content of the church . . . [Nee] frequently emphasized that anything which is not Christ in resurrection is not the church . . . the church is Christ. . . . [t]he genuine oneness of the church . . . is the Spirit Himself. . . . [T]he Holy Spirit . . . reconstitute[s] us within with the divine element. . . . Christ is both the content of the church and the reality of the church. . . . the [idea that the] Body of Christ . . . express[es] Christ corporately in each locality . . . was the goal of [Nee's] entire ministry, and he held to this goal to the day he died. . . . God and His redeemed . . . [will] express the processed Triune God forever. . . . [Salvation] bring[s] God into man, making God one with man as a God-man. . . . [T]he resurrection of Christ . . . [b]ring[s] man into God."[3792]

Nee, as a natural development of his mysticism,[3793] regularly taught this heresy of deification, and affirmations concerning it fill his writings:

> Christ the Head and the Church His body . . . Christ *and* His Church, make up together His one new Man—"the Christ."[3794] The goal of God was to establish not just the individual Christ, but also the corporate Christ. This corporate Christ is the church.[3795] [T]he corporate Christ . . . is the composite of the personal Christ and the church. . . . [T]he term Christ . . . refers to the church.[3796] "The church is simultaneously fully Christ in its state and not fully Christ in its status. . . . The corporate Christ . . . is the personal Christ and the church . . . in the *eschaton* . . . the church [will] experience the full status of the personal exalted Christ.[3797] Everything of Eve was out of Adam, and everything of the church is out of Christ. . . . The fact that Eve was made from Adam signifies that the church is made from Christ. Eve was made with Adam's rib. Since Eve came out from Adam, she was still Adam. Then what is the church? The church is another form of Christ, just as Eve was another form of Adam. The church is just Christ. . . . The church is . . . taken out of Christ. In other words, it is the man which God has made by using Christ as the material. . . . The material of the church is Christ. . . . Only that which is out of Christ can return to Christ. The material for the building of such a bride [as the church] is Christ Himself.[3798] There is a portion in us which is out of Christ and which is Christ Himself. . . . There is a life within us which has nothing to do with sin and which requires no redemption. That life in us is from Christ and it is Christ Himself.[3799] God is added to man. . . . [I]n the New Jerusalem . . . the Creator mingles with the creature . . . God and man will become one.[3800] When . . . a sinner, the old man, hears the gospel and believes in Christ and is saved, he becomes a new man. Not only has he become a new man individually; he is joined to all other Christians to become one corporate new man as well. . . . The church . . . is the new man . . . The new man is simply Christ. The nature of the new man is Christ. . . . We can even venture to say that Christ is the church and the church is Christ . . . [t]he constitution of the new man is nothing less than Christ Himself. Since the nature of the new

---

Divine and the human" (pg. 183, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple],* Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890).

[3792] Pgs. 80, 163, 164, 166, 196-197, 271, 279-280, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

[3793] B. B. Warfield wisely noted: "The history of mysticism only too clearly shows that he who begins by seeking God within himself may end by confusing himself with God" (pg. 661, *Studies in Theology: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 9, B. B. Warfield. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008).

[3794] Pg. 14, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

[3795] Pg. 7, *The Assembly Life,* by Watchman Nee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1995. cf. pg. 265, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation* by Lee.

[3796] Pgs. 14, 48, 79, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Nee.

[3797] Pgs. 151-152, *Secrets of Watchman Nee,* Dana Roberts, citing *Christ the Sum*, pg. 59, & *Love One Another*, pg. 194, by Watchman Nee.

[3798] Chapters 2, 3, *The Glorious Church*, Watchman Nee.

[3799] Chapters 2, 5, *The Glorious Church*, Watchman Nee.

[3800] Chapter 5, *The Glorious Church*, Watchman Nee.

> man—the church—is Christ, we can say that the church is Christ. . . . The constitution of the new man is Christ Himself . . . the church is Christ. . . . He would release His life on the earth to all those who would believe in Him so that they would be regenerated and receive God's life. . . . the church . . . is . . . the corporate Christ. . . . Formerly, Christ was expressed individually; now He is expressed corporately. . . . Only the church as the corporate Christ can fulfill God's goal and plan.[3801]

Nee's mystical doctrine of deification was faithfully expounded also in Witness Lee's works and other writings in their denomination. Lee forthrightly taught modalism and deification:

> [T]he Son must be the Father . . . the entire Godhead, the Triune God, became flesh. . . . The traditional explanation of the Trinity is grossly inadequate and borders on tritheism . . . the Son is the Father, and the Son is also the Spirit . . . Christ is of two natures, the human and the divine, and we are the same: we are of the human nature, but covered with the divine. He is the God-man, and we are the God-men. . . . In number we are different, but in nature we are exactly the same. . . . God's economy and plan is to make Himself man and to make us, His created beings, "God," so that He is "man-ized" and we are "God-ized." In the end, He and we, we and He, all become God-men. . . . Because the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are all one with the Body of Christ, we may say that the Triune God is now the "'four-in-one' God." These four are the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and the Body. [3802]

[3801] Pgs. 7-9, 15-16, *The Mystery of Christ: Knowing Christ in the Church & as the Church,* by Watchman Nee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1997.

[3802] See "An Open Letter To the Leadership of Living Stream Ministry and the 'Local Churches'" (http://www.open-letter.org/), signed by more than seventy evangelical scholars at institutions such as Dallas Theological Seminary, Knox Theological Seminary, Liberty Theological Seminary, Southern Evangelical Seminary, Denver Seminary, Western Seminary, and many Southern Baptist seminaries, where extensive evidence is given of Witness Lee's modalism and deification heresies.

Very regrettably, the Christian Research Institute (CRI) of Hank Hanegraaff reversed its formerly correct position on the cultic character of the Church of the Recovery in "We Were Wrong: A Reassessment of the 'Local Church' Movement of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee,'" *Christian Research Journal* 32:06 (2009). Hanegraff wrote: "[T]he Christian Research Institute has concluded that the local churches [of Nee and Lee] are a genuine expression of authentic New Testament Christianity . . . *not* a cult" (pg. 62; italics in original). This note is not the place to conduct a complete critique of the errors involved in CRI's reversal. However, the following points deserve mention. In relation to CRI's justification of the modalism of the Local Church (LC), the CRI is dangerously wrong when it argues that the revelation of the ontological Trinity in the economic Trinity appears like modalism, yet this error is alleged as a fact that is to explain Witness Lee's many modalistic statements (pgs. 16, 19, 22). God does not deceive people in His self-revelation in the economic Trinity—while all three Persons concur in the external Trinitarian works, so that the *opera ad extra sunt indivisa*, the economy nevertheless clearly reveals three distinct Persons and points to the true trinality in the ontological Trinity. An economic modalism would reveal an ontological modalism, not an ontological Trinity, so little has actually been gained by relegating Lee's modalistic language to an alleged merely economic modalism that undergirds an alleged ontological Trinitarianism. Furthermore, CRI's recording that Lee condemns one form of modalism (pgs. 16-17) does not constitute a condemnation of all forms of modalism—particularly that form to which both he and his denomination hold. Finally, the fact remains that Witness Lee regularly employs grossly modalistic language, language of a sort entirely absent in Scripture, and he has never repudiated any of it. CRI can attempt to explain it away, but Lee's statements that "[t]he Lord Jesus is the Father, the Son, and the Spirit" (pg. 15) remain utterly unjustifiable.

In relation to the Local Church's doctrine of deification, the core of CRI's argument is that deification was also taught by "ancient Greek church fathers and Eastern Orthodox theologians," so it is "within the pale of orthodoxy" (pg. 25). Even if one grants CRI's very questionable premise that Eastern Orthodoxy teaches deification in the manner that Witness Lee does, it would not justify Lee—rather, it would supply another of the many reasons, from image worship to sacramental works salvation, that Eastern Orthodoxy is heresy. The severe problems with CRI's argument, and the organization's own

The denomination's theological journal, *Affirmation and Critique*, a publication of Living Stream Ministry, had an issue entitled "Deification,"[3803] which included articles entitled: "Becoming God," "Can Human Beings Become God?" "Deification by Participation in God's Divinity," "The Gospel of the Promised Seed: Deification according to the Organic Pattern in Romans 8 and Philippians 2," "Creation, Sanctification, Regeneration, Deification," "Regeneration for Deification, Regeneration as Deification," "Deified to Be

---

extreme lack of doctrinal discernment, is evident in their argument that if one is to criticize the Church of the Recovery for teaching deification, then:

> [W]hy not go after the Episcopalians for their doctrine of baptismal regeneration, or the Lutherans for their belief in the "real presence" of the body and blood of Christ "in, with, and under" the Eucharist, or the Nazarenes for their belief in a "Second Blessing"? If . . . [we ought to] tolerate doctrinal distinctives of groups such as these . . . why is the LC not treated with the same consideration? (pg. 29)

CRI's assumption that one ought to tolerate damnable heresies such as baptismal regeneration, and severe errors such as the Second Blessing, and therefore the deification heresy of the LC ought to be extended the like toleration, is not evidence of the LC's orthodoxy, but of the CRI's openness to heresy. CRI's recognition of other unconverted heretics such as James D. G. Dunn (pg. 18), its denial that Roman Catholicism is a cult and affirmation that many devout Catholics are true Christians (cf. "The Christian Research Institute and Rome," http://www.wayoflife.org/database/criandrome.html), its unwillingness to label Seventh Day Adventism a cult (http://www.equip.org/articles/seventh-day-adventism/), are all further evidences of its lack of doctrinal health. CRI's doctrinal and practical blindness is also evident in its affirmation that LC practices such as "pray-reading" are not dangerous but have "much to offer Western Christianity" (pg. 62).

CRI also notes that members of the LC have endured persecution in China (pgs. 29-30), but this hardly proves that they are true Christians—members of the Watchtower Society, Sikhs, and even many of the Communist atheists that fought to successfully take over China endured great persecution at the hands of others, but were hardly true Christians. This argument, like the body of the others in CRI's blessing upon the LC, is clearly fallacious.

While CRI reversed its position on the cultic status of the LC, very many of the signers of the "Open Letter To the Leadership of Living Stream Ministry and the 'Local Churches'" continue to recognize the serious deficit of Christian orthodoxy in the organization. The Church of the Recovery continues to be "a movement the vast majority of Christian apologists and theologians consider to be a cult of Christianity" (http://www.apologeticsindex.org/1154-christian-research-institute-cri-descends-deeper-into-error-and-controversy). See "A Response to the *Christian Research Journal*'s Recent Defense of the 'Local Church' Movement," Norm Geisler & Ron Rhodes, http://www.open-letter.org/pdf/Geisler_Rhodes_Response_to_CRI.pdf; "Five Christian apologists [E. Calvin Beisner, James Bjornstad, Darrell L. Bock, Norman L. Geisler, Gordon R. Lewis] evaluate the teachings of Witness Lee and The Local Church," http://www.apologeticsindex.org/846-apologetics-examine-local-church-witness-lee; "Why the Local Church was included in the Encyclopedia of Cults and New Religions," http://www.apologeticsindex.org/379-local-church-encyclopedia-of-cults-and-new-religions; and many other articles at www.apologeticsindex.org. See also "The False Gospel of Witness Lee and the Living Stream Ministries," http://contrast2.wordpress.com/2010/09/25/the-false-gospel-of-witness-lee-and-the-living-stream-ministries/.

The compromise, doctrinal weakness, and spiritual confusion propagated by the Christian Research Institute's endorsement of the Church of the Recovery cult illustrates the fact that proper spiritual discernment is found only through careful study of Scripture within the pillar and ground of the truth, the local and visible Baptist congregation (1 Timothy 3:15). Parachurch countercult ministries may have some valuable material, but believers should not expect them to be soundly trustworthy, as they exist outside of the authority of the sole institution ordained of God for the teaching of truth, the immersionist assembly Christ started in the first century and preserved by His Almighty power to this present day.

[3803] Vol. 7:2 (October 2002).

the Bride of Christ," and "Aspects of the New Jerusalem: Deification." The titles of the articles indicate all that must be said. Affirmations are made such as:

> The time for silence and shrinking back out of fear of being labeled heretical, cultic, or unorthodox must come to an end . . . The believers in Christ become God in and through their organic union with Christ; the believers in Christ become God through regeneration; the believers in Christ become God through organic salvation; the believers in Christ become God by eating God; the believers in Christ become God by loving God; the believers in Christ become God through the function of the law of life.[3804]

Indeed, the modalistic "trinity" of the Church of the Recovery becomes, by faith and baptism, a quaternity—the Father, Son, Spirit, and the church: "[T]he three Persons of the Godhead . . . [which are not eternal in any case but simply] three [modalistic] stages . . . are now four in one: the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and the Body . . . by faith and baptism."[3805] Nee and his denomination's revolting and blasphemous dogma[3806] perpetuates the original lie of Satan: "And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" (Genesis 3:4-5).

The Church of the Recovery ties in closely the mingled-spirit doctrine developed by Watchman Nee with its affirmations of modalism and deification.[3807] Thus Lee and the Church of the Recovery followed Nee and taught:

3804 Pgs. 143-144, Vol. 7:2 (October 2002).

3805 Pgs. 8-9, 42, *The Practical Expression of the Church*, by Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1970.

3806 The deification doctrine of Nee, Lee, and the Church of the Recovery cannot be redeemed by a reference to deification language in patristics such as Athanasius, for, although such uninspired and generally later patristic speech was certainly improper and unbiblical, nonetheless when an Athanasius spoke of "the deification of man . . . it is obvious that he was not thinking in terms of an ontological change, but of the reintegration of the divine image of man's creation through the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit conforming the redeemed into the likeness of Christ, and also of the believer's transition from mortality to immortality so that he is enabled to participate in the eternal bliss and glory of the kingdom of God. . . . It is not the obliteration of the ontological distinction between Creator and creature but the establishment at last of intimate and uninterrupted personal communion between them" (pgs. 281, 286, *The True Image*, Philip E. Hughes).

3807 One should note that the cult, desiring to deceive the orthodox, retains the word *Trinity* while gutting the word of its content; defends its own form of modalism but repudiates the word *modalism* by denying the successive form of that heresy; and teaches that believers become God but restricts the word *Godhead* to its modalistic Father, Son, and Spirit. In this manner, it seeks to make its abominable idolatry sound orthodox. Furthermore, both Watchman Nee and Witness Lee employed the word *Trinity* and affirmed that the word represented truth, although the particular form of modalism that claims that the Son becomes the Spirit is never repudiated. For example: "Though the Bible never says plainly that God is triune, there are nonetheless plenty of proofs and hints in it to support this truth. The doctrine of the Trinity is a major teaching of the holy Scriptures which we need not question" (pg. 55, *The Mystery of Creation*, Watchman Nee). Nee is speaking of the "us" in Genesis 1:26 as evidence for the position that "in the Godhead there is more than one person." The statement of Nee here is consistent with orthodoxy, although it does not eliminate Lee's form of modalism, where the Son becomes the Spirit in connection with the resurrection—Lee can affirm what Nee wrote here without renouncing his modalistic deity. Note also pg. 151, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, by Lee.

> Jesus is the everlasting Father. . . . the Son is the Father. . . [I]n resurrection this incarnate Christ became a life-giving Spirit. To say that this life-giving Spirit is not the Holy Spirit is wrong, because there is not another Spirit who gives life besides the Holy Spirit. Christ is the Spirit who gives life[.] . . . The Son would come as the Spirit to abide in the disciples. . . . Christ the Lord is the Spirit who gives life, the life-giving Spirit . . . [t]he Father, the Son, and the Spirit. . . . The Son prayed that all of us would be one, but what kind of oneness is this? It is the oneness of the Divine Trinity, a oneness of coinherence. . . . We are to be one as the Triune God is one. . . . [T]he oneness of the Divine Trinity [is] a oneness of coinherence which was meant for the believers' participation. . . . [T]he Triune God c[ame] out of eternity into time, with His divinity into humanity, to pass through a marvelous human living, an all-inclusive death, and an all-surpassing resurrection to become the life-giving Spirit to enter into man . . . we become exactly like Him in life, nature, and appearance.[3808]
>
> After His resurrection the Spirit of God became the Spirit of the incarnated, crucified, and resurrected Christ. . . . the incarnate Christ died and resurrected to become the pneumatic Christ, the life-giving Spirit, so that He could dispense Himself into us to organically save us in His life[.] . . . The indwelling, pneumatic Christ is not for our objective study but for our subjective experience. This experience begins in our human spirit which is . . . regenerated by the divine Spirit. As such, our human spirit is now a mingled spirit . . . [o]ut from this mingled spirit, our experience of the pneumatic Christ will issue.[3809]

Watchman Nee and Witness Lee were not Christians. They were idolaters. Their worship was directed to the devil, not to true God. The Church of the Recovery they founded is an idolatrous cult, not a Christian denomination. Nevertheless, Watchman Nee is one of the leading writers in Keswick circles today.

Watchman Nee (and Lee and the Church of the Recovery) also promulgated the existence of a kind of Protestant purgatory, an eschatological error associated with their partial Rapture heresy. Believers who died with any unconfessed sin would have to suffer the eternal fires of hell—*Gehenna*—during the Millennium until the fires purified them and they could get out. "[O]ver some Christians hell still has its threat,"[3810] Nee taught. Other Christians would be cast into outer darkness. Finally, some Christians who had been good enough and who died free of any sins for which confession and restitution

---

Note also that when the cult fails to deceive the orthodox, it sues them. It sued the Spiritual Counterfeits Project and drove the countercult ministry into bankruptcy. It sued Harvest House for $136 million and would have driven this major Christian book publisher into bankruptcy had it won its lawsuit—thankfully, the Texas Supreme Court ruled against the cult—simply because the publisher included a mild page and a half critique of the cult in a book that was 731 pages long, *The Encyclopedia of Cults and New Religions*, by Ankerberg & Weldon. In the mind of the Church of the Recovery, "[t]he accusation of being a 'cult' . . . is clearly outside the realm of doctrinal disputes" and is "properly the subject of legal recourse" (pg. 45, "We Were Wrong: A Reassessment of the 'Local Church' Movement of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee,'" *Christian Research Journal* 32:06 (2009))—they are willing to destroy Christian organizations simply because they use the word "cult" to describe their cult. Consequently, the Local Church also sued publishers such as Thomas Nelson and Moody Press and threatened lawsuits against publishers such as the Christian Literature Crusade for publishing material critical of their organization. (Compare 1 Corinthians 6:1-8.)

[3808] "A Biblical Overview of the Triune God," Ed Marks. *Affirmation and Critique,* Vol. 1:1, January 1996, 23-31.

[3809] Pg. 64, *Affirmation and Critique* Vol. 2:4, October 1997.

[3810] Pg. 211, *Come Lord Jesus*, Nee.

needed to be made before God and men, would enter the Millennial kingdom and receive levels of rewards—these would be limited almost exclusively[3811] to those who were members of the religious organization founded by Nee and who had achieved a high enough spiritual plane. However, other Christians, those who sinned against too much light, would not have the opportunity to repent if they fell into sin—for such, temporary torment in hell was inevitable. Nee taught:

> There are many places in the Bible that mention God's punishment for the defeated Christians in the millennial kingdom. We will take a look at these places now. . . . The Lord shows us that if Christians tolerate sin, they will suffer either the casting into the eternal fire with both hands and both feet, or the entering into life with one hand or one foot. This shows us clearly that there are those who deal with their sins and lusts in this age and who will enter into the kingdom with one hand or one foot. There are also those who will leave their lusts unchecked and will be cast into the eternal fire. The fire is an eternal fire, but it does not say that they will remain in the eternal fire forever. What the Lord Jesus did not say is as significant as what He did say. If a person has become a Christian but his hands or feet sin all the time, he will suffer the punishment of the eternal fire in the kingdom of the heavens. He will not suffer this punishment eternally, but will suffer it only in the age of the kingdom. . . . [W]e have to realize . . . that the person spoken of here must be a Christian, for only a Christian is clean in his body as a whole and can thus enter into life after dealing with his lust in a single member of his body. It would not be enough for the unbelievers to cut off a hand or a foot. Even if they were to cut off both hands and both feet, they would still have to go to hell. In order to enter the kingdom of the heavens, it is better for a Christian to have an incomplete body than to go into eternal fire because of incomplete dealing. . . . [I]f a saved person does not deal with his lust, he will not be able to enter into life, but will go into eternal fire. The eternal fire here is the Gehenna of fire. The Bible shows us that a Christian has the possibility of suffering the Gehenna of fire. Although he can suffer the Gehenna of fire, he cannot suffer it forever. He can only suffer it during the age of the kingdom. . . . [A] saved person, a brother, [if] he has reviled his brother . . . is liable to the Gehenna of fire. . . . The kingdom is very strict. . . .
>
> No two brothers or two sisters who are at odds with each other can appear in the kingdom together. . . . If I am involved in an argument with a brother, and if the matter is not dealt with in this age, then in the future, either both of us will be barred from the kingdom, or only one of us will get in. It cannot be that both of us will enter in. It is not possible for us to have a problem with each other and yet reign at the same time in the millennium in the future. In the kingdom all the believers are in one accord. There are absolutely no barriers between any two persons. If while we are on earth today, we have some friction with any brother or sister, or if we cause a hindrance to any brother or sister, we have to be careful. Either we will go in and the other will be excluded, or the other will go in and we will be excluded, or both will be excluded. The Lord says that while you are with him on the way you have to be reconciled to him. That means that while you and he are alive and before the Lord Jesus comes back, you have to be reconciled to him. . . . Today we

---

[3811] In addition to those in the denomination Nee founded, Watchman taught that certain spiritual members of the Brethren denomination might also enter the Millennium; everyone else would be cast out, because:

> Nee presupposes that in the modern [period of the history of the] church only those who have experienced the historical recovery of the Philadelphia church [based on Nee's spiritualized reading of Revelation chapters 2-3, a reading which has no sound exegetical basis in the text itself]—the spiritual Christians of the Brethren and local church [Little Flock] movements—will share in the heavenly millennial reign of Christ. (pg. 139, *Understanding Watchman Nee*, Dana Roberts; cf. pgs. 175, 258, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear)

Nee's reading of Revelation 2-3 as representative of periods of church history neither fits the history of true churches—that is, the history of Baptists from the first century until modern times—nor the history of Christendom, whether interpreted from a Romanist or a Protestant perspective. See "The Historical Ages Interpretation of the Churches of Revelation Two and Three," by Thomas Ross. Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

may harbor complaints about others very easily; but these complaints will either keep us outside, keep others outside, or keep both us and others outside the kingdom. . . . We are clear that there is no possibility for a Christian to perish eternally, but if a Christian has any unrepented of and unconfessed sins, which are not forgiven, he will suffer the Gehenna of fire. Christ told those who belonged to Him . . . . [that if] they allow sin to develop in them, though they will not eternally perish, there is the possibility that they will "pass away into Gehenna." . . . The Word of God is clear enough. It tells us, not once, but many times, that it is possible for a Christian to be "cast into Gehenna." . . .

In the book of life the names of all the Christians are recorded. There will be many angels and many Christians. The Lord Jesus will also be there. One or more angels will then read off the names from the book of life, and the Lord Jesus will confess some of the names. Those whose names He confesses will then enter the kingdom. When the names of the others are read, the Lord will not say anything. In other words, He will not confess their names. The angels will then put a mark against these names. Hence, the overcomers' names are clean in the book of life, while the defeated ones' names are marked. As for the unsaved ones, their names do not appear in the book of life at all. One group does not have their names in the book. Another group has their names there, but their names are marked. And still a third group, by the time of the kingdom, has their names preserved in the same way as they were first written in the book. . . . [T]hose whose names are not recorded in the book of life will be eternally in the lake of fire. Those whose names do not appear in the book of life will be cast into the lake of fire. This is at the beginning of the new heaven and new earth. [As for those whose] names have been marked . . . God will cast us "into Gehenna" so that we may be punished temporarily. . . . If we tolerate sin, if we do not forgive others, if we commit adultery, if we revile the brothers, if we are afraid to suffer, to be ashamed, to be persecuted, and to confess the Lord, we have to be careful[.] . . . [D]efeated ones will suffer the hurt of the second death. Although they will not suffer the second death itself, they will suffer the hurt of the second death. Once a person is saved, he will not suffer the second death. But this does not guarantee that he will not suffer the hurt of the second death. We know that the time of the lake of fire and brimstone is the time when the new heaven and the new earth begins. . . . [A]t that time a man will be cast into the lake of fire if his name is not recorded in the book of life. That will be the time when unbelievers are officially put into the lake of fire. However, during the millennium, the defeated Christians will suffer the hurt of the second death . . . [but] not for eternity. If a Christian is joined to the world and if he loves the world and the things of the world, the Lord will allow him to go into corruption, to suffer a little of what the unbelievers will suffer. This is what being hurt by the second death . . . means, and this word is spoken to Christians. . . . The second death will cause pain for some. From the time of the great white throne on, there is the second death itself, which is the suffering for eternity in the lake of fire and of brimstone. But in the millennium there is only the hurt of the second death. If some Christians have not dealt with their sins, they will still suffer the hurt and pain of the second death. . . .

A saved person [who] . . . has seen the revealed God, the Only Begotten of the Father[,] [and] has known the love of God, and he has tasted the heavenly gift, the unique gift, Jesus Christ[,] [and] . . . has also become a partaker of the Holy Spirit . . . [and] has tasted the good word of God and the powers of the coming age . . . [i]f such a person leaves the word of the beginning of Christ today and slips and falls, there is no repentance for him. . . . He will not perish forever, but he will suffer the hurt of the second death and will suffer the Gehenna of fire in the kingdom. . . . If a Christian receives all these wonderful things but does not bear good fruit to God, but rather thorns and thistles, he will be burned. However this burning will only be for a while. Even an elementary school boy knows that if you burn a piece of land, the burning will stop after all the thorns are burned up. The burning in the kingdom will go on at most for a thousand years. How long it will actually burn depends on you. If you have brought forth many thorns and thistles, then there will be more burning. If you have brought forth few thorns and thistles, then there will be less burning. How many things are there in us that are still not dealt with? How many things have not been cleansed away by the Lord's blood, and how many things are not yet confessed, dealt with, and settled with the brothers and sisters? [O]ne cannot go out from [Gehenna] until every quadrans is paid. All the debts have to be paid. When everything is burned away, all the debts will be paid. . . .

In John 15 . . . look at verse 6 . . . [s]ome branches will be thrown into the fire and burned. Some branches have sprouted and have borne green leaves, but do not have fruit. Though they

have life inwardly, they do not have fruit outwardly. The Lord Jesus said that they would be cast out, dried up, and burned in the fire. Here we see clearly that Christians may have to pass through the fire. . . . [I]f a Christian does not take care of his sins properly, there will be punishment waiting for him. The Bible shows us clearly what kind of punishment this will be. It is not an ordinary kind of punishment but the punishment of the "Gehenna of fire." But it is the fire in the kingdom, not in eternity. . . .

What kind of sin will bring us into this state [of Gehenna]? Once a person is saved, it is important that he deal with his sins. . . . [T]here are many sins which will not be passed over. These are the sins that one regards in his heart. . . . Moreover, if we have a problem with another person that has not been solved, or if there are things that need to be forgiven but have not been forgiven, or if we have wronged others or the Lord, we have to deal with these things in a specific way . . . [or face] the coming judgment [of Gehenna].

Now let us summarize what we have seen. . . . In the age of the kingdom, some Christians will receive a reward in the kingdom. Some will receive a great reward; others will receive a small reward. Those who will not receive a reward are also divided into a few categories. One group will not enter into the kingdom at all. The Bible does not tell us where they will go. It only says that they will be kept outside the kingdom in the outer darkness. They will be left outside the glory of God. Second, there will be many who, in addition to not having worked well, have specific sins not yet dealt with. They are saved, but when they die, they still have sins which they have not repented of and dealt with. They still have the problem of sin with them. These ones will be temporarily put into the fire. They will come out only after they have paid all their debts. This will last at most until the end of the kingdom. I do not know how long this period will actually be. There are still many things which we are not clear about concerning the future, but the Bible has shown us enough. Although there are details which we have not yet seen, we do know what the children of God will face. Some will receive a reward; some will go into corruption. Some will be put into prison, and still some will be cast into the fire and be burned. . . . [I]f we do not allow the Holy Spirit to work the Lord Jesus into us, God will have to chastise us that we may receive the benefit and be counted worthy to be with Him.

I am happy in my heart because I can preach the "heresy" of God's Word and I can oppose the "truth" in man's teaching. . . . [A]ll heresies are not pure heresy; they are the truth plus a little error. Heresy is to add wrong things to right things. Add a little of man's thought to God's thought, and you will have heresy. . . . Because Catholicism does not fully know the truth in the Bible, it preaches the doctrine of purgatory. . . . You can say that it is heresy. In the Bible we see that God's discipline of the Christians happens in the millennium, but Catholics say that there is a purging going on today. . . . The Bible shows us that there will be the discipline in the kingdom in the future, but there is no purging in Hades today. . . . [O]nly after we know this will we be able to deal with the heresy in Protestantism. Today among the Protestants, two kinds of errors are being promulgated. First, one group of Protestant theologians proposes that since a man is "once saved, always saved," he can get away with anything in his conduct.[3812] . . . There is another group of Protestants who say that after a man believes, there is still the possibility that he will not be saved. Perhaps he can be saved and unsaved again three or four times within a day. . . . Both of these groups are too extreme, even though both have their scriptural basis. The Bible shows us clearly that when a man is saved, he is eternally saved. The Bible also shows us clearly that it is possible for a Christian to be "cast into Gehenna" temporarily. But the problem is that some brothers hold onto one side, insisting that salvation is eternal and that there is no such thing as discipline in the

---

[3812] Nee here misrepresents the orthodox doctrine that once one is saved he is always saved and claims it is a license to sin. He claims that to affirm that for the sinning Christian "[h]is greatest loss is confined to occupying a lower position in the kingdom. . . . is an excuse for looseness and licentiousness." Nee then mentions the error of Arminianism that believers can lose salvation, and presents his heretical view that believers can get tormented in Gehenna during the Millennium as the only other alternative. He makes a false trichotomy—believers getting tormented in a Protestant purgatory is not the only alternative to lascivious living or to Arminianism. The Biblical position, that one who is saved is always saved from both sin's penalty and power, so that there is no such thing as an unchanged, perpetually sinning Christian, is ignored.

> kingdom, while other brothers hold onto the other side, insisting that if we can be "cast into Gehenna," eternal life is shaky, and therefore we can go into eternal perdition. But if we see the difference between the age of the kingdom and the eternal age and the difference between the temporary punishment of the millennium and eternal punishment, we will be clear that a Christian can receive punishment in the future, but at the same time, God has given His sheep eternal life, and they can never lose it. . . . [T]he matter of eternal salvation is solved because of the work of Jesus of Nazareth, but as for one's situation in the kingdom, it is determined by the person himself.[3813]

The doctrine developed by Nee and received by his followers of a Protestant purgatory, where some true believers will be tormented in purifying fires in hell, while others will suffer in outer darkness, is grossly heretical.

As, it seems, modalism, deification, and the belief that Christians who sin get purified in the fires of hell did not suffice as heresies, Watchman Nee and his successor Witness Lee also believed other false doctrines. They accepted the alleged tongues, visions, and binding and loosing[3814] doctrines of Pentecostalism and claimed to cast out demons from believers and unbelievers, as both the saved and unsaved could be possessed.[3815] Nee even adopted the characteristic Word-Faith heresy of commanding God—that is, the believer, based on Ephesians 1-2 as misinterpreted by John A. MacMillan,[3816] can employ "the prayer of command . . . [w]e may command God to do things."[3817] Certainly, Nee taught, the believer can experience "supernatural revelations [and] visions . . . [that] arise from the Holy Spirit" today.[3818] While it cannot be proven that Nee personally spoke in tongues,[3819] he "found peace and spiritual blessing in [the] message and some experiences associated with [the] Pentecostal theology"[3820] under the

---

3813 *The Gospel of God*, Watchman Nee. vol. 2, chap. 24 ("How God Deals With The Believer's Sins—The Gehenna Of Fire In The Kingdom," Chap. 10 in vol. 2), Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, n. d. elec. acc. http://www.ministrybooks.org/collected-works.cfm. Published as *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee,* Set 2, Vol. 29: *The Gospel of God (2)*, Watchman Nee. ISBN 0-87083-590-4. See also pg. 96, *The Mystery of Creation*, Watchman Nee. Here Nee's Keswick theology, which professes to value dependence upon God and His keeping power so greatly, leads him to affirm that one's sanctification, and consequently one's standing in the kingdom, does not depend upon the Father's love, the Son's work on the cross, and the keeping power and the Almighty strength of the Holy Spirit, but upon the man himself.

3814 "The . . . church . . . is to maintain and demonstrate the victory of the cross of Christ by binding Satan in every place" (pgs. 54-55, cf. 72-77, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Watchman Nee. (New York: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1977). Nee was "influenced by Penn-Lewis, Simpson and Andrew Murray" in adopting the binding and loosing error (pgs. 62-63, *Binding and Loosing*, Foster & King).

3815 Compare pg. 123, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. An account of an exorcism is given on pg. 145-146, *What Shall This Man Do?* Watchman Nee. Jessie Penn-Lewis was important theological background for Nee and Lee's affirmation that believers could be demon possessed.

3816 Pgs. 74-75, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Nee.

3817 Pgs. 73-74, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*, Nee.

3818 Pg. 518, *The Spiritual Man*, Watchman Nee, comb. ed.

3819 Kinnear notes that Witness Lee thought Nee did not speak in tongues but that Lee's belief is "in every sense an argument from silence" (pg. 140, *Against the Tide*).

3820 Pg. 25, *Secrets of Watchman Nee*, Dana Roberts.

influence of Miss Elizabeth Fischbacher, Pentecostal missionary associated with the China Inland Mission, and mentor to Nee, so that Nee taught that "to say that speaking in tongues is dispensationally over is . . . wrong."[3821] Thus, when "Miss Elizabeth Fischbacher," who was "much in demand as one of the C. I. M.'s [China Inland Mission's] gifted missionary speakers, was holding revival meetings," Nee "attend[ed] her Chefoo meetings. She herself shared the . . . [beliefs of the] Spiritual Gifts . . . Movement . . . with . . . its uncontrolled emotionalism and extravagant methods of arousal . . . [and] ecstatic accompaniment of preaching and prayer," so that "she would pray and sing in the Spirit in other tongues." Through her "preaching . . . Watchman [found] . . . a quite new discovery of divine blessing," so that he "brought a message of the outpouring of the Spirit of God . . . [and] the Victorious Life" and a "fresh emphasis on experiences" among "assemblies . . . that hitherto had . . . never allowed the Christians to forget the Bible in favor of mere subjectivism." However, under Nee's new Pentecostal unction, "license was given to jumping, clapping, laughter, unknown tongues that conveyed no message to hearers or even speaker, and a flood of dramatic healings . . . not a few mistaken," so that "the loss of restraint," expanding upon an already extant practice of ending "prayer meetings with a brief period of simultaneous prayer" by all in the congregation, brought on a period where Nee observed that "the gain has been rather trivial, the loss quite large."[3822] When Nee found out his disciple and successor Witness Lee "took the initiative to contact the Pentecostal movement in Peking and began to speak in tongues, at the same time helping others to do the same," Nee did not speak a word against it but simply reminded Lee that not everyone must speak in tongues because of 1 Corinthians 12:30.[3823] Nee "certainly believed in . . . healing, and speaking with and interpretation of tongues." He stated the belief he held from very early in his ministry, which he propagated throughout its course: "Some ask me if I oppose speaking with tongues. Certainly not."[3824] Nee believed that "wonders . . . instantaneous divine healing . . . tongues . . . visions and dreams" were "real miracles" for today, and concerning such

---

[3821] Pg. 12, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1998.

[3822] Pgs. 117, 138-141, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

[3823] Pg. 311, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation,* Lee. See also Nee's book *The Latent Power of the Soul*, which was dependent upon Jessie Penn-Lewis's *Soul and Spirit* and Andrew Murray's *The Spirit of Christ* (cf. pgs. 12-13, 25ff., *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee).

[3824] Pg. 54, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee; also pg. 140, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. Kinnear goes on to recount how Nee personally told him about one episode where supernatural tongues were used to reveal hidden facts. It is also noteworthy that, among those mission works outside his denomination, Nee considered the strongly continuationist Christian and Missionary Alliance the best (pg. 165, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear).

