FIVE VIEWS OF SANCTIFICATION

G. Michael Cocoris

FIVE VIEWS OF SANCTIFICATION

G. Michael Cocoris

© 2016 G. Michael Cocoris

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced (in whole or in part, edited, or revised) in any way, form, or means including, but not limited to electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or any kind of storage and retrieval system *for sale*, except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the written permission of G. Michael Cocoris, 2016 Euclid #20, Santa Monica, CA 90405, michaelcocoris@gmail.com, or his appointed representatives. Permission is hereby granted, however, for the reproduction of the whole or parts of the whole without changing the content in any way for *free distribution*, provided all copies contain this copyright notice in its entirety. Permission is also granted to charge for the cost of copying.

Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are taken from the New King James Version ®, Copyright © 1979, 1980, 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 1
INTRODUCTION 3
THE REFORMED VIEW 5
THE WESLEYAN VIEW 11
THE KESWICK VIEW 17
THE PENTECOSTAL VIEW 25
A SUGGESTED SCRIPTURAL VIEW 33
CONCLUSION 37
BIBLIOGRAPHY 39

PREFACE

From the time of my conversion at age 18, I have had a great desire to live a spiritual life. It did not take long for me to discover great differences among Christians concerning what constitutes the spiritual life and how to live it.

Soon after trusting Christ, I met a lady who had been my babysitter when I was small. She was a flaming Pentecostalist who tried to convince me that I needed the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. Years later, I spent several hours discussing Pentecostalism with the leaders of the original Pentecostal Church founded by Charles Parham.

My cousin, a Nazarene evangelist who became a pastor, attempted to persuade me that I needed entire sanctification, which he defined as the eradication of the sin nature. Years later, I read Wesley's account of his teaching. I also talked to a professor who had written his doctoral dissertation on Wesley's view of sanctification. That interview was particularly helpful.

During my seminary days, I was introduced to the Keswick Convention held at the Scofield Memorial Church in Dallas. I was impressed with that approach more than the others, but I was not totally convinced it was accurate.

After I graduated from seminary, during a conversation with Dr. John McCormick, a Bible professor at Tennessee Temple University, I asked him what book, apart from the Bible, had influenced him the most. His answer was *Perfectionism* by B. B. Warfield. Reading that book, written from the Reformed point of view, clarified some of the confusion about the spiritual life for me.

Another helpful resource for me has been the book *The Five Views of Sanctification*.

Eventually, I began to write about the topic. My first attempt at explaining the differences and what I thought was a more biblical approach was this paper (then called the "Five Views of the Spiritual Life"). I originally delivered this material as a lecture series at Colorado Christian University. I also used this information as the speaker for a summer Bible Conference at the Church of the Open Door in Los Angeles.

Over the years, I've drawn some conclusions about the spiritual life and what it takes to live it. It seems to me that to clear up the massive confusion in the minds of many concerning this subject, it would be helpful to understand the major Protestant views of the Christian life from a historical perspective. These studies attempt to explain and evaluate those various positions.

Thanks to Teresa Rogers for proofreading this paper.

I trust it will help those who read it to not only understand the various Protestant positions on the spiritual life but also put the biblical teaching into focus.

G. Michael Cocoris
Santa Monica, CA

INTRODUCTION

Before we look at the five views of sanctification, reviewing the definitions of some key terms will be helpful.

Sin: Sin is the lack of conformity to God and His law, either in state, disposition, or acts (Rom. 3:23).

Salvation: God saves individuals from the penalty of sin when they trust His Son Jesus Christ, and is in the process of delivering them from the power of sin in this life, and will ultimately deliver them from the very presence of sin in heaven (Eph. 2:8; Jas. 1:21; 1 Pet. 1:5)

Justification: When people trust Christ, God declares them righteous (Rom. 3:24).

Sanctification: God positionally, progressively, and ultimately sets believers apart to Himself (2 Thess. 2:13; Jn. 17:17; 1 Thess. 4:17).

THE REFORMED VIEW

Within Protestantism, there is a theological system called "Reformed Theology." The novice or newcomer to theology might get the impression that the reformers, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and the men who followed them agreed on a theological system. While those within Reformed Theology might agree with each other on a number of doctrinal issues, there are also numerous differences among them, even concerning something as basic as election (predestination). What, then, is Reformed Theology?

Reformed Theology is the theological thought system that John Calvin began and refined (changed) by those who came after him. It is Calvinism. The five points of Calvinism were formulated at the Council of Dort in 1619. The Puritans popularized Calvinism in England. The Westminster Confession of 1648 is a Calvinistic Reformed document. In the United States, Reformed Theology is taught by conservatives within the Reformed Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Baptists, and anyone in any denomination who adopts Calvinism.

Thus, the "Reformed" view of the spiritual life is the view taught within Calvinism. What are the distinctive characteristics of the Reformed tradition? What do they emphasize? What are the fallacies or weaknesses of the system?

An Explanation

The Author of Sanctification Reformed Theology teaches that all of salvation, including justification, regeneration, sanctification, and glorification, is the work of God. God justifies, that is, He declares one righteous. At that point, He also regenerates, meaning He imparts new life. Then, He begins the work of sanctification and ultimately glorifies the individual. Reformed Theology proclaims, "Salvation is of the Lord" (Jonah 2:9). God regenerates, sanctifies, and glorifies. Thus, according to Reformed Theology, God is the author of sanctification.

Those within the Reformed tradition distinguish between justification and sanctification but insist that the two are inseparably connected. They often say, "Justification and sanctification can be distinguished, but they cannot be divorced." Or they say, "Salvation is by faith alone, but the faith that saves is not alone."

Berkhof states, "Justification is at once followed by sanctification since God sends out the Spirit of His Son into the hearts of His own as soon as they are justified, and that Spirit is the Spirit of sanctification" (Berkhof, p. 530). In other words, God commences, continues, and concludes the work of salvation in man. The Reformed view, then, is that sanctification is, first and foremost, the work of God. Reformed theologians point to such verses as 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Hebrews 13:20-21 to prove that sanctification is God's doing.

According to this view, sanctification is not just the natural growth of the believer's new life apart from God's direct working. It is the direct supernatural work of God. In his three volumes, *Systematic Theology*, Charles Hodge, the famous Princeton theologian, began his chapter on sanctification by declaring that it is the supernatural work of God.

He spends the first seven pages of that forty-five-page chapter proving his point (Hodge, vol. III, pp. 213-258; see esp. pp. 213-220).

Berkhof concurs. He puts it like this: "Some have the mistaken notion 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 disposition born in regeneration is strengthened, and its holy exercises are increased. It is essentially a work of God, though insofar as he employs means, man can and is expected to cooperate by the proper use of these means. Scripture clearly exhibits the supernatural character of sanctification" (Berkhof, p. 530). Berkhof adds, "It (that is, sanctification) 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" (Berkhof, p. 533). As Berkhof acknowledges, man is "expected to cooperate," but, nevertheless, in Reformed thought *sanctification is first and foremost the work of God*.

The Nature of Sanctification When God sanctifies, what does He do? What is the nature of sanctification? The Reformed concept of sanctification consists of several different elements.

The Westminster Confession says, "Sanctification is the work of God's free grace whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and to live under righteousness." Sanctification, then, consists of being renewed in the image of God.

The Reformed view would remind us that originally, God created us in His image (Gen. 1:26-27). When man fell, the image was marred. God is now restoring that image in individuals by justifying, regenerating, and sanctifying them (Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10). Since Christ is the image of God (Col. 1:15; Heb. 1:3), believers are being conformed to Him (Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18). In a book on sanctification, Anthony Hoekema, writing from the Reformed perspective, says, "Scripture teaches that God Himself, in sanctifying us, is renewing us in His likeness by making us more like Christ" (Hoekema, pp. 66-67).

According to the Reformed view, sanctification is progressive. The catechism uses the expression "more and more." Hodge puts it like this: "Sanctification, therefore, according to this representation, consists in the gradual triumph of the new nature implanted in regeneration over the evil that still remains after the heart is renewed" (Hodge, vol. III, p. 224).

Moreover, this progressive growth toward the image of God involves dying to sin and living unto righteousness. This is sometimes expressed by pointing out that the Greek word "sanctify" means "to be set apart" or "separate," and its use in Scripture indicates it is separation from the world and separation unto God (Hoekema, pp. 62-63).

In Reformed thought, righteousness is conformity to the moral code of the Mosaic Law. The Reformed view ends up placing believers under the Mosaic Law. Hoekema explains the Reformed position: "In one sense, to be sure, the believer is free from the Law. Romans 6:14 says plainly, 'For sin shall not be your master, because you are not under the law, but under grace.' 'Not under the law' here means that we are no longer under condemnation because of our failure to keep the law.... In another sense, however, believers are not free from the law. They should be deeply concerned about keeping God's law as a way of expressing their gratitude to Him for the gift of salvation. Calvin

identifies this use of the law as its third function in the lives of believers" (Hoekema, p. 85).

Hoekema goes on to say, "Spirit-led believers are precisely the ones doing their best to keep God's law" (Hoekema, p. 87), and "the Christian life, we conclude, must be a law-formed life. Though believers must not try to keep God's law as a means of earning their salvation, they are nevertheless enjoined to do their best to keep the law as a means of showing their thankfulness to God for the salvation they received as a gift of grace. For believers, law-keeping is an expression of Christian love and the way to Christian freedoms; it is equivalent to walking by the Spirit. Since the law mirrors God, living in obedience to God's law is living as image-bearers of God; the law, therefore, is one of the most important means whereby God sanctifies us" (Hoekema, p. 88).

While the Reformed position is that sanctification is progressive, it also maintains that sanctification is never perfected in this life. They insist that even though, on the one hand, God is working in every believer to make him or her progressively more and more like Christ, on the other hand, no believer reaches perfection on this side of heaven. Hodge explains, "The doctrine of Lutherans and Reformed, the two great branches of the protestant church, is, that sanctification is never perfected in this life; that sin is not in any case entirely submitted; so that the most advanced believer has need as long as he continues in the flesh, daily to pray for the forgiveness of sin" (Hodge, vol. III, p. 245).

