

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVIII.—NO. 2.

SEPTEMBER, MDCCCLXVII.

ARTICLE I.

The Works of Philip Lindsley, D. D., formerly Vice-President and President-elect of the College of New Jersey, Princeton; and late President of the University of Nashville, Tennessee. Edited by LE ROY J. HALSEY, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Northwest. 3 volumes. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott & Co. 1866.

The beautifully bound and elegantly printed volumes before us, three in number, reach respectively six hundred and forty-eight, seven hundred and twenty, seven hundred and thirty-one pages, and in the aggregate two thousand and ninety-nine: a fact that, in ordinary cases, might be as repulsive to most readers, as the anticipation of a long sermon is to most hearers. But the very style of their getting up, attracts, and invites to their perusal; while the name of the man whose works they are intended to commemorate, ensures from the large class constituting his immediate friends, and the thousands once under his care, many of whom survive him, a cordial reception, and an eager and attentive examination. When, in addition to these advantages, we find on the title-page the name of Le Roy J. Halsey as editor—a name that has already become classic, as

VOL. XVIII., NO. 2.—1.

embrace such principles as their creed. To be sure, every man may not receive the highest form of scholastic training, but every man should have an education that shall fit him for intelligent action in all the spheres he may fill; and those favored ones who may be conducted through all the chambers of the temple of science, up to its last and loftiest, can go forth among their fellow-men as luminous reflective points, radiating to all around them the light of which they are the fortunate repositories; and thus, by the union of a whole educated people, the tide now setting against us may be turned, and only thus can it be done. When we reach this lofty elevation, by God's blessing, ignorance, fanaticism, and corruption, shall cease to hold high carnival; and truth, justice, mercy, order, virtue,—the religion of Jesus Christ,—shall lead the whole land to temporal and eternal glory!

ARTICLE II.

UPHAM'S INTERIOR LIFE, AND THE DOCTRINE OF
HOLINESS.

Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life; Designed particularly for the Consideration of those who are seeking Assurance of Faith and Perfect Love. By THOMAS C. UPHAM. Eighth Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865.

“Christianity has its wonders. It requires man to acknowledge himself vile and abominable, and it requires him also to emulate the likeness of his Maker.” So wrote Pascal, the most exquisite of thinkers, in what would have been the noblest of modern works—of which, alas, we have only the accumulated *blocks*, wood, marble, and precious stones, out of which it was to

have been built—his “Thoughts.” In the grasp it takes of the two polar facts of man, his greatness and his misery, lies one of the decisive characteristics of Christianity—one of the immediate proofs that it is true, and therefore divine.

It expresses and explains that “sublime discontent,” of which Pascal so eloquently speaks. Man, made a king, but unkinged by sin, and to be re-throned by Christ, is the theme, as Emmanuel himself is the glorious hero, of its Record. And the first step of his recovery is the acknowledgment of his fall, his obligations, and his Redeemer. There is given him “an abasement of soul, not by an abasement of nature, but by penitence: not that we may abide there, but that we may attain thereby to exaltation.” The “stirrings of greatness” within us “originate not in human merit, but spring from grace, and follow humiliation.”

It is in the darkness of this humiliation, enhanced rather than relieved by transient flashes of the hope of spiritual greatness; it is there that the soul is born again. Its effectual calling is felt; “its election of God” becomes manifest. “We have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.” More; “we have access by faith into this grace, wherein we stand.”

Now, so great a thing is this—this translation from the irreligious to the religious state, “from death to life,”—that the preachers of the word almost inevitably, and almost universally, talk of it as though it were something absolute, intrinsically complete in itself: whereas we know, and occasionally say, that it is the soul’s entrance on a course whose consummation is to its beginning as mid-day to the dawn.