"miracles," he wrote, "I value them highly." Indeed, he related his own experience of these matters: "As to visions and dreams, I too have seen great light. . . . I do not oppose visions and dreams; I myself have had some experience of them."[3825]

Furthermore, prepared by Keswick theology, Nee found so much validity in Pentecostal healing doctrine that he adopted the idea that believers can choose not to be sick and "claim healing over sickness,"[3826] although he himself endured very serious and chronic illnesses, such as fevers that incapacitated him and left him unable to write or even think, a chronic cough associated with wasting away of his body, sickness that left him unable to walk without a cane, heart trouble caused by "long illness," "coronary ischemia" that left him unable to work and caused "great discomfort" as it became, he testified, "the chronic condition I have [that] is always with me. . . . The only variation is in its degree of activity, for there is no question of recovery."[3827] Nonetheless, Nee taught that believers who live by faith will never experience any kind of debilitating sickness that hinders their ability to minister for God: "[T]he real meaning of the Holy Spirit giving life to our bodies is that: (1) He will restore us when we are sick and (2) He will preserve us if we are not sick. In a word, the Holy Spirit will strengthen our earthly tents so that we can meet the requirements of God's work and walk in order that neither our life nor the kingdom of God will suffer through the weakness of the body. This is what God has provided for all His children."[3828] In addition to the failure of Nee's doctrine in his own life, the Apostle Paul's coworker Trophimus, who had a debilitating sickness of such severity that Paul had to leave him behind so that they could no longer minister together (2 Timothy 4:20; cf. Philippians 2:25-30), does not seem to have been aware of the Higher Life for the body. Furthermore, in direct opposition to the miraculous healings by the Lord Jesus and the apostles in the Bible, where all symptoms and evils from sickness were immediately, completely, and permanently removed (Mark 6:56; Luke 6:19), the "healings" Nee endorsed had to overlook obvious evidence that disease was still present. In a manner reminiscent of charismatic Word-Faith teaching,[3829] and in line with the Higher Life healing leaders from Boardman to Simpson, Nee taught that someone could be "healed" but still have symptoms of his disease.

3825 Pgs. 54-56, 65, 74-75, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Watchman Nee. Nee connected these wonders with Spirit baptism (pgs. 55-56). This sort of continuationist preaching was set forth publicly by Nee by at least 1924 (preface, *ibid*). There is no evidence that Nee was ever a cessationist.

3826 Pg. 98, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

3827 Pgs. 81, 97-98, 103-106, 130, 234-235, 244-246, etc., *Against the Tide*, Kinnear; cf. pg. 148, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155.

3828 Pgs. 644-645, *The Spiritual Man*, Watchman Nee, comb. ed.

3829 Compare pg. 151, *A Different Gospel,* McConnell.

However, if he simply denied that the symptom was really a symptom of the disease, everything would be fine. Nee commanded: "Do not accept the symptom," for if "you continue to look at your sickness, God's word loses its effectiveness" and the "healing" could then be lost. Thus, if one has been "healed" of a fever, he is to "laugh at the temperature. It doesn't matter whether it is high or low." If one is "healed" but continues to "vomi[t] blood," or is in "acute pain," this is not evidence that the "healing" is fake—rather, Nee commands: "Treat the symptom as a temptation and a lie."[3830] It was very evident to Nee that if one had been "healed" but was vomiting blood and writhing in pain from disease, the problem was not that the healing was a lie, but that the symptoms were a lie.

Being consistent with his Keswick continuationism, Nee even taught, as did various Keswick writers before him,[3831] that believers do not need to die:

> Since Christ has overcome death, believers need not feel that they must die, although they still may die. . . . Since it is a believer's goal to be free from sin, it should also be his goal to be free from death. A believer should understand that as a consequence of the death and resurrection of Christ, his relationship with death is the same as his relationship with sin. He has overcome these completely in Christ; therefore, God is now calling him to overcome them in his experience. . . . Since the Lord Jesus has met and overcome death for us, He wants every one of us to overcome it in our present life. We should not ask God to grant us strength to bear the power of death; we should ask instead for the strength to overcome its authority. . . . Unless a believer is clear that his work is finished and that the Lord does not need him to remain on the earth any longer, he should not die; that is, he should always resist death. If the symptoms of death have gradually occurred in his body . . . a believer should completely deny these symptoms and refuse to die.[3832]

Obedient believers, it seems, will never die in accidents, and will never die at other times, no matter what disease is doing to them, unless they choose to do so—they simply need to deny that they are dying and refuse to die, and they will stay alive as long as they wish, at least until the age of seventy, at which time they may end up dying, despite all the alleged promises that would keep them alive until their seventieth birthday: "Since the Bible takes seventy as a general standard for human life, we can hope to live until that time if we have faith."[3833] Nee's view that one should live until at least seventy if he had faith was "a commonly accepted teaching in the Higher Life/Keswick movements, with

---

3830 Pgs. 136-139, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation in the Present Age,* Lee.

3831 E. g., Evan Roberts: "It was our faith: 'No "death" until my work is FINISHED.' For we believe . . . that death cannot come to God's worker until he has FINISHED HIS work; and . . . each believer who is spiritual can have the knowledge when he has finished his course of life, and work on earth" (pg. 180, *The Overcomer*, December 1914. Capitalization in the original.). Roberts, in the same article, made one of his false prophecies of the end of the world.

3832 Pgs. 119-120, *The Spiritual Man*, vol. 3, by Watchman Nee. In fact, "Nee gives considerable attention in *The Spiritual Man* III:213-231 to the importance of Christians in this generation overcoming death in order to be raptured alive at Christ's return" (pg. 154, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155).

3833 Pg. 121, *The Spiritual Man*, vol. 3, by Watchman Nee.

their connecting of health and holiness. . . . Murray and Simpson exemplify the teaching that it was not necessary to die of sickness and that a person might live in health until age seventy or eighty."[3834] Similarly, the Word of Faith movement affirms that the "bare minimum . . . should be 70 years . . . after 70 years of life, a Christian then 'chooses' his time to die. The believer who dies before his 70 . . . years could have lived longer had he exercised faith in the promises of the Bible."[3835] Nee was sixty-nine when he died.

Nee also promulgated "blended evangelical and liberal views of revelation and Scripture"[3836] and the idea that irrational inner voices or intuitions should be followed rather than the Bible as interpreted using the mind. He wrote:

> Believers should not follow their soul, which means that they should not follow their thoughts, feelings, or preferences. These are all from the soul. God's way for the believers is to walk according to the spirit. All other ways belong to the old creation and have no spiritual value at all. How, then, can we walk according to the spirit? Walking according to the spirit is walking according to the intuition in the spirit. . . intuition is also completely different from our mind. Our mind comes from our head and is rational. However, the intuition is not located in our head and quite frequently is irrational.[3837]

Matching up with this emphasis upon mysticism, what Nee "cared for was not doctrine, but the release of the spirit,"[3838] explicitly contradicting 1 Timothy 4:13, 16 and many other texts of Scripture, but following Jessie Penn-Lewis, who likewise taught the "priceless blessing of release [of the] spirit" but rejected the necessity of careful grammatical-historical interpretation of God's Word.[3839] After all, Nee "was liable to make a telling point by pressing on beyond what was written" in his "excursions into allegory."[3840] Nee testified: "After completing *The Spiritual Man* . . . I realized that the task of expounding the Scriptures was not for me. . . . [neither] expounding the

---

3834 Pg. 302, *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary Word of Faith Theologies*, Paul L. King.

3835 Pgs. 156-157, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

3836 *Calvary Contender*, ed. Jerry Huffman, Huntsville, AL, Sept. 15, 1994. Elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, vers. 5.1. Port Huron, WA: Way of Life Literature, 2009.

3837 Pgs. 40-41, *The Spiritual Man*, vol. 2, by Watchman Nee. Nee's exaltation of the intuition and disparagement of logic is paralleled in the Word of Faith movement. "Your re-born spirit man can be developed to such an extent that you can hear from God exactly what He wants you to do. This is intuition" (pg. 92, *God's Laws of Success*, Robert Tilton). "Believers are not to be led by logic. . . . Reasoning is based on the failure of the earth through Satan. . . . The ministry of Jesus was never governed by logic or reason. . . . Look at Jesus. He was not led by logic. He was not led by the mind" (pgs. 7-8, *The Force of Faith*, Kenneth Copeland).

3838 Pg. 118, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee. Nee's doctrine of the "release of the spirit, described in his book, unsurprisingly named *The Release of the Spirit*, has antecedents in Jessie Penn-Lewis, who taught that Holy Ghost "Baptism [brings] the . . . influx of the Spirit of God into the believer's spirit . . . evidence[d] in the release of the spirit" (Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis; see also pg. 181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913). Such terminology is, of course, absent from Scripture, as is the doctrine of post-conversion Spirit baptism as a second blessing for the church today.

3839 Pg. iii., *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard, 2nd ed. preface by Theo. M Bamber.

3840 Pgs. 73, 250, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear.

Scriptures, preaching the ordinary gospel, [nor] paying attention to prophecies [was for me]." Indeed, expounding the Scriptures was dangerous to Nee, so that to do so was a "temptation" he had "frequently" needed to resist.[3841] Thus, not the entire Bible as the objective voice of God, but, in a manner that brings to mind the reduction of inspiration in the heretical neo-orthodoxy of Barth and Brunner, only the portion of Scripture in which one has a special encounter with God has value: "Only the word which the Lord speaks to us is of any use."[3842] In fact, Nee thought, "[w]ords alone cannot be considered as God's Word."[3843] In line with the Quaker influence upon Keswick theology, Nee taught that neither the written Word nor the preached Word are sufficient to replace the mystical voice of God spoken directly to the heart: "[T]he written Scriptures . . . [and] the living human messenger . . . contribute to our Christian life . . . [b]ut . . . neither of these can take the place of the living voice of God to our hearts."[3844] One needs a mystical experience, described in an incoherent and bizarre way by Nee,[3845] to transform the Bible into something that is useful and is God's living Word. Nee's deprecation of Scripture for mysticism led him to teach: "To the Christian there is no absolute right or

---

[3841] Nee's testimony at Kulangsu on October 20, 1936, recorded on pg. 226, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

[3842] Chapter 3, *The Glorious Church*, Watchman Nee.

[3843] Pg. 209, *The Ministry of God's Word*, Watchman Nee. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1971.

[3844] Pg. 23, *What Shall This Man Do?* Watchman Nee.

[3845] Nee speaks of a "Holy Spirit memory" that will protect the minister from giving people what the Bible actually says. Incredibly, one is not to preach what Scripture actually says (2 Timothy 4:2), literally interpreted, but is to set forth an allegedly superior Word that God gives directly to the minister. "Holy Spirit memory is necessary . . . care should be exercised lest we be carried away by the truth we find in the New or in the Old Testament. Always keep in mind that our responsibility is to bring God's current words to men. We are not to teach the Bible and forget what God has shown us" (pg. 217, *Ministry of God's Word*, Nee). One is not to be protected by the truth of the Bible from being carried away by mystical experiences; rather, the truth of mystical experiences is to protect one from being carried away by the Bible. "Holy Spirit memory . . . enable[s]" the minister "to recall both the revelation and inward words God has given" to him (pg. 210, *ibid*), as these inward words are the true communications from God. Mystical power that is the key to the encounter that results in God's living Word is conveyed through the emotions: "The spirit flows through the channel of feeling . . . [t]he spirit flows through the channel of emotion . . . not so much on his will or on his mind as upon his emotions." Indeed, if the "feeling . . . is unusable, the spirit is stuck" (pgs. 219, 220, *ibid*). Of course, the Bible, literally interpreted, cannot validate Nee's ideas but they can be validated by an encounter with God's Word conveyed through mystical experience. Nee therefore evidences the validity of his mystical view of the Bible as follows: "Smelling is a most delicate act. It represents man's tender feeling. 'Nose' in the Scriptures stands for feeling." Therefore: "Every time a minister speaks he needs to mix his feeling with the words spoken" (pgs. 220-221, *ibid*). Clearly those who hold to a grammatical-historical interpretation of Scripture and that the Bible itself is God's living Word, being literally God's speech, perfect, glorious, and entirely sufficient, will find Nee's argument a matter of scorn and a despicable misuse of the holy Scriptures. It seems, however, that one who has placed mystical encounter in the exalted place Nee gives it will find his argumentation not to be rubbish, but rather something worthy of putting into print and spreading worldwide.

wrong. . . . What is right or wrong depends upon the level of life [mystical experience] he has attained."[3846] Would writing a book about the truly spiritual man lead to a rejection of absolute right and wrong and the exposition of Scripture (cf. 2 Timothy 3:16-4:2; John 5:39; etc.)? Or is it rather true that if "any man teach otherwise" than "wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and . . . the doctrine which is according to godliness," such a one is so far from being on a higher plane of spiritual life that he is "proud, knowing nothing," and from such a one the godly must obey the command: "from such withdraw thyself" (1 Timothy 6:2-5)? Nevertheless, despite 1 Timothy 6, Nee taught:

> We have said emphatically before that the right way to follow God's leading is to depend on the intuition and not on the mind. This is very crucial, and we should not forget it. A believer should follow the revelation in the intuition and not the thoughts in the mind. Those who walk according to the mind are walking according to the flesh. This leads to the wrong way.[3847]

Nee wrote further:

> To know things in our intuition is what the Bible calls revelation. Revelation has no other meaning than that the Holy Spirit enables a believer to apprehend a particular matter by indicating the reality of it to his spirit. There is but one kind of knowledge concerning either the Bible or God, which is valuable, and that is the truth revealed to our spirit by God's spirit. . . . Revelation happens in the intuition—quietly, neither hastily nor slowly, soundless and yet with a message. . . . Searching with intellect never delivers men; revelation in the spirit alone gives true knowledge of God. . . . The Bible recognizes just one kind of knowledge, and that is the knowledge in the spirit's intuition. . . . He reveals Himself solely to man's spirit. . . . The revelation of God in our spirit is of two kinds: the direct and the sought. By direct revelation we mean that God, having a particular wish for the believer to do, draws nigh and reveals it to the latter's spirit. Upon receiving such a revelation in his intuition the believer acts accordingly. By sought revelation we mean that a believer, having a special need, approaches God with that need and seeks and waits for an answer through God's movement in his spirit. The revelation young believers receive is mostly the sought type; that of the more matured ones is chiefly the direct kind.[3848]

The dangerous error that following one's mind is sinful, that God does not work through the believer's mind, and that, instead, irrational intuitions which are Divine "revelation" should be followed, is directly contradicted by 2 Timothy 1:7; Romans 7:25; 12:1-2; and a host of other texts. However, if there is only one kind of valuable knowledge, and that is supernatural revelation to the human spirit that bypasses the mind, then the Bible cannot really be revelation at all, and its propositions are not valuable. Bible study, then, becomes a waste of time and should be given up, despite verses such as John 5:39 and Acts 17:11. Indeed, Nee's doctrine of intuition led the Little Flock movement and Witness Lee to reject Bible study, as one could simply follow intuition. Lee wrote:

3846 Pg. 142, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3847 Pg. 11, *The Spiritual Man,* vol. 3, by Watchman Nee.

3848 Pgs. 301-304, *The Spiritual Man*, comb. ed., 1977.

> [S]criptural interpretation must . . . pass away for us. . . . we must learn to just turn to our spirit and say, O Lord![3849] This is the way to experience Him. . . . When I was young I did much searching and researching of the Bible. But, Hallelujah, today I have given it up[.][3850] [S]imply pick up the Word and pray-read a few verses in the morning and in the evening. There is no need for you to exercise your mind . . . it is unnecessary to think over that you read. . . . It is better for us to close our mind! . . . There is no need to explain or expound the Word! . . . Forget about reading, researching, understanding, and learning the Word.[3851]

Both the foundations of Pentecostalism in general, and Oneness Pentecostalism in particular,[3852] as well as the Word of Faith movement, likewise reject grammatical-historical interpretation of the Bible to get their messages by mystical "revelation knowledge,"[3853] a development of earlier Quaker, Higher Life, and Keswick hermeneutical subjectivism. Of course, if the mind is not involved in the discovery of any valuable knowledge, the fact that the Bible, interpreted grammatically and historically, actually denies Nee's doctrine is irrelevant, as are contradictions in Nee's own writings (such as his affirmations of the importance of activity in the mind elsewhere); such facts can be dismissed as the mere quibbles of an unspiritual intellect. One wonders, however, why those who follow Lee in Nee's Little Flock movement read the works of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee, for reading their books cannot provide any valuable knowledge to the mind if reading the Bible cannot do so—at least unless the writings of Nee and Lee are superior to the Bible and can convey truth in a way the Omnipotent cannot in His written revelation. In any case, if all that is of true value is directly and irrationally revealed to the human spirit, one wonders if valuable knowledge is conveyed by stop signs and other forms of writing that are utilized every day by members of the Little Flock movement, or if they follow irrational intuition to know when it is their turn to cross the street. Then again, perhaps such logical contradictions must themselves be dismissed in Nee and Lee's exaltation of the irrational and intuitive.

As already noted, Nee also promulgated the idea, following Jessie Penn-Lewis, that believers can be demon possessed. He wrote:

> [E]vil spirits will seize the opportunity to take over the believer's mind. . . . If believers fulfill the condition for evil spirits to work, they will work [and] take over the believers. . . . Evil spirits

---

3849 This "O Lord" business relates to the heresy practiced in Nee and Lee's denomination in relation to salvation by the instrumentality of the "sinner's prayer," as explained below.

3850 Pgs. 73, 94, *Christ vs. Religion*, Witness Lee. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1971.

3851 *Pray-Reading the Word*, Witness Lee, chap. 1, sec. 2, http://www.ministrybooks.org.

3852 Pentecostal historians note:

> Early pentecostals . . . believed in the subjective confirmation of biblical truth. While trinitarian pentecostals occasionally charge their oneness brethren for claiming a subjective revelation, it must be remembered that it was the same principle of interpretation that established the "initial evidence" teaching in pentecostalism just a few years earlier. . . . [T]he initial revelation [of modalism] at the 1913 camp meeting [where Oneness Pentecostalism originated] was . . . not in itself a radical departure from the spirit of early Pentecostalism. (pgs. 157-158, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan)

3853 Pg. 59, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell.

> rejoice exceedingly at all who fulfill [the spiritual] condition [that allows them entry] and immediately go to work. When a 'heathen' fulfills this condition, evil spirits will possess him; when a believer fulfills this condition, evil spirits will also come into him without any reservation. We need to realize that many believers are ignorant of the conditions whereby evil spirits work and the fact that once a person fulfills these conditions, evil spirits will work in an unrestricted way. Therefore, many have unconsciously become mediums for demons and have even become possessed by demons! . . . If we tell a believer that Christians can be possessed by demons (or evil spirits), he will be greatly surprised. An ordinary believer in China thinks that only heathens have the possibility of being possessed by demons and that it is not possible for Christians to have the same experience. . . . Believers realize that there is a possibility for them to be seduced, tempted, attacked, or deceived, but they do not realize that there is also a possibility for believers to be attached to—to be possessed—by demons. When they first believed, they received many wrong teachings; now they think that as long as a Christian has Christ, he will not be possessed by demons. . . . However, this teaching is not found in the Bible. Neither is it confirmed by the experience of the saints. God's children are very unclear that evil spirits can change their appearance and attach themselves to the believers' bodies. Today there is an unexpectedly great number of believers who are possessed by demons. The unalterable fact is that many believers are possessed by demons.[3854]

Nee also followed Penn-Lewis in the affirmation that even believers "who are entirely consecrated . . . can be possessed by evil spirits."[3855] It should be of deep concern that "many believers" in the Little Flock denomination "are possessed by demons," according to their own spiritual leader.

Nee adopted the idea that each city could only have one church in it—one associated with his own denomination, of course. All other churches, whether Baptist, Catholic, or Protestant, were schismatic and in severe error. Each city must have only one church, he taught—"one city, one church, worldwide"[3856]—and this assembly must simply be called "the church [in city X]." Nee adopted the idea that "to leave the denominations . . . require[s] our obedience" in the latter half of 1922, two years after his professed conversion in 1920 at the age of seventeen—from that point on, he viewed "the Presbyterian Church . . . the Methodist Church . . . the Baptist Church" and all other denominations are unscriptural. While Paul required a simple pastor not to be a novice (1 Timothy 3:6), only two years after Nee's professed conversion he was able to found a new denomination, which he affirmed was not a denomination, but a recovery of the true church. The "church life . . . the truth of the Lord's recovery . . . began to be practiced in Watchman's home town in 1922," and by "1926 he . . . established gatherings for the Lord's recovery [his new denomination] in Amoy, Tung-An, and nearby places [in] . . .

3854 Pgs. 12-13, 50-51, *The Spiritual Man*, vol. 3, Watchman Nee.

3855 Pg. 51, *The Spiritual Man*, vol. 3, Watchman Nee.

3856 Pg. 154, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. Nee appears to have adopted this idea from the London Brethren that he had met in England in 1933 (pg. 128, *ibid*). However, while teaching that "each town or village would have but one church[,] [h]e did not wholly succeed . . . in defining how this principle should be applied in extremely large urban communities" (pg. 145, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155).

south Fukien."[3857] For the rest of his life Nee continued to call on all men to leave Baptist churches and all Protestant groups to join his new denomination, as his religious organization made "unabashed efforts to prejudice members of established churches and divert even pastors if it could," leading to "the rapid leakage of believers into their ranks from among the flourishing mission-related churches."[3858]

Nee also came to believe many further ecclesiological doctrines that, while perhaps supported by his intuition, could not be found in Scripture. Pastors, as found in Baptist churches, are unscriptural. Rather, there must be a certain form of hierarchicalism employing Apostles,[3859] since "the work is a matter of region or district."[3860] Leadership must be unquestioningly obeyed and blindly followed, even if it is in error; Nee affirmed that it is impossible to ever disobey any leader in the Church of the Recovery and please God. He wrote:

> People will perhaps argue, "What if the authority is wrong?" The answer is, If God dares to entrust His authority to men, then we can dare to obey. Whether the authority is right or wrong does not concern us, since he has to be responsible directly to God. The obedient needs only to obey; the Lord will not hold us responsible for any mistaken obedience, rather will He hold the delegated authority responsible for his erroneous act. . . . [I]f . . . the delegated authority erred, God would surely deal with him . . . [t]he [one under authority] was not held responsible. . . . Insubordination, however, is rebellion, and for this the one under authority must answer to God. . . . It is absolutely impossible for us to reject delegated authority and yet be subject directly to God; rejecting the first is the same as rejecting the second.[3861]

Thus, one must obey human authorities unconditionally, a demonic idea both current in the Confucianism of Nee's culture and acceptable to the depraved human hearts of powerful men. Even if what authorities command is sin, they must still be obeyed—the member of Nee's cult will not be accountable if he sins in obeying his church authorities. Only those commanding the sin, not those performing it, will be liable, Nee explained; for one under authority, performing a commanded sin is not sinful, but disobeying the authority's command to sin is sinful:

> Whether or not the authority makes mistakes has nothing to do with us. In other words, whether the deputy authority is right or wrong is a matter for which he has to be responsible directly before the Lord. Those who submit to authority need only to submit absolutely. Even if they make a mistake through submission, the Lord will not reckon that as sin. The Lord will hold the deputy

---

[3857] Pgs. 41-43, 173-178, 201, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

[3858] Pgs. 145-146, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. One English Baptist noted a particular group that was led into the Little Flock by, in part, "read[ing] Madame Guyon" (pg. 146, *ibid*.).

[3859] Pgs. 143-144, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear. By 1938 Nee had 128 Apostles engaged in full-time service.

[3860] Pgs. 166-167, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee; cf. pgs. 151-167, 203, 212-213, 216-217, 323-325.

[3861] Pgs. 71, 73, *Spiritual Authority*, Watchman Nee. New York: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1972. Nee does mention Acts 5:29 on pg. 74, as some kind of "exception," but he does not make it at all clear if he really intends to teach that somehow the "absolutely impossible" of pg. 73 is really not absolutely impossible.

> authority responsible for that sin. To disobey is to rebel. For this the submitting one has to be responsible before God. For this reason there is no human element involved in submission.[3862]

Nee explained further that people should never think about what is good or evil, for such thinking is rebellion. Rather, one must blindly obey those in the cult with authority:

> With us there should never be right or wrong, good or evil. . . . Submission is the first lesson for those who work. . . . We should never try to differentiate between good and evil. Rather, we should submit to authority. . . . Man . . . feels that this is good and that is not good. . . . This, however, is a condition of foolishness and the fall. This must be removed from us, for this is nothing but rebellion.[3863]

The Church of the Recovery taught, consequently, that the greatest command is not to love God with all one's heart, and soul, and mind, as Jesus Christ declared (Matthew 22:36-38), but to obey authority: "God's greatest and highest demand in the entire Bible is the demand for submission to authority."[3864] Blind and unconditional obedience to those in authority, whether they command righteousness or sin, is tied to the nature of the Deity worshipped in Nee's cult. It was the Son's subordination and obedience to the Father that led the Father to choose to reward the Son with Lordship:

> [T]he Father takes the place of the Head, and the Son responds with obedience. God becomes the emblem of authority, while Christ assumes the symbol of obedience. . . . [S]ince Christ was obedient . . . God has highly exalted Him. . . . He was exalted and rewarded by God to be Lord only after He . . . maintained the perfect role of obedience. As regards Himself, He is God; as regards reward, He is Lord. His Lordship did not exist originally in the Godhead.[3865]

As, Nee claimed, the Son was not eternally Lord, but was rewarded by the Father with Lordship because of obedience, so those in Nee's denomination must practice obedience to their human authorities with the same kind of perfect, instant, and blind obedience that was rendered by the allegedly subordinate Son to God, and such blind obedience will be rewarded. Blind and cultic obedience is important, since in Nee's denomination communism or community of goods must be practiced. "[A]ll the believers in the Lord's recovery [are] to hand over not only themselves but all their possessions to the work" of the Little Flock/Church of the Recovery denomination.[3866] One may suppose that the idea that one needs to blindly and unconditionally follow denominational authorities even if their commands are sinful is helpful if these same authorities are seeking to acquire all

---

3862 Chapter 7, *Spiritual Authority*, Watchman Nee.

3863 Chapter 2, *Spiritual Authority*, Watchman Nee.

3864 "Obsequious and Blind Obedience or Perfect and Unconditional Obedience and Submission according to the Bible?" (elec. acc. http://www.healthyteaching.org/obsequious-and-blind-obedience-or-perfect-and-unconditional-obedience-and-submission-according-to-the-bible/). This article, published by the Church of the Recovery, contains many other utterly unscriptural and cultic affirmations about unconditional obedience to sinful men.

3865 Pgs. 46-47, *Spiritual Authority*, Watchman Nee.

3866 Pgs. 166-167, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee; cf. pgs. 151-167, 203, 212-213, 216-217, 323-325; see also pgs. x, 188ff., 221, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear; pg. 146, "The Story of Watchman Nee," Bernard Earling. *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155.

of one's possessions and through tyranny to force on people other ecclesiological ideas absent from the Bible.

One reason that Nee and Lee's denomination could adopt so many grievous heresies and corruptions is that an extremely high percentage of those in it are unconverted—they are not truly sheep, so they do not hear the voice of Jesus Christ, the true Shepherd, speaking to them in Scripture, but follow false shepherds, thieves, and robbers, instead of fleeing from them (John 10:1-30). Nee and Lee, being unconverted themselves, were extremely confused about the nature of sin, the gospel, and salvation. Nee taught error about man's pre-Fall state, denying that man was holy before the Fall, instead affirming that he was "morally neutral—neither sinful nor holy."[3867] Happily, in fact neither the first nor the second Adam were morally neutral, but the first was created holy and the second is forever holy (1 Corinthians 15:22, 45; Romans 5:12-19). Nee based his unscriptural practice of open communion[3868] rather than close or closed communion on a more fundamental error in the doctrines of sin and grace, the idea that some "'sins' . . . hinder fellowship with God and [other] 'sins' do not. . . . [While committing these] other 'sins' . . . fellowship with God is not hindered."[3869] Nee's doctrine of justification was also heretical. He taught that "[j]ustification is . . . showing that we have no sin because God declares us to be without sin . . . God pronounces us as being without sin and He thus justifies us,"[3870] an insufficient and faulty view of justification, which is the doctrine that believers are declared, not merely without sin, but positively perfectly righteous, since not only does the blood of Christ remove all of a Christian's sins, but the righteousness of Christ is imputed to him, and the believer is legally viewed as if he had perfectly obeyed the Law as Christ did because of the Lord Jesus' substitutionary atonement. However, Nee also attacked the power of the blood of

---

[3867] Pg. 114, *The Normal Christian Life*, Watchman Nee. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1977. Unfallen Adam, nevertheless, "possessed a hidden ability which made it possible for him to become like God . . . to become like Him morally," for Adam "was already like Him in outward appearance," so God, it seems, has an outward appearance, and this outward appearance was similar to what Adam looked like (pg. 18, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee).

[3868] In addition to Nee's recommendation for the churches in his denomination, he practiced open communion when, for example, he partook of the elements of the Supper in the open communion service at the Keswick Convention he attended in 1938, "under the banner 'All one in Christ Jesus'" (pg. 149, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear).

[3869] Pg. 137, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear, quoting a letter from the Little Flock to the Exclusive Brethren in England from July 2, 1935, on the subject of communion. Open communion is unscriptural, for the Lord's supper is a church ordinance (1 Corinthians 10:16; 11:17-34), and the idea that some sins do not affect fellowship with God is also unscriptural.

[3870] Pg. 122, *The Mystery of Creation*, Nee.

Christ,[3871] perhaps making it more easy for him to attack justification also. Nee also believed and taught workers in his denomination that "[t]he great weakness of the present preaching of the Gospel is that we try to make people *understand* the plan of salvation."[3872] Nee's astonishing affirmation that it is a great weakness to lead people to understand the gospel is based on his idea that "the sinner is not required," if he is to receive salvation, "to believe, or to repent, or to be conscious of sin, or even to know that Christ died. He is required only to approach the Lord with an honest heart."[3873] Despite 1 Corinthians 15:1-4 and countless other texts, Nee taught that one simply needs to "touch" God in a mystical encounter to be saved, rather than believe the gospel; "it is clear . . . that salvation is not initially a question of knowledge but of 'touch.' All who touch the Lord receive life."[3874] One can "touch" God without even knowing the name of Jesus Christ, not to mention His character and saving work, despite John 8:24. Nee illustrated receiving salvation with the story of a Chinese boy who thought an idol was "too ugly and too dirty to be worshipped" and so "looked up to heaven" and prayed to God. Thirty years later he met Nee, and this Chinese man who thought an idol was dirty decades earlier testified, "I have met the Lord Jesus for the first time to-day, but this is the second time that I have touched God."[3875] The man had, Nee taught, been saved decades earlier by "touching" God apart from Jesus Christ, despite Acts 4:12 and John 14:6. "[W]e go for salvation not to the foot of the Cross but to the Throne" where we mystically "touch" and encounter "the living Lord,"[3876] for "salvation" is a "personal and subjective experience" which "may be said to rest rather upon the Lord's resurrection than upon His death."[3877] Those who do know who Jesus Christ is, as long as they pray and "touch" God, will be saved even if they do not want to repent and believe, as Nee illustrated with a man who "prayed, and told the Lord that he did not want to repent and be saved," but still "cried to Him for help." By means of this cry, Nee affirmed that the man repented even though he had said that he did not want to, "and he got up a saved man."[3878] After all, "salvation is not . . . a question of understanding or will . . . [i]t does not matter if a man wants or does not want to be saved, it does not matter if he

---

3871 "The Blood can wash away my sins, but it cannot wash away my 'old man'" (pgs. 19-20, *The Normal Christian Life*, Watchman Nee).

3872 Pg. 40, *What Shall This Man Do*? Watchman Nee. The italics are found in the original.

3873 Pg. 34, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3874 Pg. 40, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3875 Pg. 41, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3876 Pg. 41, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3877 Pg. 42, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3878 Pg. 36, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

understands or does not understand," since the "basic condition of a sinner's salvation is not belief or repentance,"[3879] but mystically encountering the Deity with a "touch." The "initial touch . . . saves the sinner" even without "the sinner's understanding of . . . the Gospel."[3880] Therefore, what the members of Nee's denomination must do is "encourage every sinner to kneel down with an honest heart and pray," and even "prayers which . . . are not uttered in the name of Jesus . . . God will hear"[3881] and save the lost, even if they do not know who Jesus is, know what the gospel is, and have no desire whatever to repent and believe in Him. In fact, even if people know and hate Jesus Christ they will be saved if they pray to God. Nee illustrates how a woman was allegedly saved who hated Jesus Christ and simply wanted to be happy, and so prayed and allegedly was born again:

> A striking example of one who came to God without even wanting to be saved is afforded by the experience of an English lady . . . She flung herself down and said, "O God, I have everything I want, wealth, popularity, beauty, youth—and yet I am absolutely miserable and unsatisfied. Christians would tell me that this is a proof that the world is empty and hollow, and that Jesus could save me and give me peace and joy and satisfaction. But I don't want the satisfaction that He could give. I don't want to be saved. I hate You and I hate Your peace and joy. But, O God, give me what I don't want, and if You can, make me happy!" . . . [S]he got up from her knees a saved woman[.][3882]

After all, since Romans 10:13 says that "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved,"[3883] therefore "[l]et there be but a cry from the heart to God, and *at that moment* the Spirit will enter" and save the sinner, whether he knows who Jesus Christ is or not, and even if he hates Jesus Christ and hates the salvation He offers. Witness Lee understood Nee's point very well:

> We have seen that to reach the unbelievers, no preaching is necessary. If we help them say 'O Lord' three times, they will be saved. If they open the window, the air will get in. All they have to do is to open their mouths and say, 'O Lord, O Lord.' Even if they have no intention of believing, still they will be caught! Regardless of whether they have the intention or not, as long as they open the window, the air will get in. It is not a matter of teaching; it is a matter of touching the seven Spirits of God.[3884]

3879 Pg. 42-3, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3880 Pg. 44, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3881 Pg. 44, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3882 Pg. 44, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee.

3883 Nee and Lee's denomination take the error of the modern "sinner's prayer" methodology to its logical conclusion—the Church of the Recovery teaches that anyone who says the sinner's prayer—or even just the words "O Lord" three times—really is going to heaven, whether or not he understands the gospel, since Romans 10:13, which in fact is not a verse about obtaining justification at all (cf. "An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians," by Thomas Ross, http://faithsaves.net), but about the prayers of the already justified, as Romans 10:14 proves, does say "whosoever shall call" receives the salvation mentioned, without any of the limitations that the large majority of evangelicals and fundamentalists who misinterpret the verse in evangelism employ to safeguard justification by repentant faith alone (cf. pg. 179, *Against the Tide*, Kinnear, etc.)

3884 Witness Lee, Stream Magazine, VIII: l, Feb l, 1970, 6, cited http://www.bcbsr.com/topics/lc.html.

By methodology of this sort, Nee personally led to salvation "many" who "did not in the first place repent or believe, or consciously desire to be saved." Those "who won't repent . . . who cannot believe . . . who have no desire for salvation . . . who are confused and cannot understand the Gospel . . . and who understand but will not acknowledge the claim of God upon them . . . *many* of them have been saved on the spot,"[3885] Nee testified, by saying the magic incantation. Nee's disciples followed their leader's example and led countless others to say the sinner's prayer and experience the mystical "touch," and so filled up their denomination with the unconverted children of hell and wrath who were utterly destitute of the new birth. However, Nee taught that the power of the sinner's prayer went even beyond saving those who hated God, those who knew nothing of Jesus Christ, those who had no desire to repent or believe, and those who hated the Son of God and the Gospel. Even atheists can be saved by saying the sinner's prayer: "[T]hose who do not believe there is a God at all . . . do not need first to substitute theism for atheism. They can be saved *as they are*, even without any belief in God at all."[3886] It is not surprising that Nee's disciples claim that the true way of "salvation . . . never became adequately clear to the Chinese Christians until Watchman Nee's ministry was raised up."[3887] Following just the Bible alone, without the writings of Watchman Nee, who would ever have guessed the true way of salvation—one that comes by means of an omnipotent sinner's prayer, rather than by faith in the Omnipotent God and the cross of His Son Jesus Christ?