The Reformed view of sanctification is opposed to the doctrine of Perfectionism. The classic work against the concept of perfectionism is a volume entitled *Perfectionism*, by the Reformed theologian B. B. Warfield. In his book, Warfield analyzes different movements that have taught various views of Perfectionism. He concludes that all forms of it have several common characteristics. In his words, "The essential elements of that doctrine repeat themselves in all these movements and form their characteristic features. In all of them alike, justification and sanctification are divided from one another as two separate gifts of God. In all of them alike, sanctification is represented as obtained, just like justification, by an act of simple faith, but not by the same act of faith by which justification is obtained, but by a new and separate act of faith, exercised for this specific purpose. In all of them alike, the sanctification which comes on this act of faith, comes immediately on believing, and all at once, and in all of them alike the sanctification, thus received, is complete sanctification. In all of them alike, however, it is added that this complete sanctification does not bring freedom from all sin, but only, say, freedom from sinning; or only freedom from conscious sinning, or from the commission of 'known sins.' And in all of them alike, the sanctification is not a stable condition to which we enter once for all by faith, but a momentary attainment, which must be maintained moment by moment, and which may readily be lost, and often is lost, but may also be repeatedly instantaneously recovered" (Warfield, p. 351).

Simply put, Perfectionism teaches that it is possible for believers to live sinlessly in the sense that they fulfill all that God requires of them. Reformed thought contends that the word "perfect" in the Scripture means "mature." Furthermore, the Scriptures plainly teach that no believer is without sin (1 Jn. 1:8; Jas. 3:1). Thus, sanctification is progressive. No believer ever reaches perfection in this life.

The Means of Sanctification What are the means of sanctification? What does the believer do? Although in substantial agreement, Reformed authors express the answer differently.

Hodge begins his discussion of means by saying that while sanctification is the supernatural work of God, at the same time, it calls for "unremitting and strenuous exertion." He then lists seven methods of sanctification (Hodge, vol. III, pp. 226-231).

1. The soul is led to exercise faith.
2. The soul, by this act of faith, becomes united to Christ.
3. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit, thus secured by union with Christ, becomes the source of a new spiritual life, which constantly increases in power until everything uncongenial with it is expelled and the soul is perfectly transformed into the image of Christ. Under this point, Hodge elaborates on the work of the Holy Spirit in enlightening the mind. He explains that the Holy Spirit enables the believer to see such truths as the glory of God, the holiness and spirituality of the Law, the exceeding sinfulness of sin, his own guilt, pollution, and helplessness, etc. He says, "The soul is thus raised above the world....thus the prayer of Christ (John 17:17) 'Sanctify them through thy truth' is answered in the experience of His people" (Hodge, vol. III, p. 230).
4. God then gives constant occasion for the exercise of all the graces of the Spirit. In his words, "Submission, confidence, self-denial, patience, and meekness, as well as faith, hope, and love are called for, or put to the test, more or less effectually every day the believer passes on the earth. And by this constant exercise, he grows in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. It is, however, principally by calling His people to labor and suffer for the advancement of the Redeemer's Kingdom and for the good of their fellow man that this salutary discipline is carried on. The best Christians are in general, those who do not merely use the restless activity of natural disposition, but from love to Christ and zeal for His glory, labor more and suffer most in His service" (Hodge, vol. III, p. 230).
5. The spiritual life is also developed by the church life of believers, including communion and worship, service, and fellowship.
6. Sanctification is promoted by the ordinances of God, the Word of God, the sacraments, and prayer.
7. The kingly office of Christ is also a factor in sanctification.

Like Hodge, Berkhof commences his delineation of the means of sanctification, reminding his reader that God, not man, is the author of it. Then, he lists three means of sanctification: 1) The Word of God. The principal means of sanctification is the Word of God as employed by the Holy Spirit. 2) The Sacraments. 3) Providential guidance. God's revelation is necessary for the interpretation of His providential guidance, but God's providence, both favorable and adverse, are means of sanctification (Berkhof, p. 535-536).

An Evaluation

There is much commendable in the Reformed view. Christians schooled in Reformed theology tend to give great glory to God for who He is and what He has done. There is simply no doubt that sanctification is by God's grace and consists of being conformed to God's image. Yet, there are elements within the Reformed position that need correction.

God's Part First, the Reformed view overextends God's part in sanctification. Granted, God is the author of sanctification, but in a very real sense, so are believers. The Scripture presents a balanced picture of God and believers being agents in sanctification.

Paul prayed that God would sanctify the Thessalonians (1 Thess. 5:23) and he explicitly told them that since sanctification was the will of God, *they* should abstain from sexual immorality (1 Thess. 4:1-6; see also 1 Thess. 5:12-22 and 1 Cor. 6:18).

The Reformed view, however, teaches that God guarantees the whole process. Although they teach that believers must cooperate and even exert themselves in the overall scheme of things, their responsibility is an illusion. In the final analysis, there is no room in their system for the free exercise of their will. God does it all.

In a book applauded by several Reformed leaders, John MacArthur, Jr. says, "We must remember above all that salvation is a sovereign work of God. Biblically, it is defined by what it produces, not by what one does to get it. Works are *not* necessary to earn salvation. But true salvation wrought by God will not fail to produce the good works that are its fruit (*cf.* Matthew 7:17). We are God's workmanship. No aspect of salvation is merited by human works (Titus 3:5-7). Thus, salvation cannot be defective in any dimension. As a part of His saving work, God will produce repentance, faith, sanctification, yieldedness, obedience, and, ultimately, glorification. Since He is not dependent upon human effort in producing these elements, an experience that lacks any of them cannot be God's saving work" (MacArthur, p. 33).

The Carnal Christian Secondly, the Reformed view eliminates the concept of the carnal Christian. The corollary to extending God's part in sanctification so far is to eliminate the biblical teaching of a carnal Christian. There is no place in Reformed thought for the carnal believer.

Yet, the New Testament clearly teaches the possibility of spiritual failure and carnality on the part of believers. The New Testament's commands, imperatives, and exhortations are meaningless unless it is possible for a believer not to obey. If God does it all in every case, why does Paul exhort the Romans not to be conformed to this world (Rom. 12:2), and why does John admonish the Ephesians not to love the world (1 Jn. 2:15)? Moreover, the New Testament plainly says believers can be and are carnal. Romans 7 does not describe a spiritual struggle. Romans 7 talks about the spiritual failure of a believer! Paul says, "I am carnal, sold unto sin" (Rom. 7:14). "For what I will do, that I do not practice; but what I hate, that I do" (Rom. 7:15). He failed! He goes so far as to say that there is a law in his members that brings him into captivity to sin (Rom. 7:23). This passage describes slavery to sin (see "sold under" in 7:14 and "captivity to" in 7:23). There is a war all right, and sin wins (Rom. 7: 23-24). Paul told the Corinthians that they were carnal (1 Cor. 3:1), meaning they lived like unsaved men (1 Cor. 3:3).

In response to Hoekema's presentation of the Reformed view, McQuilkin says, "Is there a substantial difference among Christians, or are they all more or less on an inevitable continuum from regeneration to glorification, differing only in their degree of growth of the image restored? If there is such a thing as a Christian behaving like an unconverted person, constantly failing to bear the fruit of the spirit, spiritually weak and ineffective, we learn nothing of it in Hoekema's treatise" (McQuilkin, p. 98) and "yet many Reformed theologians ignore the problem of the defeated Christian or even deny the existence of such a class of believers" (McQuilkin, p. 98).

The Mosaic Law Thirdly, the Reformed view places the believer under the Mosaic Law. While acknowledging that the New Testament teaches that the believers are not under the Law, the Reformed view ends up placing believers under the Mosaic Law. The Reformed explanation of verses like Romans 6:14, which says that believers are not

under the Law, is that they are not under the *condemnation* of the Law, but that is not what the verse says, nor is it what the context means.

Galatians 4:24 says the Law was our tutor. The next verse says that after we trust Christ, we are no longer under a tutor, the Law (Gal. 4:25)! What did Paul mean by "the Law" in Galatians? He meant all the Mosaic Law, including the civil and ceremonial law (Gal. 5:1-3, 6:12-13) and the moral law (Gal. 4:9-11). He meant "the whole law" (Gal. 5:3).

To teach that believers are not under the Mosaic Law does not mean that believers are without any law at all (1 Cor. 9:21). Believers are under the Law of Christ (1 Cor. 9:21), which is the law of love (Gal. 6:2). When believers are walking in the Spirit (Gal. 5:16), that is, loving others (Gal. 5:13), they are not obeying the Law (Gal. 5:18), but they are fulfilling it (Gal. 5:14; Rom. 13:8-10).

Summary: The Reformed view of sanctification is that God, being the author of all salvation, will see to it that every believer is progressively conformed to God's image as reflected in the Law, but no believer will reach perfection in this life. The problem with that view is that it overextends God's part in sanctification, eliminates the carnal Christian, and ends up placing all believers under the Mosaic Law.

The Reformed view of the spiritual life raises a number of issues, including 1) Who is the author/agent of sanctification? 2) What is the relationship of justification to sanctification? (3) What is the extent of sanctification in this life (perfectionism)? Are believers under the Mosaic Law?

On a practical level, perhaps, the Reformed view could be criticized for being fatalistic. God does it and if He doesn't do it, it doesn't get done. Granted, Reformed theologians would respond that man is responsible, but their *theory* insists that God is the author of sanctification, who guarantees that it will be done. The Reformed position can also be critiqued on a practical level as producing arrogant and judgmental people, which are the natural results of trying to live under the Law. Those who succeed tend to be arrogant and judgmental of others who don't.

The one thing the Reformed view insists on is that all believers should remember God is involved in the process of sanctification. Without Him, there is no spiritual life. Believers may argue over the extent of His involvement, but there is no debate over the fact that He must be involved.

As the family sat eating dinner, the small boy in the family tried to open a new bottle of catsup. As hard as he tried and as often as he tried, he continually failed to persuade the cap to come loose from the bottle. At one point, he excused himself to go to the restroom. While he was gone, the father loosened the cap on the catsup bottle. When the little boy returned, he continued his attack on the catsup bottle cap. This time, it came loose and he exclaimed, "I did it!" The truth is, without the father's intervention, he would never have done it.

THE WESLEYAN VIEW

The Wesleyan view is the second major popular view of the spiritual life within Protestantism. John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, originated this school of thought. The followers of Wesley's view differed over exactly how to interpret various issues within Wesley's thought, but all insisted that their perception was what Wesley himself thought. Since there is disagreement among those who hold to the Wesleyan view, the place to begin is with Wesley himself.

John Wesley wrote a small book entitled *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. His book underwent several revisions and enlargements during his lifetime. His last revision was in 1777. From the time of that edition, it has been customary for the title page to read: "*A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* as believed and taught by Rev. John Wesley from 1725 to 1777." This book expounds John Wesley's concept of the spiritual life, which he called "Christian perfection." He also called it "sanctification" and, on several occasions, referred to it as "entire sanctification."