But considering how almost exclusively this first event, the sinner’s regeneration and justification, is dwelt upon and urged; it is a sublime example of the enlightening power of grace, that all through the Church, and in every age, books having the same purpose as this of Prof. Upham’s, have been constantly springing up. Different sects select different phrases in which to speak of it—theologize about it in their different dialects. Successive ages ply their best powers upon the problem: “What more is the believer to be, than a rudimentary Christian? Is there a definite “higher life,” with its proper methods, boundaries, and

tests? If there be, is it accessible to all? And if so, by what route? How approach it, achieve it, possess it forever?

The grand "discontent" of man with his spiritual condition reappears in the Church; reappears, let us say it, enlightened, ennobled, energized by being commanded; made imperative by being promised. It is the voice of God, that will not be silent in her heart, saying, "Be ye holy." Inspiration has spoken of a portion of the believers as *τέλειοι*; and by that very discrimination has authorised, as it has kindled, the ambition to attain that sacred eminence.

Thus he is a benefactor in things precious beyond price, who opens for us the inner door of the temple of holiness, or even points us to it more plainly, or more cheerfully, than before. But it behoves the guardians of the prosperity of Zion to watch narrowly, and judge boldly, the men who claim that they can render this service, lest they guide the people wrongly, or lest, in the very act of guiding, they lay snares for our feet.

The work before us is itself a striking proof of the depth of interest taken in this subject. Written in a style singularly tame and dry, it has had a very wide circulation, and has retained its hold upon the public mind for upwards of twenty years. It is thus seen to be a book of considerable importance, and worthy of critical examination—which we propose now to give it. And we expect to show that, with a large amount of practical wisdom, it combines serious errors of principle. With a great deal of method, we find in it very little of system. Indeed, it makes no pretension to a scientific treatment of the subject; and it will be necessary to institute our own inquiries, and draw from various and widely separated pages Prof. Upham's views on certain fundamental questions; nor shall we always succeed in making those pages consistent with each other.

The first great question—assuming, as we well may, that it is the believer's privilege and duty to be something more than a rudimentary Christian—is, What is that "something more?" This, again divides itself into two points demanding investigation; as to the nature of it, and the method of it. And it will be convenient to reverse this logical order, and consider the

method of the inner life first. Here the question is, Does this life, once begun, advance in the same or in varying planes? Is it a grand *plateau*, a level table land, sharply differenced in kind from what preceded it, but not so differenced within itself? Are there two *kinds* of Christians in the world: the Christians who are only justified, and the Christians who are also sanctified? And are the believers of this last class only entitled to be called "saints?" And can they properly be spoken of as in a state of "entire" and "perfect sanctification," dwelling in "perfect love?" It will be easy to show that the book before us must and does answer these questions in the affirmative, though not by any means uniform in doing so.

On p. 23, "Christian perfection" is used as a convertible term for "that holiness which * * * we are imperatively required and *expected* to exercise." On the next page, "holiness" is explained as "pure and perfect love;" and "the possession of the hidden life," is said to be "impossible, except on the condition of [this] holiness of heart." Then comes a chapter (iii.) on "The Attainment of Holiness." The phrase "perfect and entire sanctification," is constantly used, and is expressly declared to be the equivalent of "assurance of faith." Once more: "If the doctrine, which is variously termed sanctification, evangelical holiness, and evangelical or Christian perfection, be true; * * * then it will follow that it is our duty and *privilege*, even in the present life, to realise in our souls the fulfilment of that great command, 'Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart.'" P. 145. These are only specimens, taken almost at random, of language to be found on almost every page.