Nee also adopted other very serious heresies, errors, and bizarre beliefs. For example, he promoted the error of the Gap Theory instead of the truth of a literal six day recent creation of all things.[3888] Examples of the bizarre include Nee's affirmation that "we may not rate Adam's power as being a *billion* times over ours, [but] we can nevertheless safely reckon it to be a *million* times over ours,"[3889] from which he concluded, in connection with the adoption of the "soul-force" concept of Jessie Penn-

---

3885 Pg. 47, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee. Italics in original.

3886 Pg. 47, *What Shall This Man Do*? Nee. Italics in original.

3887 Pg. 273, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, Lee.

3888 "In the beginning God created a perfect heaven and earth. Later on—we do not know how long afterwards—the original beautiful earth became waste and void. However, God rose up and remade the world," after destroying an entire "preadamic race" (pgs. 18, 34, cf. pgs. 4-39, *The Mystery of Creation*, Watchman Nee. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1981). In *The Mystery of Creation*, Nee repeatedly quotes and follows pre-Adamite men advocate and partial Rapturist G. H. Pember, author of *Earth's Earliest Ages* (as Nee does elsewhere also, e. g., pgs. 29-30, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee).

3889 Pg. 15, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee.

Lewis,[3890] that people today can exercise the soul-force that is latent and "frozen" in their bodies to do what is a million times over regular human ability, make sick people well, make healthy people sick, predict the future, read other people's minds, know great political events weeks and months before they come to pass so that newspapers are unnecessary, see, hear, and smell things thousands of miles away, penetrate all physical barriers, accelerate the growth of plants and quench fire, overturn governments, make physical objects come to them, materialize to distant people in a spiritual body that looks just like [one's] physical body, walk over fire for long distances without being scorched, and perform countless other wonders, as the "soul power" is "an almost unlimited power."[3891] Nee also adopted the curious notion that after the Millennium, in the eternal state, people will live on the "new earth . . . marry . . . and multiply as Adam did of old."[3892] Nee's errors seem to multiply without end, after the manner of his notion of what will take place in the eternal state on the new earth. Whether believers receive or reject his writings will determine to what extent his pernicious influence will continue to corrupt Christianity.

Applications from the Life and Teachings of Watchman Nee

The writings of Watchman Nee are extremely dangerous and unreliable. Those of Nee's successor, Witness Lee, are even worse.[3893] Believers should be warned against

---

3890 Compare *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Watchman Nee. (New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1972) with Penn-Lewis' *Soul and Spirit*, which Nee frequently references and depends very heavily upon (cf. pgs. 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, etc.). Indeed, Nee's book has far more quotations within it of Jessie Penn-Lewis than it does of the Bible.

Nee also, unsurprisingly, shares Penn-Lewis's view of the impropriety of Christian use of soul-power, affirming the use of throne-power as the better alternative. Nee knew that a "preacher like Evan Roberts, God's vessel in the Welsh Revival of 1904-5" knew how to have "his soul power . . . denied" to exercise throne-power instead (pg. 49, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee).

3891 Pgs. 19-25, 31, 38, 47-48, 58-59, 66, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee.

3892 Pgs. 235-236, *Come Lord Jesus*, Nee. Nee argued for this unscriptural notion from Exodus 20:6, the only verse he positively sets forth as proof for his position (he also argues against the obvious meaning of Matthew 22:30, employing a classical logical fallacy and some very faulty hermeneutics in his argument). Exodus 20:6 must bear the full weight of proof for the following affirmation: "Doubtless the inhabitants of the new earth will continue to be fruitful and to multiply" (pgs. 235-236, *Come Lord Jesus*, Nee). Such a verse for such a conclusion certainly fits into the category of both the curious and the bizarre.

3893 In addition to expanding upon heresies already taught by Nee, Lee added his own distinctive contributions. For example: "Witness Lee demonstrates that the book of Revelation is a book of victory and that everything seen in it is considered by the Lord to have been accomplished already." Even "the beast, the false prophet, death, and Hades [being cast] into the lake of fire (20:10, 14) . . . and the preparation of the holy city 'as a bride adorned for her husband' (21:2)" are descriptions of past events ("A Defense of Seventeen Quotations from the Ministry of Witness Lee," http://www.lctestimony.org/Witness-Lee-Quotations.htm).

them, not encouraged to read them. They would be better used to kindle a fire in a wood stove than to kindle a fire for God in a believer's soul—and they have been an instrument to lead many to the everlasting fires of hell. Do you want your church to reject the true God and join a modalistic cult that denies the gospel, banishes believers to a Protestant purgatory, confuses and hinders Biblical sanctification, and rejects the study of Scripture for demonically produced mystical experiences? Then acquire Watchman Nee's writings and study them carefully, for by the study of his writings countless people have been brought into exactly this sort of apostasy. Vast numbers in China have rejected Christianity for the Church of the Recovery, and in the United States and elsewhere in the world the cult of Nee and Lee proselytizes by spreading the teachings and writings of their false prophets to as many in Christendom as show any interest. Is rejecting Jehovah for idolatry an intolerable and infinite evil? Then have nothing to do with Watchman Nee and Witness Lee, for they were not God's watchmen, nor true witnesses to Him.

Watchman Nee illustrates the danger of receiving teaching from women preachers. Since they are not God's plan, and the Bible indicates that women are more easily deceived by Satan (1 Timothy 2:14), it is not surprising that women preachers, whether Hannah W. Smith, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Madame Guyon, Mary B. Eddy, or Jezebel (Revelation 2:20) are often the devil's instrument to deceive mankind and to corrupt Divine truth. Nee should have learned his doctrine and practice through the faithful pulpit ministry of a sound Baptist church instead of sitting at the feet of unscriptural women preachers. Learn from Nee's bad example, obey Scripture on the qualifications of the pastoral office, and recognize how Nee's disobedient method of learning about God contributed to his being drowned in destruction and perdition.

Reject the false mysticism of the view of guidance advocated by Nee and Lee. God does truly guide His people today,[3894] but He does not do so through extrabiblical and mystical revelations. While God may, in His mercy, lead you into right paths despite adopting unbiblical views of guidance, you are in danger of making decisions that will harm the rest of your life on earth, and your reward for all eternity, if you trust in alleged personal revelations and other forms of leading that are not for today. Do not be a cessationist in theory who seeks Divine guidance the way a charismatic would.

Recognize the danger of Watchman Nee's cultic doctrine that one ought always to obey those in authority, even if they are wrong. Recognize also that Nee and Lee are also promoting a cultic lie when they teach that God will not hold you accountable for what

---

[3894] *Steps for Guidance* by Peter Masters (London: Wakeman Trust, 1995) is a fine and balanced presentation of Biblical guidance.

you do that is wrong if you are told to do so by authority. There is not the slightest doubt that the Holy One will hold you accountable. Many who have adopted this extremely dangerous error on authority have plumbed the depths of Satan. The unquestioning obedience Nee and Lee require of men belongs only to God and His Word, and absolute surrender to fallen men, to men who are still sinners, is a horrible recipe for the vilest sins. This teaching, on its own, is more than sufficient to prove that the Church of the Recovery is a cult, not a holy organization devoted to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Rejoice in the pretribulational Rapture of all saints. If you are a true believer, Christ will keep you from the hour of temptation that will come on all the earth (Revelation 3:10). You do not need to worry that you will miss the Rapture to face the awful judgments of the Tribulation because you have not entered into the Higher Life or have failed to join Watchman Nee's religious organization. You certainly do not need to fear being cast into outer darkness or going to a Protestant purgatory to be tortured until you are somehow purified by suffering. No, the Lord Jesus has fully quaffed the cup of wrath for you, and there is no wrath left for you to endure. God has not appointed you to wrath, but to obtain salvation by your Lord, Jesus Christ, who died for you so that, whether alive or at rest with Him, you should live perpetually with Him (1 Thessalonians 5:9-10). Your Redeemer has perfectly accomplished His saving work (John 19:30), and His blood and righteousness have been applied to your account before God, giving you a perfect legal standing in His sight. The Father loves you, although a poor wretched worm, as He loves His incarnate Son (John 17:23). Soon your precious Jesus will return for you and bring you to a mansion He has been preparing for you (John 14:1-3). He has brought you into an unbreakable and unspeakably intimate union with Himself, and He will perfectly shield you from eschatological wrath and judgment, caring for you as a man cares for the apple of his eye. What a blessed comfort the truth of the pretribulational Rapture is! Do you long and look for the soon return of your blessed Savior? Then apply to your heart the words of the Apostle John: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure" (1 John 3:2-3).

Receive the true doctrine of your preconversion depravity and of your regenerated restoration. Before your conversion *you* were dead—not your spirit only, but your entire person in all your parts was separated from God. At the moment when you were supernaturally regenerated through the Almighty efficacy of the Spirit of God, *you* were made new in your entire being, body, soul, and spirit—your new birth was not limited to the spirit. Be amazed at the extent of your inherited corruption; no part of you was

exempt from the awful ravages of sin. Glory in the extent of your regeneration; no part of you is left unchanged and unrenewed by the Holy Ghost. For you who were formerly entirely in darkness, the Sun of righteousness has arisen with healing in His wings, His light leaving no part of you unaffected, and, through His continuing transforming power in progressive sanctification, shining more and more until the future day of your perfection in glory. How far superior is the Biblical doctrine of regeneration to the arrested and limited doctrine of Watchman Nee and Jessie Penn-Lewis, who would limit regeneration to the human spirit alone!

Reject with abhorrence the blasphemy of deification as nothing other than the repetition of the first lying hiss of the serpent, "ye shall be as gods" (Genesis 3:5). You never were God, you are not God now, and you never shall be God. If you think that you are God, you are an idolater, and you will curse your blasphemous folly for all eternity as you scream in everlasting punishment in the lake of fire. You will know, while you are being tormented with fire and brimstone, that you are not God. "Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? but thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of him that slayeth thee. . . .They shall bring thee down to the pit" (Ezekiel 28:8-9). You will join Lucifer in being "brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit" (Isaiah 14:15). The more a Christian knows intellectually and experientially of his union with Christ, his glorious renewal into the moral likeness of the second Adam, and of the inestimable blessing of partaking of ever greater measures of the communicable Divine attributes, of God's holiness, of His love, His faithfulness, His purity, His mercy, and all the rest, the more full he will grow of the deepest humility, and the more abominable the blasphemy of deification will appear to him. Those who believe that they become gods will join their god, Satan, in the lowest parts of hell, while believers will find it their ineffable blessedness to be conformed morally to Christ and to enjoy, to the uttermost extent possible for their finite beings, fellowship with Him and His glorious Divine presence. Choose, then, what you will have this day. Will it be deification and damnation, or Christ-likeness and heaven?

Rejoice in the Triune God, in the One who subsists eternally in the three eternal Persons of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Behold the beauty and glory of this Triune God, as revealed in Scripture, in His ontology and His economy. Entrust yourself fully to Him as your own Lord, God, and Savior, for He only is able to save you. His revelation of Himself in time is true—you can truly know the Father through the Son by the Spirit, for His economic manifestation provides real and substantial knowledge of His eternal being. Also, out of love for Him, reject the demonic deceit of modalism. The modalistic god of the Church of the Recovery does not exist and so is incapable of saving

you from your sin, answering your prayers, or doing anything at all—any confidence you place in such a deity is only confidence in the devils who are behind all idols. What is more, even if this modalistic god did exist, you could never learn anything about him from Scripture, as the Bible reveals a God who is a real Triunity—were modalism true, the "revelation" of Scripture would truly be a deception, and the god that was hidden behind his modalistic masks would remain actually unknown and unknowable. Only in the contradictory and confusing writings of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee could you hope to have any real knowledge of the modal deity hidden in the Bible—but since Nee and Lee contradict Scripture, God's Word remains unshakably true, and the modalistic deity of Nee and Lee is nothing but a vanity among the almost innumerable vain idols of false religion.

While the "sinner's prayer" practice of Nee and Lee is a terrible evil that produces countless unconverted people who have passed through the requisite ritual of saying a prayer and are in this manner prepared to join their religious organization, it is nonetheless consistent with the misinterpretation of Romans 10:9-14 adopted by many outside the Church of the Recovery cult who are less consistent in accepting the terrible fruits of their eisegesis. The more consistent one is with the "sinner's prayer" gospel, the more people will be damned; the further one veers away from the "sinner's prayer" gospel to the truth of justification received by the instrumentality of repentant faith alone, rather than faith and prayer together or faith mediated through prayer, the more people will come to true conversion and everlasting life. After all, if Romans 10:13 really is a statement explaining to the lost how they are to become Christians, then "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" really does justify the Local Church doctrine that people who hate God, atheists, and whoever else can be manipulated into saying the magic prayer will be saved—are not they part of "whosoever"? And have they not "called" out in prayer—a hypocritical prayer rooted in a wicked heart, it is true, but is not the alleged promise truly to "whosoever shall call"? The qualifications made by many of those who are truly God's people, and who thus hold to the true gospel along with a false view of Romans 10:9-14, are truly absent from the passage. The only truly safe route is a return to what the Apostle Paul really meant when he wrote Romans 10 by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The *confession* of Romans 10:9-10 is not the repetition of a sinner's prayer, but public confession of Jesus Christ with one's literal mouth before men (cf. Matthew 10:32), and it is not a prerequisite to justification but a mark of the regenerate, of those who will receive eschatological salvation (cf. Romans 5:9). "[W]ith the heart man believeth unto righteousness," that is, instantly at the moment of saving faith Christ's imputed righteousness is given, and then, after the moment of the new birth,

"with the mouth confession is made unto salvation," that is, public testimony for Christ is made as an evidence of prior regeneration and a sign of certain future glorification or salvation. Consequently, "whosoever believeth" on Christ "shall not be ashamed" (Romans 10:11; Isaiah 28:16; 49:23), for all who simply trust in Christ will not be ashamed in the future day of judgment. Those who believe in Christ and are born again, and consequently confess Him publicly as a mark of their regenerate lifestyle, will all receive ultimate salvation, whether Jew or Gentile, for their new hearts will also lead them all to be calling on the Lord, regularly seeking God in prayer because of their renewed hearts (Romans 10:12), and all those who do such will also receive eschatological salvation (Romans 10:13). That is, those who love prayer and enter God's coming kingdom are those who are already born from above, and Romans 10:13 is a promise to such, not a promise to the unconverted that if they say and mean some special words they will be justified. As Joel 2:32 confirms, Romans 10:13 is not about the moment of justification or how to enter a justified state, but about the type of people who receive eschatological deliverance. Indeed, calling on the Lord, the prayer that is a mark of the regenerate, is impossible unless one has already exercised saving faith—people cannot call on the Lord until they have already believed (Romans 10:14).[3895] Scripture never promises that all who ask for salvation will be saved, nor that all who ask for it with certain added qualifications, such as "really meaning it" or other additions absent from Romans 10:13, will be saved. This fact explains the deafening silence of Christ and the Apostles in the Gospels and Acts about the "sinner's prayer" bringing justification. Rather, the entire Bible testifies that one who will in repentance believe on the crucified and risen Christ will be justified, regenerated, transformed, and ultimately glorified. Perhaps you are not as consistent as Watchman Nee and Witness Lee in your misinterpretation of Romans 10:13, so fewer people are eternally deluded and damned by you than were by them. However, if you hold to the modern misinterpretation that the passage is about the lost receiving justification by saying a sinner's prayer, it is time to abandon your eisegesis of the text. If the idea of presenting the gospel to the lost the way Christ and the Apostles did—not using Romans 10:13 and the "sinner's prayer" as the door into the kingdom of God—seems inconceivable to you, it is time to unlearn your false methodology and learn from Scripture how to properly counsel the unconverted and direct them to receive Christ by faith alone, rather than by saying and meaning the

[3895] For a detailed exposition of Romans 10:9-14 proving that the "sinner's prayer" to obtain justification is entirely absent from the passage, see "An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians," Thomas Ross. Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

sinner's prayer.[3896] Furthermore, if you are resting your hopes for eternal salvation upon the fact that you have prayed and meant a sinner's prayer or have asked Jesus to come into your heart, you will surely be damned unless you repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. If you are a true believer, you should neither place your confidence for assurance of salvation upon the fact that you have said a sinner's prayer nor doubt your salvation based on not saying a sinner's prayer. Repetition of such a prayer, or lack thereof, has nothing to do with assurance in the Bible. Rather, Biblical assurance comes from the objective promises of God to save those who come to Him (John 6:37), the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit (Romans 8:16), and the evidences recorded in 1 John of the truly holy and spiritual life that are found in all genuine believers and in no others. The common misinterpretation of Romans 10:9-14 that makes the passage about the lost repeating a "sinner's prayer" to enter the kingdom of God has done tremendous damage to the cause of Christ by misleading many unconverted people and so keeping them from salvation while also leading many of the Savior's dear ones to doubt their salvation. The Church of the Recovery, by being more consistent in its abuse of Romans 10 and the "sinner's prayer" than the large majority of evangelicals and fundamentalists, has effectively set in relief the ravages wrought by this perversion of the gospel and made all the more clear the necessity for returning to the meaning intended by the Holy Ghost as understood by proper contextual and grammatical-historical interpretation of the chapter.

The abominable heresies of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee illustrate where the Keswick continuationism can lead—their cult is Keswick theology gone to seed. The rejection of grammatical-historical exegesis and literal interpretation for mystical and experiential hermeneutics fundamentally undergirds Keswick, Pentecostal, and Church of the Recovery doctrine; all these movements fall away, and classical orthodoxy on sanctification and other areas of Christianity is restored, when literal hermeneutics are reinstated and their implications rigorously applied. A proper recognition of *sola Scriptura*, and its robust application to all areas of theology, is the end of all continuationisms and Higher Life systems and the restoration of historic Baptist cessationism and spirituality. On the other hand, a failure to recognize the sole authority of Scripture and its corollary of literal hermeneutics allows the tares of all sorts of continuationism, Higher Life systems, mysticism, and fanaticism the soil they need to sprout and multiply. Some continuationists may end up in the Church of the Recovery

---

[3896] A helpful introduction to a more Biblical method of dealing with the lost is presented on pgs. 122-187 of *Today's Apostasy: How 'Decisionism' is Destroying our Churches*, Hymers & Cagan.

and others in the Word of Faith movement, but all end up in serious and deepening error, and the more consistently they employ their fundamental errors on authority and interpretation, the more error they descend into. For protection from sin and true holiness of life, it is essential that the truth of 2 Timothy 3:16-17 is recognized and embraced in all its implications, as enabled by the Holy Spirit: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

IV. A Concluding Exhortation

1.) One who is crucified dies, and one who is spiritually alive grows. 2 Corinthians 3:18—"we all." All believers get this.

Sanctification is certain, Romans 6:14-so fight confidently and in faith against sin, 6:10-13—God has promised you victory!

How highly believers ought to value and strive after holiness!

> We should labor after holiness, to go quite out of ourselves, and all creatures, and go wholly as it were unto God, making him the ground, measure, and end of all our actions, striving above all things to know him, esteem him and set all our powers upon him. This is the felicity of the creature, to be holy as God is holy; this is the felicity of the Saints in Heaven, they care for nothing but God, are wholly and altogether carried to him and filled with him. He is all in all unto them, as he is all in all unto himself. In being thus carried to him, they are united to him and enjoy him and are blessed.[3897]

a

Since believers are sanctified through the Word of God, how highly they ought to esteem that Word! In the words of Wilhelmus á Brakel:

> The Word of God is necessary and profitable not only for beginners and little ones but also for the most advanced and spiritual believers here upon earth. . . . This is evident from the following:
>
> First, it is the only means instituted by God to faith and conversion. Without the Word none shall believe. "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Romans 10:14, 17). Apart from the Word no one can be regenerated. "Of His own will begat He us with the Word of truth" (James 1:18); "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but

[3897] Leigh, Edward, *Treatise of Divinity* (London: 1646) I.xiii (p. 105), cited pg. 503, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* vol. 3, by Richard Muller.

incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Peter 1:23).

Secondly, the Word of God is the food which nurtures the spiritual life of the converted: "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby" (1 Peter 2:2). Since many persons use the Word so infrequently, they are in darkness, unsteady, tossed to and fro by all winds of doctrine, live in sorrow, suffer from weak faith, and experience the hiding of God's countenance.

Thirdly, the Word of God is the only rule whereby the condition of our hearts, thoughts, words, and deeds should be governed. "And as many as walk according to this rule" (Galatians 6:16); "To the law and to the testimony" (Isaiah 8:20); "Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto all Thy commandments" (Psalm 119:6). If people neglect to retain the Word of God in mind and heart, they will begin to elevate their own intellect as their Bible, and thus will mislead themselves and be a cause for concern to others. Such neglect will result in a sinful life as well as much backsliding. Yes, many who do not establish the Word of God as their rule of life "will seek to enter in, and shall not be able" (Luke 13:24).

Fourthly, the Word of God provides a steadfast comfort. "That we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope" (Romans 15:4); "Unless Thy law had been my delights; for they are the rejoicing of my heart" (Psalm 119:92, 111). This comfort which originates from the Word may come while reading or hearing it or during prayer and meditation. It may originate from a text of Scripture or when the soul, while engaged in sweet exercise, is directed to a text. Such comfort is generally of a much deeper and more fundamental nature, and more steadfast and durable than the comfort which the soul receives without any reflection upon the Word. . . . It is therefore desirable to read or hear the Bible read frequently so that one may have ready access to a supply of Scripture in time of need. Furthermore, while meditating, texts of Scripture may be impressed upon the heart to the comfort of the soul[.] . . .

Fifthly, the Word is a special means for sanctification. "Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy word is truth" (John 17:7). God's Word does not only work sanctification by means of continual exhortation by which the soul is inclined towards obedience by the very voice of God. It also works sanctification through a continual dialogue with God Himself while hearing, reading, and meditating upon His Word as the believer seeks to regulate his life by means of the Word. In addition to this the soul will be more exercised in faith and will become more established in the truth by virtue of its consistent use of God's Word. Faith then gives birth to love, and love in turn to sanctification. Yes, the soul is led further in this way into the mysteries of God's Word and perceives many matters which it previously was not able to discern. Every new acquaintance with spiritual mysteries, however, as well as each mystery itself, has a sanctifying influence. Those who are remiss in reading and lax in acquainting themselves with God's Word will be deprived to a considerable degree of these blessed fruits.

Sixthly, the Word of God is the spiritual sword which must be wielded at all times in our battle against the devil, heresies, and our flesh (Ephesians 6:17); "For the Word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Hebrews 4:12). Those who stand ready with this sword stand firm, provide themselves protection, and are victorious over their enemies.

Seventhly, to state matters comprehensively, the Word of God is the only means whereby we can be saved. "It is the power of God unto salvation" (Romans 1:16); "The gospel of your salvation" (Ephesians 1:13); "The engrafted Word, which is able to save your soul" (James 1:21). Therefore, whoever desires salvation will esteem and acknowledge the Word of God as necessary and profitable and will be desirous for this

Word. . . .

Since we have shown the Word to have all these qualities, it obligates everyone to the following.

First, man must acknowledge, value, believe, and view the Word of God in this manner. Apart from this, the Word shall not be profitable. "The Word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith" (Hebrews 4:2). . . . [E]veryone [ought] to bring [his] thoughts into obedient captivity to the Word of God, nipping all wrong impulses in the bud, lest by permitting such thoughts to be multiplied the soul will become more distraught. . . .

Secondly, men ought to rejoice wholeheartedly in this most precious gift of God, embrace it with much love, and be joyful whenever they may either behold it or hold it in their very hands. . . . We . . . may have it in our possession and may hear and read it. How our hearts ought to rejoice over this fact! "I have rejoiced in the way of Thy testimonies, as much as in all riches. O how love I Thy law!" (Ps 119:14, 97); "More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb" (Psalm 19:10).

Thirdly, we should thank and magnify the Lord, who has given it for this. "At midnight I will rise to give thanks unto Thee because of Thy righteous judgments" (Psalm 119:62); "Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem; praise thy God, O Zion. He sheweth His word unto Jacob, His statues and His judgments unto Israel" (Psalm 147:12,19).

Fourthly, make use of the Word of God in prosperity, adversity, darkness, seasons of doubt, times of perplexity, and your entire walk. Nothing can befall you, nor is there any duty in which you must engage where the Word of God would not provide you with comfort, peace, counsel, and direction. "Thy testimonies also are my delight and my counselors; I have chosen the way of truth: Thy judgments have I laid before me; Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path; Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage for ever: for they are the rejoicing of my heart" (Psalm 119:24, 30, 105, 111).

Fifthly, purchase this inestimable jewel, and be diligent in giving it a place in your home. . . . One of the most appropriate acts of mercy is to provide the poor with Bibles, and to question them frequently whether they are also reading them daily. . . . Those who are not able to read must exert every effort to learn, with the objective to be able to read the Word of God. A home without a Bible is a ship without a rudder and a Christian without a Bible is a soldier without a weapon. . . .

Sixthly, read, search, and meditate upon the Word of God with all diligence and persistence. This should even be the practice of kings. "And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life" (Deuteronomy 17:19). It is the duty of scholars as well. "Give attendance to reading" (1 Timothy 4:13). It is the privilege and obligation of the lowly and of every individual. "Search the Scriptures" (John 5:39); "Have ye not read?" (Matthew 12:3).

The eunuch read while riding in his chariot (Acts 8:28). The Bereans searched the Scriptures daily (Acts 17:11). How everyone ought to practice this in private, prior to going to work, both by himself alone, and with his family! At noon when one nourishes his body, he ought also to nourish his soul. In the evening after work, one must end the day by seeking some refreshment from the Word of God. In the meantime, while engaged to understand the spiritual meaning as well as experience the power of God's Word. This will cause the soul to grow in grace, prevent vain thoughts from arising, control the tongue, suppress corruptions, and direct man to fear God. . . .

For the reading of Scripture to be profitable, there must be preparation, practice, and reflection. . . . Each time when one engages himself to read:

(1) He must, with mental concentration, place himself in the presence of God. He must promote a reverent, spiritual frame, being conscious that the Lord shall speak to him. The

consciousness of that reality should cause us to tremble with holy reverence. To promote such reverence, reflect upon Isaiah 1:2, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the Lord hath spoken."

(2) He must lift up his heart to the Lord, beseeching Him who is the Author of this Word for His Spirit, that He may cause us to perceive the truth expressed in God's Word and apply it to the heart. Our prayer ought to be with Ps 119:18, "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law."

(3) He must also attentively incline the heart to obedience in order to exercise faith, be receptive to comfort, and comply with all that which the Lord shall proclaim, promise, and command, saying, "speak, Lord; for Thy servant heareth" (1 Samuel 3:9). . . .

As you read, it is essential to do so calmly and attentively rather than to do it hastily with the objective of bringing the exercise of this duty to a conclusion. . . . [W]ith a humble, hungry, and submissive spiritual frame, one places himself before the Lord while reading slowly and thoughtfully as if hearing the voice of God, and subjecting himself to the Holy Spirit to operate upon the heart as he reads. . . . Whenever there is a passage which has a special power upon the heart, such a person pauses in order that this Scripture might have its effect in the heart. Then he prays, gives thanks, rejoices, and is filled with amazement—all of which revive the soul and stimulate it to obedience. Upon concluding these exercises he will continue reading. After having read a chapter, he will meditate upon it, time permitting. When he encounters a remarkable text, he will mark or memorize it. In such a fashion both the learned and the unlearned should read the Word of God. In so doing, one will understand its spiritual meaning with increasing clarity and God's Word will increasingly become more precious to us. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God" (John 7:17); "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32). . . .

[R]eflection upon reading Scripture consists in[:]

(1) joyfully giving thanks that the Lord has permitted His Word to be recorded, that we may have it in our homes, that we can and were privileged to read it, and that it was applied to our heart;

(2) painstakingly striving to preserve this good spiritual frame which is obtained by reading God's Word;

(3) meditating while engaged in one's occupation upon that which one has read, repeatedly seeking to focus his thoughts upon it;

(4) sharing with others what was read, whenever possible, and discussing it;

(5) especially striving to comply with what was read by bringing it into practice.

If the Holy Scriptures were used in such a fashion, what wondrous progress we would make in both knowledge and godliness! Children would soon become young men, and young men would soon become men in Christ Jesus.[3898]

a

Application: Pastors and other Christian teachers should preach all the truth, that people may be sanctified. They are less sanctified when all the preaching is only "simple" and basic. Expository preaching and application through the entire Bible is required.

[3898] Pgs. 72-81, *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, by Wilhelmus á Brakel, vol. 1.

--corporate growth takes place in the church. So, if you are a believer, you must immediately separate from all religious assemblies other than the true churches of Christ and join yourself to a historic Baptist church.

V. Classic Documents that Relate to Crucifixion with Christ and Sanctification in General

A. *The Baptist Catechism,* Question & Answer #38.[3899]

Q. 38. What is sanctification? A. Sanctification is the work of God's free grace (2 Thessalonians 2:13), whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God (Ephesians 4:23, 24), and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness (Romans 6:4, 6).

A. 2nd London Baptist Confession of Faith (1677), Article 13, Of Sanctification (also Philadelphia Baptist Confession of Faith 1689/1720; the article is identical)[3900]

1. Those who are united to Christ, effectually called, and regenerated, having a new heart, and a new spirit created in them, through the virtue of Christ's death, and resurrection, are also (Acts 20:32; Romans 6:5-6) farther sanctified, really, and personally, through the same virtue (John 17:17; Ephesians 3:16, 17, 18, 19), the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed (Galatians 5:24) and the several lusts therof, are more and more weakened, and mortified; and they more and more quickened, and (Colossians 1:11) strengthened in all saving graces, to the (2 Corinthians 7:1; Hebrews 12:14) practice of all true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

2.) This sanctification is (1 Thessalonians 5:23) throughout, in the whole man, yet imperfect (Romans 7:18, 23) in this life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a (Galatians 5:17; 1 Peter 2:11) continual, and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.

3.) In which war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much (Romans 7:23) prevail, yet through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ the (Romans 6:14) regenerate part doth overcome; and so the saints grow in grace,

---

3899 The complete title is *The Baptist Catechism, Or A Brief Instruction In the Principles Of Christian Religion, Agreeable to the Confession of Faith, put forth by the Elders and Brethren of many Congregations of Christians (baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in London and the country; owning the Doctrines of Personal Election and Final Perseverance.* Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

3900 Commenting on the almost identical article on sanctification in the *Westminster Confession*, it was noted: "No subscriber to that stern formulary can evertain such views as are taught by the [Higher Life] theology in question" (pg. 95, "The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875). That is, nobody who holds to the classical Baptist doctrine of sanctification can be an advocate the Higher Life of Keswick theology.

perfecting holiness in the fear of God (Ephesians 4:15-16; 2 Corinthians 3:18; 7:1), pressing after an heavenly life, in evangelical obedience to all the commands which Christ as Head and King, in his Word hath prescribed to them.

B. *An Orthodox Creed* (1678), Article 26, Of Sanctification and Good Works[3901]

Those that are united unto Christ by effectual faith, are regenerated, and have a new heart and spirit created in them, through the virtue of Christ's death, resurrection, and intercession, and by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, received by faith, and are sanctified by the word and Spirit of truth, dwelling in them, by destroying and pulling down the strong-holds, or dominion of sin and lust, and more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces, in the practice of holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. And this sanctification is throughout the whole man, though imperfect in this life, there abiding still in the best saints, some remnants of corruption, which occasions a continual war in the soul, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; yet through the continual supply of strength from Christ, which flows from him to believers by means of the covenant of grace, or hypostatical union with our nature, the regenerate part doth overcome, pressing after a heavenly life, in evangelical obedience to all the commands that Christ, their king and law-giver, hath commanded them in his word, or holy scriptures, which are the only rule and square of our sanctification and obedience in good works and piety. And sith our only assistance to good works, such as God hath commanded, is of God, who worketh in us both to will and to do, we have no cause to boast, nor ground to conclude we merit anything thereby, we receiving all of free and undeserved grace, and when we have done the most yet we are unprofitable servants, and do abundantly fall short; and the best duties that we can now perform will not abide 'the judgment' of God. Neither do any good works whatsoever, that are done by unregenerate men, or without faith in and love to Christ, please God, or are accepted of him. Yet good works are of great ad-vantage, being done in faith and love, and wrought by the Holy Spirit, and are to be done by us, to show our thank-fulness to God for the grace of the new covenant by Christ, and to fit us more and more for glory. And in this sense the ten commandments, as handed forth by Christ the mediator, are a rule of life to a believer, and show us our duty to God and man, as also our need of the grace of God and merit of Christ. Ezekiel 36:26; Ephesians 4:24; 2 Corinthians 5:17; 1 John 3:9; Titus 3:5; 1 Corinthians 4:15; 2 Corinthians 3:18; 1 Timothy 2:20; Psalm 110:3; 2 Corinthians 10:4,

---

[3901] The *Orthodox Creed* is a product of the English General Baptists. Its complete title is: "An Orthodox Creed, Or A Protestant Confession of Faith, Being An Essay To Unite And Confirm All True Protestants In The Fundamental Articles Of The Christian Religion, Against The Errors and Heresies Of Rome." Note that the General Baptists who produced the *Orthodox Creed* were neither defenders of TULIP Calvinism nor were they Arminians—Article 18 of the Creed states: "God's love is manifest to all mankind, in that he is not willing, as himself hath sworn, and abundantly declared in his word, that mankind should perish eternally, but would have all to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. And Christ died for all men, and there is a sufficiency in his death and merits for the sins of the whole world, and hath appointed the gospel to be preached unto all, and hath sent forth his Spirit to accompany the word, in order to beget repentance and faith: so that if any do perish, it's not for want of the means of grace manifested by Christ to them, but for the nonimprovement of the grace of God, offered freely to them through Christ in the gospel." Thus, limited atonement is rejected. Likewise, Article 36 of the Creed affirms the eternal security of the believer, that those "justified by faith do receive such a measure of the holy unction, from the holy spirit, [that] they shall certainly persevere unto eternal life."

5, 5:17; John 17:17; 16:14, 15; Hebrews 12:14; Romans 7:20; Galatians 5:16, 17; 1 John 3:8; 2:20; Romans 6:14; Ephesians 4:15; 2 Corinthians 3:18; 7:1; Psalm 112:1; 119:48; John 15:4, 6; Isaiah 43:13; 26:12; Philippians 2:1 3; 2 Corinthians 3:5; Job 9:2, 3, 20; 25:4; Galatians 2:16; James 2:9, 10; 3:2; Hebrews 11:6, 19; Isaiah 64:6; Proverbs 8:17; 1 Corinthians 16:22; James 1:18, &c.; Galatians 5:22, 23; John 4:14, 5:25; Galatians 5:6; 1 Corinthians 6:9, &c.; Hebrews 12:28, 29; 1 Corinthians 13:2, 3; Psalm 50:14.

Excerpts From The Circular Letter of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, 1787, P. P. Vanhorn, and the Circular Letter of 1803, William White.[3902]

Dear brethren . . . [a]s we wish you to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, we shall address you on the important subject of Sanctification. We are exhorted to contend earnestly for the faith, once delivered to the saints; and as there are some who deny the work of sanctification, and too many who are little acquainted with it, we shall therefore consider the subject in the following order —

I. We shall explain the term sanctification.
II. Give some reasons why sanctification is necessary.
III. The happy effects in the subjects of it.

I. In a performance of this nature, brevity must be expected; yet enough may be said to display our sentiments on the subject. By searching the Scriptures, you will find the term hath various significations. 1. It is used to signify the setting apart a person or thing to the peculiar service of God. This is the general use of the word in the Old Testament, and in this sense God is said to sanctify the Sabbath, Genesis 2:3; and to the same purpose it is applied to the first born, Exodus 13:2. Thus the temple, the priests, the altar and sacrifices, were sanctified under the law. 2. It is used for that holiness and purity of nature, which gives us a meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light; and, in some respects, may be distinguished from regeneration, though it is radically connected with it. The Apostle, speaking of our salvation, said, "It was not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Titus 3:5. By washing of regeneration, we understand that great change, which is instantaneously made in us by the power of the Holy Ghost, when we are first made alive in Christ Jesus; and from that period we are new creatures, created in Christ Jesus unto good works. The word is used in the same sense in 1 Corinthians 6:11, where the Apostle says, "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified." In regeneration, the divine nature is begun in us by the power of the Holy Ghost, and without this work, there can be no growth in grace. From these passages of Scripture, we see that the Holy Ghost makes a distinction between regeneration and sanctification; in regeneration we receive a new nature or principle, and sanctification is the growing of that, new nature to the stature of a man in Christ Jesus. The washing of regeneration is never repeated, but the renewing of the Holy Ghost is carried on through the whole life of a Christian, till he ascends to be with Jesus, Philippians 1:6. It is the Holy Ghost which begins it, and it is his work to finish it; for in the great plan of salvation, the Holy Spirit is

[3902] Cited pgs. 258-262, 427-436, *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association*, A. D. Gillette. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

as firmly engaged to begin and finish this work, as the Son of God was to finish the work of redemption assigned him to do. The council of God has ordained this way to make us meet for that state of glory, to which we have a right by the adorable Redeemer's righteousness; and therefore we are said to be "chosen unto salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit," 2 Thessalonians 2:13.