An Explanation

In 1764, Wesley explained his view of sanctification in eleven propositions. Propositions 1 through 3 deal with the time of sanctification; 4 through 7 deal with the nature of sanctification; 8 through 11 address the means of sanctification.

The Time of Entire Sanctification John Wesley believed in justification by faith. He also believed that after individuals had been justified, they were to be sanctified, but Wesley differed with Reformed teaching; he believed that a justified, partially sanctified believer could be "entirely sanctified." In the Reformed view, all believers are entirely sanctified at death. In Wesley's view, this entire sanctification, or "Christian perfection," occurs after justification and before death. Wesley wrote, "But we do not know a single instance, in any place, of a person's receiving, in one and the same moment, remission of sins, abiding witness of the Spirit, and a new, clean heart" (Wesley, pp. 34-35).

Concerning the time of sanctification, Wesley wrote, "(1) There is such a thing as perfection, for it is again and again mentioned in Scripture. (2) It is not so early as justification, for justified persons are to 'go on to perfection' (Heb. 6:1). (3) It is not so late as death, for St. Paul speaks of living men that were perfect (Phil. 3:15)" (Wesley, p. 167).

For John Wesley, the time of entire sanctification is *after* salvation and *before* death. In this, he differed from all who preceded him, especially the Reformed thinkers.

The Nature of Entire Sanctification When believers attain entire sanctification, that is, Christian perfection, what is it like? What is the nature of entire sanctification?

Wesley had a number of different ways to describe his view of sanctification. Like those in the Reformed tradition, he spoke of renewal in God's image (Wesley, pp. 78-79). He taught that sanctification is progressive, that is, gradual (Wesley, pp. 133, 168). Beyond that, the Wesleyan view emphasized two main concepts.

First, Wesley repeatedly declared that Christian perfection consisted in not sinning. He wrote, "In what sense, then, are they perfect? Observe we are not now speaking of babes in Christ, but adult Christians. But even babes in Christ are not so far perfect as to not commit sin" (Wesley, p. 26). "In conformity, therefore, both to the doctrine of St. John, and the whole tenor of the New Testament, we fix this conclusion: a Christian is so far perfect as not to commit sin" (Wesley, p. 26). He also wrote, "It remains, then, that Christians are saved in this world from all sin, from all unrighteousness; that they are now in such a sense perfect as to not commit sin and to be freed from evil thoughts and evil temper" (Wesley, p. 26).

Second, Wesley repeatedly stressed that Christian perfection is loving God with all our heart and our neighbor as ourselves. He said, "Christian perfection is pure love filling the heart and governing all the words and actions" (Wesley, p. 77) and "Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life—this is the whole of scriptural perfection" (Wesley, p. 78).

These issues, especially the first one, need to be clarified. Wesley himself did that in several places in his book. He wrote, "Now, mistakes, and whatever infirmities necessarily flow from the corruptible state of the body, are no way contrary to love; nor, therefore, in the Scripture sense, sin. To explain myself a little further on this head: (1) Not only sin, properly so-called (that is, a voluntary transgression of a known law), but sin, improperly so-called (that is, an involuntary transgression of a divine law, known or unknown) needs the atoning blood. (2) I believe there is no such perfection in this life as exclude these involuntary transgressions, which I apprehend to be naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. (3) Therefore, 'sinless perfection' is a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. (4) I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions. (5) Such transgressions you may call sin if you please; I do not, for the reasons mentioned above" (Wesley, pp. 66-67).

As mentioned above, in his propositions from 1764, Wesley addressed the nature of sanctification: "(4) It is not absolute. Absolute perfection belongs not to man, nor to angels, but to God alone. (5) It does not make a man infallible; none is infallible while he remains in the body. (6) Is it sinless? It is not worthwhile to contend for a term. It is 'salvation from sin.' (7) It is 'perfect love' (1 Jn. 4:18). This is the essence of it: its properties, or separate fruits, are rejoicing evermore, praying without ceasing, and in everything giving thanks (1 Thess. 5:16; etc.)."

Wesley also spoke of "circumcision of heart" (Wesley, p. 8), being "saved from inbred corruption" (Wesley, p. 18) and "a heart cleansed from all sin and filled with pure love to God" (Wesley, p. 46).

Thus, while Wesley agreed with the Reformed tradition concerning some aspects of the spiritual life, his distinctive teaching concerned Christian perfection. According to Wesley, Christian perfection consists of not sinning and loving God and one's neighbor.

John Wesley developed the theology and Charles Wesley helped spread it through his hymns. In Charles Wesley's hymn "Love Divine, All Love Excelling," he wrote, "Take away our bent to sinning."

The Means of Entire Sanctification What is the means of sanctification? What does the believer do? Again, Wesley himself tells us plainly. He wrote, "Can anything be more clear than (1) That here also is as full and high a salvation as we have ever spoken of? (2)

That this is spoken of as receivable by mere faith and as hindered only by unbelief? (3) That this faith and, consequently, the salvation which it brings is spoken of as given in an instant? (4) That it is supposed that instant may be now? That we need not stay another moment? That very 'now?' 'Now is the day of' this 'full salvation.?'" (Wesley, p. 39).

Wesley dealt with the means of sanctification in his propositions of 1764: "(8) It is improvable. It is so far from lying in an indivisible point, for being incapable of increase, that one perfected in love may grow in grace far swifter than he did before. (9) It is amissible, capable of being lost, of which we have numerous instances. But we were not thoroughly convinced of this until five or six years ago. (10) It is constantly both preceded and followed by a gradual work. (11) But is it in itself instantaneous or not? In examining this, let us go on step by step. An instantaneous change has been wrought in some believers: none can deny this. Since that change, they enjoy perfect love; they feel this, and this alone; they 'rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks.' Now, this is all I mean by perfection" (Wesley, pp. 167-168).

Wesley also wrote, "I have been the more large in these extracts, because hence it appears, beyond all possibility of exception, that to this day both my brother and I maintain (1) that Christian perfection is that love of God and our neighbor which implies deliverance from all sin; (2) that this is received merely by faith; (3) that it is given instantaneously, in one moment; (4) that we are to expect it, not at death, but every moment; that now is the acceptable time, now is the day of this salvation" (Wesley, pp. 60-61).

In a question-and-answer format, Wesley said, "Q. Is this death to sin, and renewal in love, gradual or instantaneous? A. A man may be dying for some time, yet he does not, properly speaking, die until the instant the soul is separated from the body, and in that instant, he lives the life of eternity. In like manner, he may be dying to sin for some time; yet he is not dead to sin, until sin is separated from his soul; and in that instant, he lives the full life of love. And as the change undergone when the body dies is of a different kind, and infinitely greater than any we had known before, yea, such as till then it is impossible to conceive, so the change wrought when the soul dies to sin is of a different kind, and infinitely greater than any before and that any can conceive until he experiences it. Yet he still grows in grace, in the knowledge of Christ, in the love and image of God, and will do so not only till death but to all eternity" (Wesley, p. 80).

Perhaps one other observation should be made. Wesley said, "It is true we receive it by simple faith; but God does not, will not, give that faith until we seek it with all diligence in the way in which he hath ordained" (Wesley, p. 81).

According to John Wesley, then, the means of entire sanctification is that it is instantaneous by faith. This is in stark contrast to the Reformed view, which insists that sanctification is gradual throughout the believer's lifetime and is never perfected on this side of death.

Wesley died in 1791. His teaching concerning Christian perfection continued to be taught within the Methodist Church, which was his legacy. Like Wesley in England, Methodist circuit riders in America called men and women to Christ and holiness. In the nineteenth century, Wesley's teaching on sanctification was presented with a different emphasis, change, and also spread beyond Methodism.

Asa Mahan, president of Oberlin College, and Charles G. Finney taught entire sanctification within a Calvinistic theology "despite the strong aversion of traditional Calvinism to anything smacking of perfectionism" (McQuilkin, p. 185).

W. E. Boardman, a Presbyterian, wrote a book on sanctification called *The Higher Christian Life* and Robert Pearsall Smith, a layman, wrote several books on a Wesleyan type view of sanctification. These two men and their books were the forerunners of the Keswick movement (McQuilkin, p. 185).

Eventually, holiness churches were formed. These included the Church of the Nazarene, the Pilgrim Holiness Church, the Free Methodist Church, the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), the Wesleyan Church, etc. The Salvation Army also has its roots in Wesleyan thought. These, like others within the Wesleyan tradition in the nineteenth century, tended to emphasize the instantaneous aspects of Wesleyanism more than the gradual, and freedom from sin more than perfect love. They also began to call the instantaneous element the filling of the Holy Spirit.

An Evaluation

Like the Reformed view, the Wesleyan understanding of the spiritual life stresses the need for holiness. I once asked a Calvinist professor who was teaching at a Wesleyan institution (Azusa Pacific University) how that institution agreed to hire him. He said, "When they interviewed me, they had one major concern. They wanted to know if I believed in holy living." When he assured them that he did, they were satisfied.

While both the Reformed and the Wesleyan traditions have emphasized holiness, they have attempted to explain it differently. Reformed teachers tend to emphasize holiness and righteousness, that is, conformity to the Ten Commandments. Wesley and those who have followed him have stressed that holiness is pure love. The insistence on love being the essence of sanctification is the most commendable aspect of the Wesleyan view. Nevertheless, aspects of the Wesleyan view need to be brought in line with biblical teaching.

Perfectionism First, the Wesleyan view errs in overextending the extent of sanctification. Wesleyanism teaches perfectionism. Granted, Wesley himself qualified it. He insisted he was not teaching sinless perfection or absolute perfection. He conceded that even believers filled with perfect love were liable to involuntary transgressions, mistakes, and infirmities. Yet, he taught that an entirely sanctified believer was perfect "as not to commit sin." He taught that it was possible for a believer in this life to be perfect in the sense "as not to commit sin and be free from evil thoughts and evil tempers." The Wesleyan view has been legitimately criticized for teaching entire sanctification as meaning not sinning. A relative of mine, an advocate of this view, once told me he had not sinned in ten years!

There are two problems with Wesley's interpretation of sanctification as being free from sin. In the first place, his definition is wrong. He defines sin as the "voluntary transgression of a known law." That is not biblically correct. Sin is anything contrary to God's nature (Rom. 3:23), whether consciously or unconsciously. Paul said he sinned though he was ignorant (1 Tim. 1:13)! He also stated, "For I know nothing against myself, yet this does not justify me; but He who judges me is the Lord" (1 Cor. 4:4). In

the second place, even if Wesley's definition is accepted, his conclusion is wrong. No one can live without voluntary transgression in this life (1 Jn. 1:8, 10; Jas. 3:1).