To complete our view of his doctrine on this point, it only remains to say that, having appropriated such words as "holiness," "saints," "sanctification," etc., exclusively to this class, he evidently experiences a difficulty in either finding scriptural names for the remainder of the Church, or even admitting its existence. On the first page, he does, indeed, distinctly admit that "the hidden or interior life," is "a *modification* or *form* of religious experience;" and that "when a person first * * * exercises faith in Christ as a Saviour from sin, there is no doubt, *however*

feeble these early exercises may be, that he has truly entered upon a new life." But chapter v. takes a different tone. Speaking of the man who has just made an entire and effectual consecration of himself, and thus begun his life of perfect sanctification, he says, "*Perhaps he had faith before. If he were a Christian, he must of course have known something of justifying faith!*" He then proceeds to treat of three kinds of faith—"historical faith," and "general religious faith,"—both of which he justly pronounces "dead;" and thirdly, "appropriating faith;" and this faith, at least where it is "strong and operative," is spoken of as though it were almost or entirely the possession of them who have entered on the "interior life." Christians of the other class are elsewhere spoken of as "persons who believe to some extent in God and in Christ, and perhaps in their own final acceptance." P. 88. "*It is generally supposed that God may exhibit pity and pardon to those in whom there still exist some relics and stains of inward corruption; in other words, that those may be forgiven who are not entirely sanctified*"!! P. 17. The allegations of both these paragraphs might be more largely proved; but doubtless the above examples will suffice.

Next we inquire, How are these doctrines proved? It is rather startling to find amid so much explanation so little attempted in the way of proof. It is nearly summed up, 1. In the argument that what is commanded must be achievable, in order that it may be obligatory; and that perfect holiness is commanded. 2. In the production of certain scripture terms, as "sanctified," "holy," "saints," "perfect in love," etc., no one of which terms in the original, either in itself or in the context, necessitates the doctrine here advanced. And 3. In the extraordinary assertion that "we can have no available faith in the promises of God without it," *i. e.* without this entire consecration. P. 28. "If * * * * we consecrate ourselves to him, * * * * *then and not otherwise* can we believe that he will be to us and do for us all that he has promised in his holy word." P. 29. That is: there is faith in the Church; but faith cannot be available without entire consecration; therefore, here must be entire consecration!

True it is, that we shall have to produce some excellent and lucid passages in connexion with another point, which teach precisely the opposite doctrine as to the relative positions of faith and holiness; but these are there; and they are an integral part of his argument.

We submit, now, that the premises involved in the first and third of these positions are not only errors, but they are errors of the first water. They draw deep.

So far is the major premise of the first argument from being true, that we must maintain the precise contrary of it. The fundamental, vital duty of man is *never* capable of complete fulfilment in this life, in any direction. If it were, it would so far forth lose one essential element of its divineness. It is precisely as demanding indefinite, incessant, immeasurable *approximations*, a struggling, or a soaring up, toward the ever-soaring zenith, the springing out to view of new heights, starry pinnacles clothed in virgin white, the lifting of the standard, and the "reaching forth" after the crown which only heaven gives: it is precisely in that quality of human life and duty, that its true grandeur appears.

Put an immovable limit upon man's intellectual or moral progress; put it ever so far ahead; still, if it be there at all, you dissolve the noblest charm of his ambition; you reduce almost infinitely the promised rewards of his zeal; you make his spirit so much the tamer, and his climbing of the steeps, which are none too easy now, so much the harder and more irksome.

And yet the evil done in these departments, intellect and virtue, by placing a limit on their progress—and that limitation necessarily ensues upon the recognition of any perfectness to be consummated at a definite time—these evils are trivial, compared with the mischief wrought by the same doctrine in religion. Because the standards there are impersonal; here, personal. A barrier is interposed by it between us and the LORD JESUS CHRIST, which the Scripture has not raised. "God hath joined us together;" but this doctrine "puts us asunder."

Thus, therefore, without lengthened argument, it is seen that

the command to be holy does not infer the ability definitely to achieve perfect holiness in this life.

But what shall we say of the other argument, that consecration to God is the necessary antecedent of faith? Is it so, that a man must find a guarantee *in himself*, before he can find one *in God*? Waiving for the present anything like a full discussion of the relations of faith and holiness, we need not hesitate to proclaim, what the heart and voice of the Church every where and always acknowledge—what Prof. Upham himself on other pages admits and maintains. We are to “ask of God,” not because we *have*, but because we “*lack*, wisdom.” It is they “who labor and are heavy laden,” that are commanded to “come” unto him; not those who have themselves broken the yoke.