II. We now proceed to demonstrate the necessity of sanctification. 1. We premise, that the necessity of sanctification and regeneration arise from the same cause, the fall of man. This has incapacitated us for communion with God; therefore, notwithstanding all our blessed Redeemer has done, we are represented to be in a lost state till this good work is begun. As sanctification is a progressive work, the necessity of it arises from the consideration that we are at first only babes in Christ, and not complete in holiness; for the best men have a body of sin and death. Every renewed soul must feel this to be his case. The great Apostle groaned under it, and the beloved disciple said, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves," 1 John 1:8. The Holy Ghost is promised to dwell with us and remain in us as his temple, and ye know the temple of the Lord must be holy. "Without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." 2. Sanctification is necessary, because without it we cannot honor and glorify God. For this our blessed Lord prayed, and for this we should daily apply to the throne of grace, that we may understand the mysteries of his kingdom, and the glory of his grace; that we copy after his great example, and honor him in every dispensation of his providence. 3. It was the great design of Christ's coming into the world; therefore his name is called Jesus, because he saves his people from the demerit and the pollution of sin; purifying a peculiar people unto himself, zealous of good works. This great end of the Redeemer's coming shall be fully accomplished in all God's elect by the effectual operations of his Holy Spirit; whose work it is to glorify the Son of God, in applying his benefits to the heirs of glory, and give them a meetness to that inheritance that fadeth not away.

III. We shall now attempt to consider the effects of sanctification. 1. The effects of it appear immediately after regeneration, in a sincere and hearty detestation of sin. The prophet having spoken of a new heart and a new spirit, adds, "Then shall ye remember your own evil ways and your doings that were not good, and shall loathe yourselves in your own sight," Ezekiel 36:31. No man can loathe himself till he is born of God, because the new man only sees the deformity of sin. After he is turned he truly repents after a godly sort, and is humbled in dust and ashes before God; firmly believing that nothing can deliver him from guilt, but the precious blood of the dear Redeemer. 2. Another effect is, we see more clearly our divorcement from the law, by the satisfaction of Christ, as the way by which life is to be obtained by the believing soul, who, at the same time, honors the law, by acknowledging that it is good, just, and holy. It is the fatal mistake of all in a state of nature, to expect acceptance with God, by the deeds of the law; but the renewed man knows that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. The great Apostle says, "I, through the law, am dead to the law, that I might live unto God." What a display of infinite wisdom in the plan of salvation! Here we see the sinner saved by grace, flowing consistent with all the perfections of God, and, at the same time, maintaining the honor of the divine law. Vain are the expectations of all who separate what God has joined together. Preserve divine truth in its own order, and it

is glorious and harmonious. In the great plan of salvation, God joined together justification by the righteousness of Christ, imputed unto us by an act of grace, by which we have a right to eternal life, and sanctification, which gives us a meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light. One great error in religion is, separating what God has joined together, and joining together what God has separated. Beware of all who applaud the imputed righteousness of Christ, and, at the same time, either deny the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification, or speak lightly or reproachfully of it. He, therefore, who would either verbally or doctrinally exclude the imputed righteousness of Christ, and, at the same time, make great professions of holiness and zeal for religion, ought to be considered as an inveterate enemy to the blessed Redeemer and his truth. Now, dear brethren, we take our leave of you, by entreating you to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith you are called. Watch over one another in love; in humility, seek spiritual growth to glorify your heavenly Father, and appear as lights in the world. May the God of all grace sanctify you wholly, and preserve you blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen (1787).

Beloved brethren . . . we have deemed it expedient to continue an investigation of the officework of the Holy Ghost. . . . He is called the Holy Spirit, Psalm 51:11, and Ephesians 1:1- 3; intimating thereby, that such is the purity of his nature, being purity in the abstract, that there is an absolute necessity that those who would enjoy the fellowship of the Spirit, Philippians 2:1, should be holy, not using the members of the body, which is the temple of the Holy Ghost, 1 Corinthians 6:19, in the service of sin. He is also called the Spirit of holiness, Romans 1:4, because he implants a principle of holiness in all the elect; and forasmuch as there is not any thing amiable or lovely in God's dear children, but what is the fruit of the Spirit, Galatians 5:22. . . . He is called the Spirit of grace, Hebrews 10:29, because the holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of the Spirit of God, make known all the gracious designs of Jehovah towards his people; and because he implants gracious affections, and applies the blessings of grace to the subjects of it. He is called the Comforter, John 14:16, by reason of that support which pious men derive from him, when under affliction. He is styled the Spirit of promise, Ephesians 1:13, with relation to his bringing the promises to our view, applying them to us, so as exactly to suit our particular cases, and enabling us to take consolation from them: or, because the marvellous descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the fruit of promise, as well as the indwelling and aid of the holy Spirit to believers, to whom it is promised, that he shall abide with them forever, John 14:16. He is. called the Spirit of the Lord, 2 Corinthians 3:17, and the Spirit of Christ, Romans 8:9, denoting that he comes in consequence of covenant stipulations, for which cause Christ is said to receive gifts for men, Psalm 68:18, and to shed forth the Spirit, Acts 2:32, and to send the Comforter to abide with the disciples, John 16:7; and lastly, he is called the Spirit of glory, because he gives a foretaste of it — assures us of our right to it — and prepares us for the complete enjoyment of it. In treating further on this subject, we shall show, 1st, That the children of the Lord only, are made partakers of the Holy Spirit in its operations on their hearts. And 2dly, What is effected by the Holy Ghost in such. . . . The work of the Spirit is called a creation, Psalm 51:10, 2 Corinthians 5:17, in allusion to an almighty agent giving existence to the system of nature, both with respect to matter and form. As there was no pre-existing matter to form the present material world, and consequently infinite power

was necessarily engaged in producing it, these phrases evidently show, that the sinner is not an effectual agent to hinder the work, and that nothing can possibly frustrate that grace which creates the soul in Christ Jesus to good works. . . . [T]here is a fulness in [Christ], Colossians 1:19, out of which all his people receive grace for grace. Therefore, provision has been made in Christ for all that were given to him; and as they are justified by his blood and saved from wrath through him, so also, by the Holy Ghost which Christ sheds forth, they are completely emancipated from the tyranny of the prince of darkness, and made meet for the inheritance among the saints in light. The first work, in order, effected by the Holy Spirit, is regeneration, which consists in an infusion of spiritual life into the soul. . . . From this principle, thus implanted, flow all those holy affections, such as faith, hope, love, and humility, which are usually denominated graces of the Spirit, because they originate from him and are all of grace. Notwithstanding the spiritual man, thus begotten, is perfect with relation to parts, he is not so in stature; for those graces become more vigorous under divine cultivation, which we shall have occasion to notice hereafter. This work is instantaneous; some examples of which we find in the New Testament, as in Paul's conversion, that of the jailor, and of the three thousand under Peter's sermon. . . . It is peculiarly the office-work of the Spirit to discover the Lord Jesus, in all his glory and fulness, to such; "He shall take of mine and show it unto you," John 16:14; "No man can call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost," 1 Corinthians 12:3. . . . The apostle says, "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us," Romans 5:5. Many are the powerful temptations that assault us, so that by reason of contending passions for victory over us, and the prince of darkness presenting sin in its most alluring form, we feel our weakness and frequently despair of making head against them. But behold, we are "strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man," Ephesians 3:16. Yea, when our way seems hedged up on every side, so that there seems no way to escape, and error, like a flood, carries all before it[,] yet, says the prophet, "the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against the enemy," Isaiah 59:19. Mixing with the world and being necessarily engaged in temporal concerns, we often get into a lukewarm state and experience spiritual languor and the consequence, a loss of the sensible presence of God. But the divine Spirit disengages us from time-things, dissipates our coldness, invigorates our souls, and, after showing us that it is easier to lose than to regain those divine joys, transports us with a view of the unchangeable love of God. Having lost a spirit of prayer, so that the heavens seem as brass above, and the earth as iron beneath us, at the same time a preached gospel making no impression, and the holy Scriptures seeming like a sealed book, this divine Spirit "helps our infirmities with groanings which cannot be uttered," Romans 8:26, and giving efficacy to the word preached and read, we can once more take delight in public and secret devotions. It is by the agency of the Spirit our perception of divine things is enlarged. It is truly desirable that we should not be always children tossed to and fro by the sleight of men, but on the contrary become acquainted with the mysteries of the gospel—be built up in our most holy faith and become firmly established thererein: these favors are conferred by that Spirit which leads into all truth, John 16:13. An assurance of faith comes from the divine Spirit. Upon this assurance our comfort much depends, and as there are different degrees of it, and each degree his work, we ought to remember with thankfulness that "the Spirit bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God."

Lastly, the work of sanctification must be carried on in us, in conformity with which the apostle prays, (1 Thessalonians 5:23) that the believers of the church of Thessalonica might be sanctified wholly in "spirit and soul and body," and "be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." This work consisteth in the mortifying of our inbred corruptions, so that our sinful affections become more and more weakened, and we are set apart, (as the signification of the term is) to the service of God. Therefore, as this work progresses, sin loses its dominion over us, (Romans 6:14) and we are made conformable to the death of Christ, (Philippians 3:10) the "old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin," (Romans 6:6,) and "[we are] changed into the image of the Lord from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord," 2 Corinthians 3:18. The instrument used in sanctification is the divine word, which has a transforming effect: Sanctify them through the truth: thy word is truth," John 17:17; That he might sanctify and cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water, by the word," Ephesians 5:26: the preaching and reading of which, under the influence of the divine Spirit, furnishes such powerful motives to obedience, and to forsaking of sin, — setting the one in so abhorrent a point of view, and the other in such an amiable light, that the soul falls in love with and embraces the service of God, and flees from sin as the most deadly evil. Hence it is that the word has different effects, as awaking our fears, exciting our hopes, abounding with threatenings, promises, warnings, reproofs, expostulations, exhortations, tender and pathetic addresses,[3903] lively descriptions of the glory of the person and offices of Christ, and of the joys of the heavenly world; all which, set home upon the heart by the divine Spirit, produce fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life. How comfortable must the reflection be to the Christian, that all the changes he meets with in this world, whether in spiritual or temporal things, are closely connected with his sanctification! To this we must attribute sickness and pain, poverty and disgrace, personal and relative afflictions, severe tempations, spiritual desertion, trials which faith and patience meet with; and, what seems most of all astonishing, that even their very backslidings, by being made the instruments of their correction, are made use of by the divine Spirit, who brings light out of darkness, order out of confusion, and causes "all things if work together for good to them that love God" (Romans 8:28). This work of sanctification is not, like regeneration, instantaneous; nor is it perfect during life, but more or less of the body of sin still remains; but so as that it does not reign over us, but disturbs our peace, and creates in us much self-abhorrence. . . . And now, dear brethren, having treated on the office-work of the Spirit, and merely touched on the most important points, to help your meditations, we close this epistle, by earnestly intreating you to labor after a greater sense of your need of his influences, and not to grieve, by an unholy life, this sanctifying and sealing Spirit. And that you may, under his influence, become exemplary for purity of doctrine, zeal in his service, and uprightness in your lives, is the sincere prayer of your brethren who represent you in this our associate capacity. (1803).

C. "The Means Of Sanctification," James Petigru Boyce.[3904]

3903 That is, addresses full of pathos.

3904 Pgs. 8-14, Chapter 37, "Sanctification," *Abstract of Systematic Theology*. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006. Boyce was the first president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The manner in which the Spirit operates in sanctification is beyond our knowledge. In none of the acts of God can we tell how he exerts his power, not even in creation. "As thou knowest not," says the preacher, "what is the way of the wind, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child; even so thou knowest not the work of God who doeth all." Ecclesiastes 11:5. In sanctification the Spirit moves as mysteriously as we are taught that he does in regeneration. John 3:8. In general, undoubtedly, it is in accordance with the laws of mind and of spiritual life. Yet we know no reason why there is not a place for supernatural action in sanctification, as well as in regeneration. We can only know the effects produced, and the means which are revealed in the word of God, and in Christian experience.

1. The primary means which the Spirit uses for our sanctification, as both of these sources of information teach, is the truth of God. "Sanctify them in the truth; thy word is truth" (John 17:17), was the prayer of the Lord, in which the whole work, both of consecration and cleansing, is set forth as thus to be accomplished. (See also John 17:19). "Growth in the grace" is inseparably connected with growth "in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 3:18.

This is further taught in Scripture by:

1.) Such passages as connect spiritual life with truth; as John 6:63; 8:32.
2.) Such as ascribe quickening power to the word of God; as Psalm 119:50, 93.
3.) Such as teach the that truth is promotive of obedience; as Psalm 119:34, 43, 44.
4.) Such as declare its usefulness in preventing sin; as Psalm 119:11.
5.) Such as associate it with cleansing from sin; as Psalm 119:9; 1 Peter 1:22.
6.) Such as state that it produces hatred of sin; as Psalm 119:104.
7.) Such as assert its power to lead to salvation; 2 Timothy 3:15-17.
8.) Such as say that "all things that pertain unto life and godliness" have been given through the knowledge of God, and Christ; as 2 Peter 1:2, 3.
9.) Such as imply that growth in grace is due to greater knowledge; as Hebrews 5:12-14.
10.) Such as account for inability to accept higher doctrinal truth, by such weakness as should be characteristic only of those who are babes in Christ; as 1 Corinthians 3:1-3.
11.) Such as set forth the word of God as "the sword of the Spirit;" as Ephesians 6:17.
12.) Such as announce that all the ministerial gifts bestowed by Christ are "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ; till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Ephesians 4:11-16.

2. In connection with this primary means of divine truth others are presented. But they are not only secondary, but actually subordinate means to the word of God. They rather furnish occasions for the exercise of the means of sanctification contained in the truth of God than are proper means of themselves to that end. In themselves they have no efficacy, and only accomplish the end of sanctification by bringing the believer into connection with the truth of God.

(1.) Such are the providences of God, which tend in various ways to arouse and move his children, and avail unto sanctification so far only as they recall, and lead to the apprehension of divine instructions. They are frequent and effective means of such apprehension, and, through this, of the believer's growth in holiness. Such especially are the afflictions, sent as chastisements by the Heavenly Father upon his children. Such,

also, are the temptations and trials to which they are subjected. Such, likewise, are the infirmities of the flesh, and perplexities of the spirit which God permits to remain, or causes to arise in his own elect. In these, and in numerous other ways, as well as what is called good, as of what is called evil, does God surround his people with the acts of his providence. But these acts themselves avail not unto their sanctification but are only made effective through the truth of God apprehended amid such events, and received as spiritual food for the growth of the believer.

(2.) The good works of the Christian, furnish another secondary means for his sanctification. By these are not meant works that are good in a legal sense, for such goodness would require a perfection and freedom from taint which no work of fallen man can possess; but it is the privilege of the Christian to live unto the Lord, and the name of good works is given in Scripture to such outward actions as are the results of his life through the Spirit.

These good works are the result of sanctification; but, in their performance, they naturally become the means of further sanctification. John 14:23; Ephesians 3:16-20. Yet, is this accomplished, not apart from, but in connection with, the truth of God. The new development will always be in the direction of the particular truths, contemplated in their performance. These will furnish the motives to further action, the strength for additional duty, the earnest purpose of deeper consecration, or whatever else the Spirit may graciously use for a more complete sanctification of the believer.

(3.) Prayer is still a further means to the same end; which, from its nature, can be effective only through the believer's apprehension of divine truth.

Hence the worthlessness of mere lip service (Isaiah 29:13; Ezekiel 33:31; Matthew 15:8), or vain repetitions, Matthew 6:7. Not only are they offensive to God, but without value to the soul. Hence also the necessary spirituality of divine worship, because that only is true worship which is the service of the soul. John 4:23, 24. Prayer, which is a mere formal or mechanical utterance of words, can have no value; because the one that offers it, does so in ignorance, or forgetfulness of the truth of God appropriate to accompany it.

(4.) The Lord's day is another secondary means of sanctification, which manifestly becomes such only in the Christian's use of divine truth; either such as is suggested by God's appointment of such a day, or such as is attained through the opportunity for such purpose which it affords.

(5.) The association of believers in church relations,[3905] is another means ordained by God for the increase of individual spiritual life and consequently of sanctification. This is attained not only through social prayer, and the preaching of the word, but also by Christian watchcare and discipline, and by the mutual sympathy and aid of believers in

[3905] Note that this means of sanctification is impossible for those who are not part of true churches. Those who reject Biblical Baptist churches for religious organizations of human origin, such as Roman Catholicism, Eastern Catholicism, and all Protestant denominations, greatly hinder their sanctification. See "Bible Study #7: The Church of Jesus Christ" at http://sites.google.com/site/thross7.

matters both temporal and spiritual. Whatever in these pertains to sanctification, must be connected with the recognition of divine truth in the moving influences which bestow, or the accepting thankfulness which receives.

(6.) The ministry given by Christ, is also a means for the sanctification of his people, in the preaching of his truth, in the spiritual guidance and rule of the flock, and in the sympathizing bestowment of the consolations of his grace. But, even these, though officially appointed, cannot either of themselves, or by virtue of their office, confer or increase spiritual grace. Their ministry is one only of the word of God, and it is only through his inspired truth "that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." 2Timothy 3:17. What these works are, is shown by verse 16, viz.: "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness." Ministers are in no other sense vehicles of grace. They are not appointed as personal channels of access to God, or of the bestowment of blessings by him, except so far as he has made it their duty to make known his truth. In connection with that truth they are means of sanctification to his people, and only thus are to be regarded as occupying relations between their fellow-men and God.

(7.) The ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper are also means of sanctification. It is especially important to understand in what respects they are so. Upon this subject there are several opinions.

By the Papal Church[3906] these, with five others (confirmation, penance, matrimony, extreme unction and orders), are regarded as the Sacraments of the New Law. As to their efficacy as means of grace:

1. This Church maintains that the Sacraments are, in and of themselves, — wherever conferred with the intention of the church, and where the recipient does not put obstacles in the way, — active causes to produce the grace which they signify, by virtue of the sacramental action itself, instituted by God for this end. The sufferings of Christ concur as the meritorious, but not as the efficient cause, which also depends neither upon the merit of the agent, nor upon that of the receiver.

They make distinctions, however, as to the necessity of these two Sacraments; regarding baptism as absolutely necessary to justification, in which they include sanctification; but the Lord's Supper as only necessary because commanded and eminently useful.

The efficacy which is thus ascribed to the Sacraments is that of what is called an *opus operatum*, in which grace is conferred *ex opere operato*, viz: from the mere act done. It denies that faith alone in the divine promise suffices to obtain the grace. Will, faith, and repentance, in the adult, are necessarily required as dispositions on the part of the subject, but only to remove obstacles, for, as fire burns wood, not because the wood is dry, nor because the fire is applied to it, but because of the power in the fire to consume,

---

3906 See "Bible Truths for Catholic Friends" at http://sites.google.com/site/thross7 for a Biblical evaluation of Roman Catholicism.

so, they maintain that a sacrament, by its own inherent power, confers the grace when no obstacle
prevents, such as would be dampness in wood to the power of fire to burn.[3907]

The objections to this explanation of the use of the Sacrament as means are:

(a.) That the ordinance is thus regarded as effective in itself, disconnected from any divine truth which may be symbolized in it, or taught in its objective presentation, or suggested through the Christian experience which accompanies its reception. The Scriptures nowhere teach such efficacy apart from the truth of God.

(b.) To no immediate connection of God with these, is ascribed their effective power. They are held to be mere appointments of God to be applied through man, and grace is taught to be as inherent in them as is, in any merely physical substance, any natural quality which God has bestowed upon it.

(c.) The faith which is declared requisite to remove obstacles is "mere assent" to receive, and not the appropriating faith of personal trust in Christ which alone is the saving faith of the Bible.[3908]

(d.) This doctrine of the Sacraments places the salvation of every one entirely in the power of others. Whatever his own faith, unless some one else will baptize him, he cannot attain justification and sanctification.

(e.) Inasmuch as the sacraments are valid to convey grace only when performed with "the intention of doing what the Church does," no one can know that the grace has been conferred, since he cannot know the mind of the administrator.

2. A second opinion, different in many respects as to the efficacy of the Sacraments, has been held by almost all Protestants.[3909]

(1.) In opposition to the doctrine of Rome, they teach that the Sacraments,vwhich are but two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are not in themselves means of grace, and have no separate inherent power to convey it.

(2.) They say, however, that these are "real means of grace," that "they are not, as Romanists teach, the exclusive channels; but they are not channels."[3910]

(3.) They also assert that they are "sacred signs and seals of the covenant of grace."[3911]

3907 Boyce notes: "See statements and extracts from the Canons of the Council of Trent, and from Bellarmine, contained in Hodge's Outlines, pp. 597-600."

3908 Boyce notes: "Hodge's Sys. Theol., vol. 3, p. 512."

3909 Boyce here speaks specifically of the doctrine of Reformed denominations. Baptists are not Protestants and, as Boyce effectively explains, they reject the idea of *sacraments*.

3910 Boyce cites: Hodge's Sys. Theol., vol. 3, p. 499.

3911 Boyce cites: Westminster Confess., ch. 27, sec. 1.

(4.) They hold that the efficacy of the Sacraments depends "upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution, which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers."[3912]

This position is preferable to that of the Romanists inasmuch as:

1. It recognized the necessary presence of the Spirit in connection with the grace bestowed, and thus denies that this proceeds exclusively from any natural inherent power.

2. The benefits are said to be conferred only upon those "who worthily receive the Sacraments." By this possibly meant persons receiving them through the exercise of true faith in Christ. Such is generally the position assumed by the various theologians of these churches as to the adult recipients of the Sacraments. But it should have been more clearly stated in their creeds. The language used could mean this in adult receivers only. Yet it is almost certain that the intention was to include infants among those who "worthily receive." He, however, who "worthily receives" through faith must be capable of personal faith. If the receiver is not himself a believer, he does not receive "through faith." He may receive *because* of the faith of another, but it is *through* the personal exercise of faith, and not on account of its exercise by others, that the Scriptures teach that the Christian is blessed in connection with the ordinances.

The objections to this form of the doctrine are:

1. The continued use of the word sacrament. It has no Scripture authority. It has led many to attach a superstitious sacredness to these ordinances.

2. The use of the word "seal" is also objectionable. A seal is a visible stamp, or impression which is made upon a paper or some other substance for the purpose of certifying to the truth of some fact thus implied. It may either be attached personally by the one whom it represents, or by some person authorized by him; but its presence by his authority is his testimony to the genuineness or correctness of what is witnessed.

Now neither of the ordinances makes a visible mark upon their recipients. They are thus without an important characteristic of the seal. Neither of them is affixed to a designated individual by divine authority. The authority to administer is only a general one. No man can put marks upon the elect of God which shall authoritatively certify that they are his. Neither Baptism, nor the Lord's Supper, becomes such an authentication either to the recipient or to others. This is found in the conscious possession of truth faith, or in the manifestation of that faith by the good works of his life.

This common usage of the word "seal" in connection with the ordinances has no other Scriptural support than the reference to Abraham in Romans 4:11. "He received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision." Cf. Genesis 17:11. But the rite then performed had the characteristics of a seal which have been denied of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. It was a visible mark and not only so, but it was applied to the individual man Abraham by direct divine authority.[3913]

3912 Boyce cites: West. Conf., ch. 27, sec. III.

3913 The use of the word "seal" (*sphragis*) in Romans 4:11 for the already justified and already believing Abraham by no means supports the Reformed sacramental notion that infant baptism is a vehicle of conveying saving grace, that through baptism grace is "conferred by the Holy Ghost" to the elect (*Westminster Confession of Faith,* Article 28). Since Romans 4:11 is the only verse in Scripture that could with any plausibility be used to support the Reformed view, its advocates argue from this text that

> 3. Objection may also be made to the word "sign" in the sense in which it is used. These two ordinances are indeed "signs;" but signs of what Christ did and suffered, and not of what is done to is people. Yet it is in the latter sense that the word "sign" is exclusively used by those holding this opinion.
>
> 4. The use of these two words has let to the mistake about the manner in which these two ordinances are means of grace, which constitutes the fatal error of this opinion. They are means of grace as they set forth truth, as they teach something, and only in this way do they convey grace. In the act of receiving, that grace may be conferred either from the consciousness of an act of obedience or through the apprehension and comprehension of the truth symbolized. It can come in no other way. . . .

Serious has been the error which has resulted from these expressions and the doctine taught in connection with them. It has led men actually to teach that the grace of God has been really conferred upon or pledged to a recipient by the agency of the administrator. In the Anglican Catechism the question is put to the child: "Who gave you this name?" to which it is taught to reply: "My God-father and God-mother, in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Here the ordinance performed upon an unconscious subject is taught to have produced regenerating power. This doctrine of baptismal regeneration has been commonly regarded as unscriptural and false by evangelical Christians.[3914] But is the effect declared of this baptismal act any more a matter of the mere human choice and will and action of some one who is not the recipient, than is the result ascribed by [the] eminent Presbyterian theologian [Hodge] to the baptism of the child of a believer? He says:

> "And so when a believer adopts the covenant of grace, he brings his children within that covenant in the sense that God promises to give them, in his own good time, all the benefits of redemption,

---

circumcision is a "seal" of grace, that their sacrament of infant baptism is equivalent to circumcision, and that, therefore, infant baptism seals or conveys grace to their infants. This argument breaks down at many points. First, the verse does not say that circumcision was a seal of grace to Jewish male infants. While circumcision was a "sign" by nature, it is not affirmed to have been a "seal" to all, but only personally to believing Abraham, who received it when he had already been justified by faith. A recognition of this distinction in Romans 4:11 explains the Old Testament use of the word "sign" or "token" (Hebrew *'oth*) in connection with circumcision (Genesis 17:11) but the complete absence of references in the Old Testament to the ceremony as a "seal." Second, the New Testament does not equate circumcision with baptism or state that the latter replaces the former. Third, the Biblical immersion of believers has nothing to do with the ceremonial application of water to infants that Catholics and Protestants claim is baptism. Fourth, when advocates of Reformed theology and other Protestants speak of baptism as a "seal" or vehicle of grace, they use the word in a sense entirely absent in Scripture. None of the appearances of the word "seal" (*sphragis*) in the New Testament indicate that grace is conveyed through a "seal" (Romans 4:11; 1 Corinthians 9:2; 2 Timothy 2:19; Revelation 5:1-2, 5, 9; 6:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12; 7:2; 8:1; 9:4). Both those who think that infant baptism was the instrument of their receiving forgiveness and those who think that they received the sacrament as confirmation and evidence that they were already regenerated in the womb are underneath a terrible spiritual delusion. They will certainly be damned unless they recognize that their unbiblical religious ceremony did nothing beneficial for them, admit they are still lost, and then repent and believe the gospel.

[3914] The heresy of baptismal regeneration is refuted by the book *Heaven Only for the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ vs. Baptismal Regeneration*, by Thomas Ross, elec. acc. http://sites.google.com/site/thross7. Note also "The Truth of Salvation for Reformed Friends" and "Were the Reformers Heretics? Their Theology of Baptism and Other Topics Analyzed," on the same website.

provided they do not willingly renounce their baptismal engagements."[3915]

3. The true statement of the sanctifying power of these ordinances seems the rather to be:

1. A denial of all inherent power in them as means of grace.

2. Recognition of them as conveying truth by symbolical instruction.

3. The fact that they are partaken of because of the command of Christ also makes the act of obedience to him a means of grace to the recipient.

4. Only as truth is, in some way or other, brought by them to the acceptance of the heart and mind, can they have sanctifying power.

It is thus seen that all the means of sanctification are connected with the truth, and are secondary to it. They only become such, as they convey truth, or as they suggest truth, or as they are employed in the recognition of some truth.

C. An Excerpt From *A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*, John Owen.[3916]

Sanctification is an immediate work of the Spirit of God on the souls of believers, purifying and cleansing of their natures from the pollution and uncleanness of sin, renewing in them the image of God, and thereby enabling them, from a spiritual and habitual principle of grace, to yield obedience unto God, according unto the tenor and terms of the new covenant, by virtue of the life and death of Jesus Christ. Or more briefly: — It is the universal renovation of our natures by the Holy Spirit into the image of God, through Jesus Christ.

D. An Excerpt from *The Method of Grace: How the Spirit Works*, by John Flavel.[3917]

3. [Flavel comments on 2 Corinthians 5:17]: "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." He satisfies not himself to express it in general terms, by telling us the man in Christ must be a new creature; but more particularly, he shows as what this new creature is: "Old things are passed away — all things are become new." By old things he means all those principles and lusts belonging to the carnal state, or the old man: all these are passed away — not perfectly, but in part at present, and wholly in hope and expectation hereafter.

"All things are become new." He means not that the old faculties of the soul are abolished, and new ones created in their room; but as our bodies may be said to be new bodies by reason of the endowments to be bestowed upon them in their resurrection, so our souls are now renewed by the imparting of new principles to them in the work of

---

[3915] Boyce cites: Hodge's "Syst. Theology," vol. 3, p. 555.

[3916] Book 4:2, pg. 448. Elec. acc. AGES Digital Software Library, Christian Library Series vol. 9. Rio, WI: 2005.

[3917] Pgs. 357-358. Elec. acc. AGES Digital Software Library, Christian Library Series vol. 18. Rio, WI: 2006.

regeneration.

These two parts, the passing away of old things and the renewing of all things, comprise the whole of sanctification, which in other scriptures is expressed by equivalent phrases: sometimes by putting off the old and putting on the new man, Ephesians 4:24; sometimes by dying unto sin, and living unto righteousness, Romans 6:11, which is the same thing the apostle here intends by the passing away of old things and making all things new. And because this is the most excellent and glorious work of the Spirit wrought upon man in this world, the apostle asserts it with a note of special remark and observation, "Behold!" — "behold and admire this surprising, marvelous change which God has made upon men; they are come out of darkness into his marvelous light, 1 Peter 2:9, out of the old, as it were, into a new world. "Behold, all things are become new."

Hence, *God's creating of a new supernatural work of grace in the soul of any man, is infallible evidence of a saving interest in Jesus Christ.*

Suitable hereto are those words of the apostle:

> "But ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Ephesians 4:20-24.

Where we have, in other words of the same import, the very selfsame description of the man that is in Christ which the apostle gives us in this text.

Appendix E. The Nature of True Holiness[3918] Explained, John Brine.[3919]

[3918] Many other writers have given helpful definitions of holiness. For example, Stephen Charnock wrote concerning the Divine holiness of which the believer becomes a partaker:

The holiness of God negatively is a perfect and [entire] freedom from all evil. As we call gold pure that is not imbased by any dross, and that garment clean that is free from any spot, so the nature of God is estranged from all shadow of evil, all imaginable contagion.

Positively, it is the rectitude or integrity of the divine nature, or that conformity of it in affection and action to the divine will as to his eternal law, whereby he works with a becomingness to his own excellency, and whereby he hath a delight and complacency in everything agreeable to his will, and an abhorrency of everything contrary thereunto. ("A Discourse Upon The Holiness of God," in *The Existence and Attributes of God,* Stephen Charnock, vol. 2.)

Similarly, Richard Muller, summarizing the orthodox doctrine of the believer's participation in the Divine holiness, wrote:

[I]n relation to creatures . . . [i]n a negative sense, holiness indicates separation from what is low and base. . . . In a positive sense, holiness may be defined as the purity or the moral goodness of a thing, so that holiness in man is that virtue whereby he giveth and yieldeth himself to God, in doing all for and to Him, in regard of which, the actions he does are acceptable to God. The foundation of all moral good is in God's goodness and holiness, therefore [human holiness] can also be called the brightest part of the image of God in man.

Human holiness, then, consists in conformity unto God, to the attainment of the divine likeness, and, specifically, in the application of our minds and actions to God. This conformity, moreover, is a conformity both to the nature and to the will of God. The believer is a partaker of God's nature in the sense that his life embodies an analogical resemblance to God both in the attributes that we have as created and regenerate in God's image, patience, mercy, justice, faithfulness, truth, love; and in the affections that we display when we love what God loves, when we hate what God hates, when what pleases God pleases us also. Conformity to the will of God . . . is a conformity to [His] external will signified by His Word, [so that] every action of man is holy or unholy, according to its conformity

Let us then [first] attend unto the Consideration of the Causes of Holiness, wherein consists the true Exaltation of our Nature, which is dreadfully debased by Sin; the *impulsive*, *procuring*, *efficient*, *and instrumental* Causes or Means of that Purity which is absolutely necessary to future Blessedness.

1.) The impulsive Cause, is the eternal Goodwill and Grace of God exerting itself in the Election of our Persons to everlasting Life . . . 2 Thessalonians 2:13 . . . 2 Timothy 1:9[.]

2.) The procuring Cause of real Holiness, is the Death and Satisfaction of Christ. . . . Hebrews 13:20, 21. In that eternal Covenant which was entered into by the Father and Christ, it was a Condition required of him, and agreed to by him, to make his *Soul an Offering for Sin*, and a Promise was made him, that on this Condition he should have the Satisfaction of seeing his Seed Participants of Holiness and Happiness. This Condition is fulfilled, hence he has a Right to expect the Fulfilment of that Promise relating to them all; nor can the Father, in Justice, fail of the Performance of his Promise. That invaluable Price which was paid for the Redemption of our Persons from Misery, ascertains our Participation of Holiness here, and complete Happiness hereafter.

3.) The efficient Cause of true Holiness is the Spirit of God; Grace . . . is his Production . . . the Holy Spirit is the Author of our Regeneration. Grace in the Heart is the Effect of his gracious Operation upon us [John 3:6]. If there is any Thing in us of a truly spiritual Nature, it is the Product of the Spirit of God, for we are naturally *Flesh*; the very *Reverse* of what is *holy and Spiritual*.

4.) The instrumental Causes, or Means of our Improvement in Holiness are various,[3920] *viz*. the Gospel . . . *the sincere Milk of the Word*, *that we may grow thereby* (1 Peter 2:2); And our dear Lord prays the Father *to Sanctify*, *his People thro' his Truth*, *whose Word is Truth* (John 17:17). . . . Again, The sacred Institutions of Christ are appointed to this End. In those sacred Rites, Christ is represented in his Person, Offices, Work, and Benefits, and Grace; and, therefore, they are adapted wisely to corroborate the Heaven-born Principle in our Souls. Farther, the afflictive Dispensations of Providence are graciously designed to this Purpose. . . . Besides, spiritual and holy Conversation tends to promote Holiness; *No corrupt Communication ought to proceed out of our Mouths*; *but such as is good to the Use of edifying*, *that it may minister Grace to the Hearers* [Ephesians 4:29]. There are the Causes of Holiness, supreme and subordinate.

[Secondly, the] Nature of true Holiness . . . I proceed . . . *to shew* . . . *negatively and positively*. . . .

---

with or variation from this will. (pg. 502, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, vol. 3: The Divine Essence and Attributes*, by Richard Muller. Quotations from other sources have been removed and other minor changes made.)

[3919] "The Nature of True Holiness Explained In a Discourse [on Hebrews 12:14], Delivered at a Monthy Exercise of Prayer, with a Sermon, on the Twentieth of April, 1749," John Brine. London: John Ward. Sermon #11. Elec. acc. *The Collected Writings of John Gill,* v. 2.0. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2003. Only excerpts from Brine's sermon, giving its main outline and a summary of its content, are reprinted here.

[3920] Compare Appendix C, "The Means Of Sanctification," James Petigru Boyce.

Negatively: This is to be done in several Particulars, *viz*.

1.) What Men usually call Virtue, is not Holiness. By this I intend the Propriety and Impropriety of Things, in relation to human Actions[.] . . . Now this is an abstracted Consideration of Actions, as in themselves, without Regard to the governing Authority of God in his Law; and, therefore, it is at a very great Remove from Holiness, which is an Obedience to the Will and Command of that infinite Being, on whom we are absolutely dependent.