Wesley made the standard for sin subjective, not objective. The standard for sin in the Wesleyan view is what the believer knows, not what the objective Word of God says. Sometimes, people commit sin and don't know it, but everyone else does. As someone has said, "Our sins are like notes pinned on our backs. Others see them and we do not, but they are still there."

Instantaneous Experience Secondly, the Wesleyan view establishes an instantaneous concept of sanctification that is not in the New Testament. Wesley originated the concept of instantaneous, entire sanctification. B. B. Warfield said, "It was John Wesley who infected the modern Protestant world with the notion of entire instantaneous sanctification" (Warfield, cited by Sangster, p. 26).

Some Wesleyans have tried to play down this aspect of Wesley's teaching. For example, author Melvin Dieter accuses 19th-century evangelist Phoebe Palmer of shifting the focus and even revising the experience so as to put too much importance on the moment of total consecration (Dieter, p. 40), but there is simply no doubt that Wesley taught instantaneous entire sanctification. He wrote, "An instantaneous change has been wrought in some believers: none can deny this.... But in some, this change was not instantaneous. It did not perceive the instant when it was wrought. It is often difficult to perceive the instant a man dies, yet there is an instant in which life ceases. And if even sin ceases, there must be a last moment of its existence and a first moment of our deliverance from it" (Wesley, p. 168-169). Even Dieter admits that "each of Mrs. Palmer's assumptions and statements can be documented with almost identical statements in Wesley himself" (Dieter, p. 40).

What was Wesley's scriptural proof for an experience of instantaneous entire sanctification after conversion? None! He offered no scriptural proof whatsoever. A Wesleyan professor who wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection says, "The conclusion seems inescapable: Wesley's authority for the substance ('love excluding sin') was scriptural, but his authority for the circumstance (a process comprising two instantaneous crises—initial' and 'entire' sanctification) was primarily experiential" (Staples, p. 9). He goes on to argue from Paul's use of the indicative and imperative in Romans 6 that Wesley was not wrong, but he concedes Wesley himself had no scriptural proof.

Overemphasis on Faith Thirdly, the Wesleyan view overemphasizes faith as a means of sanctification. Wesley taught that instantaneous sanctification was achieved through faith. In that sense, faith believes God for an instantaneous work of removing all sin and filling the heart with pure love. Granted, the spiritual life is by faith (Gal. 2:20), but it is a *life* of faith, not an instant of faith for entire sanctification. Moreover, obedience is also involved (Rom. 6:16), as well as other means. Therefore, the Wesleyan view overemphasizes faith as the means of sanctification.

Summary: The Wesleyan view of sanctification is that after conversion and before death, believers can experience instantaneous entire sanctification, whereby they are filled with pure love, which excludes all sin.

The problem with such a teaching is that it overextends the extent of sanctification, establishes an instantaneous concept of sanctification not in the New Testament, and overemphasizes faith as the means of sanctification.

The Wesleyan view raises several critical questions: 1) Is entire sanctification possible in this life? 2) Is entire sanctification obtainable in an instant? 3) Is the essence of sanctification pure love?

Both the Reformed and Wesleyan views of the spiritual life agree that the goal is to restore the image of God in man, but they differ as to exactly what that means. The Reformed tradition tends to emphasize the keeping of the Law. Wesley's contribution to the discussion of the spiritual life was to remind us that the goal is to love. The goal of the spiritual life is Christlikeness, maturity, that is, love.

Adolphe Monod, the famous 19th-century French evangelical preacher, said before dying, "I have strength for nothing more than to think about the love of God; He has loved us. That is the whole of dogmatic; let us love Him—that is the sum total of the ethic of the gospel."

THE KESWICK VIEW

The Keswick view of the spiritual life is named after a town in England. Here's the story of how it got started. The main source of this historical sketch is *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention* by J. C. Pollack. For a short history, see *So Great Salvation* by Steven Barnabas (pp. 15-18), and for short biographical sketches of the earliest key Keswick leaders, see Barnabas (pp. 157-188).

In 1859, W. E. Broadman, a Presbyterian minister, wrote a book entitled *The Higher Christian Life.* It was the first book on holiness that broke down the prejudice against the subject among all the denominations.

Robert Pearsall Smith and his wife Hannah Whitall Smith were born and bred American Quakers. Eight years after they were married, they were converted (1858). When the joy wore off, Mrs. Smith struggled with being defeated by sin. From a Baptist theological student, she heard that the way of victory was by faith, and from a Methodist dressmaker, she learned of an experience called "the second blessing." She discovered that when she committed her daily life as well as her future destiny to Christ, she had deliverance from the power of sin. Her husband entered the experience when she showed him Romans 6:6. They felt that "the Lord was able and willing to deliver us out of every temptation if we would but trust Him to do it" (Pollack, p. 13).

The Smiths began to propagate their view of the spiritual life. Robert wrote *Holiness through Faith* (1870) and *Walk in the Light* (1873). Hannah wrote *The Record of a Happy Life* and *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* (1875); the latter was enlarged in 1889. They also traveled around the eastern United States, speaking on the spiritual life.

Robert was a New Jersey businessman. Between running the Whitall Glassworks and public speaking, his health began to break. Several years before, he had a riding accident and since then had not been in the best of health. The doctor recommended rest in England. But it wasn't long before the Smiths were conducting meetings in England!

In the spring of 1873, Smith and American pastor William Boardman, who was also in England for his health, were asked to speak to small groups of ministers and Christian workers in London. Thirty to forty people at a time attended these breakfast meetings. In all, 2,400 ministers heard their message.

On April 1, 1873, Smith spoke to a small group of 15 or 16. One of those present was the Rev. Evan Hopkins. As a result of hearing Smith and analyzing 2 Corinthians 9:8, Hopkins declared that the Lord would not just merely help him, "It's that He will do all and will live in me His own holy life, the only holiness possible to us" (Pollock, p. 15). He called this his "May Day" experience. When he talked to his wife, she said, "I too took God at His Word and accepted Christ as my indwelling Lord and life, and believed that He did enthrone Himself in my heart" (Pollock, p. 15). Later, Hopkins became one of the most influential of the Keswick leaders.

Smith traveled widely in England. Pollock says, "The movement stirred little as yet beyond the upper classes. Besetting sins to be overcome were a tattling tongue, angry looks, viciousness on the croquet lawn, impatience with servants.... Women discovered inner strength under days of 'feeling poorly,' men ceased to worry about the next bank failure, parents knew peace when death struck the nursery" (Pollock, pp. 15-16).

"Before 1873 was over, Frances Ridley Havergal, already famous for her hymns and devotional verses, 'saw clearly the blessedness of truth consecration. I saw it as a flash of electric light... so I just utterly yielded myself to Him and utterly trusted Him to keep me.' And thus was able before her early death to write those hymns indelibly identified with Keswick: 'Like a River Glorious is God's Perfect Peace,' and 'Take My Life and Let it Be'" (Pollock, p. 16).

In the summer of 1874, the British politician William Cowper-Temple opened his country home, "Bradlands," for a conference. The stated purpose was to "have a few days of quiet prayer and meditation upon the scriptural possibilities of the Christian life as to maintain communion with the Lord and victory over all known sin." About 100 assembled, all by invitation, on July 17th for the six-day meeting. Robert Smith acted as chairman. At the close of the meeting, it was proposed that the conference be repeated on a larger scale. Sir Arthur Blackwood, a well-known Christian layman and head of the post office, proposed that it be held at Oxford University during vacation time when the dormitory rooms would be empty.

So, a few weeks later, between August 29th and September 7, 1874, a conference was held at Oxford. The chairman and principal speaker was Robert Smith. The Reverend T. D. Harford-Batterby, Rector of St. John's in a town called Keswick, was present for the first time. Back in 1860, when he had read Broadman's book, he had exclaimed, "Oh what a compound we are of good wishes and miserable performance! When, when shall it be otherwise? I do not realize the 'higher Christian life' which Dr. Broadman speaks of and which I have preached to others of—the life hid with Christ in God" (Pollock, p. 24).

The chairman and principal speaker was Robert Perisol Smith. He and his wife Hannah gave Bible readings in the afternoon. William Broadman and Evan Hopkins spoke. Attendance estimates range from 900 to 1200.

At first, Hartford-Batterby did not accept what was being taught. Pollock records, "As far as Hartford-Batterby could gather, they were saying that you could have intimate companionship with Christ all day long, that God's will and your happiness were one, that the Holy Spirit and not yourself overcame your temptations; but you had to make a deliberate act of full surrender and enter a 'rest of faith'—there would be a crisis leading to a process. A lady of his acquaintance met him in the street. She asked, 'Can you explain to me the teaching they are giving? Can you accept it?' 'No, I cannot,' Hartford-Batterby replied. 'I do not believe it is sound, or in accordance to Scripture'" (Pollock, p. 26).

On Tuesday evening, Evan Hopkins delivered one of the two addresses from the story of the nobleman in John 4. He made a distinction between seeking faith and resting faith. That night Hartford-Batterby decided he would "rest in Him."

From May 29th through June 8, 1875, another meeting was held at Brighton with between 5000 and 8000 present. Smith was again chairman. Hartford-Batterby attended. D. L. Moody, closing out his London campaign, publicly prayed for the meeting and said the Brighton convention was perhaps the most important meeting ever gathered.

Rev. Hartford-Batterby had invited the Smiths to Keswick. The meeting was to begin on June 29th, only three weeks after the close of the Brighton convention, but within a few days of the opening of the convention meeting, it was suddenly announced that Smith was ill, that all engagements were canceled and that he was returning to America.

Rumors said that Smith had been summoned to an urgent private meeting with eight of his supporters, including Evan Hopkins. James Fountain, Smith's host in north London, told friends that "Smith had been behaving oddly, had no appetite, frequently felt sick, suffered relapses of memory, and seemingly was on the verge of a brainstorm, and wrestling with some horrible fear" (Pollock, p. 34). Hannah wrote Mrs. Cowper-Temple, "This is my dear husband's third attack, since our marriage, of nervous prostration, and he is very weak and suffering."

Rumors persisted that the real reason for his departure was erroneous teaching and immoral conduct. It was said Smith committed adultery. Toward the end of the year, the eight men who had summoned Smith published the following statement: "Some weeks after the Brighton convention, it came to our knowledge that the individual referred to had, on some occasions in private conversation, inculcated doctrines, which were most unscriptural and dangerous. We also found there had been conduct which, although we were convinced it was free from evil intent, was yet such as to render action necessary on our part. We, therefore, requested him to abstain at once from all public work, and when the circumstances were presented to him in their true light, he entirely acquiesced in the propriety of this course and recognized with deep sorrow the unscriptural and dangerous character of the teaching and conduct in question. In addition to the above, a return to the distressing attack of the brain, from which he had previously suffered, rendered the immediate cessation of work absolutely necessary" (Pollock, pp. 34-35).