So far from admitting, then, that entire consecration must be possible, because it is the necessary antecedent of faith; we insist that so far as consecration obtains at all, it does so precisely as the consequence, and partly the effect, of faith. The inference, therefore, fails.

We propose, now, to offer a few considerations respecting the method of the inner life, not based upon the work before us.

1. No inference can be drawn, hostile to the standing belief of the Church, from the meaning, or from the employment in Scripture, of the word *τέλειος*. The word which corresponds most accurately with it in English, is the word “finished.” But who ever inferred, from a man’s being a “finished” gentleman, or a “finished” scholar, that he had attained perfection?

The correlatives of *τέλειοι* in Scripture are *παιδιά* and *νήπιοι*; see 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 13; and the word, whether used literally or figuratively, hence appears to mean “of full age.” In Heb. v. 14, it is so translated, and a definition attached, viz., “those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.”

The *τέλος* to which these “perfect” men have attained, is thus seen to be simply the “end” of immaturity and spiritual childhood. Manhood, ripeness of heart, experience and discernment attained by use; these are the goal at which Paul represents

them as arriving when he uses this word. But there is surely no "perfection" or entire sanctification in that.

But at this point we are confronted by the text: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Here, it is said, this very word is used to predicate perfectness of God, and that in connexion with the command to be perfect laid upon us. To which the reply is easy:

(a.) We have not denied the obligation resting on man, to be perfectly holy.

(b.) We have seen that it cannot be inferred from the fact that perfection is commanded, that it is attainable in this life—or at any given period.

(c.) If pressed, as a measure of the perfectness required of us here, this text would prove far too much for Prof. Upham. His second chapter, "On the Doctrine of Holiness," makes large deductions from even paradisiacal perfection, in describing that which is demanded of us.

(d.) It would appear that no other comparison our Lord could have used, would have so compelled that very view announced above. He has here expressly made the Father in heaven our standard of excellence. How could language more impressively convey the thought, that we are forever to advance, and never completely to attain?

2. The Scriptures explicitly teach the non-perfection of the *τέλειοι*. See Phil. iii. 12, 15, 17. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded," *i. e.* as he, who was *not* perfect, had just described himself to be; "and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded," *i. e.* not as right-minded as I, "God shall reveal even this unto you. *Brethren, be ye followers together of me.*" Here we have those who are called "perfect" commanded to follow one who by inspiration declares himself not "perfect;" which would be simply impossible, if what we call perfection were intended. The conclusion seems irresistible, therefore, that the perfectionists put a wrong construction on this word.

3. The elevation of the soul involves the elevation of all its parts. The perfection of the soul would involve the perfection

of all its parts, conscience and its standards included. Overtaking the standard of to-day, therefore, if so happy a feat were accomplished, would bring about, among other things, the application of severer tests, the being scrutinized with a more exquisite sensibility, and thus the discovery of *im*-perfections unnoticed before.

Here, again, we find that the true method of the inner life in this regard, is that of an indefinite advance in Christian excellence.

It grieves us to touch so slightly and coldly points of such profound interest; but the ground yet to be covered is too large to allow of our lingering. We hasten, now, to

4. A fourth remark. The experience of the whole Church, in the whole long life of the Church, is against any other change in regenerate persons, in this life, than from immaturity to maturity. Here, surely, labored argument is unnecessary. If there is any blessed hope in the heart of God's people, in connexion with death, it is the sure hope of sinlessness then. If there is any thing the universal understanding of the Scripture has taught us to expect, it is that the conflict with sin will run through our earthly years with us, and in its own despite confer a royal dignity upon the king of terrors, by dying under his spear. If there is one challenge we can never cease to proclaim to each other, it is—

“Fight on, my soul, *till death*
Shall bring thee to thy God.”

But all this stands upon the historical, unvarying, mournful experience of the saints, that “entire and perfect sanctification” is *not* “attainable in this life.”