2.) Legal Obedience, which rises higher than the former, is not Holiness. . . . Lust . . . retains its Dominion in the Heart, and will so do, until . . . Grace takes it away, and brings a Man to submit to be saved in the Way of God's Appointment [Romans 9:31-32]. Sin still perserves its Rule in the Mind, tho' the Form of its Government is altered, and none of the Actions of such a one are holy, they all spring from a selfish Principle, and are directed to selfish Ends, which is not serving God, but is a Man's Aim to serve himself. This legal Obedience, therefore, hath not any Thing of true Holiness in it.

3.) The Knowledge of the Truth of Evangelical Doctrines is not Holiness; Orthodoxy is not Grace; nor is Soundness of Judgment, Holiness. . . .

4.) Gifts, and the Exercise of them, is not Grace or Holiness. By Gifts, I mean an Ability to discourse of Gospel Doctrines in such a Manner, as may be very instructive and beneficial to others. . . .

I go on to shew . . . In a positive Sense, what [holiness] is: And it is to be considered as a Principle, and Acts flowing from that Principle.

1.) True Holiness is a *new*, *spiritual* Principle or Spring of Action in the Mind. It is *new*, for which Reason, it is called a *new Heart*, and the Subject of it is said to be a *new Creature* . . . 2 Corinthians 5:17. This is called new, in Opposition to the Flesh, or corrupt Habits of the Mind, and it is the very Reverse, and direct contrary of all that was in a Person before. Grace is not corrupt Nature mended, but it is a Disposition opposite and contrary to it. . . . Galatians 5:17. Again, this Principle may be called *new*, tho' not in Opposition to, yet in Distinction from, that original Righteousness, which Man possessed in a State of Innocency. . . . Farther, it is a spiritual Principle . . . and all the Acts which arise from it, are of a pure and spiritual Kind, and of the same Nature with itself. This Principle alone is the Spring of holy Actions in a Believer[.] . . .

2.) This Principle exerts itself various Ways, to the Glory of God who wrought it in the Soul, and to the Comfort and Advantage of those in whom it is, *viz*.

I. In believing; or in Acts of Faith on Jesus Christ. It discerns our Need of him, his Suitableness to our Condition; applies to him, and receives him, as he *of God is made unto us Wisdom*, *Righteousness*, *Sanctification*, *and Redemption* (1 Corinthians 1:30); yea, as *our all in all* (Colossians 3:11): And this Faith purifies the Heart [Act 15:9] . . . It

influences unto a cheerful and holy Obedience, for which Reason it is called the *Obedience of Faith* [Romans 16:26], which is alone acceptable and pleasing unto God, thro' Christ . . . Hebrews 11:6; and we are no farther truly holy and spiritual in the Discharge of Duty, than Faith is acted therein.

II. This gracious Principle loves and delights in heavenly Things. In the Understanding, it is a Perception of their infinitely excellent and glorious Nature. In the Will, it is a closing with, and Adherence unto them. In the Affections,[3921] it is a Delight and Complacency in

---

[3921] Shedd considers a division in anthropology of the acts of the soul into the will and understanding superior to a division into understanding, will, and affections. He wrote (*Dogmatic Theology: Anthropology*, Chapter 3, pgs. 1-9):

> [M]uch depends upon the definition of the Will; whether it be taken in a wide, or in a narrow sense. The elder psychology divides the powers of the soul into Understanding and Will; the later psychology divides them into Intellect, Sensibility, and Will. The former includes the moral affections and desires in the Will; the latter excludes them from it. For the former, inclination is the principal characteristic of voluntariness; for the latter, volition is the principal characteristic. In classifying the powers of the soul under two modes, it is not meant that there is a division of the soul into two parts. The whole soul as cognizing, is the understanding; and the whole soul as inclining, is the will. . . . We regard the elder psychology as correct, in including the moral desires and affections in the total action of the will, and in making two faculties of the soul: namely, understanding and will.
>
> The Understanding is the cognitive faculty or mode of the soul. It comprises the intellect and the conscience. These are percipient and preceptive powers. They are destitute of desire and inclination; and they are not self-determining and executive powers. The intellect perceives what ought to be done, and the conscience commands what ought to be done, but they never do anything themselves. They do not incline to an end. . . . The Will is that faculty or mode of the soul which self-determines, inclines, desires, and chooses in reference to moral and religious objects and ends. These objects and ends are all centred and summed up in God. We say moral and religious objects and ends, because there is a class of propensities and desires that refer to non-moral and nonreligious objects. They are the natural or instinctive desires[.] . . . Speaking generally, the voluntary and moral desires relate to God. They are either inclined or averse to him; they are either love or hatred. . . .
>
> The elder theologians include the moral and religious desires and affections in the Will. Edwards (Affections, in initio) states the view in the following terms: "The will and the affections of the soul are not two faculties; the affections are not essentially distinct from the will, nor do they differ from the mere actings of the will and inclination of the soul, but only in the liveliness and sensibleness of exercise." Again he says (Will, III. iv.), "The affections are only certain modes of the exercise of the will." "The inclination of the will is a leading act of the will." In this sense of the term "will," the religious affections are voluntary affections. Edwards identifies the will with the heart, and contradistinguishes it from the understanding. "In the former case, is exercised merely the speculative faculty, or the understanding strictly so called, in distinction from the will or disposition of the soul. In the latter, the will, or inclination, or heart, is mainly concerned." . . .
>
> The will, unlike the understanding, is mutable. It is capable of a radical and total change, or revolution. It has met with such a change in the apostasy of Adam. Man now is inclined exactly contrary to what he was by creation. In respect to moral and religions ends and objects, he inclines, desires, loves, and acts directly contrary to what he did when he came from the Creator's hand. This great change is denominated a "fall." It is an overthrow, a catastrophe. It is not a mere difference in the degree or intensity with which the will operates, but it is an entire alteration of the direction of its activity. The fall of the will was a revolution, not an evolution.
>
> The elder psychology, by regarding the moral desires and affections as modes of the inclination of the will brings them within the sphere of responsibility . . . Moral desires and affections are the self-activity of the will; its inclination and tendency showing itself in the phases of love or hatred of God; of desire or aversion towards goodness. . . .
>
> The recent psychology distributes the faculties of the soul into three divisions: Intellect, Sensibility, and Will. [An] objection [among others to this classification [is that] . . . moral desires and religious affections must, if anywhere, be included under the Sensibility, by this arrangement. But this is too narrow and shallow a term, to denote those profound feelings, desires, and inclinations that relate to religion. "Sensibility," by its etymology, refers us to the five senses. Properly speaking, it comprises only sensuous feelings and desires. Hence it is wholly inadequate to denote feelings and desires that have no connection at all with the five senses: such as the holy affections of reverence, faith, hope, humility, joy, peace, love; or the sinful affections of pride, envy, malice, hatred, and the like. . . .

them, as pure, holy, and spiritual, and congruous to its own Nature; no Acts of which Kind can ever arise in an unsanctified Mind [1 Corinthians 2:14].

III.) Grace hopes for better Things than it hath in present Possession. . . . The Christian, in the Exercise of Grace, *enters into that within the Vail whither the Forerunner is for him entered* (Hebrews 6:19, 20), and hath *his Conversation in Heaven* [Philippians 3:20]. Where he shall actually be, hereafter, there he now is, sometimes, in *Desire*, and in a way of *gracious Communion*.

IV.) This spiritual Principle exerts itself in a holy Reverence of God. [Hebrews 12:28]; . . . And there is no true Reverence of God in a Mind destitute of this holy Principle, for from that alone it springs; and there is more or less of this Fear of the Divine Majesty, as this gracious Principle is more or less lively and vigorous.

V.) Grace disposes the Mind to submit to the Will of God, in the various Dispensations of his Providence, whether prosperous or adverse. [Romans 8:28]. . . .

VI.) This holy Principle is a Disposition to practice all the Branches of Righteousness in our Conversation in the World; Sobriety, Justice, Compassion, Benevolence, and whatever else Morality includes [Titus 2:11-12]; . . . True Grace in the Heart is a solicitous Care to maintain good *Works* in the Life. . . .

VII.) The regenerate [Nature] of a Believer casts a holy Contempt on the World, and all the most delectable Things in it. It is of a Nature far more sublime than the best of earthly Treasures, and it elevates the Mind towards, and fixes it on Objects infinitely more glorious than the gayest and most splendid Things, which please the Fancy, and attract the Affections of an unsanctified Person. This Heaven-born Principle aspires towards unseen and heavenly Objects. From Heaven it came, that is its proper Centre, and thither it tends [Colossians 3:1-2]. . . .

VIII.) This Principle aims at the Glory of God in all its Acts. . . . Unless we design the Glory of God in our Acts of Obedience, there is nothing of true Holiness in what we do. . . .

Thirdly, We ought to follow Holiness, i.e. in an earnest Manner we should endeavour after our Improvement therein. The original Word ["follow," διώκω, in "Follow . . . holiness," Hebrews 12:14] is elsewhere rendered, I press (Philippians 3:14). It signifies a Fervency of Desire, and an Earnestness in Endeavour. If we are desirous of an Improvement in Grace, we must, in order to it, make it our *Scope* and *Aim*; not rest satisfied with our present Measure of Grace, but use a holy Diligence to increase it;

In the Biblical psychology, the will comprehends the heart. It comprises all that moral activity of the soul which is manifested in loving, hating, inclining, desiring, purposing, seeking, repenting, turning, delighting, trusting, hoping, believing. Each and all of these affections are phases of the will. They are modes of a man's inclination and self-determination. If they are conformed to the moral law, they are right affections, and the will is a holy will. If they are contrary to the moral law, they are evil affections, and the will is a sinful will. This species of psychical activity is not intellectual and percipient, but affectionate and executive.

without this, we cannot reasonably expect and hope for an Advancement in Holiness and Spirituality.

1.) We must oppose, and *make no Provision for the Flesh*. . . . We shall never arrive to any *Eminency* in Holinesss, without much Self-Denial, and *a strict* Watch kept upon Lust, which hath numberless Ways of exerting itself, and a constant Opposition to it, in What Manner soever it acts its Part in us.

2.) We must make it our *Scope* and A*im*, in religious Exercises, to act our Graces, if we would improve in Holiness: Attendance to them is a necessary Branch of our Duty, and the Neglect of that Attendance is *inexcusable*; but a bare external Performance of those Exercises, will be of no Efficacy towards our Improvement in Grace. As there is no greater Degree of Holiness in our religious Services, than what consists in the Actings of the spiritual Principle in our Souls; so all our Advancement in Holiness in those Services, is from the Exercise of this holy Principle. Unless, therefore, we aim at performing Spiritual Duties, in *a spiritual Manner*, our Expectations of gaining Advantage to our spiritual Part thereby, must be disappointed, because we have no Ground for such Expectations.

3.) We ought to desire *the Sincere Milk of the Word*. . . .

Fourthly, Without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord. . . . Two Things must be attended unto, in this Branch of the subject, *viz*. *the Sight of God,* and, that no Man who is not the Subject of Holiness, shall have this happy Vision of him. In discoursing on the former, I would shew, what are the Properties of this View, and then the Objects, which are beheld with a Joy to us, at present inconceivable.

1.) I begin with *the Properties of this Vision of God*. And they are such as must be exceedingly delightful to every one who truly desires to enjoy it.
For,

I.) It will be immediate, clear, and full. Here the Saints sometimes have spiritual Views of God by Faith, which fill them with Joy unspeakable, and full of Glory: But these Prospects are far inferior to that View they will have of God in the heavenly State. . . .

II.) The Saints will enjoy an uninterrupted View of God hereafter. . . .

III.) This Prospect will be endless. . . . As their Existence will be eternal, so their Views of God will be without a Period. As no Change can possibly happen in the Nature of that blissful State, so it shall never have an End. If we consider the infinitely glorious Nature of the Objects seen; if we consider the Properties of this heavenly Vision, *viz*. that it is clear and full, that it is uninterrupted, and without End; surely we must conclude, that this State is most desirable, and perfectly blessed.

2.) *This is a Vision, or Sight of God*.

I.) We shall distinctly discern what each Person in the adorable Trinity hath acted, in order to our eternal Salvation and Happiness.

A.) The kind Part the divine Father hath acted in our Favour. Our Election to everlasting Life, was his gracious Act. He *chose us in Christ before the Foundation of the World* [Ephesians 1:4]; and this Choice of us, was unto perfect Holiness. The Contrivance of the Way of our Recovery from that Ruin brought on us by Sin, is his. He appointed Christ to be our Mediator, Head, and Surety, and decreed his taking upon him our Obligation to the Law. . . . If the imperfect Views we have at present of the stupendous Acts of the Father in our Favour, yield us inexpressible Pleasure, what transcendent Delight will be produced in our Minds, by the future Prospect of them?

B.) We shall forever have in View the compassionate Part, which the eternal Son hath performed in our Favour. His undertaking for us, in the eternal Covenant transacted between the Father and himself, and the Holy Spirit. His Assumption of our Nature . . . His Susception of our Guilt, and voluntary Submission to the Father's Pleasure, in *making his Soul an Offering for our Sins*, [Isaiah 53:10] whereby he expiated our Guilt, *made Peace* for us, and secured our Persons from that *direful* Vengeance, which we, in Consequence of our Sins, were liable unto. Besides, he *brought in* for us an *everlasting Righteousness*, which justifies our Persons, and gives us an *unalienable* Right to eternal Life. And now he is in Heaven, it is his continual Employ to make Intercession for us, as a sympathizing and compassionate High Priest, under all our Difficulties, Temptations, and Sorrows, in this State of Imperfection, and Snares and Dangers. The imperfect View we have of these Things now, affords us the highest Pleasure; the clear, distinct, and endless Prospect of them hereafter, therefore, must possess our Souls with a Delight, that far surpasses our present Comprehension. For, since ineffable Joy arises from those low and imperfect Views of heavenly Objects, which this State admits of; certainly unknown and inconceivable Delight will result from the clear and perfect, and uninterrupted Prospects of those Objects, in the happy World above.

C.) We shall eternally behold what a gracious Part the blessed Spirit acts in our Favour, who inspires us with spiritual Life, when we are *dead in Trespasses and Sins*; infuses heavenly Light into our Souls, which are naturally Darkness; operates on us in a Way of spiritual Conviction; gives us a Sense of the Evil of Sin; shews us the exceeding Sinfulness of our Nature; presents us with a View of our inevitable Misery, as in ourselves considered; discovers to us the Ability and Suitableness of Christ, as a Saviour; encourages and assists us to make a humble Application to him for Life and Salvation; applies his Blood to our Souls, to ease us of the *pressing* Load of our Guilt, and heal the Wounds it gives us; shews us the Glory of his Righteousness, and enables us to lay hold on it, and embrace it, as the Matter of our Acceptance with God, our righteous Judge; open, to our View the Secrets of the Almighty, relating to the stupendous Design of our Recovery, and powerfully applies to us the *precious Promises* of his Word, whereby we are encouraged to hope in him, and draw near to him, as our gracious Covenant-Father, and in this Character to ask of him all that is needful to our Support, Guidance, and Consolation: He bears with all our Provocations, heals all our Backslidings, reduces our Souls when we go astray, revives the good Work under its Decays, and *restores to us the*

Joy of God's Salvation, and establishes us afresh in the Ways of Holiness and Peace, and will continue so to do, until we arrive safe to the heavenly World, where we shall see the Wonders of his Love, in that perspicuous Manner the present State admits not of.

II.) We shall enjoy a constant View of the divine Perfections, as they are exercised and displayed in our eternal Salvation. Everlasting, free and sovereign Love . . . Infinite Wisdom . . . infinite Rectitude and Righteousness . . . Truth and Faithfulness . . . [and] his absolute Immutability, on which our Security rests, is fully manifested. Much of the Glory of Heaven will consist in clear, distinct, and endless Views of the infinitely glorious Perfections of God, as exercised in our Redemption, and as they shine thro' the Person of the Mediator.

III.) We shall always behold the Glory of Christ our dear Redeemer. He who was crowned with Thorns for our Sakes, we shall have the Satisfaction of viewing seated on a Throne of Majesty, and crowned with Glory, and surrounded with the whole Number of the Elect of God, and Myriads of holy Angels, all uniting in joyful Songs of Praise to him for his redeeming Love to us miserable and worthless Creatures. . . .

IV.) We shall have a constant and full Perception of the Love of each divine Person to us, and of the infinite Delight Father, Son, and Spirit will eternally take in our complete Felicity. It is Matter of Joy to the divine Persons to do us Good now, and when the Design of our Salvation shall be completed, our Souls will have a ravishing Sense of that Pleasure, which arises to them from the Accomplishment of that gracious Design. The divine Persons *rejoice over us to do us Good* [Deuteronomy 30:9], as we are the Objects of their infinite Affection and Love. . . .

That alone desires the Enjoyment of Heavenly Glory, which is a true Preparation for it, and is the real Commencement of it in the Soul, *viz*. that gracious, holy, and spiritual Principle which is implanted in a Person, at the Time of Regeneration, and is Regeneration itself. . . . *[N]o Man, without Holiness, shall have this happy Sight of God.* No Man whatever, let him be what he may, as to Descent, Education, State Gifts, Usefulness to others, whether in the Civil or Religious Life, unless he partakes of Holiness in this, he shall not participate of Happiness in the next. As God designed all to become Subjects of Holiness in this World, whom he appointed to eternal Salvation; so holy Persons *only* are capable of that Glory, which consists in the Vision of him, Communion with him, and in a constant Adoration of him, which is maintained in the Mind by a Perception of his infinitely glorious Excellencies and Perfections; and, consequently, no Man, without Holiness, shall ever see the Lord.

E. THE OLD MAN CRUCIFIED

By Charles H. Spurgeon.[3922]

[3922] Sermon #882, delivered on Sunday Evening, April 11, 1809, at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Newington. The portion of Scripture read before the sermon was Romans 6. Brackets in the text define a few rarely used words in both this sermon by Spurgeon and the sermon that follows it by Thomas Boston.

"Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him." — Romans 6:6.

Every new man is two men; every believer in Christ is what he was and not what he was: the old nature and the new nature exist at the same time in each regenerate individual. That old nature the apostle calls a man, because it is a complete manhood after the image of fallen Adam; it has the desires, the judgment, the mind, the thoughts, the language and the action of man, as he is in his rebellious estate. He calls it the "old man," because it is as old as Eden's first transgression, it is as old as we are; it is the nature born with us, the natural depravity, the fleshly mind which we inherited from our parents. It is tainted by the old serpent, and bears within it a dread propensity to his old sin. When Adam first plucked of the forbidden fruit, sin polluted our race, and the original stain abides in all mankind; it is manifest in the most ancient history, and continues to reveal itself all along the page of the story of this blighted world. The old nature, then, is what the apostle means. The lusts of the flesh, the carnal desires, the affections of our estranged hearts, these he calls the old man. I am much mistaken if every Christian does not find this old man still troubling in him. He has a new nature which was implanted in him, as through the Spirit's sacred working he was led to hate sin and believe in Jesus to his soul's salvation. It is the heavenly offspring of the new birth, the pure and holy result of regeneration. That new nature cannot sin, it is as pure as the God from whom it came, and like the spark which seeks the sun, it aspires always after the holy God from whom it came;[3923] **I need to consider taking this out or changing it (??)** its longings and its tendencies are always towards holiness and God, and it utterly hates and loathes that which is evil; so that finding itself brought into contact with the old nature, it sighs and cries as the apostle tells us, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Hence a warfare is set up within the believer's bosom; the new life struggles against the old death, as the house of David against the house of Saul, or as Israel against the accursed Canaanites. The enmity is irreconcilable and lifelong. As the Lord hath sworn to have war with Amalek throughout all generations, so doth the holy seed within the saint wage war with inbred sin so long as it remaineth. Neither nature can make peace with the other. Either the earthy water must quench the heavenly fire, or the divine fire, like that which Elijah saw, must lick up and utterly remove all the water in the trenches of the heart. It is war to the knife, exterminating war.

In the text the apostle says that the old nature is in every believer crucified with Christ. I take the liberty also to refer you to two or three words which occur in the verse

---

[3923] It should be noted that this is not the teaching of 1 John 3:9, which is an affirmation that the Christian is unable to practice a lifestyle of sin, because the dominion of sin has been broken in him. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin [as a lifestyle, Gk. "is not doing/practicing sin"]; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin [as a practice of life, Gk. "he is not able to be sinning"], because he is born of God. πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει· καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται. 1 John 3:9 is not an affirmation about a certain portion of the Christian, but about the Christian himself—because he has a new nature, he *as a person* cannot continue in the permanent practice of sin. However, there is a sense in which this sentence of Spurgeon's statement contains truth, in that what the believer has that comes directly from the hand of God is itself perfectly pure and holy, as God cannot sin, nor lead into sin or create sin in any man.

before the text, where he speaks of baptized believers as having taken upon themselves the likeness of Christ's death; and then he speaks of the old man being crucified, which was Christ's death, and therefore without straining the text we may gather from it, that the old man in us dies in the same way as Christ died — that the death of Christ on the cross is the picture of the way in which our old corruptions are to be put to death.

That shall make our first point, the old nature crucified; the second point shall be, that if ever the old nature be put to death at all, it must be with Christ — we are crucified with him; the old man is crucified with him; and then, in the third place, we shall have some practical and solemn applications to make.

I. Now, first, THE OLD MAN IS TO DIE, BUT IT IS TO DIE IN THE LIKENESS OF CHRIST'S DEATH BY CRUCIFIXION.

1. What kind of death was that? First, our Lord died a true and real death. There were certain heretics who disturbed the early Christian church, who said that our Lord did not really and actually die; but we know that he died, for his heart was pierced by the spear, and the flowing of the blood and water proved that he was in very deed most truly dead. Moreover, the Roman officer would not have sanctioned that the body should be given up if he had not made sure that he was dead already, and even made assurance doubly sure by piercing our Lord's most blessed side. Christ really and truly died, there was no sham or make-believe; it was no phantom which bled, and the atoning death was no syncope [a temporary loss of consciousness caused by a fall in blood pressure] or long swoon. Even thus it must be with our old propensities, they must not pretend to die, but actually die; they must not be restrained by holy customs; they must not be mowed up by temporary austerities, or laid in a trance by fleeting reveries, or ostentatiously buried alive by religious resolves and professions, they must actually die, and die a real and true death before the Lord and within our souls. Sometimes persons who are really alive appear as dead, because death reigns over a part of their bodies; the heart beats exceedingly indistinctly, the pulse is but faintly felt, the lungs are languidly heaving; they lie in a state of coma, their hands are powerless as those of a corpse, and their eyes are closed, and every member palsied; yet they are not dead, because they are in some measure, and really and truly, as to their vital organs, still in the land of the living. So have I known some that have given up a part of their sins; they have been persuaded to renounce the grossest vices, or the more abominable lusts, but yet they have never made a clean renunciation of all their sins; they have never actually within their hearts, in all integrity of purpose, given up every false way; they still indulged some one or other sin secretly; or, if they have not carried their desires into practice, they have, at least, a secret goodwill towards evil, a love towards some sweet sin in the core of their heart of hearts. O my brethren, this must, with those who are renewed in the spirit of their minds, the old nature must, so far as our will is concerned, endure a real crucifixion. No man shall enter heaven while one propensity to sin lies in him, for heaven admits nothing that pollutes; and, further, no man should expect to enter the abode of bliss while he cherishes and desires to keep alive a solitary sin within him. I do not say that no one is a saved soul who is not perfect here; God forbid I should thus [belie] the hopes of the faithful and the word of God; but I do say, that you must desire perfection, will it, and seek it, or grace is not in

you. I do not say that any man lives perfectly and absolutely free from sin in this life; but I do say that no man is a Christian who does not wish it to be so with him. There must be in our soul a wish, deep, hearty, thorough, real, for the death of every sin of every sort, or we are not in union with Christ. Our prayer must be —

"Return, O holy Dove! return,
Sweet messenger of rest!
I hate the sins that made thee mourn,
And drove thee from my breast.

The dearest idol I have known,
Whate'er that idol be,
Help me to tear it from thy throne,
And worship only thee."

I beseech you be careful on this point, for let mere creed-lovers prate as they will, "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Sin must be slain. You must utterly hate evil. Sin must be to you as a condemned, detestable thing, to be hunted down and put to death, or else the life of God is not in you. No mere professions or shams will suffice; sin must really and truly be crucified.

2. The death of our Lord, in the next place, was a voluntary death. He said, "I lay down my life for the sheep .... no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." Jesus need not have died, he could have come down from the cross and saved himself, but he willingly gave himself up a sacrifice for our sins. Brethren, such must essentially be the death of sin within us, it must be on our parts, as we put it to death, perfectly voluntary. Oh, what a sieve is this in which to sift the chaff from the wheat! Some men part with their sins with the intention of corning back again to them if they can, as the dog returns to its vomit and the sow to her wallowing in the mire; or they part with them as of old the oxen parted with their calves at Bethshemesh, lowing as they went because of the calves they had left behind; like Lot's wife they set out to leave Sodom, but their eyes show where their hearts would be. How many a drunkard has given up his cups because he would otherwise have lost his situation or been laid by with illness! how many a foul liver has renounced a vice because he felt that it was too great a strain upon his constitution, or brought too much shame upon him! they drop their sins as the dog does the meat when it is too hot to hold, but they love it none the less; they will be back when it cools. Such sinners leave sin as Orpah did Moab, but they soon find opportunity to return. They fight sin as stage-players fight on the stage; it is mimic conflict, they do not hate sin in reality. Ah! but friends, we must have our whole hearts burning with an intensity of desire to get rid of our sins; and such intensity we shall be sure to feel if there be a work of grace in our soul wrought by the Holy Ghost. To will is present with us. Nay, we are not merely willing, that is a poor cold term, we are vehemently desirous, insomuch that we would be content to give up our eyes and live in lifelong blindness if we could but be wholly delivered from our sins. There is no martyrdom to which any saint would be reluctant to subject himself if he could thereby escape from the tenfold plague of his daily corruptions and temptations. I would make no bargain with God if he

would leave me free from sin; it should be left to him whether I should shiver amid northern ice, or stagnate in a poor-house, or lie in prison till the moss grew on my eyelids, or quiver in perpetual fever, if I might henceforth never again in this world fall into a single sin. The execution of sin, then, must be undertaken by us with a willing mind and a vehement determination.

3. At the same time, mark you, in the third place, our Lord's death was a violent death. He was no suicide; he willed to die in obedience to the highest law of his being, which was not self-preservation (which makes it necessary for us to do all we can to live), but consecration to the will of God, and to human welfare; which highest law rendered it necessary for him to die. He died, I have said, voluntarily, but yet by wicked men he was taken, by violent hands and by force put to death. So the crucifixion of sin is voluntary as to the person who crucifies sin; but it is both violent and involuntary as to the sin itself. Believe me, my dear brethren, sin struggles awfully in the best of men; especially besetting sins, and constitutional sins. Outward iniquities are in most cases soon conquered, but inward constitutional sins are hard to overcome. One man is proud, and oh, what prayers and tears it costs him to bring the neck of old pride to the block! Another man is naturally grasping, his tendency is to covetousness, and how he has to humble himself before God, and to cry out and lament because his gold will stick to his fingers, and will rust and corrode within his soul! Some are of a murmuring spirit, and so rebel against God, and to conquer a spirit of contention and murmuring is no easy task. Envy too, that horrible monster, so obnoxious in a Christian, why, I think I have known God's ministers indulge in it, and it has not always been easy to kill it. To let another star eclipse you in the firmament, or suffer another servant of God to do more for him and to have greater success than yourself, is too often a bitter trial when it should be a theme for joy. Yet, brethren, cost us what it may, these sins must die. Violent may be the death and stern the struggle, but we must nail that right hand, ay, and drive home the nail; we must pierce the left hand too, and fasten the foot, yes, and nail that other foot, and hammer fast the nail; and while the struggling victim seeks to live, we must take care that no nail starts, but run to the Master, if it must be so, and pray him to drive the nails yet closer home, that the monster of the old man may not in any one of its members regain its liberty. It will be a violent death, indeed, if my inward experience be rely sample of what we are to expect.

4. In the fourth place, crucifixion was a painful death. The suffering of crucifixion was extreme; all men have put that into their general belief, their language creed, for we say of great pain it is excruciating, that is to say, it is like crucifixion. So the death of sin is painful in all, and in some terribly so. Oh, it has cost some men nights, days, weeks, and months of misery and anguish, to overcome their deeply-seated sins. Read John Bunyan's "Grace Abounding," and see how year after year that wonderful mind of his had red hot harrows dragged across all its fields. The inmost vitals of his spirit were pierced as with barbed shafts; his soul was as a great battle field, covered with armies who trampled it down, tore it up in all directions, and made it tremble with their furious shocks of combat. The new man was struggling against the old death that was within him. Believe me, none of us would wish to go over the same ground again, for the sears remain upon us to this hour. There was a plucking out of right eyes and a tearing off of right arms — and this

hacking and maiming could not be done without poignant suffering; and meanwhile in the case of some of us there was such a horror of darkness concerning our guilt cast over us, that our soul chose strangling rather than life, and it was of the Lord's mercies that our griefs did not utterly consume us. Some, I grant you, are brought unto salvation much more easily, but even they find that the death of sin is painful, at least to this degree, they have a humbling sense of the guilt of sin, they feel bitter regret that ever they should have fallen into it, and they are depressed with great fear and horror lest they should fall into it again. Along the valley of deathshade most, if not all, pilgrims to heaven occasionally wend their way. Sin dies hard; such a hundred-headed hydra has many lives, it will not die without much pain, and the violence of the pain proved the natural vitality of that which is put to death.

5. Brethren, let us remind you of yet another point. The death of our Lord Jesus Christ was an ignominious death. It was the death which the Roman law accorded only to felons, serfs, and Jews; few were condemned to it but slaves; it was not a freeman's death — a nobler execution was allotted to citizens. So our sins must be put to death with every circumstance of shame and self-humiliation. I must confess I am shocked with some people whom I know, who glibly rehearse their past lives up to the time of their supposed conversion, and talk of their sins, which they hope have been forgiven them, with a sort of smack of the lips, as if there was something fine in having been so atrocious an offender. I hate to hear a man speak of his experience in sin as a Greenwich pensioner might talk of Trafalgar and the Nile. The best thing to do with our past sin, if it be indeed forgiven, is to bury it; yes, and let us bury it as they used to bury suicides, let us drive a stake through it, in horror and contempt, and never set up a monument to its memory. If you ever do tell anybody about your youthful wrongdoing, let it be with blushes and tears, with shame and confusion of face; and always speak of it to the honor of the infinite mercy which forgave you. Never let the devil stand behind you and pat you on the back and say, "You did me a good turn in those days." Oh, it is a shameful thing to have sinned, a degrading thing to have lived in sin, and it is not to be wrapped up into a telling story and told out as an exploit as some do. "The old man is crucified with him," who boasts of being related to the crucified felon. If any member of your family had been hanged, you would tremble to hear any one mention the gallows; you would not run about crying, "Do you know a brother of mine was hanged at Newgate?" Your old man of sin is hanged, do not talk about him, but thank God it is so; and as he blots out the remembrance of it, do you the same, except so far as it may make you humble and grateful.

6. Crucifixion was a lingering death. Our old nature has not been put to the death of the sword, or stoning, or burning; it has been crucified; this will bring on a sure death in due time, but it; is slow. A man crucified often lived for hours, and days, and I have read even for a week. Our old man will linger on his cross as long as we are alive on earth. Each one of our sins has a horrible vitality about it. "As many lives, as a cat," John Bunyan said unbelief had; and the like may be said of every sin within us; it is crucified, but; it is not; wholly dead. Expect to have to fight with sin, till you sheathe your sword and put on your crown. I speak with great respect to my dear friends who wear the honorable insignia of old age, but they may let one who is a child compared to them remind them

that old age does not bring with it such a weakening in the man to sin, as to permit them to cease from watchfulness. When passions cannot be indulged, they often rage the more furiously; and if one sin be driven out by change of life, another will often labor to possess the soul in its place. Alas! alas! alas! that men should ever begin to trust to their experience or their acquired prudence, for then they are the most likely persons to fall into sin. Your lusts are crucified, but they live, and there is vitality enough in them to make you rue the day if the nails of grace do not hold them fast, and keep the demons to their tree of doom.

The last remark is, that our Lord died a visible death. It could be discovered that he was dead; so we must put a sins to a visible death. Do not tell me, you men-servants and maid-servants who profess godliness, that you have crucified your sins, when you are such lazy and dishonest servants that your masters and mistresses would be right glad to do without you. Do not tell me, you masters and mistresses, that you have crucified your sins, when you fall into such ugly tempers, and tyrannize over your servants, and treat them like dogs. Do not tell me, you men of business, that your sins are banished, when you help to get up bubble companies, falsify your weights and measures, defraud your creditors by villainous bankruptcies, or grind the faces of the poor. Do not sneak into this Tabernacle — or rather, if you come at all, do sneak in, for you ought to wear a hang-dog look, if you answer to this description. Do not come into prayer-meeting, and pray with the saints, if you are behaving as unregenerate sinners do. If there is no visible difference between you and the world, depend upon it there is no invisible difference. I have generally found that a man is not much better than he looks, and if a man's outward life is not right, I shall not feel bound to believe that his inward life is acceptable to God. "Ah, sir," said one in Rowland Hill's time, "he is not exactly what I should like, but he has a good heart at bottom." The shrewd old preacher replied, "When you go to market and buy fruit, and there are none but rotten apples on the top of the basket, you say to the market woman, 'These are a very bad lot.' Now, if the woman replied, 'Yes, they are rather gone at top, sir, but they are better as you go down,' you would not be so silly as to believe her, but would say, 'No, no, the lower we go, the worse they will be, for the best are always put on the top.'" And so it is with men's characters; if they cannot be decent, sober, and truthful in their daily life, their inner parts are more abominable still; the deeper you pry into their secrets the worse will be the report. O dear hearers, do be sincere in renouncing outward sin. Ye sinful men, put away your drunkenness, your swearing, your lying, your fornication, and uncleanness. These must be nailed up before God's sun in open day. Let all men know by your outward conduct that you are dead to sin, and cannot live any longer therein.

II. There was much room in this first point to have enlarged, but I must not, for time flies so swiftly. This crucifixion of the old nature is, let us remember, WITH CHRIST.

The old man was crucified with Christ representatively. Christ represented the [saints]. When he died he died for the [saints], and the [saints] died in him, all his people died when he died representatively. Christ's dead body represents to us in its death the death of our old man; and virtually and before God the body of this death died for each of us when Jesus died. We have not the time, however, to go into that doctrine, but the

experience is what I would say a word upon. Depend upon it, my dear brethren, if ever our sins are to die, it must be with Christ. You will find you cannot kill the smallest viper in the nest of your heart if you get away from the cross. There is no death for sin except in the death of Christ. Stand and look up to his dear wounds, trust in the merit of his blood; love him, love him with a perfect heart, and sin-killing will not be difficult. You will hear the Savior say, "Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines;" and you will note his words, take us, not do you take them, but take us. Come with me, says the spouse, we will go together, and we two will do it. Your killing of your sin is not in your power, but if Jesus go with you, it will be done. I have known some people struggle against a horrible temper, and they never quite overcame it until they grew into closer communion with Christ. Some dispute the doctrine before us, and assert that contemplations of death are the most effectual helps in overcoming sin — very likely; others have thought that the study of the beauties of holiness might do it — it may be so; but in my experience the mightiest gun to blow down the Sebastopol of sin within me is to flee to the cross of Christ. I am persuaded that nothing but the blood of Jesus will kill sin. If you go to the commandments of God, or to the fear and dread of hell, you will find such motives as they suggest, to be as powerless in you for real action, as they have proved themselves to be on the general world; but if you remember gratefully that the first death of sin in you was by the blood of Jesus, you will firmly believe that all the way through you will have to overcome by the same weapon.

"Tears, though flowing like a river,
Never can one sin efface;
Jesus' tears would not avail thee —
Blood alone can meet thy case;
Fly to Jesus!
Life is found in his embrace."

See you yonder blood-washed host, as without spot or wrinkle they stand before the throne of God, ask them whether they had to fight with sin, and they will tell you that they were men of like passions with us. Ask them how they overcame sin; ye glorious ones, out of what armoury did you take your weapons, and who girded you for the sacred conflict? —

"I ask them whence their victory came?
They, with united breath,
Ascribe their conquest to the Lamb,
Their triumph to his death.
They marked the footsteps that he trod,
His zeal inspired their breast,
And, following their incarnate God,
Possess the promised rest."

You must get to Christ, nearer to Christ, and you will overcome sin.