The eight would say nothing more of Smith's heresy except that it concerned the bride of Christ, and they never revealed what he had done. Ninety years later, Smith's own detailed confessions were discovered at Broadlands. In a letter he wrote to Cowper-Temple, He said he had whispered an "ancient heresy or delusion to a young woman in emotional and spiritual distress, with his arm around her in a hotel room at Brighton." He swore to Temple that his intentions were "as free from the wish for adultery as were it my own child" (Pollock, p. 35). The young woman "spread a colorful version of her relationship with Smith" (Pollock, p. 35). The "council of eight" summoned him to a meeting; he told them everything, but they insisted he must terminate his ministry. Smith returned to his business in Philadelphia and, except for one "short public appearance" in Pennsylvania, withdrew from Christian work, though he kept his faith. The children of the Smiths became leaders among the agnostic intellectuals of the time. One daughter was the first wife of philosopher Bertrand Russell.

Three or four days before the opening of the meeting with the Smiths in Keswick on June 29, 1885, Hartford-Batterby received a telegram saying the Smiths would not be coming. Hartford-Batterby did not, however, cancel the meetings. Except for the war years, there has been a convention at Keswick every year since. Evan Hopkins did not attend the first Keswick Convention, but he did attend the next forty-one (Pollock, p. 39).

Hopkins' book, *The Law of Liberty and the Spiritual Life*, appeared at Easter in 1884. During that summer, H. C. G. Moule, principal since 1881 of the New Theological College of Ridley Hall at Cambridge, wrote four articles in which he said Hopkins' book was faulty in exegesis and unsound in conclusion. In September, Moule heard Hopkins speak and surrendered himself to the "indwelling Friend." Later he signed a letter to Hopkins with, "Your once prejudiced and now most thankful convert and friend" (Pollock, pp. 68-70). Moule delivered a set of scholarly lectures widely circulated as *Thoughts on Christian Sanctity*. Pollock says that with the publication of that book the

movement matured theologically and "Hopkins did not disguise his debt to Moule's adjustment of balance and focus" (Pollock, p. 72).

Many well-known Christian leaders have been connected with Keswick, some slightly and others giving their full support. Although he only spoke at Keswick once (1892), D. L. Moody became a "strong supporter" (Pollock, p. 77, 78 fn.). He invited Keswick speakers to Northfield and Chicago. At first, R. A. Torrey, the superintendent of the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, and C. I. Scofield, who at the time was a pastor in Northfield, Massachusetts, lodged "heavy protest," but later they understood "the drift" (Pollock, p. 117). Torrey spoke at Keswick on one occasion. In 1904, while in England to conduct meetings, he traveled to Keswick to listen. Once there, he was invited to give the Bible readings because Webb-Peploe had been called away due to family illness. He spoke on his series concerning the Holy Spirit. Other notable Keswick Convention speakers include F. B. Meyer, William Murray, Graham Scroggie, Donald Grey Barnhouse, Alan Redpath, Paul Rees, Wilbur Smith, John R. Stott, and Warren Wiersbe.

What is the Keswick view of the spiritual life?

An Explanation

Traditionally, there has been a sequence to Keswick teaching that follows the days of the week. On Monday, the nature and effect of sin in the believer is revealed. In a carnal believer, sin is the controlling factor. Tuesday's theme is God's provision for victory. Cleansing is proclaimed; identification with Christ is stressed. Wednesday's subject is man's response, namely consecration. The believer must surrender unconditionally to God. On Thursday, the message is the filling of the Spirit. The spiritual life is a crisis (Wednesday) with a process in view (Thursday). Friday's focus is service, the result of the sequence. For a thorough treatment of this sequence, see *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, edited by Herbert F. Stevenson. It contains 65 messages delivered at Keswick from 1875-1957. Except for messages on service, it follows the sequence.

The Need for Sanctification The Keswick approach begins with the need for sanctification. The practical reality is that believers are carnal, controlled by sin. McQuilkin puts it like this: "What is the average Christian's experience? Church members typically think and behave much like morally upright non-Christians. They are decent enough, but there is nothing supernatural about them. Their behavior is quite explainable in terms of heredity, early environment, and present circumstance. They yield to temptation more often than not, lusting when their bodies demand it, coveting what they do not have, and taking credit for their accomplishments. The touchstone of their choice is self-interest, and though they have a love for God and others, it does not control their life. There is little change of behavior; in fact, most church members do not expect much improvement and are little concerned about that prospect. Scripture is not exciting. Prayer is perfunctory, and service in the church demonstrates a little touch of the supernatural. Above all, their life seems to have an empty core, for it does not center around a constant, physical companionship with the Lord" (McQuilkin, pp. 151-152).

The Nature of Sanctification The solution to carnality is, of course, sanctification, but what is the nature of the Keswick view of sanctification?

When the author of *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention* wanted to describe the essence of sanctification, he quoted a passage from

Thoughts on Christian Sanctity by H. C. G. Moule. According to Moule, the aim is "to displace self from the inner throne, and to enthrone Him; to make not the slightest compromise with the smallest sin. We aim at nothing less than to walk with God all day long, to abide every hour in Christ and He and His Word in us, to love God with all our heart and our neighbor as ourselves." As Pollock goes on to explain, Moule makes the stupendous claim that "it is possible to cast every care on Him daily, and to be at peace amidst pressure, to see the will of God in everything, to put away *all* bitterness and clamor and evil speaking, daily and hourly. It is possible by unreserved resort to divine power under divine conditions to become strongest through and through at our weakest point" (Pollock, p. 74).

The Means of Sanctification How is this type of sanctification to be obtained? What is the means of the spiritual life? Again, Pollock quotes Moule: "It does not depend on wearisome struggle, but on God's power to take the consecrated soul and to keep him. God is an eternal Person undertaking for you. Keswick stands distinctly for this: Christ our righteousness, upon Calvary, received by faith, is also Christ our holiness, in the heart that submits to Him and relies upon Him ... a message as old as the apostles but too much forgotten: the open secret of inward victory for liberty and life and service through the trusted power of an indwelling Christ, Christ in us for our deliverance from sin, for our emancipation from the tyranny of self, for the conquest of temptation. The entrance is a twin door: surrender and faith" (Pollock, p. 74). "Would we know the Christ *in us* in His power? We must yield ourselves to the Christ *over us,* in His will, His rights. This great truth of Christ over us by every claim of lordship, sovereignty and possession is the other side of Keswick's distinctive message" (Pollock, p. 75).

According to Moule, the Keswick view of the spiritual life is illustrated by Aristotle's definition of a slave, "a chattel that lives." As a slave of Christ, Moule said Christ was "my master, my possessor; absolute, not constitutionally, supremely entitled to order me about all day. How delightful the thought that hands or head or voice are indeed the implements of the faithful slave, kept at work for such an owner—His property, and glad indeed to be so" (Pollock, p. 75).

An Evaluation

The Keswick view is to be applauded for pointing out that the New Testament teaches that Christians can be carnal and that Christians can have victory over sin. The New Testament certainly teaches both (Rom. 7:24-25). The emphasis on the believer's identification with Christ within the Keswick tradition is excellent. Nevertheless, there are several misconceptions.

Christ's Part First, the Keswick view overextends Christ's part in sanctification. Granted, Christ lives in the believer, but according to the way the Keswick message is presented, He lives His life through the believer to such an extent that everything is Christ; the believer is nothing.

One popular Keswick speaker put it like this, "To be *in Christ*—that is redemption; but for Christ to be *in you*—that is sanctification! To be *in Christ*—that makes you fit for heaven; but for Christ to be *in you*—that makes you fit for earth! To be *in Christ*—that changes your destination, but for Christ to be *in you*—that changes your destiny! The one makes heaven your home—the other makes this world His workshop" (Thomas, p. 29).

That same author also wrote, "It is only the life of the Lord Jesus—His activity, *clothed* with you and *displayed* through you, that ultimately we find the approval of God. As a forgiven sinner, you are a member of 'a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ' (1 Peter 2:5). It is the Lord Jesus Christ alone who makes your sacrifices acceptable to God. Only what He does in you and through you merits His approval, and God can, and will, accept nothing less!" (Thomas, p. 29).

Another well-known book on the Keswick view of the spiritual life says it like this: "He wants to come Himself into our lives, to dwell in our hearts and live His life in us. What a wonderful thing this is!" (*Unknown Christian*, p. 33). "This Victorious Life is a *gift* and it is not to be secured by any struggling or striving on our part. It is not a thing to be obtained to by long and laborious effort. It is not a thing we can reach gradually or by growing more and more like Christ. This must be clearly seen" (Unknown Christian, p. 65). "Let go—surrender: then 'let God' do His part. But God would not allow any effort or struggle on your part to help Him. Salvation is entirely a gift of God: entirely of grace" (Unknown Christian, p. 67). "We have proved by our experience that we cannot be good by self-effort. Stop trying to be good. Stop struggling and let the Savior do the work for you" (Unknown Christian, p. 71).

Crisis Secondly, the Keswick view insists on a crisis not taught in the New Testament. In 1874, when Hartford-Batterby, the founder of Keswick, first heard Broadman, Smith and Evans, he understood that they were teaching that believers had to make a deliberate act of full surrender and enter a rest of faith, that is, "There must be a crisis leading to a process" (Pollock, 26). (In the early years of my Christian experience, I heard R. R. Brown teach that the spiritual life was "a crisis with a process in view.") In 1890, Moule warned, "There is a risk when it is too much insisted upon that an instantaneous experience of a liberty unknown before is an essential." He believed that a crisis might be the beginning of a deeper spiritual life for some, but not for all (Pollock, p. 76).

Candidly, the Keswick movement did not hear Moule's warning. The message for every Wednesday of the Keswick week is consecration—full surrender! Granted, Keswick has not gone as far as the Wesleyan teaching that the act of surrender means the creation of a "clean heart," which is different from the new nature (Pollock, p. 76). Nonetheless, the Keswick approach teaches a "crisis" about which the New Testament knows nothing.

Passivity Thirdly, the practical net result of the Keswick doctrine ends up making believers passive. They call the "process" a "rest of faith." Too often, this comes off with believers resting and not exercising effort. Believers are exhorted to "Let go and let God." They let go, all right and wait for God to do it through them.