Nor will the apparent exceptions to this experience of the Church prove real. This will be evident when we proceed, as we shall do presently, to consider the nature of holiness. One argument, however, must be examined, which is suggested by the remark just made. It will be said: “You concede the immediate and absolute sinlessness of the believer at death; where then is the impossibility of his sinlessness before death? And

what becomes of all your reasonings about a necessarily gradual and indefinite advance in holiness?" The answer is easy and complete, though perhaps not obvious.

What we have been discussing is the method of the inner life as developed in the working of a gracious *nature*, according to the *laws of the kingdom of grace*, and without the interposition of miracle. What is the *fact*, as experience, observation, Scripture, declare it? It is not denied that God *can*, and we gladly and devoutly proclaim that he *will*, set man free from his inbred sin; that he has appointed him a time, and will not fail, wherein all that pollutes or offends or darkens will be forever removed. But that is not a part of the method of the inner life. It is the miraculous beginning of another phase of that life. It is made known only by revelation. It comes at the end of the "good fight," and is a special interposition of divine power. "We shall be changed;" not as here, "from glory to glory," steadfastly beholding as in a mirror the glory of God, but "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye;" "we shall *be* like him, *for we shall see him as he is.*" Here we have the contrast of the two processes, and of the two results, clearly set forth. The one is a life-long beholding, and a life-long likening; the other is a flash of glory upon the eyes, and an instantaneous victory in the soul.

But all these points will be made more plain when we consider, as we now proceed to do, the true nature of holiness. And first, we must look a little into Prof. Upham's ideas on this point. We shall have to classify his views under three heads, thus:

(a.) Holiness is "freedom from actual voluntary transgression." P. 21. This phrase and its equivalents occur often. On p. 161, we are told that "ideas or suggestions of some evil to be done * * * which * * * on certain occasions arise necessarily and involuntarily in the mind, *are not evil*, unless they are consented to in act or feeling."

(b.) Holiness is formally defined as "pure and perfect love," p. 24; "loving God with the whole heart," p. 23. Of this perfect love, three "marks" or tests are given. 1. "An entire approbation of, and delight in, the character of God in all

respects." 2. "The existence of a desire to promote his glory * * * in such a degree that we are not *conscious* (note that) of having any desire or will at variance with the will of God." 3. "Perfect love excludes in a great degree, and perhaps entirely, any reflections upon self, which are of a self-interested or selfish character."

(*e.*) Evangelical holiness is also in some measure defined by what it does *not* include. We may pass over the first and second negations, viz., that holiness in this life does not imply perfection of the physical or intellectual system, as self-evident. But the third, p. 20, involves, as it is expounded and prepared for use in the argument, very strange notions indeed. "One of the particulars * * * in which the holiness of the future life may be regarded as differing from that of the present is, that it is not liable, by any possibility whatever, to any interruption or suspension." Another is, "unavoidable errors and imperfections of judgment, which, in their ultimate causes, result from sin, (we have reference here to Adam's sin)"; even such that they "*require an atonement.*" P. 21. "In accordance with this view, we"—*i. e.* we of the inner life, evidently—"may very properly, sincerely, and deeply mourn over those various infirmities and imperfections * * * and may with deep humility make application to the blood of Christ, as alone possessing that atoning efficacy which can wash their stains away." "He has mercifully seen fit to remit or forgive all these involuntary sins, more commonly, and perhaps more justly, called imperfections or trespasses, if we will but cordially accept of the atonement in the blood of Christ." "It is probably in reference to such imperfections or trespasses, rather than to sins of a deliberate and voluntary nature, that some good people speak of the moral certainty or necessity we are under of sinning all the time." P. 22. "*If such is their meaning, it is not very necessary to dispute with them.*" P. 23.

