

Excursus XII: Do Keswick Critics Routinely Misrepresent Keswick Theology?

The contradictory nature and unintelligibility of the Higher Life position¹ explains why defenders of Keswick can complain that its critics employ “inaccuracy” and “major misrepresentation” when discussing the movement.² 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

¹ 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 ordo.” We are not sure it would suffer (with trifling qualifications) by arranging its eighteen chapters in any order different from the present, even if that were by chance.

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

Similarly, Stephen Barabas notes: “Keswick [has] furnishe[d] us with no formal treatise of its doctrine of sin, and no carefully prepared, weighty discourses 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.

² 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.

attempt, therefore, to survey the preaching at Keswick and create a systematic picture . . . is bound to be unsatisfactory.³

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”⁴ 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*.”⁵ 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 Perfectionism*] 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.”⁶

³ Pgs. 34-35, 222-226, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁴ Pg. 22, “Evangelical Spirituality: A Biblical Scholar’s Perspective.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31:1.

⁵ 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.

⁶ Pg. 245, *Five Views of Sanctification*, Dieter et. al.

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 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."⁷ 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."⁸

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.⁹

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

⁷ Pg. 465, *The Theology of B. B. Warfield: A Systematic Summary*, Fred G. Zaspel.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Pgs. 473-474, *The Theology of B. B. Warfield: A Systematic Summary*, Fred G. Zaspel.

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 *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.¹⁰ Again, no actual documentation of misrepresentation is forthcoming. Packer, for instance, is criticized for “misunderstand[ing]”¹¹ 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 century¹² 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.¹³ 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,”¹⁴ 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.”¹⁵ Griffith Thomas makes some striking and eye-opening

¹⁰ Pgs. 210-227, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

¹¹ Pg. 221, *Transforming Keswick*, Price & Randall.

¹² 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.

¹³ “The Victorious Life (I).” *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:303) July 1919, 267-288; “The Victorious Life (II).” *Bibliotheca Sacra* (76:304) October 1919, 455-467.

¹⁴ Pg. 267, “The Victorious Life (I).”

¹⁵ Pg. 267, “The Victorious Life (I).”

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,”¹⁶ and: “‘Keswick’ stands for perfectionism. I have heard that scores of times, and so have you—and it does.”¹⁷ 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[!]”¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ a few of which are valid,²⁰ 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,”²¹ 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”²² that support

¹⁶ Pg. 279, “The Victorious Life (I).”

¹⁷ Pg. 283, “The Victorious Life (I).”

¹⁸ Pg. 285, “The Victorious Life (I).”

¹⁹ Pgs. 267ff. “The Victorious Life (I).”

²⁰ E. g., Griffith Thomas is correct that Warfield downplays the resistibility of grace (pg. 279, “The Victorious Life (I).”).

²¹ Pgs. 272-274, “The Victorious Life (I).”

²² Pg. 269, “The Victorious Life (I).”

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 writings of . . . John Wesley [and his proposed successor in the Methodist movement] Fletcher of Madeley.”²³ 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.²⁴

Griffith Thomas avers that “Mr. Trumbull . . . H. W. Smith . . . Mr. Boardma[n] . . . [are] men and women . . . sincere and . . . earnest”²⁵ 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,²⁶ Thomas argues for the Keswick theology based on what he has “observed,” on “experience,” and on “very many a Christian experience.”²⁷ 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.”²⁸ While affirming, though not expositing passages to prove it, that Warfield contradicts

²³ 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.

²⁴ Pgs. 285-286, “The Victorious Life (I).”

²⁵ Pg. 463, “The Victorious Life (II).”

²⁶ 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.

²⁷ Pgs. 273, 275, 277, “The Victorious Life (I).”

²⁸ Pg. 464, “The Victorious Life (II).”

Scripture in affirming progressive eradication and renewal, Thomas also argues that “Warfield . . . is disproved . . . by experience of everyday life.”²⁹ 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.”³⁰ Griffith Thomas would have done far better had he carefully explicated 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.³¹

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.”³² 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 . . .

²⁹ Pg. 275, “The Victorious Life (I).”

³⁰ Pgs. 462-463, “The Victorious Life (II.).”

³¹ Pgs. 465-466, “The Victorious Life (II.).”

³² Pg. 466, “The Victorious Life (II.).”

. of my personal experiences.”³³ Thus, Scripture must be interpreted in light of Keswick experiences.³⁴ 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.³⁵

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,”³⁶ 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.³⁷ 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.’”³⁸ 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.”³⁹ 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 exposts it⁴⁰

³³ Pg. 467, “The Victorious Life (II).”

³⁴ Pg. 466, “The Victorious Life (II).”

³⁵ 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.

³⁶ Pg. 667, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

³⁷ Compare pgs. x-xi, *The Holy Spirit of God* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913).

³⁸ Pg. 492, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

³⁹ Pg. 667, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹

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*,⁴² and affirmed that Bingham's position was "the true position" which Thomas was glad to "cal[l] attention to."⁴³ Bingham, the founder of "Canadian Keswick,"⁴⁴ 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

⁴¹ Article 27, "Of Baptism," *Thirty-Nine Articles*.

⁴² *The Bible and the Body*, R. V. Bingham. Toronto, Canada: Evangelical Publishers, 1921 (1st ed.); 4th ed. 1952.

⁴³ Pg. vii, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.

⁴⁴ Pg. 53, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

“gives the signs” today.⁴⁵ To describe the first century as “the age of miracles” which is now “past” is an error.⁴⁶ In “this dispensation” God still gives “the gift of healing,”⁴⁷ and in answering the question about whether the signs of the book of Acts are for today, Bingham answers that, in some “conditions, yes.”⁴⁸ 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.”⁴⁹

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.

⁴⁵ Pg. 66, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.

⁴⁶ Pg. 91, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.

⁴⁷ Pg. 113, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.

⁴⁸ Pg. 113, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.

⁴⁹ Pg. 69, *The Bible and the Body*, Bingham.