Summary: The Keswick view of sanctification is that believers need to recognize their carnality and identification with Christ and fully surrender to Him so that He can live His life through them as they trust Him. The result is service. The problem with such a view is that it overextends Christ's part in sanctification, especially through a crisis unknown to the New Testament, and tends to make believers passive.

The Keswick view of the spiritual life raises several critical questions: 1) Is there such a thing as a carnal Christian? 2) Is a crisis necessary for sanctification? 3) Is Christ's part

in sanctification to live His life through believers? 4) Are believers active or passive in sanctification?

While the Keswick explanation of Christ's part in sanctification is overextended, their preoccupation with Him is their contribution to the overall discussion of the spiritual life. Granted, Christ does not dwell in believers in such a way that they become nothing and Christ lives His life through them as if they were nothing more than a glove and Christ were the hand in it, but it is true that Christ is the believer's life (Col. 3:4) and that every believer ought to say, "For me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1:21). It is Christ who is to be formed in the believer (Gal. 4:19). As believers focus on the Son of God in the Word of God, the Spirit of God transforms them into the same image from glory to glory (2 Cor. 3:18).

Dr. S. D. Gordon tells of a Christian lady who, in her old age, began to lose her memory. In her younger years, she had known much of the Bible by heart. In her later years, the only verse that she could remember was, "I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed to Him against that day," but even that verse began to slip from her memory. All she could repeat was, "That which I have committed unto Him." As she lay on her deathbed, her loved ones noticed her lips moving. They drew close to hear what she was saying. She was repeating over and over again to herself the only word of the text she could remember, "Him, Him, Him." She had lost the whole Bible, except for one word, but she had the whole Bible in that one word. In the final analysis, the Christian life is summed up in the one word, Christ.

THE PENTECOSTAL VIEW

John Fletcher was John Wesley's friend and confidant. He was also the first to write a formal theology of Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection (Dieter, p. 44). Fletcher, however, took a new tack. He called the moment of entire sanctification the "baptism of the Holy Ghost" (Dieter, p. 43). In a letter to him, Wesley said, "If they like to call this 'receiving the Holy Ghost' they may: only the phrase in that sense is not scriptural and not quite proper, for they all 'received the Holy Ghost' when they were justified" (Wesley, cited by Sangster, p. 84). Thus, Wesley himself did not call his view of sanctification receiving the Holy Spirit or the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Although Fletcher's terminology was not adopted within the Wesleyan tradition, others, especially in the nineteenth century, began to talk more and more about the Holy Spirit. The Keswick movement frequently speaks of the filling of the Spirit. On Thursday of the Keswick week, it is the day's theme. R. A. Torrey preached the filling of the Spirit and called it the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The Holiness Movement even began to call the entire, instant sanctification the "baptism of the Holy Spirit." That term was commonly used by the end of the nineteenth century (Dieter, p. 44).

The Pentecostal Movement, however, defined the baptism of the Holy Spirit in a way that had not been done before in all of church history. It all began in Topeka, Kansas.

Charles F. Parham was a Methodist preacher who taught, "Sanctification is a second definite work of grace, as taught by John Wesley and the early Methodists." So said his wife in her biography of him (Parham, p. 21). He also preached healing (Parham, p. 33). In fact, in 1898, he established a divine healing house he called "Bethel" on the corner of Fourth and Jackson Streets in Topeka, Kansas (Parham, p. 39). In October 1900, he opened a Bible school there (Parham, p. 51).

Parham had a question: "What was the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit?" In his words, "Having heard so many different religious bodies claim different proofs as the evidence of their having the Pentecostal baptism, I set the students at work studying out diligently what was the Bible evidence of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that we might go before the world with something that was indisputable because it tallied absolutely with the Word" (Parham, p. 52).

His sister-in-law, who was there, said the substance of what he told the students was, "Students, as I have studied the teachings of the various Bible schools and full gospel movements, conviction, conversion, healing, and sanctification are taught virtually the same, but on the baptism, there is a difference among them. Some accept Steven Merrits' teaching of baptism at sanctification, while others say this is only the anointing and there is a baptism received through the 'laying on of hands' or the gift of the Holy Ghost, yet they agree on no definite evidence. Some claim this fulfillment of promise 'by faith' without any special witness, while others, because of the wonderful blessings or demonstrations, such as shouting or jumping. Though I honor the Holy Ghost in anointing power both in conversion and in sanctification, yet I believe there is a greater revelation of His power. The gifts are in the Holy Spirit and with the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the gifts, as well as the graces, should be manifested. Now, students, while I am

gone, see if there is not some evidence given of the baptism so that there can be no doubt on the subject" (Parham, p. 58).

Having given his students an assignment, Parham traveled to Kansas City to preach. He returned on December 30, 1900. He immediately gathered the students in the chapel and inquired about their findings. They all agreed that the "indispensable proof" of the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2 was "that they spoke with other tongues" (Parham, p. 52).

One of the students was Miss Agnes N. Osman (later LaBerg). Just before 7:00 p.m. on January 1, 1901, she asked Parham to lay his hands on her so that she might receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Parham's description of what happened next is: "I'd scarcely repeated three dozen sentences when a glory fell upon her, a halo seemed to surround her head and face, and she began speaking in the Chinese language and was unable to speak English for three days" (Parham, p. 52-53). Parham quoted Osman as saying, "It was nearly seven o'clock on the first of January that it came into my heart to ask Bro. Parham to lay his hands upon me that I might receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. It was as his hands were laid upon my head that the Holy Spirit fell upon me and I began to speak in tongues, glorifying God. I talked several languages, and it was clearly manifest when a new dialect was spoken. I had the added joy and glory my heart longed for and a depth of the presence of the Lord within that I had never known before. It was as if rivers of living water were proceeding from my innermost being" (Parham, p. 66).

According to Pentecostalism, that was the first time since the New Testament times that the baptism of the Holy Spirit had been sought, and speaking in tongues was expected as the initial evidence. Thus, the modern Pentecostal movement was born.

In his book, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Donald W. Dayton argues that to define Pentecostalism in terms of the doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Holy Spirit is reductionism (Dayton, pp. 15-17). He insists Pentecostalism consists of four theological issues: salvation, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, healing, and Premillennialism (Dayton, pp. 117-123). Granted, those four elements are virtually universal within all varieties of Pentecostalism. Nevertheless, many non-Pentecostals have taught salvation, healing, and Premillennialism before and after the inception of the modern Pentecostal movement. The fact is that the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues is the distinctive characteristic of Pentecostalism. William Menzies, in his history of the Assembly of God, entitled *Anointed to Serve*, defines the Pentecostal movement as the belief in "the experience of an endowment with a power called 'the baptism of the Holy Spirit'...to be evidenced by the accompanying sign of 'speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance'" (Menzies, p. 9).

The modern Pentecostal movement was born in Topeka, Kansas, on January 1, 1901. From Topeka, by way of Houston, the tongues phenomenon spread to 312 Azusa Street near downtown Los Angeles in 1906. From there, the movement spread around the world.

What is the Pentecostal view of the spiritual life?

An Explanation

The Pentecostal view of the spiritual life centers on their doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. While other schools of thought on the spiritual life believe in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the Pentecostal view is distinctive.

The Time of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit Classic Pentecostalism and the contemporary Charismatic movement both teach that after conversion, believers should experience the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues, but not all within those groups agree on the time element of the experience. Originally, Pentecostalism taught that there were three experiences: conversion, sanctification, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Remember that Parham was a Methodist preacher who had already been "sanctified" when he experienced the baptism (Parham, p. 21, 54)! The doctrinal statement of the Los Angeles document "The Apostolic Faith Movement," dated September 1906, clearly says that the first work is justification, and sanctification is the second and the last work of grace. Then it says, "The baptism with the Holy Spirit is a gift of power upon the sanctified life" (Hollenweger, p. 513).

Stanley Horton has observed, "The early Pentecostals continued to teach sanctification as a second definite work of grace, believing that the baptism of the Holy Spirit represented a third experience" (Horton, p. 107). That view is still taught today in such Holiness-Pentecostal groups as the Church of God of Prophecy, headquartered in Cleveland, Tennessee, and the Pentecostal Holiness Church (Horton, p. 108).

From the earliest days of the Pentecostal movement, others taught only two experiences. In 1910, William H. Durham, a Chicago Holiness preacher who had received the baptism, began to preach that believers are sanctified from the time of their justification. They do not need a second work of entire sanctification. They do, however, need to receive the Spirit. Durham moved to Los Angeles, where he caused a great controversy among the Pentecostalists. Charles Parham prayed that God would take Durham's life if the second definite work was true. Durham died six months later, but that did not end the controversy (Horton, pp. 107-108).

The Pentecostal denomination called the Assemblies of God was formed in Hot Springs, Arkansas in 1914. In 1918, the headquarters was established in Springfield, Missouri, where it remains. From their inception, they have taught two experiences: conversion and the baptism of the Holy Spirit after conversion.

Thus, some Pentecostalists teach two experiences and others insist on three, but all Pentecostalists agree that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is subsequent to conversion. In the words of the doctrinal statement of the Assemblies of God, "This wonderful experience is distinct from and subsequent to the experience of the new birth" (Hollenweger, p. 515).

The Nature of the Baptism of the Spirit Pentecostalists have not only differed over the time of the baptism of the Holy Spirit; they have differed over other aspects of it, but they are all agreed that the need and nature of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is power. Concerning the first experience of the baptism, with the evidence of speaking in tongues, Parham said, "When I beheld the evidence of the restoration of Pentecostal power, my heart was melted in gratitude to God for what my eyes had seen" (Parham, p. 54). Notice he called the experience "the restoration of Pentecostal power." The woman on whom Parham first laid hands, the first person to have the Pentecostal experience, said she cried

out “for the endowment with power from on high” (Parham, p. 66). The statement of faith of the Apostolic Faith Movement says, “The baptism with the Holy Ghost is a gift of power upon the sanctified life” (Hollenweger, p. 513). Likewise, the Assemblies of God doctrinal statement says, “With it (that is, the baptism) comes the endowment of power for life and service, the bestowment of the gifts and their use in the ministry” (Hollenweger, p. 515).

According to the Pentecostal perspective, the need and nature of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is power.

The Evidence of the Baptism Pentecostals have differed among themselves concerning the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. There is no doubt, however, that Parham believed the evidence was speaking in tongues. For him, that was the issue (Parham, pp. 51-52, 58). It is what he looked for and what he said Osman, as well as he experienced, but within a few years, others disagreed. F. F. Bosworth, A. G. Canada and others did not regard tongues as the sole sign of the baptism. They wanted to recognize other gifts as signs of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In 1918, Bosworth demanded a discussion of this issue at the pastor’s conference. He lost the vote. From that time, “It was no longer possible to be a pastor of the Assemblies of God and at the same time deny the distinctive doctrine of the Assemblies of God that speaking with tongues had necessarily to accompany the baptism in the Spirit” (Hollenweger, p. 32).