III. I must now conclude with these two observations: First, Christian, here is your practical lesson tonight — Fight with your sins. Hack them in pieces, as Samuel did Agag, let not one of them escape. Take them as Elijah took the prophets of Baal, hew them in pieces before the Lord. Revenge the death of Christ upon your sins, but keep to Christ's cross for power to do it. Think more of Jesus' cross, spend more time in contemplation of his blessed person, of his death and of his rising again; drink in more of his life, and live more upon him. I pray you do this. The words may sound in your ears as very common, and such as you have heard ten thousand times before, but the sense is weighty and all-important. If I had but one sentence that I might utter to you believers, I think I should make it this: live nearer to Christ. All virtues flourish in the atmosphere of the cross, all vices die beneath the shade of the cross; but get away from your Master, and you will be undone.

The other word is to the unconverted. You say you do not care much about death unto sin. Well, then, there is nothing for it but you shall have your choice; if you will not have death unto sin, you shall have sin 'unto death. There is no alternative, if you do not die to sin you shall die for sin; and if you do not slay sin, sin will slay you. As surely as you live, my unsaved hearers, you cannot harbour any sin and go to heaven. Let no man deceive you. I try to preach a very free and open gospel, and these lips have spoken ten thousand invitations to the very chief of sinners; in fact, I never seem to have a more suitable theme for myself than when I am opening mercy's gate very wide, so as to admit the vilest of the vile; still I am bound to tell you, wide as God's mercy is to those who are willing to give up their sins, there is not a grain of mercy in the heart of God towards that man who goeth on in his iniquities. "God is angry with the wicked every day." Bunyan tells us he was one day playing the game of "cat" on Sunday, when a voice seemed to sound in his ears, "Wilt thou have thy sins and go to hell, or leave thy sins and go to heaven?" You have dropped into this Tabernacle, and this is the question I have to put to you, "Wilt thou leave thy sins and go to heaven, or wilt thou have thy sins and go to hell!" I know what you would prefer. You would like to have your sins and heaven too, but it is utterly impossible, not only because God forbids, but because nature forbids. You are sitting in a room with a fire tonight, and the windows are closed, and you say, "I would like to be cool;" put out the fire, then. "No, but I would like to be cool, and yet keep the fire." It cannot be done — nature forbids. And so a lover of sin cannot be a saved soul, not because of any enmity on God's part, but because it is contrary to nature. Sin is a poison, you cannot drink it and yet live the life of grace. If a man love sin, sin is its own punishment; to be an enemy of God is hell. Even if the flames of Gehenna could be quenched, and the pit of Tophet could be closed, yet as long as a man was out of accord with God, there must be a hell; for sin is misery, and only let it develop itself, and evil is sorrow, be it in what breast it may. You have heard of the Spartan youth who concealed a stolen fox under his garment, and although it was eating into his bowels, he would not show it, and therefore died through the creature's bites; you are of that sort, sinner, you are carrying sin in your bosom, and it is eating out your heart. God knows what it is, and you know what it is; now you cannot keep it there and he unbitten, undestroyed. Why keep it there? O cry to God with a vehement cry, God save me from my sin! O bring me, even me, to the foot of thy Son's cross, and forgive me, and then crucify my sin, for I see clearly now that sin must perish or I must. God give thee grace:

dear hearer, not to go to bed tonight till thou hast had thy sins nailed up to Christ's cross. The Lord grant it for his mercies' sake. Amen.

F. THE OLD AND THE NEW MAN IN BELIEVERS[3924]

By Thomas Boston

Rom 6:6.—*Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin*.

The sanctification of sinners is no less a mystery than their justification: the former springing out of the cross of Christ unto them, through the intervention of faith knitting the sinner to a crucified Christ, as well as the latter. Hence the apostle, having asserted the insurance of the sanctification of believers, that they shall certainly walk in "newness of life," Rom 6:4; in "the likeness of Christ's resurrection," Rom 6:5—*i.e*., as Christ, during the forty days after his resurrection, lived in the world after a new manner, very different from his manner of life in it before his death—brings the ground of it from the cross of Christ, in the words of the text. In which we have,

1. The ground insuring holiness of life in believers united to Christ: "Our old man is crucified with him." This secures their holiness of life, in such manner as the drying up of the fountain doth the drying up of the streams.

(1.) The state of the fountain of sin is in believers, "Our old man is crucified with him." This supposeth that Christ was crucified; that in believers there is a twofold man, a new man, and an old; for [when he says], "our old man," he intimates that the old man is not the whole man, as in the unregenerate. The new man is the new creature of grace in the believer, or he as renewed. The old man is the corruption of nature, or he as unrenewed. This old man is the fountain of sin in his heart and life.

Now, the state it is in, is a state of crucifixion; it is nailed to the cross, which is a state of death. And its crucifixion is a con-crucifixion with Christ, Gal 2:20, "I am crucified with Christ." In so far as the believer is by faith united to Christ, his old man is nailed to the cross of Christ, to fare here as Christ fared: and that was heavy fare.

(2.) The issue of this state of the fountain of sin in believers. It is twofold.

1*st*, The final issue, "That the body of sin might be destroyed."

The old man is the body of sin, being a complication of the several sinful lusts opposite to the holy law, as the body is of members competent to the human frame. Now, the final issue of this state of the old man, the body of sin, is its destruction and utter ruin. Crucifixion is not present death indeed, but it is sure and certain death. Pilate would have "chastised Christ, and released him," Luke 23:16, but the Jews would have him crucified, for that would carry him quite away from among them: even so the old man is not to be

---

[3924] The Puritan Thomas Boston preached this insightful sermon on Romans 6:6 at a time the Lord's Supper was being celebrated at Maxton, in A. D. 1729. The text is from Boston's *Works,* vol. 6, pgs. 319-327; elec. acc. *Encyclopedia Puritannica Project* CD. Bealton, VA: 2006. The content of the sermon is, overall, excellent, although Scripture does not call the Supper a sacrament, but an ordinance (1 Corinthians 11:2, 17ff.). Thus, the word "sacrament" has been replaced in the text of the sermon with Biblical terminology. Replacements have been indicated by brackets, which also, as indicated in a footnote on the Spurgeon sermon above, follow and define a few rarely used words.

corrected and amended, but destroyed quite and clean.

2*dly*, The intermediate issue, "That henceforth we should not serve sin;" that from the moment of our union with Christ we should not serve sin any more, voluntarily living in it, and giving up ourselves to it as its servants, to live and act for satisfying it, as we did before. The old man may live long on the cross before he be destroyed: but then his hands and feet cannot serve him as they did before; there are nails driven through them; he may move them indeed, but then it is with pain and difficulty. So was it with Christ; he behooved to recommend his mother to the care of his beloved disciple John, for that his own hands and feet were not at liberty to act and go for her as formerly.

2. The certainty concerning this ground, "Knowing this." It is not a matter of uncertain hope, but known for truth. It could not be known by sense; no bodily eye could discern our old man on the cross with Christ: nor yet by rational deduction from natural principles; for the whole mystery of Christ is supernatural. Therefore, it is known by faith upon divine testimony; it is a conclusion of faith to be laid down for invigorating us in all our endeavours after holiness of life, and to be firmly held and stuck by in all our struggles with the old man, as ever we would desire to make head against him.

That I may touch the several purposes of this text, I shall offer them in several doctrines to be briefly handled.

Doctrine I. There is in believers united to Christ a new man, a holy principle; and an old man, a fountain of sin.

I. Why the holy principle and the corrupt nature in believers are called the *new* and *old man*?

1. They are called *men*, because each of them possesseth the whole man, though not wholly. There are, by their means, two I's in every believer, Rom 7:15, "For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate that do I." There is not one part of the man that is in Christ, but grace has a part of it, and corruption has a part of it: as in the twilight there is light over all, and darkness over all too, the darkness being mixed in every part with the light. So my renewed part is I, a man having an understanding enlightened, a will renewed, affections spiritualized, using my body conformably: but my unrenewed part is I too, having an understanding darkened, a will rebellious, affections corrupted, and using my body accordingly.

2. They are called the *new* and *old man*, for two reasons.

(1.) Because the *new* nature is brought in upon the corrupt principle, which was the first possessor. The corrupt nature is of the same standing with ourselves from the conception and birth, and possessed us alone till our union with Christ by faith. And then only came in the *new* nature, and that made the former old.

(2.) Because of their different originals; the one being in us from the corrupt first Adam, the other from the holy second Adam. So the believer, looking on the corruption of his nature, may call fallen Adam father; and on the new creature in him, he may call Christ father. The second Adam coming after the first, made the first old: so the produce of them in us is the old and new man accordingly.

II. How the believer comes to be thus split in two, two men. This is done by virtue of his union with Christ, from whence ariseth a communication of grace to him from Christ, 1 Cor 1:30, "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us

wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Concerning which, two things are to be noted.

1. That in the moment of one's union with Christ by faith, there is communicated to him, out of the fulness of grace in the man Christ, a measure of every grace in him, as the wax impressed receives every point in the seal. John 1:16, "And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." Eph 4:13, "Till we all come unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." And thus is the new creature formed, being a new man perfect in parts, entire or having all its members, no grace totally wanting.

Hence it is that the new man is formed immediately after Christ's image, so that it is the very picture of the man Christ, as Eve was of Adam. Therefore, the forming of it is said to be the forming of Christ in the believer, Gal 4:19.

2. That yet there is not then, nor during this life, communicated to the believer a full measure of any grace, 1 Cor 13:9, "For we know in part." So all the graces, being imperfect, though they remove sin as far as they go, they cannot fill up the room in any part, mind, will, or affections. And thus is there an old man left in the believer still, Rom 7:14, which is the image of the first Adam, from whom the corruption composing it is derived.

Use 1. Hence see, that the believer's life while here cannot miss to be a struggling life, Gal 5:17, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." The believer is like Rebekah in another case, the two men struggle in him; and like the two armies in the Shulamite.

Use 2. See here the rise of the peace and easy life of it most men have. The flesh in them has no competitor. In the state of glory, grace has all, so there is a perfect peace: in the state of nature, corruption has all, so there is peace too; except what is marred by the struggle between the flesh in one part lusting, and the flesh in another part fearing, as in Balaam, 2 Pet 2:15, "who loved the wages of unrighteousness." Compared with Num 22:18, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more." Whereas the struggle in the believer is betwixt the flesh and Spirit in the same part willing, and willing the same thing of their proper motion, Rom 7:15-16 forecited.

Doctrine II. The old man in believers is a body of sin, an entire body, lacking none of its members, Rom 7:24, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" This appears from the account of it already given. As we derive every grace from the second Adam in our regeneration, so every corruption from the first Adam in our natural generation.

Use 1. This may serve to humble believers, when they are at their best. There is an entire body of sin in them while they are here. Do they excel in any grace? yet there is in them a member of the old man opposite to it, as passion in weak Moses. Have they every grace in them? They have every corruption too, though every one does not appear, more than every grace. Therefore, they have need to watch against all sin whatsoever; for there is never a snare in the ill world but there is a member of the old man ready to fall in with it. Col 3:6, "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness," etc.

Use 2. No wonder the believer groans being burdened, having a whole body of sin carrying about with him. And they that groan not under it are certainly all flesh; no new man in them. If ye belong to Christ ye cannot want an errand to him for sanctification. Ye have a body of sin to lay before him, which he alone can destroy.

Doctrine III. The old man in believers is crucified with Christ. This bears two things.

I. Christ was crucified. He not only died for us, but died for us the cursed, painful, shameful, lingering death on the tree of the cross; which we are met to commemorate. Christ was put to this death for us, rather than another kind of death.

1*st*, That the first sin that let in all sin into the world might be the more clearly read in the punishment. When ye consider the awful and tremendous dispensation of the Son of God, the second Adam, hanging naked on a tree, and dying there at great leisure in exquisite pain, can ye miss to see the fiery wrath of God against the sin of that naked pair in paradise, pleasuring themselves in the fruit of the forbidden tree, and in an instant defacing the image of God in them?

2*dly*, That the whole world might see what a low and hard state Christ took on him, putting himself in our room. We were bondmen under the curse, and Christ took on him our state of servitude, and that under the curse becoming a bondman for us under the curse, Phil 2:7, "He took upon him the form of a servant." Hereof the death on the cross was the sign and badge, being the punishment of slaves, and accursed in the law. And to make way for this circumstance, the Jews were subjected to the Romans.

Use 1. Remember a crucified Christ; enter this night deep into the thought of the Son of God hanging, groaning dying on a cross for us. Admire the matchless love in it. Behold the severity of divine justice against sin in it. Prize the salvation so dearly bought, and receive it with thankfulness.

Use 2. Think it not strange, if ye have a crucified life in the world. If ye are Christians, followers of Jesus, why should ye think strange of it, to be thus conformed to your head?

II. The old man in believers is crucified together with him. Here we are to inquire how it is crucified with him; which take in the following particulars.

1. Christ hung on the cross as a public person, a representative of his spiritual seed. For he was the second Adam suffering, as the other the first Adam sinning. So that as they sinned in Adam, they suffered in Christ; the law having them all on the cross in Christ their representative, Gal 2:20, "I am crucified with Christ."

2. Christ hanging on the cross had the body of all their sins upon him, your old man, and my old man. They were on him by the imputation of the guilt of them, though not inherent in him, 2 Cor 5:21, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Therefore, our old man is said to be crucified, not in him, but with him.

3. While he was hanging on the cross, he was meritoriously doing away the guilt of them, and consequently the power, pollution, and very being thereof; inasmuch as the guilt being removed, these must cease of course. For the strength of sin is the law, whereby it stakes down the sinner under the curse, 1 Cor 15:56.

4. The sinner being united to Christ by faith, the merit and virtue of Christ's

suffering on the cross is actually applied to him. So that, his guilt being removed, there is a reigning principle of grace planted in him, going through the whole man, whereby the dominion of sin is broken, Rom 6:14, and the pollution removed so far as that new man goes, Titus 3:6. So that the believer is an image of Christ on the cross, full of grace in him, and of sin on him; but the former working of the latter.

Use 1. See then, O communicants, that the crucifying of the old man, the body of sin, in you, depends entirely on your uniting with Christ by faith. The [ordinance of the Lord's Supper] is appointed to seal and strengthen that union. Therefore, your great business at the table should be, closely to knit with a crucified Christ. The more of that, the more will the death of sin be hastened on. And they that aim not at the destruction of sin in their communicating, while they pretend to remember a crucified Saviour, forget the end of his crucifixion, *viz*. that the body of sin, being crucified with him, might be destroyed.

Use 2. The old man in believers is in a state of death, though not dead outright. It is crucified with Christ. It may move and stir in them, and vehement struggles it may make, as a dying man struggling with the mortal disease: but whatever efforts it make, it is on the cross, whence it shall not come down till it breathe out its last.

Use 3. The practice of religion is painful work; and Christians must not think it strange, that ofttimes they are pained to the heart in it. The saints in glory have no pain in their work; for the old man is destroyed in them: but the saints here have an unrenewed part; and that is on the cross, and cannot but pain them. There are right eyes in them to be plucked out; the man has a painful struggle in denying himself, crossing his own inclinations, wrestling against his own flesh and blood. Providence thrusts a spear into the old man's side, by piercing trials and troubles; it breaks his legs by cutting disappointments from many airths [quarters or locations], to forward his death. This cannot be but painful.

Use 4. The old man is long a-dying out; for crucifying is a lingering death. There must be an exercise of patience in the Christian course; for there may be many a battle ere the complete victory be got. Many a wound the old man will take ere he fall; and after he is worsted again and again, he will get up and renew the battle, till he get the final stroke from the Lord's immediate hand.

It is a grave question, why doth the Lord suffer the old man of sin to dwell in his people after their conversion? Why is not sin quite expelled at the first entry of grace? Our text affords one weighty reason for it, *viz*. that the members may be conformed to the head. Christ did not put off the body of our sins, that by imputation lay on him, at his very first encounter with it: nay, he had a grievous struggle with it for the space of three hours on the cross, till he himself got the first fall, dying by its hand on the cross. Nay, if we reckon rightly, it lay heavy on him the space of thirty-three years; only upon the cross was the heat of the battle, which ended in his death and burial, whereby he put it off quite and clean. So, since imputed sin was on Christ the head all his life, inherent sin is left in believers, the members, all their life. The old man is crucified with him.

Doctrine IV. By virtue of the cross of Christ, the old man in believers shall certainly be destroyed quite and clean at length. Here we may inquire,

I. What destruction is that, that is certainly abiding the old man in believers? It is an

utter destruction of it, with all effects of it, all marks and vestiges of it, all belonging with it to the old Adam.

1. The old man himself shall be destroyed, utterly destroyed, out of all that are Christ's; so that though he has many a time trode them like a field of battle, there shall not be in them the least print of his feet to be discerned, Heb 12:23, "The spirits of just men made perfect." The day will come, when there shall not be the least guilt of it on them, to draw a frown from their Father's face against them, (Isa 33:24, "The people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity"); when it shall have no power to prevail over them in the least: nay, when it shall no more have an indwelling in them, Heb 12:23 forecited; but shall be utterly cast forth as an abominable branch. So the new man shall possess all alone, without a competitor for ever.

2. The sinful vile body derived from old Adam, which brought him down from Adam to us, Ps 51:5, and continues to the end the best friend he has in believers, shall be destroyed for his sake. The soul shall leave the sinful flesh to be carried into the grave, where it shall rot and consume, till it return to the dust again, so as not the least lineament of old Adam's image or likeness shall be discerned on it. And Christ will take the same dust thus purified, and form it anew after his own likeness as Second Adam, Phil 3:21.

3. The visible heavens that covered him, and this earth that bore him, and furnished fuel to his lusts, shall for his sake be set on flames, and reduced to ashes, 2 Pet 3:10, "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burnt up." Compare Gen 3:17, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake." So that it shall no more for ever be to be said, there is the earth where the old man some time lived, and there the heavens that gave him light and air. But Christ will make new heavens and a new earth for the new man, 2 Pet 3:13, "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

4. *Lastly*, All that shall remain of him shall be buried in hell, Rev 20:14, "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." Old Adam brought in the old man into the world, and he spread his poisonous efficacy over all: so that look where ye will, ye shall not see in all this world, that in which there is not sin, or some effect of sin. But then all shall be gathered from off believers, and from off the now groaning creatures, and cast into the lake of fire; so that there shall not be the least sin, nor effect of sin, without the boundaries of hell.

II. When will the old man be thus destroyed? You will easily conceive, from what is said, that destruction will have two periods.

1. At the death of the believer, and not till then. Till then the child of God must wrestle on with it; for so did Christ with it as imputed to him, till death set him free. It is a grave *question*, how come believers to die, being freed from the curse of the covenant of works? *Answer*. They die in conformity to Christ their head; that as death came in by sin, sin may go off by death. It is not dying that does it indeed; for sin goes through death in them that are out of Christ, not moved from off them for all that death can do. But at death, Christ gives the redding stroke betwixt the new and old man, kills the old man outright, as 2 Sam 1:10. And he does it, by letting in a full measure of every grace from himself into the believer, which takes up the whole man wholly; and so the old man is gone in a moment, as the darkness upon the sun's displaying his beams over all.

2. At the end of the world. Then comes the utter abolition of all vestiges of it out of hell.

III. The certainty of it. It is even as sure as the death of Christ could merit its destruction, and as the end of his death cannot be frustrated, and as he rose again from the dead free from the imputed guilt of it, and sits in heaven today without sin so much as imputed to him.

Use. Let the saints then take courage, and renew the battle vigorously with the old man; for the victory will undoubtedly fall to their side. And as for you that are still for keeping the old man's head and heart hale [healthy, whole]; as ye do interpretatively desire none of Christ's cross, it is an argument ye have as little saving interest in it.

Doctrine V. In the meantime, till the old man be destroyed quite and clean by virtue of the cross of Christ, by virtue of the same cross the believer shall not be a servant to the old man more. That is the present piece of freedom from it the believer has.

1. The believer has heartily given up with him for a master. Some time he said, as Exod 21:5, "I love my master,—I will not go out free." But now he hates him mortally, and would fain be altogether free at any rate, Rom 7:24, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" The very being in the house with the old man is a burden.

2. He will get no work, but forced work, off his hand more, Rom 7:15, "For that which I do, I allow not," etc. He will not yield his members to the old man voluntarily, as before, Rom 6:13, "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin." He will never get work with whole goodwill at his hand more, but half will at most.

Use. This writes death to such as have given their hand to Christ at his table, and are ready to go back into the service of their lusts. If from henceforth ye enter not into a struggling life against sin, ye have not felt the virtue of Christ's cross.

Doctrine VI and lastly. Believers should go out against the old man in acts of holiness, in the faith that he is a crucified man; *i.e*., believe your old man is crucified with Christ, and in this belief bestir yourself against him in the use of appointed means. If you believe it not, how can your hands be strong, having all to do yourself alone? But believe it firmly, and it will make you as a giant refreshed with wine.

VII. Bibliography[3925]

[3925] The inclusion of a work in this bibliography is by no means an endorsement of its contents or its theological position. Mentioning all the theological and other errors of those included in the bibliography, from the annihilationism of the Anglican minister Hughes, (*The True Image,* pgs. 394-407), to Bacchiocchi's Seventh Day Adventist heresies, to the baptismal regeneration of Alford, to the theological modernism of authors of lexica such as BDAG and writers such as J. Vyrnwy Morgan, to the antinomianism of Hodges, to the questionable historical reconstructions found sometimes in the woman minister Henrie, would be difficult. This author believes that a separatist, militant, historic Baptist perspective correctly represents the position of Scripture, and the theology presented in a systematic theology such as Robert Sargent's *Landmarks of Baptist Doctrine* is very close to that of the Bible.

In relation to the points of the TULIP of Calvinism, Scripture teaches that man is pervasively and awfully depraved in his entire being before regeneration (Ephesians 2:1-3; Genesis 6:5), and nobody will

exercise saving faith without the enablement of grace (John 6:44; Romans 3:11). Nevertheless, prevenient grace is given to all men (John 12:32) to enable them to respond to the gospel positively and receive the gifts of repentance and faith (2 Timothy 2:25; Philippians 1:29) from the Spirit through the Word (Romans 10:17) since God is not willing that any perish (2 Peter 3:9; 1 Timothy 2:4). Personal election to salvation (cf. Romans 16:13) is based upon foreknowledge (1 Peter 1:2), which is not synonymous with foreordination. While there is a special sense in which Christ died for "me" (Galatians 2:20), for the congregation of immersed believers (Ephesians 5:25), and for the elect (Romans 8:32), Scripture plainly states that Christ died for all men (1 John 2:2; 1 Timothy 2:6) including specifically those who are never born again (2 Peter 2:1). The grace of God is resistible, not irresistible (Acts 7:51; Matthew 23:37). All believers are eternally secure and are preserved by the power of God from both hell and the domination of sin (John 10:27-30), so that no regenerate person ever can be eternally lost (Romans 8:28-39) or, during his earthly life, totally unchanged and exactly like the unregenerate (Ephesians 2:10).

John 12:32 affirms that the Lord Jesus draws "all men" to Himself, employing the same verb for drawing (ἕλκω) as that which is employed to state that nobody can come to Christ without being drawn (John 6:44). The Calvinist contention that John 12:32 should be altered to affirm that Christ draws not "all men," but "all the elect," is purely gratuitous. There is no exegetical or syntactical basis whatsoever for changing the "all men" of John 12:32 to "all the elect," nor does any similar text with πᾶς provide exegetical support for such an alteration—the Calvinist view of John 12:32 is eisegesis, not exegesis. On the other hand, there are sound exegetical reasons for supplying "men" with the "all" in John 12:32 and many other texts with the like syntax—including, it is worthy of note, every related text in John's gospel (compare John 1:7 & 9; John 2:24 & 2:25; John 3:26 & 27; John 5:23 & 5:21-22; John 11:48 & 12:19; John 13:35 & 17:21; also Luke 9:23 & 25; Acts 21:28 & 22:15; Romans 16:19 & 1:8; Ephesians 3:9 & 3:5; 1 Thessalonians 3:12 & 5:14-15; 2 Timothy 2:24 & 2 Timothy 2:25-26; 1 Timothy 2:4; Titus 3:2; 1 Peter 2:17 & 2:15; etc.)

Furthermore, there is no evidence in the New Testament or in extrabiblical Koiné that the noun *foreknow* (πρόγνωσις) or the verb *to foreknow* (προγινώσκω) mean anything other than precognition. The Calvinist contention that the words really signify *predetermine* or something of the sort are arbitrary, and no such meaning for the word appears in the Liddell-Scott Greek lexicon, since in that work theology is not driving the meaning assigned to these words. In all the clear instances, the words simply signify precognition, and no text requires a different meaning, either in the NT (Acts 2:23; 1 Peter 1:2, πρόγνωσις, Acts 26:5; Romans 8:29; 11:2; 1 Peter 1:20 (the perfect tense probably explains the translation in the KJV); 2 Peter 3:17, προγινώσκω), the LXX (Judith 9:6; 11:19, πρόγνωσις, Wisdom 6:13; 8:8; 18:6, προγινώσκω), or elsewhere (cf. 1 Clement 44:2; 2 Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 32:4; Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho 1:39, 92, 134; Josephus, Antiquities 8:234, 418; 13:300; 15:373; 17:43; 18:201; Apion 1:232, πρόγνωσις, Shepherd of Hermas 31:4; 66:5, Apology of Justin 1:28, 43, 45, 49, 53; Trypho 1:42, 70, 77, 140–141; Athenagoras, Resurrection 1:2; Josephus, Antiquities 1:311; 2:86; 4:121; 5:358; 6:54, 348; 7:57; 8:419; 13:175; 16:214; 18:218; War 1:55, 608; 2:159; 3:484; 4:236; 6:8; Life 1:106; Apion 1:204, 256; Pseudo-Hecateus 6:23; προγινώσκω). Nor is it valid for the Calvinist to assume that senses of other words, such as *know*, uniformly transfer to the noun and verb *foreknow* (by such reasoning, βαπτίζω could be made to signify "to dye" because the verb derives from βάπτω, which has this meaning); rather than making such an assumption, the actual words for *foreknow*, which are common enough, must themselves be analyzed. While John 15:16, isolated from other texts of Scripture, is certainly consistent with an unconditional personal election to salvation, it does not require such a doctrine, even if one assumes that election to salvation, rather than the election of the twelve to their apostolic office, is in view. The syntax "ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," while it certainly places the emphasis upon God's choice of man, does not require the exclusion of all activity on the part of humanity any more than Paul's "the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do" (Romans 7:19) means that Paul did no good at all, or the statement that "it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you" (Matthew 10:20; Mark 13:11) excludes human speech entirely.

Furthermore, while regeneration and faith are temporally simultaneous, the new birth is logically subsequent to faith (cf. John 3:1-21). Scripture neither teaches the soteriology of Arminianism nor of TULIP Calvinism. Furthermore, statements advocating baptismal regeneration by Calvin must be unequivocably repudiated and anathematized (Galatians 1:8-9). Calvin taught: "God, regenerating us in baptism, ingrafts us into the fellowship of his Church, and makes us his by adoption . . . whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified . . . forgiveness . . . at our first regeneration we receive by baptism

"A Brief Response to 'An Open Letter to the Leadership of Living Stream Ministry and the "Local Churches."'" Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 2007. Elec. acc. http://LCTestimony.org.

"A Longer Response to 'An Open Letter to the Leadership of Living Stream Ministry and the "Local Churches."'" Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 2008.

Accordance Bible software, OakTree Software, Inc., Palm Springs Drive, Suite 100, Altamonte Springs, FL 32701. http://accordancebible.com. Tools used included:

Apocrypha, King James Version, *Revised English Bible*, & *Revised Standard Version*.

Apocryphal Gospels, The, Greek text prepared by Craig A. Evans, English Translation Craig A. Evans.

Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations, ed. & rev. Michael W. Holmes.

---

alone . . . forgiveness has reference to baptism. . . . In baptism, the Lord promises forgiveness of sins" (*Institutes,* 4:17:1, 4:15:3, 4, 15). "We assert that the whole guilt of sin is taken away in baptism, so that the remains of sin still existing are not imputed. . . . Nothing is plainer than this doctrine" (1547 *Antidote to the Council of Trent,* Reply to the 1st Decree of the 5th Session). Note the discussion in "Were the Reformers Heretics?" and *Heaven Only For the Baptized?* by Thomas Ross, http://sites.google.com/site/thross7, in "Paedobaptism and Baptimal Efficacy," Rich Lusk, *The Federal Vision*, ed. Steve Wilkins & Duane Garner. (Monroe, LA: Athanasius, 2004), and in "Regeneration: A Crux Interpretum," David R. Anderson. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 13:2 (Autumn 00) 43-65. Some advocates of Reformed theology follow Calvin in his error of baptismal regeneration (e. g., "The Bible teaches us that baptism unites us to Christ," pg. 55, *The Federal Vision*; cf. pgs. 89ff., while others reject his doctrine and attempt to explain his statements away (e. g., James J. Cassidy, "Calvin on Baptism: Baptismal Regeneration or the *Duplex Loquendi Modus?* pgs. 534-554 in *Resurrection and Eschatology: Theology in Service of the Church*, ed. Lane G. Tipton & Jeffrey C. Waddington. Cassidy nonetheless has to admit (pg. 546): "[T]here are some quotations that make us scratch our heads and wonder whether [Calvin] did not, in fact, believe in baptismal regeneration"). Baptismal regeneration as the view of the Westminster Standards is advocated by modern Reformed writers in *Reformed Is Not Enough,* Doug Wilson (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2002) pgs. 103-104; Lusk, *Federal Vision*, pgs. 96-99, etc.

Many Calvinists also hold the dangerous soteriological error, based on their view that regeneration preceeds faith, that infants and others may be regenerated, grow up, and go to heaven, without ever conciously coming to a recognition of their lost estate and consiously, for the first time, repenting and believing the gospel. Thus, for instance, John Murray affirmed: "Baptised infants are to be received as the children of God and treated accordingly," citing the Directory of the Public Worship of God prepared by the Westminster Assembly, which affirmed: "The seed and posterity of the faithful, born within the church have, by their birth, interest in the covenant . . . they are Christians" (pg. 56, *Christian Baptism*, John Murray. (Philipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980). Many others even repudiate the necessity of any kind of experimental religion (cf. the discussion in "Historic Calvinism and Neo-Calvinism," William Young. *Westminster Theological Journal* 36:1 (Fall 1973) 48-65 & 36:2 (Winter 1974) 156-173, and the related discussion in "Edwardsean Preparation For Salvation," John H. Gerstner & Jonathan Neil Gerstner, *Westminster Theological Journal* 42:1 (Fall 1979) 5-71). Thus, while it is true that in exceptional and very unusual situations, such as a believer who suffers a mental disease and loses his memory of thirty years of his life, including that portion in which he was converted, when the Reformed affirmed "against the Anabaptists . . . that believers did not have to know, and could not always know, the time of their regeneration" (pg. 74, *Reformed Dogmatics*, Herman Bavinck, J. Bolt, & J. Vriend, vol. 4: Holy Spirit, Church, and New Creation. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), they placed themselves on very dangerous ground.

Aramaic Targums (Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Writings, Neofiti & Esther Sheni, Pseudo-Jonathan, Fragment Targums, Cairo Geniza Texts), text from The Complete Aramaic Lexicon Project. English Translations, Eldon Clem.

Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity, G. Adolf Deismann, trans. Alexander Grieve.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ed. by Karl Elliger, William Rudolph, et al.

Byzantine/Majority Textform Greek New Testament (1991).

Church Fathers: The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 1 and 2, ed. Alexander Roberts, Philip Schaff, et. al.

Christian Apologists, *The,* a digital version of selected works from Jacques-Paul Migne, Patrologiae Graecae (Paris, 1866). Volume 6.

Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, The, Hannah Whitall Smith, as pub. Christian Witness Co.

Dictionary of Early Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century A. D., with an Account of the Principal Sects and Heresies, ed. Henry Wace.

Easton's Bible Dictionary, M.G. Easton.

Expositor's Bible Commentary, gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein.

Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, An, Bruce K. Waltke & M. O'Connor.

King James Version of the Bible.

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (GKC), Wilhelm Gesenius, ed. E. Kautzsch, Eng. ed. A. E. Cowley.

Joüon, Paul & Murakoa, Takamitsu, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew,* rev. English ed. Leiden: Netherlands Institute of Near Eastern Studies, 2005.

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (BDAG), 3rd ed., rev. & ed. Frederick W. Danker.

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains, Johannes P. Louw & Eugene A. Nida, ed. (Louw-Nida)

Greek New Testament: Textus Receptus, Stephanus 1550/Scrivener 1894. *The Greek New Testament: The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*," by the Trinitarian Bible Society.

Greek Pseudepigrapha, The, elec. text Craig A. Evans. English Translation *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. R. H. Charles, and *The Pseudepigrapha (English)*, trans. Craig A. Evans, et. al.

Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, Ludwig Koehler & Walter Baumgarnter, rev. Baumgarnter & Stamm. (KB)

Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. (BDB)

Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary, gen. ed. Chad Brand et. al.

Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon, An, Founded Upon The Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, Liddell & Scott.

An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor.

Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th ed.

New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology, *The*, Edward M. Blaiklock, et. al.

New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, J. D. Douglas, gen. ed.

Septuaginta, ed. by Alfred Rahlfs.

Synonyms of the New Testament, Richard Chenevix Trench.

Thayer's Greek Lexicon, Henry Thayer.

Textus Receptus, Scrivener 1894/Stephanus 1550.

The Theological Journal Library, Version 5, Galaxie Software. Numerous issues of the Journal of Christian Apologetics, Bibliotheca Sacra, Chafer Theological Seminary Journal, Conservative Theological Journal, Emmaus Journal, Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society, Grace Seminary Journal, Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, Master's Seminary Journal, Michigan Theological Journal, Trinity Journal, and the Westminster Theological Journal are included.

Tyndale New Testament (1525), William Tyndale.

Word Biblical Commentary. gen. eds. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, & Glenn W. Barker; OT ed. John D. W. Watts, NT ed. Ralph P. Martin. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson: 1996.

Works of Flavius Josephus, Greek text from the 1890 Niese ed. English Translation *The Works of Flavius Josephus, Complete and Unabridged*, trans. William Whiston.

Works of Philo, Greek text from The Norwegian Philo Concordance Project. English Translation *The Works of Philo, Completed and Unabridged*. New Updated Ed., trans. C. D. Yonge.

Zondervan Pictoral Encylopedia of the Bible, The, gen. ed. Merrill C. Tenney.

Abbott, Jacob J., Review of William E. Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July 1860) 508-535.

Adams, Samuel Hawley, *Life of Henry Foster, M. D., Founder Clifton Springs Sanitarium*. Clifton Springs, NY: Sanatarium Board of Trustees, 1921. Elec. acc.

http://www.archive.org/download/lifeofhenryfoste00adam/lifeofhenryfoste00adam.pdf.

Adams, Stephen & Foster, K. Neill, ed., *Healing Voices: A Narrative of the Acts of God in the Christian and Missionary Alliance; A Celebration of Deliverance Among God's Hurting People*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2000.

Aerts, W. J., *Periphrastica: An Investigation into the use of εἶναι and εἶχειν as Auxiliaries or Pseudo-auxiliaries in Greek from Homer up to the Present Day*. Amsterdam: 1965.

Affirmation and Critique, Vol. 7:2 (October 2002), "Deification."

Alexander, Archibald, *Thoughts on Religious Experience*. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publications, 1844.

Alford, Henry, *Alford's Greek Testament: An Exegetical and Critical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1980 (reprint of 1874 ed.).

Allen, Thomas G., "Exaltation and Solidarity with Christ: Ephesians 1:20 and 2:6." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (1986) 103-120. Elec. acc. http://jnt.sagepub.com/content/9/28/10.citation.

Althouse, Peter, "Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements." Pneuma Foundation, http://www.pneumafoundation.org/print_article.jsp;jsessionid=FE2CF975C0564B213728E3094612A20C?article=/Keswick-PAlthouse.xml&xslt=article_print.xslt.

Anderson, David R., "Regeneration: A Crux Interpretum." *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 13:2 (Autumn 00) 43-65.

Anderson, Gerald H., *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Anderson, Robert Mapes, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Ankerberg, John & Weldon, John, *Can You Trust Your Doctor? The Complete Guide to New Age Medicine and Its Threat to Your Family*. Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1991.