An Evaluation

The Pentecostalists, as a group, are no doubt sincere and committed. Their very presence in the body of Christ in the twentieth century has brought the discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to the forefront more than once. The question is, “Is their view the biblical view?” Candidly, their doctrine does not fit what the New Testament teaches.

The Time of Spiritual Baptism First, the Pentecostal perspective misplaces the time of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostalism uniformly places the baptism of the Holy Spirit after regeneration. What does the New Testament teach?

The first occurrence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is in Acts 2. All present were Jews (Acts 2:1, 5). In this case, the baptism of the Holy Spirit was indeed after regeneration for at least one hundred and twenty, but that was because it was the first historical occurrence of it.

The second occurrence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is in Acts 8. In that case, the baptism was given to the Samaritans (Acts 8:5, 14). Again, it was after regeneration, but that was because the Apostles were not present. The Samaritans had to wait for the arrival of the Apostles before they could receive the baptism. Why? If the Holy Spirit had come upon the Samaritans in Acts 8 as He did on the Jews in Acts 2, there would have forever been two mother churches. God had Peter and John lay hands on them to prevent such a division and produce unity.

The third occurrence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is in Acts 10. This time, it was on the Gentiles (Acts 10:1, 2, 45) and at conversion, not after their conversion (Acts 11:17).

The fourth and final occurrence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Acts is in chapter 19. On this occasion, some of the disciples of John the Baptist received it after their regeneration.

Since spiritual baptism only happened four times in Acts and on four different and distinct groups, such as Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles, it would appear that Acts describes a transitional period during which Christianity spread from Jews to Gentiles. That theory explains the first three occurrences, but what about the fourth? Why, after all that, did the disciples of John the Baptist receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit?

The answer is in the purpose and plan of the book of Acts. Acts can be divided into two parts: the acts of Peter and the acts of Paul. Many commentators have pointed out that whatever Peter does, Paul does. For example, both healed a lame man, which got them into trouble. Both were arrested in the Temple and brought before the Sanhedrin. Both incurred the jealousy of the Jews. Both were beaten. Both raised someone from the dead. Both were worshiped. Both were jailed. Both were delivered from jail. Both gave the baptism of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands. Commentators have also concluded that the parallelism between the acts of Peter and the acts of Paul is due to the author's intention to defend Paul's apostolic authority. Thus, the disciples of John the Baptist received the baptism of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of Paul's hands so it could be demonstrated that Paul had the same apostolic authority as Peter. It was a special case.

The question, then, is, "What is normative?" Even during the transitional period in Acts, there is no consistent pattern. The spiritual baptism occurred both at and after the conversion. Apparently, after the transitional period, all who trusted Christ were baptized by the Holy Spirit at the moment of their conversion. First Corinthians 12:13 says that all believers are baptized into one body by one Spirit. Remember, 1 Corinthians is addressed to "all who in every place call on the name of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 1:2). Now all believers receive all spiritual blessings in Christ (Eph. 1:3) and all believers are complete in Him (Col. 2:10).

The Nature of Spiritual Baptism Second, the Pentecostal perception misinterprets the nature of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostalism teaches that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is the reception of the Holy Spirit for power and service, but that is not what the New Testament teaches.

First Corinthians 12:13 declares that "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." The baptism of the Holy Spirit is not power for service; it is the placement of believers into the body of Christ! Only five verses in the epistles refer to the baptism of the Holy Spirit: Romans 6:3, 1 Corinthians 12:13, Galatians 3:27, Ephesians 4:5, and Colossians 2:12. These references make it clear that spiritual baptism places believers into the body of Christ. Romans 6:3 and Galatians 3:27 say it places the believer "into Christ." Colossians 2:12 says we are buried with Him. First Corinthians 12:13 says believers are baptized into one body. By being baptized into the body of Christ, believers are permanently united to Christ and to each other.

The Evidence of the Baptism Third, the Pentecostal persuasion misunderstands the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostalism claims that speaking in tongues is evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. There are two aspects of this issue: What is the nature of tongues, and are tongues the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit?

There is no question that tongues in the New Testament were known languages. The phenomenon of tongues only occurs in three books of the New Testament: Mark, Acts, and 1 Corinthians. In Mark 16:17, tongues are languages. The Greek word rendered

"tongues" means either the physical tongue or a language. It cannot be disputed or debated that tongues in Acts 2 were known languages. They are called languages (Acts 2:6, 8) and the languages that are spoken are listed (Acts 2:8-10)! Since this is the first occurrence of tongues in the book of Acts and there is no other definition or description of tongues given in Acts, all other occurrences of tongues in Acts must be languages. The tongues in 1 Corinthians is also a known human language. The same Greek word translated "tongues" in 1 Corinthians 12 is used in Mark and Acts for "languages." Furthermore, 1 Corinthians 14:21 is a quotation from Isaiah 28:10-11. The tongues of Isaiah were foreign languages. They were the languages of the Assyrians and the Babylonians. Some object that Paul refers to the tongues of men and angels (1 Cor. 13:1), but every time an angel spoke in the Bible, it was in a known human language, either Hebrew, Aramaic or perhaps Greek.

Within Pentecostalism, the original idea was that tongues were a language. Even before the first "experience," Parham expected a language. He said, "I had felt for years that any missionary going to the foreign field should preach in the language of the natives. That if God had ever equipped His ministers in that way, He could do it today" (Parham. p. 51). He said that Agnes Osman, the first to speak in tongues as the evidence of the baptism, spoke in Chinese (Parham, p. 52). When he received the "experience," Parham claimed he spoke in Swedish (Parham, p. 54). Many Pentecostalists since have claimed they spoke in a known human language. The problem with that claim is that no objective linguist has been able to verify it. When qualified and recognized linguists study the tongues of today, they conclude that these tongues are not known languages. The nature of tongues in the Pentecostal movement today is not the same as the tongues of the New Testament.

Are tongues the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit? Granted, tongues accompanied the first experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit on the Jewish Christians in Acts 2 and on the first experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit among the Gentiles in Acts 10, as well as on the disciples of John the Baptist in Acts 19, but the text of Acts does not say that the Samaritans spoke in tongues when they received the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Acts 8. Furthermore, those are the only examples of the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Acts, but many other people in Acts were converted and, no doubt, received the Holy Spirit, yet nothing is said of them speaking in tongues.

The proof that tongues is not the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is in 1 Corinthians 12. First Corinthians 12:13 says that all believers have received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Yet 1 Corinthians 12:30 teaches that not all Christians speak with tongues. Therefore, tongues cannot be the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Summary: The Pentecostal view of sanctification is that after conversion, believers can receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues.

The problem with that view is that it misplaces the time of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, misinterprets the nature of the baptism, and misunderstands the evidence for it.

The Pentecostal view of the spiritual life provokes several critical questions: 1) Is the baptism of the Holy Spirit after conversion? 2) Is the baptism of the Holy Spirit for power? 3) Is the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit tongues?

While the Pentecostal view of the work of the Holy Spirit in the spiritual life is not according to the New Testament, the fact remains that the Scriptures teach that the Holy

Spirit plays an indispensable part in the believer's spiritual life. He enlightens (Jn. 16:13-14) and empowers (Eph. 3:16). As the children of God behold the Son of God in the Word of God, the Spirit of God transforms them into the image of Christ (2 Cor. 3:18).

Years ago, A. J. Gordon told of an American who said to an English friend, “Come and I’ll show you the greatest unused power in the world.” He took him to the foot of Niagara Falls and said, “There is the greatest unused power in the world,” to which the Englishman replied, “Ah, no, my brother, not so. The greatest unused power in the world is the Holy Spirit of the living God.” Though the Holy Spirit is available to every believer, unfortunately, believers do not behold the Son of God in the Word of God to allow the Spirit of God to conform them to Christ.

A SUGGESTED SCRIPTURAL VIEW

Every Protestant position on the spiritual life claims Scriptural support. In their opinion, their view is the biblical view, but it can be demonstrated to believers outside of these groups that every view has an item or two that is not biblically based. What, then, is the Scriptural teaching concerning the spiritual life?

Surely, anyone attempting to suggest that all the major Protestant explanations of the spiritual life fall short and proposing to have the biblically accurate understanding of the subject will be perceived as being arrogant. Imagine correcting everyone within Protestantism! Is that not what all Protestant views claim? Does not everyone claim his or her view is the biblical view? Since that is the case, another *suggested* attempt at an accurate biblical exposition of the spiritual life is not pride. It is simply being "fair-minded" (Acts 17:11). Therefore, all believers should search the Scriptures to see God's view of the spiritual life.

The Author of the Spiritual Life

Perhaps the first and foremost issue is, who is the author of the spiritual life? The Reformed view insists that God is the author of sanctification to the extent that man's responsibility is virtually eliminated. They, of course, would deny that charge, but their denial does not solve their problem. By rejecting the concept of a carnal Christian, they negate man's responsibility. Failure, according to them, is impossible.

What is the biblical balance? There is no question but that the Scripture teaches that God is the author of sanctification. In fact, most occurrences of the word "sanctification" refer to what God has done or will do. While the New Testament teaches God is the author of sanctification, it also teaches believers are genuinely responsible. That is the biblical balance.

God Sanctifies Obviously, God is the author of sanctification. Using spiritual baptism, God has placed believers into Christ (Rom. 6:3), which means they are put into Christ's death (Rom. 6:3) and resurrection (Rom. 6:4). The believer's death is the death of the old man (Rom. 6:6). The phrase "old man" has been the subject of much discussion, debate, and disagreement. Some say the old man is the old nature in a believer. Those of that opinion either say the old man (nature) is "positional" truth (Scofield) or the old man (nature) must be experientially put to death, but the old man is not the old nature. The word "man" does not refer to the part of a person but to the entire inner person who lived before conversion. The man of old was crucified with Christ (Gal. 2:20). He has been put off (Col. 3:9 and Eph. 4:22) and, therefore, no longer exists. The old man was crucified "that the body of sin might be done away with" (Rom. 6:6). The "body of sin" is the mass of sin of pre-conversion days (Col. 2:11). That mass of sin was crucified at conversion. Simply put, believers are not the same individuals they were before conversion. That person is dead. Believers' resurrection means they are alive to God (Rom. 6:10-11). Moreover, God not only placed believers into Christ (Rom. 6:3), He has placed Christ in the believer (Gal. 2:20). Truly, God is the author of sanctification!