"An Open Letter To the Leadership of Living Stream Ministry and the 'Local Churches'" (http://www.open-letter.org/?gclid=CLWvz7-ZjaECFQkhDQodMQn7NQ),

"At The Keswick Convention," *Latter Rain Evangel* of September, 1922, 12-13. Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

Atkinson, William, "Spirit, Soul and Body: The Trichotomy of Kenyon, Hagin and Copeland." Elec. acc. http://www.tffps.org/docs/Spirit,%20Soul%20and%20Body,%20The%20Trichotomy%20of%20Kenyon,%20Hagin%20and%20Copeland.pdf.

Atwater, Lyman H., "The Higher Life and Christian Perfection." *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* (July 1877) 389-419.

Bacchiocchi, Samuele, *Wine in the Bible: A Biblical Study on the Use of Alcoholic Beverages*. Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 2001.

Bailey, Nathan, *New Universal English Dictionary of Words, and of Arts and Sciences*. London: William Cavel, 1775 (5th ed.).

Barabas, Steven, *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005. Orig. pub. 1952.

Barclay, Robert, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People called Quakers*., 8th ed. London: John Baskerville, 1765.

Barnes, Philip L., "Miracles, Charismata and Benjamin B. Warfield." *Evangelical Quarterly* 67:3 (1995) 219-43.

Bartleman, Frank, *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As it Was in the Beginning*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, n. d. orig. pub. 1925.

Bartleman, Frank, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-day Pentecost*, forward by Vinson Synan. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1980. Orig. pub. 1925, under the title, *How "Pentecost" Came to Los Angeles—How It Was in the Beginning*, with only the introduction and appendices added.

Baptist History Collection CD, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005. Resources accessed the *Confession of 1527, Second London Confession of Faith* of 1677, the *Orthodox Creed* of 1679, the *Philadelphia Confession of Faith* of 1720, the 1847 German *Confession of Faith and Constitution of the Churches of Baptized Christians commonly called Baptists*, the 1879 *French Baptist* Confession, and other listed separately.

Baxter, J. Sidlow, *A New Call to Holiness: A Restudy and Restatement of New Testament Teaching Concerning Christian Sanctification*. London: Marshall, Morgan, & Scott, 1967.

Baxter, J. Sidlow, *Our High Calling.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1967.

Bauer, Walter, Danker, Frederick W., & Arndt, William, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed (BDAG). Chicago: IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Bauman, Louis S., *The Tongues Movement*. rev. ed. Winona Lake, IN: Brethren Missionary Herald, 1963.

Beale, G. K. & Carson, D. A., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

Beeke, Joel. R., & Jones, M., *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.

Beeke, Joel R., "Does Assurance Belong to the Essence of Faith? Calvin and the Calvinists." *Master's Seminary Journal* 5:1 (Spring 1994) 43-73.

Beeke, Joel R., *Living for God's Glory: An Introduction to Calvinisim*. Orlando, FL: Reformation Trust, 2008.

Beeke, Joel R., "Personal Assurance of Faith: The Puritans and Chapter 18.2 of the *Westminster Confession*." *Westminster Theological Journal* 55:1 (Spring 1993) 1-30.

Beisner, Cal & Passantino, Robert & Gretchen, *Witness Lee and the Local Church*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Christian Research Institute, 1978.

Berkhof, Louis, *Systematic Theology*, New Combined Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996.

Berkouwer, G. C., *Faith and Sanctification*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952.

Bible, Holy: The Holy Scriptures in the Original Languages: תורה נביאים כתובים*, 1894/1998,* Bomberg/Ginsburg ed. *Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ,* Beza/Scrivener, 1894. London, England: Tyndale House/Trinitarian Bible Society, 1894/1998.

Biblia Sacra Juxta Vulgatam Clementinam (Clementine Vulgate). Elec. ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2005.

Bingham, Rowland V., *The Bible and The Body: Healing in the Scriptures*, intr. W. H. Griffith Thomas. Toronto, Canada: Evangelical Publishers, 1952 (4th ed.; orig. pub. 1921).

Botterweck, G. Johnannes & Ringgren, Helmer, eds, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 7 vol. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1973-95.

Braude, Ann, *Radical Spirits: Spiritualism and Women's Rights in Nineteenth-Century America*, 2nd ed. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2001.

Brown, Francis, Driver, Samuel Rolles, & Briggs, Charles Augustus, *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1951.

Buckley, J. M., *Faith-Healing, Christian Science, and Kindred Phenomena*. New York, NY: The Century Co., 1892. Elec. acc. http://www.archive.org/details/faithhealingchriOObuckiala

Bunyan, John, *Works of John Bunyan*, 3 vol., ed. George Offor. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2006.

Burd, Van Akin, ed., *Christmas Story: John Ruskin's Venetian Letters of 1876-1877*, John Ruskin. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1990.

Burd, Van Akin, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

Blumhofer, Edith L, ed., *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Boardman, Henry, *The "Higher Life" Doctrine of Sanctification Tried by the Word of God*. Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle, 1996.

Boardman, Mrs., *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1887.

Boardman, William E., *Faith Work under Dr. Cullis in Boston*. Boston, MA: Willard Tract Repository, 1874.

Boardman, William E., ed., *Record of the International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness held at the Agricultural Hall, London, June 1-5, 1885*. London: J. Snow & Co., 1885.

Boardman, William E., *The Higher Christian Life*. Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1858.

Boardman, William E., *The Higher Christian Life*. Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1871.[3926]

[3926] The edition of 1871 is somewhat abridged and rewritten from the 1858 edition; page numbers to quotations from *The Higher Christian Life* are, therefore, different in the different editions.

Boardman, William E., *The Higher Christian Life*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1984, photocopied reprint of the 1858 ed.

Boardman, William E., *The Lord that Healeth Thee*. London: Morgan and Scott, 1882.

Bordin, Ruth, *Frances Willard: A Biography*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Boston, Thomas, "Miscellaneous Questions," in *The Complete Works of Thomas Boston,* ed. Samuel McMillan. 12 vol.; 6:99-124; elec. acc. *Encyclopedia Puritannica Project CD*. Bealton, VA: 2006.

Boston, Thomas, "The Old and the New Man in Believers," *The Complete Works of Thomas Boston,* 12 vol.; 6:319-327; elec. acc. *Encyclopedia Puritannica Project CD*. Bealton, VA: 2006.

Boyce, James Petigru, *Abstract of Systematic Theology*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Bradley, John Lewis, ed., *The Letters of John Ruskin to Lord and Lady Mount-Temple*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1964.

Brakel, Wilhelmus á, *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, 4 vol. Trans. Bartel Elshout, ed. Joel R. Beeke. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2007.

Bridges, Jerry, "Gospel-Driven Sanctification." *Modern Reformation Magazine* 12:3 (May/June 2003).

Brine, John, "The Nature of True Holiness Explained In a Discourse, Delivered at a Monthy Exercise of Prayer, with a Sermon, on the Twentieth of April, 1749." Orig. pub. *The Sermons of John Brine*. London: John Ward, Sermon #11. Elec. acc. *The Collected Writings of John Gill,* v. 2.0. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2003.

Bromiley, Geoffrey W., trans. & ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,* ed. Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967.

Bruner, Frederick Dale, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.

Buchanan, James, *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of its History in the Church and of its Exposition from Scripture*. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1997 (orig. pub. 1867).

Burgess, Joseph. A., *A History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19 from 1781 to 1965*. Ph. D. Diss., University of Basel; Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, MI: 1976.

Burkitt, Henry L. rev., Burkitt, Lemuel & Read, Jesse, *A Concise History of the Kehukee Baptist Association*. pub. 1850. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection CD,* ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Burton, Earnest DeWitt, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh: the usages of Πνεῦμα, Ψυχή, and σάρξ in Greek Writings and Translated Works from the Earliest Period to 180 A. D.; and of Their Equivalents* רוּחַ, נֶפֶשׁ, *and* בָּשָׂר *in the Hebrew Old Testament.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918.

Bundy, David, *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements*. Wilmore, KY: B. L. Fisher Library, Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975. Elec. acc. First Fruits Press, 2012, http://place.asburyseminary.edu/firstfruitspapers/2/

Bushnell, Horace, *Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the One System of God*. London: Richard D. Dickinson, 1880.

Cadbury, Henry J., "The Meaning of John 20:23; Matthew 16:19; and Matthew 18:18." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939), 251–54.

Caesar, Julius, *Caesar's Gallic War.* Medford, MA: Harper & Brothers, 1869.

Calvin, John, *Works of John Calvin*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 7: John Calvin Collection,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Carroll, B. H., *Ecclesia*. Emmaus, PA: Challenge Press, n. d. reprint ed.; Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Carroll, B. H., *An Interpretation of the English Bible*, ed. J. B. Cranfill. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1948. Elec. acc. AGES Christian Library Series, Vol. 11, B. H. Carroll Collection. Rio, WI: 2006.

Carson, D. A., "Reflections on Christian Assurance," *Westminster Journal of Theology* 54:1 (Spring 1992) 1-29.

Carter, Huntly, ed., *Spiritualism: Its Present-Day Meaning; A Symposium.* Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott, 1920.

Cathcart, William, *The Baptist Encyclopedia*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Cavallin, H. C. C., "'The Righteous Shall Live by Faith'—A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation." *Studia Theologica* 32 (1978) 33-43.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, *He That is Spiritual*. New York, NY: Our Hope, 1918.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 1." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 91:364 (Oct 34) 390-408.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 2." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 92:365 (Jan 35) 7-25.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 3." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 92:366 (Apr 35) 134-153.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 4." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 92:368 (Oct 35) 394-411.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 5." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 93:369 (Jan 36) 5-25.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 6." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 93:370 (Apr 36) 133-161.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry "The Doctrine of Sin, Part 7." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 93:371 (Jul 36) 263-288.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, *Systematic Theology: Pneumatology*, reprint ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1976.

Chaitow, Leon, auth. & ed., *Naturopathic Physical Medicine: Theory and Practice of Manual Therapists and Naturopaths*. Philadelphia, PA: Elseveir, 2008.

Chamberlain, William Douglas, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1979.

Charnock, Stephen, *The Existence and Attributes of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2000 (reprint of 1853 ed., *Discourses upon the Existence and Attributes of God*).

Chesnut, Glenn, *Changed by Grace: V. C. Kitchen, the Oxford Group, and A.A.* New York, NY: iUniverse, 2006.

Cho, John Chongnahm, "John Wesley's View of Baptism." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7 (Spring 1972) 60-73.

Christian and Missionary Alliance Archives, http://archives.cmalliance.org/; many issues of the *Alliance Magazine* and other CMA resources.

Christian Science Journal XXII:4 (July 1904) 193-256.

Christian Science Journal XXII:8 (November 1904) 457-536.

Clark, Gordon H., *Sanctification*. Jefferson, Maryland: Trinity Foundation, 1992.

Clendenin, Daniel B., "Partakers Of Divinity: The Orthodox Doctrine Of Theosis." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37:3 (September 1993) 365-379.

Cloud, David, "The Delusions of Madame Guyon." Port Huron, MI: Fundamental Baptist Information Service, November 16, 2010. http://wayoflife.org.

Cloud, David, *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, ver. 5.1. Port Huron, MI: Way of Life Literature, 2009.

Cohn-Sherbok, Lavinia, *Who's Who in Christianity*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1998.

Combs, William W., "Filling of the Holy Spirit." Detroit Baptist Seminary lecture, Mid-America Conference on Preaching 2003, on The Ministry of the Holy Spirit. http://www.dbts.edu/5-1/5-12.asp#03.

Combs, William W., "The Meaning of Fellowship in 1 John." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 13 (2008): 3-16.

Compton, R. Bruce, 1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 (2004) 97-144.

Compton, Bruce R., "James 2:21-24 and the Justification of Abraham." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 2 (Fall 1997) 19–45.

Confidence: A Pentecostal Paper for Great Britain, ed. A. A. Boddy. 5 (August 15, 1908). Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

Copeland, Kenneth, *Force of Faith*. Fort Worth, TX: Kenneth Copeland Publications, 1992.

Corum, Fred T. & Sizelove, Rachel A., collectors, ed. Noble, E. Myron, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of "The Apostolic Faith" (1906-1908)*. Washington, D. C.: Middle Atlantic Regional Press, 1997.

Cowper-Temple, Georgina, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple, a biography by his wife, Georgina Cowper-Temple, Baroness*

Mount-Temple, followed by biographical notes by other authors]. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890.

Cramp, J. M., *Baptist History: From the Foundation of the Christian Church to the Close of the Eighteenth Century*. Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1869. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection CD,* ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Cranfield, C. E. B., *On Romans: And Other New Testament Essays*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

Cumming, James Elder, *Through the Eternal Spirit: A Biblical Study on the Holy Ghost*. Chicago, IL: Revell, 1896.

Curtis, Heather D., "Faith Healing, Christian Science, and Kindred Phenomena: Women and Healing in Late-Nineteenth-Century Boston." Elec. acc. http://www.hds.harvard.edu/cswr/resources/print/rhb/first/06.Curtis.pdf

Curtis, Heather D., *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

Dabney, Robert L., "Theology of the Plymouth Brethren. Orig. pub. *The Southern Presbyterian Review,* January, 1872, as part of a review of *God's Way of Peace*, H. Bonar, *Müller's Life of Trust*, ed. Wayland, *Notes on Genesis,* by C. H. M., *Scripture Testimony*, ed. Charles Campbell, *A Word to Young Believers*, W. B., *The Return of the Lord Jesus*, J. G. Bellet, *Waymarks in the Wilderness*. New York: Inglis & Colles. 8 vol, *The Witness,* and *Who are the Plymouth Brethren?* H. Grattan Guinness. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Dabney, Robert L., *Systematic and Polemical Theology*. Elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Dahms, John D., "Dying With Christ." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36:1 (March 1993) 15-23.

Dana, H. E. & Mantey, Julius R., *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York, NY: MacMillan, 1955.

Danker, Frederick William (ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature,* 3rd. ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Darby, John, *Synopsis of the Books of the Bible*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 15: Classic Commentary Collection,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Davies, Gwyn, *A Light in the Land: Christianity in Wales, 200-2000*. Bryntirion, Wales: Bryntirion Press, 2002.

Dayton, Donald W., "Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1974): 60-69.

Dayton, Donald W., ed, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. New York, NY: garland Publishing, 1985. Orig. pub. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

Dayton, Donald W., *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987.

Dayton, Wilber Thomas, *The Greek Perfect Tense in Relation to John 20:23, Matthew 16:19 and 18:18*. Th. D. Dissertation, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1945.

Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887 (Orthodox Quaker). http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml

Dockery, David S., "Romans 7:14-25: Pauline Tension in the Christian Life." *Grace Theological Journal* 2:2 (Fall 1981) 239-258.

Dockery, David S., "The Use of Hab. 2:4 in Rom. 1:17: Some Hermeneutical and Theological Considerations." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22:2 (Fall 1987) 24-37.

Duddy, Neil T., *The God-Men: An Inquiry Into Witness Lee and the Local Church*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1981 (2nd ed.).

Duffield, G. P., & Van Cleave, N. M., *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*. Los Angeles, CA: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1983.

Dunnett, Walter M., "Scholarship and Spirituality." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31:1 (March 1988) 1-7.

DuPlessis, J. Du, *The Life of Andrew Murray of South Africa*. New York, NY: Marshall Brothers, 1919.

Earling, Bernard, "The Story of Watchman Nee." *Lutheran Quarterly* 28 (May 1976) 140-155.

Eddy, Mary Baker, *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*. Bedford, MA: 1st ed. 1875.

Edersheim, Alfred, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, orig. pub. 1896.

Edwards, Jonathan, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 2 vol. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Edwards, Jonathan, *The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin Defended; Evidences of Its Truth Produced and Arguments to the Contrary Answered, Containing, in Particular, a Reply to the Objections of Dr. John Taylor.* Elec. acc. Encyclopedia Puritannica Project, CD Version 3.0. Bealton, VA.

Edwards, Jonathan, *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*. Elec. acc. Encyclopedia Puritannica Project, CD Version 3.0. Bealton, VA.

Elbert, P., 'The Perfect Tense in Matthew 16.19 and Three Charismata', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 17 (1974), 149–55.

Elliff, Jim, Review of "*Glory Filled The Land, A Trilogy On The Welsh Revival Of 1904–1905.* Richard Owen Roberts, ed.; H. Elvet Lewis, G. Campbell Morgan and I. V Neprash. Wheaton, IL: International Awakening Press, 1989," in *Reformation and Revival* 8:2 (Spring 1999) 206-213.

Elwell, Walter, ed., *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1984.

Emerton, J. A., "Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining," *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1962), 325–31.

Erickson, Millard. J., *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1998.

Evans, Eifon, *Fire in the Thatch: The True Nature of Religious Revival*. Bryntirion, Wales: Evangelical Press of Wales, 1996.

Fahlbusch, E., & Bromiley, G. W., *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, 4 vol. (466). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

"Faith Cure and Healing Homes List," http://healingandrevival.com/Faith%20Homes.htm.

Feinberg, J. S., & Johnson, S. L., ed., *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments: Essays in honor of S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.* Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1988.

Ferguson, S. B., & Packer, J., *New Dictionary of Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.

Fichman, Martin, *An Elusive Victorian: The Evolution of Alfred Russel Wallace*, Martin Fichman. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Figgis, J. B., *Keswick from Within*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1914.

Figgis, J. B., *Visions; With Addresses on the First Epistle of John.* London: James Nisbet, 1911.

Finney, Charles Grandison, *Finney's Systematic Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 1994 (1878 ed.).

Finney, Charles Grandison, *Sermons on Gospel Themes*. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1876.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. A., "Habakkuk 2:3–4 and the New Testament." In *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

Flavel, John, *The Whole Works of the Reverend John Flavel*, 6 vol. London: W. Baynes and Son, 1820.

Flavel, John, *The Method of Grace: How the Spirit Works*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series vol. 18: Classic Theological Works*. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software Library, 2006.

Forster, Charles, *The Apostolic Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: James Duncan, 1838.

Foster, K. Neill & King, Paul L, *Binding and Loosing: How to Exercise Authority Over the Dark Powers*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1998.

Fraser, James, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification, Being a Critical Explication and Paraphrase of the Sixth and Seventh Chapters of the Romans, and the First Four Verses of the Eighth Chapter, Wherein the True Scope and Sense of that Most Important and Much Disputed Context is Cleared and Asserted, Against the False Interpretations of Grotius, Hammond, Locke, Whitby, Taylor, Alexander, etc.* Edinburgh: J. Ogle; Oliphant, Waugh, & Innes; D. Brown; & W. Whyte, 1813. Elec. acc.

Fryer, A. T., *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905) 80-161. Elec. acc. http://books.google.com.

Fryer, A. T., "The Revival in Wales." *The East and the West: A Quarterly Review for the Study of Missions*. Westminster: Society for the Propogation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, (1905) 174-188. Elec. acc. http://books.google.com.

Full Gospel Sunday School Quarterly, various issues; elec. acc. http://www.cmalliance.org/resources/archives/.

Fullerton, W. Y., *F. B. Meyer: A Biography*, 2nd ed. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, n. d.

Gaebelien, Frank E., ed., *Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990.

Gaede, Charles S., "Glossolalia at Azusa Street: A Hidden Presupposition?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 51:1 (Spring 1989) 77-92.

Gaffin, Richard B., Jr., Saucy, Robert L, Storms, C. Samuel, & Oss, Douglas A., *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today? 4 Views*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry & Wayne A. Grudem. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

Gardiner, A. J., *The Recovery and Maintenance of the Truth*. Kingston on Thames, England: Stow Hill Bible and Tract Depot, 1951.

Garrard, Mary N., *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*. Streetsville, Ontario: Ontario Christian Books, 1989 (1st ed. 1930, under the title *Mrs. Penn-Lewis, A Memoir*, by the Overcomer Book Room).

Gee, Donald, *The Pentecostal Movement: Including the Story of the War Years (1940-1947)*, rev. ed. London: Elim Publishing, 1949.

Geisler, Norman L., *Systematic Theology*, 4 vol. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 2002-2005.

Gerstner, John H. & Gerstner, Jonathan Neil, "Edwardsean Preparation For Salvation." *Westminster Theological Journal* 42:1 (Fall 1979) 5-71.

Gillette, A. D., *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection,* ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Gleason, Randall, "B. B. Warfield and Lewis S. Chafer on Sanctification." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40:2 (June 1997) 241-256.

Goadby, J. J., *Bye-Paths in Baptist History*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection* CD, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Gordon, A. J., *The Ministry of Healing: Miracles of Cure in All Ages*. New York, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1882. Elec. acc. http://www.archive.org/details/ministryofhealin00gordiala.

Gouge, William, *Of Domestic Duties*. *Encyclopedia Puritannica Project*, CD Version 3.0. Bealton, VA. http://www.puritannica.com.

Greene, L. F., *The Writings of the late Elder John Leland*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Griffith Thomas, William Henry, *The Holy Spirit of God*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913.

Griffith Thomas, William Henry, *The Principles of Theology: An Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles*. Elec. acc. http://anglicanbooksrevitalized.us.

Griffith Thomas, William Henry, "The Plan of the Fourth Gospel, Part II." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 125:500 (October 1968) 313-324.

Griffith Thomas, William Henry, "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel, Part I." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 125:499 (July 1968) 254-263.

Griffith Thomas, William Henry, "The Victorious Life (I.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:303) July 1919, 267-288.

Griffith Thomas, William Henry, "The Victorious Life (II.)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:304) October 1919, 455-467.

Grillmeier, Aloys, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chacedon (451)*, vol. 1, trans. John Bowden. Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1975. 2nd ed.

Grillmeier, Aloys, *Christ in Christian Tradition, Reception and Contradiction: The development of the discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the beginning of the reign of Justinian*, vol. 2:1, trans. Pauline Allen and John Cawte. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1987.

Gundry, Stanley N., series ed., *Five Views on Sanctification* (Melvin E. Dieter, Anthony A. Hoekema, Stanley M Horton, J. Robertson McQuilkin & John F. Walvoord, authors). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987.

Gutierrez, Cathy, *Plato's Ghost: Spiritualism in the American Renaissance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Hagin, Kenneth E., *The Believer's Authority*, 3rd ed. Tulsa, OK: Rhema Bible Church, 1986.

Hamel, Ken, *The Online Bible for Mac,* version 3.0. Oakhurst, NJ: Online Bible Software, 1996. Modules used included:

Annotations upon the Holy Bible, Matthew Poole (1700).

Brenton's English Septuagint, Lancelot Brenton (1851).

Commentary on the Bible Adam Clarke (1832).

Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments R. Jamieson, A. R. Faussett, and D. Brown (1871).

Exposition of the Old and New Testament, John Gill (1809).

Exposition of the Old and New Testament, Matthew Henry (1721).

Family Bible Notes, Justin Edwards (1861).

Geneva Bible Notes (1599).

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Joseph Henry Thayer (1889).

Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Brown, Driver, Briggs (1907). (BDB)
Latin Vulgate
King James Version (1769).
Nestle 27/UBS 4 Greek New Testament.
New Testament in the Original Greek according to the Byzantine/Majority Textform (1991).
Notes on the New Testament, Albert Barnes.
Notes on the Old and New Testaments, John Wesley (1767).
Textual and Translation Notes on the Gospels, Jay P. Green (1994).
Textus Receptus, Scrivener 1894.
Textus Receptus, Stephens 1550.
Treasury of David, Charles Spurgeon.
Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament (1881).
Word Pictures in the New Testament, A. T. Robertson.

Hanegraaff, Hank, *Christianity in Crisis*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1993.

Hanegraaff, Hank, pres., "We Were Wrong: A Reassessment of the 'Local Church' Movement of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee.'" *Christian Research Journal* 32:06 (2009)

Harford, *Memoir of T. D. Harford-Battersby, Late Vicar of St. John's, Keswick, and Honorary Canon of Carlisle, Together with some Account of the Keswick Convention, by Two of his Sons*. London: Seeley & Co., 1890.

Harford, Charles F., ed., *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Its Method, and its Men*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1907.

Harford, John Battersby & Macdonald, Frederick Charles, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1922.

Harris, R. Laird, Archer, Gleason L, Jr., & Waltke, Bruce K., eds., *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1999.

Harvey, John, *Photography and Spirit*. London: Reaktion Books, 2007.

Hawkes, R. M., "The Logic of Assurance in English Puritan Theology." *Westminster Theological Journal* 52:2 (Fall 1990) 247-261.

Henke, Frederick G., "The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day." *The American Journal of Theology*, 13:2 (April 1909) 193-206.

Henry, Marie, *The Secret Life of Hannah Whitall Smith*. Grand Rapids, MI: Chosen Books, 1984.

Hervey, W., *Aspasio Vindicated, and the Scripture Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness Defended, in Eleven Letters from Mr. Hervey to Mr. Wesley, in Answer to that Gentleman's Remarks on Theron and Aspasio*. Glasgo: J. & M. Robertson, 1762.

Hervey, W., *Eleven Letters from the Late Rev. Mr. Hervey, to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley, Containing an Answer to that Gentleman's Remarks on Thereon and Aspasio*. 2nd ed. London: J. & F. & C. Rivinot, 1789.

Hiers, Richard H., "'Binding' and 'Loosing": The Matthean Authorizations." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985), 233–50.

Hodge, A. A., *Evangelical Theology*, Elec. acc. i5n *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Hodge, Charles, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vol. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003 (repr. ed.).

Hodges, Zane C., "The New Puritanism Part 1: Carson On Christian Assurance." *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 6:1 (Spring 93) 19-31.

Hoehner, Harold W., *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002.

Hoekema, Anthony A., *Created in God's Image*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.

Hollenweger, Walter J., *The Pentecostals*. London: SCM Press, 1972.

Hollinger, Dennis, "Enjoying God Forever: An Historical/Sociological Profile Of The Health And Wealth Gospel." *Trinity Journal* 9:2 (Fall 1988) 131–149.

Holy Bible, The, Translated from the Latin Vulgate (Douay-Rheims). Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2009.

Hopkins, Evan, *The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1884. Elec. acc. http://www.pembrokebiblechapel.com/pdf/TheLawofLibertyintheSpiritualLifeHopkins.pdf.

Horton, Michael, *Christ the Lord: The Reformation and Lordship Salvation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1992.

Horton, Stanley M., *What the Bible Says about the Holy Spirit*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1976.

Hovey, Alvah, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*. Boston, MA: Henry A. Young, 1885. Elec. acc. http://books.google.com.

Hovey, Alvah, "The Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Examined," in *Studies In Ethics and Religion*. New York, NY: Silver, Burdett & Co, 1892; 344-427.

Hulst, A. R., "Kol basar ...," *Studies in the Book of Genesis*, *Oudtestamentische Studien* 12 (1958): 48–9.

Huffman, Jerry, ed., *Calvary Contender*, Sept. 15, 1994. Huntsville, AL. Elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, vers. 5.1. Port Huron, WA: Way of Life Literature, 2009.

Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe, *The True Image: The Origin and Destiny of Man in Christ*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001.

Hymers, R. L, & Cagan, Christopher, *Today's Apostasy: How 'Decisionism' is Destroying our Churches*. Oklahoma City, OK: Hearthstone Publishing, 2001.

Ice, Tommy, "The Filling of the Holy Spirit: A Quality of Life." *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal* 2:1 (Spring/Summer 1996) 9-11.

Ironside, Harry. A., *Holiness: The False and the True*. New York, NY: Loizeaux Brothers, 1912. 15th printing, 1952.

Jackson, Edna V., *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscenses of the Broadlands Conferences*. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1910.

Jamieson, Robert, Fausset, A. R., & Brown, David, *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997.

Jarrel, W. A., *Baptist Church Perpetuity*. W. A. Jarrel. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Johnson, S. Lewis, Jr., "Studies in the Epistle to the Colossians, Part VI: Beware of Philosophy." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 119:476 (Oct 62) 302-311.

Johnson, S. Lewis, Jr., "Studies in the Epistle to the Colossians, Part X: Christian Apparel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 121:481 (Jan 64) 22-34.

Jones, Brynmor Pierce, *An Instrument of Revival: The Complete Life of Evan Roberts, 1878-1951*. South Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Publishing, 1995.

Jones, Brynmor Pierce, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

Jones, Brynmor Pierce, *Voices from the Welsh Revival: An Anthology of Testimonies, Reports, and Eyewitness Statements from Wales's Year of Blessing, 1904-1905*. Bridgend, Wales: 1995.

Jones, Charles Edwin, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement: A Comprehensive Guide.* Landham, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 2008.

Jones, Charles Edwin, *The Keswick Movement: A comprehensive guide*. Landham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007.

Jones, Charles Edwin, *The Wesleyan Holiness Movement: A Comprehensive Guide*, rev. & exp. ed., 2 vol. Landham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005.

Kaiser, Walter, *The Promise-Plan of God: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.

Kaiser, Walter, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1985.

Kay, Brian K., *Trinitarian Spirituality: John Owen and the Doctrine of God in Western Devotion*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.

Kemble, Howard R. & Weiss, Harry Bischoff, *The Great American Water-Cure Craze: a History of Hydropathy in the United States*. Trenton, New Jersey: Past Times Press: 1967.

Kendrick, Klaude, *The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1961.

Kenyon, E. W., *In His Presence: The Secret of Prayer; A Revelation of What We Are in Christ; A Solution of the Prayer Problem; A New Conception of this Sacred Privilege*. Seattle, WA: E. W. Kenyon, 1945.

Kenyon, E. W., *The Hidden Man: An Unveiling of the Subconscious Mind*. Lynwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1998 (17th printing).

Kenyon, E. W., *The Two Kinds of Knowledge.* Fullerton, CA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing, 1942.

"Keswick and the Higher Life," http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm.

King, Guy H., *The Fellowship*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1954. Elec. acc. http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com/NTStudies/FirstGeneralEpistleofJohnbyGuyKing/tabid/196/Default.aspx

King, Paul, "A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement," *Alliance Academic Review*, ed. Elio Cuccaro. (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1996). Elec. acc. http://allianceacademicreview.com.

King, Paul L., *A Believer with Authority: The Life and Message of John A. MacMillan*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2001.

King, Paul L., *A Case Study of The Authority of the Believer: The Impact of the Life and Ministry of John A. MacMillan*. D. Min. Diss., Tulsa, OK: Oral Roberts University, 2000.

King, Paul L, "John A. MacMillan's Teaching Regarding the Authority of the Believer and its Impact on the Evangelical, Pentecostal, and Charismatic Movements." SPS History Interest Group, Oral Roberts University. Presented at the 30th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies. Elec. acc. http://www.pneumafoundation.org/article.jsp?article=/article_0027.xml.

King, Paul L., *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary Word of Faith Theologies*. Tulsa, OK: Word & Spirit Press, 2008.

King, Paul L., "The Restoration of the Doctrine of Binding and Loosing," *Alliance Academic Review*, 1997. Elec. acc. http://allianceacademicreview.com.

Kinnear, Angus, I., *Against the Tide*. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1973.

Kittel, Gerhard, Bromiley, Geoffrey W., & Friedrich, Gerhard, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964–.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., "What Does It Mean To Be Filled With The Spirit? A Biblical Investigation." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40:2 (June 1997) 229-240.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed., *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007, 20th ed.

Larson, Tim, ed. & Bebbington, David & Noll, Mark, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Law, William, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. London: William Innys, 1729. Elec. acc.

Law, William, *Spirit of Love*. Orig. pub. 1752, 1754. Elec. acc. http://www.iinet.com/~passtheword/DIALOGS-FROM-THE-PAST/sprlove.htm

Lee, Cheul Hee, "Sanctification by Faith: Walter Marshall's Doctrine of Sanctification in Comparison with the Keswick View of Sanctification." Ph. D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2005.

Lee, Witness, *Christ vs. Religion*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1971.

Lee, Witness, *Concerning the Triune God: The Father, the Son, and the Spirit*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1973.

Lee, Witness, *Guidelines for the Lord's Table Meeting and the Pursuit of Life*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 2005.

Lee, Witness, *Pray-Reading the Word*. http://www.ministrybooks.org.

Lee, Witness, "Testimony to Watchman Nee." http://www.watchmannee.org/others-testimonies.html

Lee, Witness, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1998; repr. of 1969 ed., Los Angeles: The Stream Publishers.

Lee, Witness, *The Economy of God*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministries, 2005

Lee, Witness, *The Practical Expression of the Church*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1970.

Lee, Witness, *The Truth Concerning The Trinity: Two Answers By Witness Lee*. Anaheim: Living Stream Ministry, 1976.

Lee, Witness, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of Divine Revelation in the Present Age*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1997.

Leonard, William, *Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews: Critical Problem and Use of the Old Testament*. Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1939.

Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. *Greek-English Lexicon,* 9th ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Lightfoot, John, *The Whole Works of John Lightfoot*, ed. John Rodgers Pitman. London: 1832.

Lightfoot, John, *Lightfoot's Commentaries on the Episties*. OakTree Software, Inc., Palm Springs Drive, Suite 100, Altamonte Springs, FL 32701.

Linder, Jr., William, *Andrew Murray*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 1996.

Link, John B., ed., *Texas Historical and Biographical Magazine,* vol. 1-2. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1.0. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Logos Bible Software, version 4, Portfolio Edition. http://www.logos.com. Tools used included:

Analytical Key to the Old Testament, John Joseph Owens.

Anchor Yale Bible, gen. ed. David Noel Freeman.

Ante-Nicene, Nicene, & Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, & Philip Schaff.

Archaeological Encyclopedia of the Holy Land, The, 3rd. ed., Avraham Negev.

Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling, D. G. Benner & P. C. Hill, 2nd ed.

Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible, W. A. Elwell & B. J. Beitzel.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A., & Funk, R. W., *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (BDF). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bromiley, G. W. & Fahlbusch, E., *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, 5 vol. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999-2003.

Bruce, A. B., *The Humiliation of Christ in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900.

Baker New Testament Commentary Series, gen. ed. S. J. Kistemaker.

Believers Church Bible Commentary, ed. Owen H. Alderfer, Elmer A. Martens, Howard H. Charles, et. al.

Clementine Vulgate

Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible, Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, & David Brown.

Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals, ed. T. Larsen, D. W. Bebbington, & M. A. Noll.

Commentary on the Old Testament, C. F. Keil & F. Delitzsch.

Continental Commentary Series, Fortress Press.

Complete Works, Arthur Pink.

Complete Works, John Bunyan.

Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains, James Swanson.

Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible, 2nd ed.; K. Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. Horst.

Dictionary of Historical Theology, The, gen. ed. Trevor A. Hart.

Easton's Bible Dictionary, M. Easton.

Eerdmans Bible Dictionary, The, ed. A. C. Myers.

Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible, David N. Freedman.

Encyclopedia of Practical Christianity, The, R. A. Morey.

Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon, F. Brown, S. R. Driver, & C. A. Briggs.

Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Horst Balz & Gerhard Schneider.

Exegetical Summary Series, SIL International.

Exhaustive Dictionary of Bible Names, The, ed. Judson Cornwall & Stelman Smith.

Exploring Church History, J. P. Eckman.

Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures, W. Gesenius, ed. & trans. S. P. Tregelles.

Gospel According to St. Matthew, The, Arthur Sloman.
Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament, A, M. Zerwick & M. Grosvenor.
Greek-English Lexicon, A, 9th ed., rev. & ed. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Jones.
Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian literature, A, 3rd ed., (BDAG), ed. W. Arndt, F. Danker, W. Bauer.
Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Based on Semantic Domains, 2nd ed.; J. P. Louw & E. A. Nida.
Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, A, rev. ed., Johan Lust.
Harper's Bible dictionary, ed. P. J. Achtemeier.
Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament, The, ed. Ludwig Koehler & Walter Baumgarnter.
Hermeneia Commentary Series, gen. ed. Frank M. Cross, Hemut Koester, etc.
Holman New Testament Commentary Series, gen. ed. Max Anders.
Holy Bible, The, Translated from the Latin Vulgate.
International Critical Commentary, gen. ed. Driver, Plummer, & Briggs.
International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, The, rev. ed. G. W. Bromiley.
JPS Torah Commentary, The, Nahum M. Sarna, gen. ed.
Let Go and Let God? A Survey and Analysis of Keswick Theology, Andrew D. Naselli.
Lexham Syntactic Greek New Testament: Expansions and Annotations, A. L. Lukaszewski, gen. ed.
Messianic Christology: A Study of Old Testament Prophecy Concerning the First Coming of the Messiah, Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum.
New American Commentary, The, gen. ed. E. Ray Clendenen.
New Bible Dictionary, 3rd ed.; D. R. W. Wood & I. H. Marshall.
New Encyclopedia of Christian Martyrs, The, Mark Water.
New International Commentary on the New Testament, The, gen. ed. Gordon Fee.
New International Commentary on the Old Testament, The, gen. ed. R. K. Harrison.
New International Greek Testament Commentary, The, gen. ed. I. Howard Marshall & Donald A. Hagner.
Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, The, 3rd rev. ed., F. L. Cross & E. A. Livingstone.
Pillar New Testament Commentary, gen. ed. D. A. Carson.
Pulpit Commentary, ed. H. D. M. Spence & Joseph Excell.
Reformed Dogmatics, Herman Bavink, ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend. 4 vol.

Sermons, on Several Occasions, *and to which reference is made in the trust-deeds of the Methodist Chapels, as constituting, with Mr. Wesley's notes on the New Testament, the standard doctrines of the Methodist connexion*, John Wesley.

Soanes C & Stevenson, A., *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 11th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Syntax of the moods and tenses in New Testament Greek, E. D. W. Burton (3rd ed., 1898).

Systematic Theology, A. H. Strong.

Systematic Theology, Charles Hodge.

Systematic Theology, Lewis Sperry Chafer. 8 vol.

Systematic Theology, Norman Geisler. 4 vol.

Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity, Rolland McCune. 3 vol.

The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life: The Unpublished Personal Writings of Hannah Whitall Smith, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Melvin E. Dieter.

The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation, Bruce A. Demarest.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. & ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (TWOT), R. L. Harris, G. L. Archer, & B. K. Waltke.

United Bible Society Handbooks, ed. United Bible Societies.

Vitality of Worship, The: A Commentary on the Book of Psalms, R. Davidson.

Who's Who in Christian History, ed. J. D. Douglas, P. W. Comfort, & D. Mitchell.

Word Pictures in the New Testament, A. T. Robertson.

Literary World, The: Choice Readings from the Best New Books, and Critical Reviews. #703, vol. 28, new series. London: April 20, 1883, reviewing *The Midnight Cry: An Inquiry into the Evidence of the Near Approach of the Second Advent*, by E. McHardie. (London: S. W. Partridge & Co, n. d). Elec. acc. http://books.google.com

Lloyd-Jones, D. M, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors: Addresses Delivered at the Puritan and Westminster Conferences, 1959-1978*. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1987.

Longenecker, Richard N., "'The Faith of Abraham' Theme in Paul, James and Hebrews: A Study in the Circumstantial Nature of New Testament Teaching." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20:3 (September 1977) 203-212.

Lossing, B., ed., *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History*. Medford, MA: Perseus Digital Library.

Lovelace, Richard F., "Evangelical Spirituality: A Church Historian's Perspective." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31:1 (March 1988) 25-35.

Louw, Johannes P. & Nida, Albert, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1996.

Lowe, Chuck, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation?* Sevenoaks, Kent: Mentor/OMF, 1998.

Lusk, Rich, *The Federal Vision*, ed. Steve Wilkins & Duane Garner. Monroe, LA: Athanasius, 2004.

MacArthur, John, *Charismatic Chaos*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.

MacArthur, John, *Saved Without A Doubt*. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1992.

MacLeod, David J., *Counterfeit Revival* [Hank Hanegraaff, *Counterfeit Revival* (Dallas: Word, 1997)]: *A Review Article*. *Emmaus Journal* 7:1 (Sum 98) 71-100.

MacMillan, John A. *The Authority of the Believer* (repub. 3 vol. in 1 of *The Authority of the Believer, The Authority of the Intercessor, & Encounter with Darkness*). Camp Hill, PA: Wing Spread Publishers, 1981; orig. pub. 1932)

MacMillan, John A., *The Authority of the Believer*. http://hopefaithprayer.com/books/The_Authority_of_the_Believer_John_MacMillan.pdf.

MacMillan, John A., ed., *The Full Gospel Adult Sunday School Quarterly*, various issues.

Mantey, Julius R., "Evidence That the Perfect Tense in John 20.23, Matthew 16.19 Is Mistranslated," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 16 (1973), 129–38.

Mantey, Julius R., "The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in John 20.23, Matt 16.19 and Matt 18.18," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939), 243–49.

Marks, Ed, "A Biblical Overview of the Triune God." *Affirmation and Critique* 1:1 (January 1996) 23-31.

Marsden, George M., *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Martin, Benjamin, *Lingua Brittanica Reformata, or A New English Dictionary*. London: J. Hodges, 1748.

Marshall, Walter, *The Gospel-Mystery of Sanctification*, 12th ed. New York, NY: Southwick, 1811.

Martin, Walter, *The New Cults*. Santa Ana, CA: Vision House, 1978.

Mason, Roy, *The Myth of the Universal, Invisible Church Theory Exploded*. Emmaus, PA: Challenge Press, 2003.

Masters, Peter, *Steps for Guidance*. London: Wakeman Trust, 1995.

Matthews, David, *I Saw The Welsh Revival*. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1951.

Mauro, Philip, *Sanctification: Notes of an Address*. New York, NY: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.

Maynard, Constance Louisa, *Between College Terms*. James Nisbet & Co.: 1910. Elec. acc. http://books.google.com & http://www.welshrevival.org/misc/maynard/01.htm.

Mercer, Jesse, *History of the Georgia Baptist Association*. Washington, GA, pub. 1838. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

McClintock, John & Strong, James, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 2. Albany, OR: AGES Software, 2006.

McCominsky, Thomas Edward, ed., *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993.

McConnell, D. R., *A Different Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995 (updated ed.).

McGrath, Alister E., *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

McGrath, Alister E., *J. I. Packer: A Biography.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997.

Meyer, Frederick B., *A Castaway and Other Addresses*. Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1897.

Meyer, Frederick B., *The Wideness of God's Mercy*. New York, NY: Eaton and Mains, 1906.

Merritt, John G., "'Dialogue' Within a Tradition: John Welsey and Gregory of Nyssa Discuss Christian Perfection." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22:2 (Fall, 1987) 92-117.

Miller, E., *The History and Doctrines of Irvingism*. 2 vol. London: Thynne and Jarvis, 1878.

Montanye, T. B., *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association,* October 5-7, A. D. Gillette, 415-420. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection,* ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Moody, R. M., "The Habakkuk Quotation in Romans 1:17." *Expository Times* 90 (1980-81) 205-208.

Morgan, J. Vyrnwy, *The Welsh Religious Revival, 1904: A Retrospect and a Criticism*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1909.

Mountfort, Huelon, "Watchman Nee (1903-1972): A Biographical Study." *IIIM Magazine Online*, 4:19, May 2002, Third Millennium Ministries. Elec. acc. http://thirdmill.org/watchman-nee-1903-1972-a-biographical-study.

Moreau, A. Scott, ed., *Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2000.

Moreland, J. P., & Craig, William Lane, *Philosophical Foundations For A Christian Worldview*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Moule, H. C. G., *Christus Consolator: Words for Hearts in Trouble*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

Moule, H. C. G., *Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1977 (repr. ed.).

Moule, H. C. G., *Veni Creator: Thoughts on the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit of Promise*, by H. C. G. Moule. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1890. Elec. acc. http://www.archive.org/download/venicreator00mouluoft/venicreator00mouluoft.pdf.

Mouring, Steve, *Encyclopedia Puritannica Project*, CD Version 3.0. Bealton, VA. http://www.puritannica.com. Works accessed included:
Boston, Thomas, *Works*, 12 vol.
Charnock, Stephen, *Existence and Attributes of God*.
Dabney, Robert, *Discussions*.
Edwards, Jonathan, *Works*.
Gouge, William, *Of Domestic Duties*: *Eight Treatises*
Manton, Thomas, *Works*.
Poole, Matthew, *Commentary*.

Muller, Richard, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek theological terms: Drawn principally from Protestant scholastic theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1985.

Muller, Richard, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*. 4 vol. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003.

Mullins, Edward Young, *The Christian Religion In Its Doctrinal Expression*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Murray, Andrew, *Abide in Christ: Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God*. Philadelphia, PA: Henry Altemus, 1895.

Murray, Andrew, *Absolute Surrender*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1895. Elec. acc. Christian Classics Ethereal Library, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/murray/surrender.html.

Murray, Andrew, *Divine Healing: A Series of Addresses*. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1900.

Murray, Andrew, *Out of His Fulness: Addresses Delivered in America*, Andrew Murray. London: J. Nisbet & Co, 1897.

Murray, Andrew, *Raising Your Children for Christ*, Andrew Murray. New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 1984.

Murray, Andrew, *The Full Blessing of Pentecost: The One Thing Needful*, trans. J. P. Lilley. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1908.

Murray, Andrew, *The Fullness of the Spirit.* Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 2004 ed. Originally titled *The Believer's Full Blessing of Pentecost*.

Murray, Andrew, *The Key to the Missionary Problem*. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1902.

Murray, Andrew, *The New Life: Words of God for Young Disciples of Christ*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Hurst & Company, 1891.

Murray, Andrew, *The Prayer-Life: The Inner Chamber and the Deepest Secret of Pentecost*. London: Morgan & Scott, 1914.

Murray, Andrew, *The Spirit of Christ*. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1888.

Murray, Andrew, *The Spirit of Christ: Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church*. New York, NY: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1888.

Murray, Andrew, *The Spiritual Life*. Chicago, IL: Tupper & Robertson, 1896.

Murray, Andrew, *The Two Covenants and the Second Blessing*, Andrew Murray. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1899.

Murray, Andrew, *Waiting on God! Daily Messages for a Month*. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1896.

Murray, Andrew, *With Christ in the School of Prayer*, Andrew Murray. Springdale, PA: Whitaker House, 1981 & http://www.ccel.org/ccel/murray/prayer.pdf.

Murray, Andrew, *Why Do You Not Believe? Words of Instruction and Encouragement for All Who Are Seeking the Lord*. Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1894.

Murray, John, *Christian Baptism*. Philipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980.

Murray, John, *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999 (repr. 1957 ed.).

Murray, John, review of Steven Barabas, *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention,* in vol. 4 of *Collected Works*, 4 vol. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1982.

Murray, John, *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968.

Naselli, Andrew David, *Keswick Theology: A Historical and Theological Survey and Analysis of the Doctrine of Sanctification in the Early Keswick Movement, 1875-1920*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Bob Jones University, 2006.

Nee, Watchman, *Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, 62 vol. http://ministrybooks.org.

Nee, Watchman, *Come Lord Jesus: A Study of the Book of Revelation*. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1976.

Nee, Watchman, "Four Planes of the Spiritual Life," a reprint of a portion of *Life Out of Death*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Orig. pub. The Overcomer Literature Trust, Parkston, Poole, Dorset, England. Elec. acc. http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/article_pdf.php?aid=18101.

Nee, Watchman, *God's Plan and the Overcomers*. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1977.

Nee, Watchman, *How To Know God's Will*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1998.

Nee, Watchman, "Rapture." http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/Partial_rapture.htm.

Nee, Watchman, *Seeking God's Will*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 2001.

Nee, Watchman, *Spiritual Authority*. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1972.

Nee, Watchman, *Spiritual Authority*. Elec. acc. http://faithsite.com/uploads/147/95784.pdf.

Nee, Watchman, *Study on Matthew*, Set 1, Vol. 15, *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, n. d. ISBN: 0-87083-589-0.

Nee, Watchman, *The Assembly Life*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1995

Nee, Watchman, "The Corporate Christ." *Affirmation and Critique*, 3:3, July 1998, 17-24.

Nee, Watchman, *The Gospel of God*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, n. d. Published as *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee,* Set 2, Vol. 29. ISBN 0-87083-590-4. Elec. acc. http://www.ministrybooks.org/collected-works.cfm.

Nee, Watchman, *The Ministry of God's Word*. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1971.

Nee, Watchman, *The Mystery of Christ: Knowing Christ in the Church & As the Church*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1997.

Nee, Watchman, *The Mystery of Creation*. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1981.

Nee, Watchman, *The Normal Christian Faith,* 2nd ed. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1997.

Nee, Watchman, *The Normal Christian Life*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1977.

Nee, Watchman, *The Normal Christian Life*. http://www.ccel.org/ccel/nee/normal.pdf.

Nee, Watchman, *The Glorious Church*. Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, n. d. Published as *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, Set 2, Vol. 34. ISBN 0-87083-590-4. Elec. acc. http://www.ministrybooks.org/collected-works.cfm.

Nee, Watchman, *The Latent Power of the Soul*. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1972.

Nee, Watchman, *The Release of the Spirit.* Sure Foundation: 1965.

Nee, Watchman, *The Spiritual Man.* Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1992. 3 vol. edition elec. acc. http://www.freethechurch.org/Way/Library/nee.html.

Nee, Watchman, *The Spiritual Man*. New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1968; combined ed. Richmond, VA: 1977. Elec. acc.

Nee, Watchman, *What Shall This Man Do?* Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1973.

Nicoll, W. Robertson (ed.), *The Expositor's Greek Testament.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002 (reprint ed.).

Noll, Mark A., "John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132:526 (April 1975) 161-178.

Nygren, Anders, *Commentary on Romans*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1988. (Orig. pub. as *Romarbrevet* by Verbum, Stockholm, 1944).

"Obsequious and Blind Obedience or Perfect and Unconditional Obedience and Submission according to the Bible?" Elec. acc. http://www.healthyteaching.org/obsequious-and-blind-obedience-or-perfect-and-unconditional-obedience-and-submission-according-to-the-bible/

Oliphant W. Oliphant, Margaret, *The Memoir of the Life of Laurence Oliphant and of Alice Oliphant, His Wife*. New ed., William Blackwood & Sons: London, 1892. Elec. acc. http://ia600407.us.archive.org/8/items/memoiroflifeofla01olip/memoiroflifeofla01olip.pdf.

"On the Trinity, God's Full Salvation, and the Church: A Defense of Seventeen Quotations from the Ministry of Witness Lee." Anaheim, CA: DCP Press, 2010.

Owen, John, *A Discourse of the Work of the Holy Spirit in Prayer, with a Brief Inquiry into the Nature and use of Mental Prayer and Forms* (orig. pub. London, 1682). Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.

Owen, John, *A Treatise of the Dominion of Sin and Grace, Wherein Sin's Reign Is Discovered, In Whom It Is, And In Whom It Is Not; How The Law Supports It; How Grace Delivers From It, By Setting Up Its Dominion In The Heart.* Elec. acc.

Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.

Owen, John, *Exposition of Hebrews*, 5 vol. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.

Owen, John, *Of Communion With God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.

Owen, John, *Of Temptation: The Nature and Power of It; The Danger of Entering Into It; and the Means of Preventing that Danger: With a Resolution of Sundry Cases Thereunto Belonging*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.

Owen, John, *Pneumatologia: A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.

Owen, John, *The Nature, Power, Deceit, and Prevalency of the Remainders of Indwelling Sin in Believers, Together With the Ways of its Working and Means of Prevention, Opened, Evinced, and Applied, with a Resolution of Sundry Cases of Conscience Thereunto Appertaining*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.

Packer, J. I., *Keep in Step with the Spirit: Finding Fullness in Our Walk with God*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005.

Packer, J. I., "'Keswick' and the Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification." *The Evangelical Quarterly*, vol. 27 (1955) 153-167.

Packer, J. I., "Seventeenth-Century Teaching on the Christian Life—An Introduction to some Puritan and Roman Moral Theology." *Churchman* 71:4 (1957). Elec. acc. http://www.churchsociety.org.

Packer, J. I, "The 'Wretched Man' in Romans 7." *Studia Evangelica* 2:1 (1964) 621-627.

Panton, D. M., "Testing the Supernatural." *The Dawn: An Evangelical Magazine*, May 15, 1925, 64.

Parham, Charles Fox, *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness*, 2nd ed. (Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1910. 1st ed. January 1902.

Parham, Charles Fox, *The Everlasting Gospel*. Baxter Springs, Kansas: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1911. Elec. acc. http://www.apostolicfaithonline.org/TheEvelastingGospelCharlesFParham144pages.pdf.

Payne, J. D., *The Theology of the Christian life in J. I. Packer's Thought: Theological Anthropology, Theological Method, and the Doctrine of Sanctification*. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2006.

Pearlman, Myer, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*. (Pentecostal Classics). Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2002 (orig. pub. 1937, rev. 1981).

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, *The Awakening in Wales*. London: R. W. Simpson, 1905.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, *Secrets of Spiritual Warfare*. New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 1996.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, *Soul and Spirit*. Elec. acc. http://www.worldinvisible.com/library/jessiepenn-lewis/soulspirit/soulspirit.c.htm.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, *The Centrality of the Cross*. Elec. acc. http://www.worldinvisible.com/library/jessiepenn-lewis/8791/8791tc.htm.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, & Roberts, Evan, ed., *The Overcomer* magazine, 1909- 1914. Elec. acc. http://www.rewlach.org.uk; 1906-available at Buswell Memorial Library, Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, *The Spiritual Warfare*. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1991 (orig. pub. Overcomer Literature Trust, England).

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, & Roberts, Evan, *War On The Saints*, Full Text, Unabrided, 9th ed. New York, NY: Thomas E. Lowe Ltd., 1973.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, & Roberts, Evan, *War On The Saints*. http://www.birthpangs.org/articles/background/WarontheSaints/Contents.html.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, *The Warfare With Satan*. Dorset, England: Overcomer Literature Trust, 1963.

Penn-Lewis, Jessie, *The Warfare with Satan and the Way of Victory*. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1973.

Peterson, Robert A., "Christian Assurance: Its Possibility and Foundations," *Presbyterion* (18:4) 10-24.

Pierson, Arthur T., *A Spiritual Clinique: Four Bible Readings Given at Keswick in 1907*. New York, NY: Gospel Publishing House, 1907. Elec. acc. http://ia600306.us.archive.org/7/items/spiritualcliniqu00pier/spiritualcliniqu00pier.pdf.

Pierson, Arthur T., *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*. New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1905.

Pierson, Arthur T., *The Modern Mission Century Viewed as a Cycle of Divine Working*. New York, NY: Baker & Taylor Co., 1901.

Pike, Sarah M., *New Age and Neopagan Religions in America*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Pink, Arthur W., *Doctrine of Sanctification*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Albany, OR: AGES Software, 2000.

Pink, Arthur W., *Practical Christianity*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Albany, OR: AGES Software, 2000.

Pink, Arthur W., *The Holy Spirit*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Albany, OR: AGES Software, 2000.

Pink, Arthur W., *Complete Works*. Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Albany, OR: Ages Software, 2000.

Plessis, J. Du, *The Life of Andrew Murray of South Africa*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1919.

Pollock, John Charles. "A Hundred Years of Keswick." *Christianity Today* 19:18 (20 June 1975): 6-8.

Polluck, John Charles, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1964.

Pope, Robert, "Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57:3 (June 2006) 515-535.

Porter, Stanley E., "Vague Verbs, Periphrastics, and Matt 16:19," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 1 (1988), 155–73.

Pratt, Jonathan R., "Dispensational Sanctification: A Misnomer." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 7 (Fall 2002) 95–108.

Price, Charles Wesley & Randall, Ian M., *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present and Future*. Carlisle: OM, 2000.

Pugh, E. Cynolwyn, "The Welsh Revival of 1904-1905." *Theology Today* XII (July 1955) 226-235. Elec. acc. http://www.revival-library.org/catalogues/1904ff/pugh.html.

Pyne, Robert A., & Backmon, Matthew L, "A Critique of the 'Exchanged Life.'" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 163 (April-June 2008): 131-157.

Rademacher, Elizabeth P., "The testimony of Elizabeth P. Rademacher, A Western Missionary," to Watchman Nee. http://www.watchmannee.org/others-testimonies.html.

Rennie, Ian S., review of *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements*, by D. D. Bundy. Wilmore, Kentucky: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975, in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 19:4 (Fall 1976) 340-343.

Reuver, Arie de, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation*, trans. James A. De Jong. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

Robert, Dana Lee, *Arthur Tappen Pierson and Forward Movements of Late-Nineteenth-Century Evangelicalism*. Ph. D. Diss., Yale University, 1984.

Roberts, Dana, *Secrets of Watchman Nee: His Life, His Teachings, His Influence*. Gainesville, FL: Bridge-Logos, 2005.

Roberts, Dana, *Understanding Watchman Nee*. Plainfield, NJ: Haven Books, 1980.

Robertson, A. T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934.

Rodgers, Cleon L. Jr., "The Dionysian Background of Ephesians 5:18." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136:543 (July 1979) 249-258.

Rodgers, Cleon L. Jr. & Rodgers, Cleon L. III, *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998.

Romaine, William, *The Whole Works of the late Reverend William Romaine*. London: Thomas Tegg, 1837.

Ross, Thomas, "A Study of the Biblical Doctrine of Abiding in Christ." Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, "Are Accurate Copies and Translations of Scripture Inspired? A Study of 2 Timothy 3:16." Elec. acc. faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, "An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians." Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, "Considerations on Revival in American History." Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, *Heaven Only For the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ versus Baptismal Regeneration*. Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, "Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism." Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, "The Great Commission in Scripture and History." Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, "The Historical Ages Interpretation of the Churches of Revelation Two and Three." Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Ross, Thomas, "Were the Reformers Heretics?" Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Runge, Albert, "Exorcism: A Satanic Ploy?" *His Dominion*, 14:4 (Summer 1987) 13-18.

Ryle, J. C., *Holiness: Its Nature, Hindrances, Difficulties, and Roots*. 2 vol. repr. ed. Pensacola, FL: Chapel Library, n. d.

Ryrie, Charles, *The Holy Spirit*. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1965.

Sanders, Fred, *Wesley on the Christian Life: The Heart Renewed in Love*, ed. S. J. Nichols & J. Taylor. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2013.

Sarles, Ken L., "A Theological Evaluation of the Prosperity Gospel." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 143:572 (Oct 86) 329-352.

Sargent, Robert, *Landmarks of Baptist Doctrine*, 4 vol. Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d.

Sattler, Michael, *Confession of 1527*. Cited in *A History of the Baptists,* vol. 2, Thomas Armitage. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1.0. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Saucy, Robert L., "'Sinners' Who Are Forgiven or 'Saints' Who Sin?'" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 152:608 (Oct 95) 400-412.

Schürer, E., *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. 5 vol. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1890.

Shanafelt, T. M., *The Baptist History of South Dakota.* Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Shaw, S. B., *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

Shedd, William G. T., *Dogmatic Theology*. Orig. pub. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889; Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Shedd, William G. T., & Gomes, A. W., *Dogmatic theology*, 3rd ed. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2003.

Shedd, William G. T., *History of Christian Doctrine*, 9th ed. Orig. pub. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889; Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin, *A Larger Christian Life*. http://www.swartzentrover.com/cotor/e-books/holiness/Simpson/LargerChristian/A%20Larger%20Christian%20Life.pdf.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin, *Days of Heaven Upon Earth: A Year Book of Scripture Texts and Living Truths*. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1897.

Simpson, A. B., "Divine Healing in the Atonement." http://www.davidcox.com.mx/library/S/simpson-Divine_Healing_in_Atonement.htm.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin, "Himself." http://www.biblebelievers.com/simpson-ab_himself.html.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin, *The Gospel of Healing*. http://www.swartzentrover.com/cotor/e-books/holiness/Simpson/Healing/The%20Gospel%20of%20Healing.pdf.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin, *The Life of Prayer*. http://www.swartzentrover.com/cotor/e-books/holiness/Simpson/LifePrayer/The%20Life%20of%20Prayer.pdf.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin, *The Lord for the Body, With Questions and Answers on Divine Healing*. New York, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1925. Elec. acc. http://www.cmalliance.org/resources/archives/downloads/simpson/the-lord-for-the-body.pdf.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin, *Seeing the Invisible: The Art of Spiritual Perception*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1994. Edited from Simpson's previously published work *Seeing the Invisible*.

Smellie, Alexander, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*. New York, NY: Marshall Brothers, 1921.

Smiley, Sarah. F, *The Fulness of Blessing; or, The Gospel of Christ, as Illustrated from the Book of Joshua*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876.

Smith, Amamda, *An Autobiograpy: The Story of the Lord's Dealings with Mrs. Amanda Smith, The Colored Evangelist, Containing an Account of her Life Work of Faith, and her Travels in America, England, Ireland, Scotland, India, and Africa, as an Independent Missionary*. Chicago, IL: Meyer & Brother, 1893.

Smith, Charles R., *Tongues in Biblical Perspective: A Summary of Biblical Conclusions Concerning Tongues*, rev. ed. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1976.

Smith, D. Moody, "Ο ΔΕ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ." In *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament*, FS K. W. Clark, ed B. L. Daniels and M. J. Suggs. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1967. 13–25.

Smith, Hannah Whitall, *Every-Day Religion, or The Common-Sense Teaching of the Bible*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1893.

Smith, Hannah Whitall, *My Spiritual Autobiography: How I Discovered The Unselfishness of God*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1903.

Smith, Hannah Whitall, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life,* Christian Witness. Elec. acc. Accordance Bible Software, OakTree Software, Inc., Palm Springs Drive, Suite 100 Altamonte Springs, FL 32701. http://accordancebible.com.

Smith, Hannah Whitall, *The Christian's Secret of a Holy Life: The Unpublished Personal Writings of Hannah Whitall Smith*, ed. Melvin E. Dieter. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, 1994.

Smith, Hannah Whitall, *The Record of a Happy Life: Being Memorials of Franklin Whitall Smith*. Boston, MA: Willard Tract Repository, 1873.

Smith, Hannah Whitall, *The Unselfishness of God*. Princeton, NJ: Littlebrook Press, 1987.

Smith, Logan Pearsall, ed., *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of "H. W. S." (Mrs. Pearsall Smith)*. London: Nisbet & Co. 1949.

Smith, Logan Pearsall, *Unforgotten Years*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company, 1939.

Smith, M. H., *Studies in Southern Presbyterian Theology*. Jackson, MS: Presbyterian Reformation Society, 1962.

Smith, T. L., "How John Fletcher Became the Theologian of Wesleyan Perfectionism, 1770–1776." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 15:1 (Spring 1980): 68–87.

Smith, Thomas, "Means and Measure of Holiness." *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (April 1876) 251-280.

Snodgrass, W. D., *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification Stated, and Defended, Against the Error of Perfectionism*. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publications, 1846.

Snoeberger, Mark A., "Second-Blessing Models of Sanctification and Early Dallas Dispensationalism," *Master's Seminary Journal* 15:1 (Spring 2004) 93-105.

Spicq, C., & Ernest, J. D., *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (188). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers. 1994)

Spurgeon, Charles H., *Complete Works*. *Christian Library Series, vol. 6: Charles Spurgeon Collection.* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Spurgeon, Charles H., "The Old Man Crucified." Sermon #882, delivered on Sunday Evening, April 11, 1809, at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Newington. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 6: Charles Spurgeon Collection,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Spurgeon, Charles H., *Treasury of David*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 6: Charles Spurgeon Collection,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Stanford, Miles J, *The Red Letters*. Elec. acc. http://withchrist.org/MJS/redletters/rlchapters.htm.

Stannus, Hugh H., *A History of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Early Church*. London: Christian Life Publishing, 1882.

Stead, W. T., *The Revival in the West: A Narrative of Facts*. 4th ed. London: The Review of Reviews Publishing Office, 1904 (1st ed.).

Stevenson, Herbert F., ed., *Keswick's Authentic Voice: Sixty-Five Dynamic Addresses Delviered at the Keswick Convention, 1875-1957*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1959.

Stevenson, Herbert F., ed., *Keswick's Triumphant Voice: Forty-Eight Outstanding Addresses Delivered at the Keswick Convention, 1883–1962.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1963.

Strabo, *The Geography of Strabo. Literally translated, with notes, in three volumes*, ed. H. C. Hamilton. Medford, MA: George Bell & Sons, 1903.

Strachey, Barbara,[3927] *Remarkable Relations: The Story of the Pearsall Smith Women*. New York, NY: Universe Books, 1982.

Strachey, Ray, ed., *Religious Fanaticism: Extracts from the Papers of Hannah Whitall Smith*. New York, NY: AMS Press, 1976 (repr. of 1928 London ed.)

Strachey, Ray & Strachey, Rachel C., *A Quaker Grandmother: Hannah Whitall Smith.* New York, NY: Fleming & Revell, 1914.

Strong, Augustus, *Systematic Theology*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 17: Systematic Theologies,* AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Synan, Vinson, ed., *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1975.

Taylor, James B., *Virginia Baptist Ministers,* 2nd series. New York, NY: Sheldon & Co., 1860. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Taylor, R. B., *The Biographia Leodiensis, or Biographical Sketches of the Worthies of Leeds and Neighbourhood*. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1865.

[3927] The author is a great-granddaughter of Hannah W. Smith, and her book is "based mainly on the vast and fascinating family archives which [she] inherited" (pg. 9).

Teachout, Robert, *The Use of "Wine" in the Old Testament.* Th. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1979. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, MI. Elec. acc. http://faithsaves.net.

Thayer, Henry, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978 (reprint ed.).

The Baptist Catechism, Or A Brief Instruction In the Principles Of Christian Religion, Agreeable to the Confession of Faith, put forth by the Elders and Brethren of many Congregations of Christians (baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in London and the country; owning the Doctrines of Personal Election and Final Perseverance. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

"The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents." Author unstated. *The London Quarterly Review* (October 1875) 84-128.

The Christian Worker's Magazine, 20:7, March, 1920.

The Friends' Quarterly Examiner, 9:23-26. London: Barrett, Sons & Co, 1875.

"The Great Revival in Wales," Jessie Penn-Lewis, reprinted in *The Pentecostal Evangel* 1773 (May 1, 1948) 7-8 from *The Life of Faith* in 1905. Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

The Medium and Daybreak: A Weekly Journal Devoted to the History, Phenomena, Philosophy, and Teachings of Spiritualism, 15:718 (January 11, 1884) 1-32.

The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God, 442-443, April 29, 1922. Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God, 448-449, June 10, 1922. Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God. 1681 (July 27, 1946) Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God, 1928 (April 1922, 1951), articles "The Great Welsh Revival," Ruth Russell & "Evan Roberts is Dead" (11-12). Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

"The Preparation Necessary for Revival." *Latter Rain Evangel* of September, 1922, 19-24. Elec. acc. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, http://iFHPC.org.

Thiessen, Henry C., *Lectures in Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949.

Tilton, Robert, *God's Laws of Success*. Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1986 (3rd ed.)

Tipton, Lane G. & Waddington, Jeffrey C., ed. *Resurrection and Eschatology: Theology in Service of the Church; Essays in Honor of Richard B. Gaffin, Jr.* Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2008.

Toon, Peter, *Justification and Sanctification*. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1983.

Torrey, R. A., Feinberg, C. L., & Wiersbe, W. W., ed., *The Fundamentals*, 4 vol. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2005. Reprint ed.

Trench, Richard Chenevix, *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1880.

Tromp, Marlene, *Altered States: Sex, Nation, Drugs, and Self-Transformation in Victorian Spiritualism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Trumbull, Charles Gallaudet, *Victory in Christ: Messages on the Victorious Life*. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1959. Elec. acc. http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com.

Turner, Nigel, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.

Turretin, Francis, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, trans. George Musgrave Giger, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr. Philippsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1994.

Underhill, Edward B., *Confessions of Faith, And Other Public Documents, Illustrative of the History of the Baptist Churches of England in the Seventeenth Century*. Finsbury, England: Haddon Bros. & Co., 1854. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Underhill, Edward B., *Records of the Churches of Christ*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Unger, Merrill F., "Divine Healing." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 128:511 (July 1971) 234-244.

Unger, Merrill F., *What Demons Can Do To Saints*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1991.

Van Gelderen, John R., "Holiness by Faith in Jesus." *Revival* magazine, Issue 12 (2011). Germantown, WI: Revival Focus Ministries, Inc.

Van Gelderen, John R., "Keswick: A Good Word or a Bad One?" Elec. acc. http://www.bcmedu.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=73&Itemid=138.

Van Gelderen, John R., "Keswick: A Good Word or a Bad One?" *Revival* magazine Issue 13 (2011). Germantown, WI: Revival Focus Ministries, Inc. 17-20.

Van Gelderen, John R., *The Faith Response: Understanding and Applying a Biblical View of Dependence on God*. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 2011.

Van Gelderen, John R., *The Revived Life: Exploring the Glorious Freedom of Divine Cleansing, Enabling, and Authority*. Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 2012.

Van Til, Cornelius, *The Works of Cornelius Van Til*. Elec. acc. *Logos Bible Software*.

Von Kanel, Randall Lewis, *A Critical Analysis of the Discipleship Motif in the Keswick Movement.* Th. D. Diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.

Votaw, Clyde W., "Christian Science and Faith Healing." *New Englander and Yale Review* (New Haven, CT: Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, 1891). 18:3:249-258.

Wallace, Daniel, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

Waltke, Bruce, "Evangelical Spirituality: A Biblical Scholar's Perspective." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31:1 (March 1988) 9-24.

Walvoord, John F., *The Holy Spirit: A Comprehensive Study of the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1958.

Walvoord, John F., "Premillennialism and the Tribulation, Part V: Partial Rapture Theory." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 112:447 (Jul 55) 193-209.

Ware, Steven L., *Restorationism in the Holiness Movement in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries*. Lewiston, NJ: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Benjamin B. Warfield Collection*. Elec. acc. *Christian Library Series, vol. 14*. AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Biblical Doctrines,* vol. 2 of *Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003; reprint of 1932 Oxford ed. Article orig. pub. *The Princeton Theological Review*, v. ix, 1911, pgs. 242-267.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Biblical Doctrines: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 2. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Calvin and Calvinism: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 5. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Christology and Criticism: The Works of Benjamin B.* Warfield, vol. 3. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Counterfeit Miracles: A Defense of Divine Miracles Against Pagan, Medieval, and Modern Marvels*. Unicoi, TN: Trinity Foundation, 2007.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Faith and Life*. New York, NY: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Perfectionism*, 2 vol. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003; reprint of 1932 Oxford ed.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Revelation and Inspiration: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 1. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Studies in Perfectionism, Part One*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 7. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Studies in Perfectionism, Part Two*, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 8. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield,* vol. 4. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *Studies in Theology: The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 9. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *The Plan of Salvation: Five Lectures*, B. B. Warfield. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1915.

Warfield, Benjamin B., *The Power of God unto Salvation*. Philadelphia: PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1903.

Wesley, John, Sermon 18, "Marks of the New Birth." Elec. Acc. Wesley Center Online, http://wesley.nnu.edu/john-wesley-the-sermons-of-john-wesley-1872-edition/sermon-18-the-marks-of-the-new-birth/.

Wesley, John, *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley*, 3rd ed., with the last corrections of the author. London: John Mason, 1830.

Wesley, John, *The Works of the Reverend John Wesley*, 7 vol. New York, NY: Emory & Waugh, 1831.

White, William, *Emanuel Swedenborg: His Life and Writings*. 2nd. rev. ed. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co., 1868.

Wilkins, Steve & Garner, Duane, ed., *The Federal Vision*. Monroe, LA: Athanasius, 2004.

Wilkinson, John, "Healing in the Epistle of James," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 24 (1971) 326–45.

Wilson, Douglas, *Reformed Is Not Enough*. Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2002.

Westminster Confession of Faith, & *Smaller & Larger Catechism*.

Williams, Ernest Swing, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vol. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1953.

Worrall, B. G. (1993). *The Making of the Modern Church: Christianity in England since 1800* (New ed.). London: SPCK, 1993.

Wright, Stephen, *History of the Shaftsbury Baptist Association from 1781 to 1853*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Wuest, Kenneth S., "Victory Over Indwelling Sin in Romans Six," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 116:461 (Jan 59) 43-51.

Yates, Arthur W., *The Doctrine of Assurance, with Special Reference to John Wesley*. London: Epworth, 1952.

Young, William, "Historic Calvinism and Neo-Calvinism," part 1. *Westminster Theological Journal* 36:1 (Fall 1973) 48-65.

Young, William, "Historic Calvinism and Neo-Calvinism," part 2. *Westminster Theological Journal* 36:2 (Winter 1974) 156-173.

Zaspel, Fred G., *The Theology of B. B. Warfield: A Systematic Summary*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.

Zaspel, Fred G., *Warfield on the Christian Life: Living in Light of the Gospel*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway. 2012.

Zemek, George G., *A Biblical Theology of the Doctrines of Sovereign Grace: Exegetical Considerations of Key Anthropological, Hamartiological, and Soteriological Terms and Motifs*. Little Rock, AR: Zemek, 2002.

Zuck, Roy. B., *The Speaker's Quote Book: Over 4,500 Illustrations and Quotations for all Occasions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1997.