At the same time, believers "should no longer be slaves to sin" (Rom. 6:6). Believers do not have to be slaves to sin because they've been freed from it (Rom. 6:7). They should walk in a new kind of life (Rom. 6:4). That is God's purpose for the believer.

Believers Must Cooperate God is the author of sanctification, but believers are genuinely responsible. They are responsible to know (Rom. 6:3, 6), to believe (6:8, 11), and to present themselves to the Lord (6:13). There is nothing in Romans 6 that says God guarantees man will do that. In fact, the extended passage acknowledges believers, indeed, might not! Instead of not being a slave to sin (Rom. 6:6), which is God's purpose for believers, some believers may indeed be slaves to sin (Rom. 7:23). To teach that carnality or failure is not possible is to render the imperatives concerning sanctification in the New Testament either redundant or useless. For example, Romans 12:2 says, "Do not be conformed to this world." If that is not possible, why did Paul issue that command?

Thus, the biblical balance is that God is the author of the spiritual life, but believers must do their part, or there will be carnality, not sanctity. The whole New Testament indicates that.

The Nature of the Spiritual Life

Conformity to Christ The goal is to be conformed to the image of Christ. God predestined believers to be conformed to the image of His Son (Rom. 8:29). Paul labored until Christ was formed in his converts (Gal 4:19). The nature, essence, and object is to be transformed into Christ's image (2 Cor. 3:18).

Again, this is not a debated or disputed issue. All agree. The disagreement comes over some of the details of what that means. Is the image of Christ reflected in the Mosaic Law so that as believers use the Law as a guide, they are conformed to Christ? Are believers under the Law? The answer is, "No!" (Rom. 6:14; Gal. 3:24-25; 4:10-11).

Jesus is said to be full of grace and truth (Jn. 1:14). Still later, John adds, "For the law was given through Moses, but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (Jn. 1:17; see also 14:5). Jesus spoke the truth. Jesus told Nicodemus the truth; He told him that he had to be born again (Jn. 3:7). Jesus is full of grace (Jn. 1:14). Jesus was gracious. He did not condemn the woman caught in the act of adultery. After forgiving her, He told her not to sin again (Jn. 8:11). He spoke the truth and was gracious.

Conformity to Christ consists of both being righteous and being loving. Believers are to pursue righteousness and love (1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22). The Reformed emphasis on the Law is misplaced. The Wesleyan explanation of love is more on target. If we love, we fulfill the Mosaic Law (Rom. 13:8; Gal. 5:18). The Law says, "Don't murder, commit adultery, steal, or bear false witness." If you love a person, you will not harm his life, wife, property, or reputation. Therefore, love automatically fulfills the Law. As Paul said, "Love does no harm to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfillment of the law" (Rom. 13:10).

Gradual Growth The nature of the spiritual life is that it is a life of gradual growth whereby believers are increasingly conformed to the image of Christ. As the old is put off and the new is put on, believers gradually become more like Christ.

All Protestant points of view on the spiritual life agree with this point. The Westminster Confession uses the very phrase "more and more" to describe the gradual growth and sanctification. Wesley believed that a Christian could experience some

growth before the crisis and should grow even more after it. The Keswick view defines the spiritual life as "a crisis with a process in view." Pentecostalism likewise teaches growth after the baptism of the Holy Spirit experience.

The issue is whether believers have some kind of a crisis. Does the New Testament teach instantaneous sanctification, a crisis, or an experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit after conversion? The answer is "No."

The most often heard argument for a crisis is that Romans 12:1 says, "present your bodies" and the word "present" is in the aorist tense, signifying a definite complete act. That is pouring entirely too much meaning into the aorist tense. The constative aorist contemplates the action in its entirety regardless of the time involved and views the action as a single unit (Dana and Mantey, p. 196). For example, Jesus said, "It has taken forty-six years to build this temple" (Jn. 2:20), using the aorist tense to express something that took place over forty-six years! Concerning the use of the aorist tense in 1 Thessalonians 5:23, Hiebert, a Greek professor, states, "Some insist that the aorist tense here points to the crisis experience of entire sanctification, but it is generally accepted that the action is best viewed as a constative [something that can be judged as true or false], a process of sanctification occurring during the entire life and viewed as consummated at the return of Christ. Even those who insist upon the meaning of the initial crisis experience stress that it must be followed by a continuing process of sanctification" (Hiebert, p. 250).

The presentation of Romans 12:1 is realized in acts of obedience (Rom. 6:16).

Prior illustrates, "I may say to my little boy 'Eat up your dinner,' and if I were speaking in the Greek New Testament, I might well use an aorist imperative because I want him to make a definite act of obedience. I could not, however, mean that this one act of obedience will be enough to last him for the rest of his life!" (Prior, p. 89).

The thrust of the New Testament is that the spiritual life is a life of growth. We are to desire the Word that we may grow (1 Pet. 2:2). We are to grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 3:18). We are to grow up in all things into Him (Eph. 4:15). We are to grow in love "more and more" (Phil. 1:9; 1 Thess. 4:9-10).

Some may object, "Have not many believers testified to an experience that has changed their life?" Prior answers, "Now it is usually a good thing to remember that Christian experience is not necessarily the same thing as the experience of some Christians!" (Prior, p. 85).

The Means of the Spiritual Life

The Word The first and foremost means of the spiritual life is the Word of God. Berkhof calls the Word the "principal means" (Berkhof, 535).

Jesus prayed, "Sanctify them by Your truth; Your Word is truth" (Jn. 17:17). Peter commands us to desire the Word that we may grow (1 Pet. 2:2). Paul says we must "know," which necessitates the Word of God (Rom. 6:3, 6). John said, "He who keeps His commandments abides in Him" (1 Jn. 3:24), which again means one must have the Word of God. The believer is to desire the Word (1 Pet. 2:2) and meditate on the Word (Ps. 1:2).

The Holy Spirit The Holy Spirit teaches through the Apostles (Jn. 14:26; see also Jn. 16:12-15), that is, the New Testament and through the gift of teaching (Rom. 12:7). He empowers (Acts 1:8; Eph. 3:16) and He transforms (2 Cor. 3:18; Rom. 12:2).

The spiritual life is lived by faith. Paul said it is from faith to faith (Rom. 1:17, see also 6:8, 11) and that the life we now live, we live by faith (Gal. 2:20; 2 Cor. 5:7; Eph. 3:17). Believers walk by faith when they believe what God says in His Word and trust God to deliver them in every circumstance (2 Cor. 1:9-10). Hearing the Word and believing the Word should result in doing what the Word says. Obedience is a part of the process (Jas. 1:21-25; Mt. 28:20; Rom. 6:16; 1 Jn. 3:28; etc.).

Fellowship Other believers also help. They provide a model (1 Pet. 5:3; 1 Cor. 11:1), encouragement and exhortation (Heb. 10:25), and maybe even correction and rebuke (2 Tim. 4:2; Titus 1:9), as well as restoration if need be (Gal. 6:1). Believers are involved with each other as they all move toward maturity (Eph. 4:16).

Trials also play a part in the process of sanctification. The genuine part of faith produces endurance (Jas. 1:3) and, as we endure, we are made complete and mature (Jas. 1:4).

Summary: A suggested Scriptural view of the spiritual life is that both God and the believer are involved in the process of gradual growth, whereby, as believers believe and obey God's Word, as well as have fellowship with other believers, they become more and more like Jesus Christ.

When discussing the Reformed view, I told the story of a little boy eating dinner with his family. He, without success, tried to open a bottle of catsup on the table. In his absence, the father loosened the cap and when the boy returned, he was able to take it off. I used the story to illustrate that had the father not loosened the cap, the boy would not have been able to do it. The truth is also that, had the boy not returned to the table and once again tried, the cap would still have been on the bottle. In the final analysis, although the boy could not have done it without the father, it wouldn't have been done without the boy's effort too. That is the biblical balance.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, the issues in formulating a view of the spiritual life are: 1) Who is the author of sanctification? 2) What is the nature of sanctification? 3) What are the means of sanctification?

The Reformed view says the author of sanctification is God. Its nature is the progressive restoration of the image of God as reflected in the Law, and the means to it is primarily the Word of God.

The Wesleyan view, although recognizing that God is the author of sanctification, tends to emphasize believers are the authors of the spiritual life and an instantaneous experience followed by a process producing love is the nature of it, and the means to getting it is an act of faith.

The Keswick view also recognizes that God is the author of sanctification, but, like the Wesleyan view, it tends to emphasize believers as the authors of the spiritual life. Its nature is a crisis with a process in view that produces Christ-likeness, and the means to it is a crisis of faith.

The Pentecostal view again recognizes that God is the author of sanctification but insists that men must seek the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The nature of it is an instantaneous experience that produces power, and the means to it is an act of faith.

A more biblical view is that God and believers are the "authors" of sanctification. Its nature is a gradual growth in conformity to the image of Christ, and its means are the Word of God, the Holy Spirit (faith and obedience), fellowship, and trials.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnabas, Stephen. *So Great Salvation*. Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1957.

Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.

Dana, H. E. and Julius R. Mantey. *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959.

Dayton, Donald W. *The Theological Roots of Pentecostalism.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1987.

Dieter, Melvin E. "The Wesleyan Perspective," *Five Views on Sanctification.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.

Hiebert, D. Edmond. *The Thessalonian Epistles*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1971.

Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.

Hoekema, Anthony A. "The Reformed Perspective," *Five Views on Sanctification.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.

Hollenweger, Walter J. *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*, Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972.

Horton, Stanley M. "The Pentecostal Perspective," *Five Views on Sanctification.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.

MacArthur, Jr., John F. *The Gospel According to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1988.

Menzies, William. *Anointed to Serve*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1971.

McQuilkin, J. Robertson. "The Keswick Perspective," *Five Views on Sanctification.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.

Parham, Sarah E., *The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985 reprint.

Pollack, J. C. *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964.

Sangster, W. E. *The Path to Perfection.* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1943.

Staples, Rob L. "Sanctification and Selfhood." Bethany, Oklahoma: Unpublished paper by the Professor of Theology at Bethany Nazarene College (now Southern Nazarene University), n. d.

Stevenson, Herbert F., ed. *Keswick's Authentic Voice*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing. House, 1959.

Thomas, Major W. Ian. *The Saving Life of Christ.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1961.

Unknown Christian. *How to Live the Victorious Christian Life*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1966.

Walvoord, John F. "The Augustinian-Dispensational Perspective," *Five Views on Sanctification.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.

Wesley, John. *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. New York: Eaton & Mains, n. d.