It is but justice to this good and earnest man to say that there are many passages in which a far higher and more evangelical idea of holiness is conveyed—casually, but emphatically and sincerely,—than in these. But in them, the Christian in-

stinct speaks; here, the necessities of his argument. These are his formal, deliberate, carefully worded statements of one of his main points; and if his book is not to be held responsible for them, criticism is a farce.

Our first remark, at this point, then, is that the phrase "perfect holiness," or any synonyme of it, is entirely out of place among such conditions. A holiness that does not exclude suggestions of evil to be done, arising involuntarily in the mind; which does not absolutely exclude reflections upon self of a selfish character; which may be interrupted or suspended; which includes unavoidable errors, imperfections, trespasses, involuntary sins that we may deeply mourn, and humbly make application to the blood of Christ for them, (because they require an atonement,) that their stains may be washed away, and they be remitted or forgiven: a holiness like this, whatever else it may be, is certainly not "perfect;" and the mind that can think it so is sadly warped.

We remark again upon the purely subjective standard employed, at least at one point. One mark of "perfect love," it will be remembered, was that "we are not *conscious* of having any desire or will at variance with the will of God." Now there is no more fixed or notorious law of Christian experience than this—that it is the *more* stagnant and torpid heart that is the less conscious of its variances with the will of God. Not being conscious of such variance usually implies only that we are too crass and cold to be conscious of it. The test is bad as a test, and worse as a principle.

We pause here to remark that these low views of holiness are not peculiar; they are common to the advocates of the doctrine that perfect sanctification is attainable in this life. We quote two sentences from Prof. Finney, as an illustration: "Sanctification consists in the will's devoting or consecrating itself and the whole being, all we are and have, *so far as powers, susceptibilities, possessions, are under the control of the will*, to the service of God." Systematic Theology, p. 200. "Sanctification does not imply *any constitutional change*, either of soul or body." Ibid, p. 199. What a portentous reservation is that of

the first sentence! And what a tremendous negation, that of the second!*

These shallow volitional theories, which take no account of man's nature, but only of his ways, are indispensable to this doctrine, as they are the life of many other errors. One feels a certain embarrassment about combating them; the things to be said are the very lore of children in pious houses. Deep down, below a man's will, are the elements which decide the action of his will. If we adopt Edwards's doctrine, that the will is always and necessarily as the greatest apparent good, we have only opened the way for another question: WHY does this or that "appear" the greatest good? Why is money "the greatest apparent good," in Edwards's sense, of the covetous man, and pleasure, of the worldling, and holiness, of the believer? To say, because the man has chosen it, is to give us back the effect, calling it the cause. Why *does* he choose it? That is the fundamental question; and the answer, obviously, must be sought, not in the will, but in the nature.

Nor does the attempted answer of these men remove the difficulty more than a step. They divide our volitions into two classes, specific and generic, or emanent and immanent; and they refer the specific or emanent volitions to the generic or immanent as their cause. But these more permanent states of the will—and that is all they mean by "immanent volitions"—confessedly originate in acts of the will. And the question immediately recurs, Why are they what they are? The cause must be sought within and beneath these voluntary acts, or we must have an infinite series of volitions to account for any given one.

* We are tempted here to set down a brief authentic dialogue. A Presbyterian minister, some years ago, visited a most excellent old lady of another denomination—a true suffering saint, whose grace of patience rivalled her grace of charity, both in giving and forgiving. During a most refreshing conversation she suddenly said: "Mr. D., you believe in perfect sanctification, don't you?" "No, ma'am." "Oh, how *can* you reject that precious doctrine?" "Mrs. G., consider what you are saying—**PERFECT** sanctification?" "Pshaw," answered she, very promptly, "you know I don't mean they don't sin!" "Precisely so, ma'am; we agree exactly."

We feel that any formal discussion of this point is supererogatory here. Too well and thoroughly have the great teachers of the Presbyterian Church done their work, to leave the minds of those who think unimpressed with the truth. Man's nature and man's will, though not separable *in re*, are separable *in conceptu*; not only are separable, but they must be distinguished, if we would have any just ideas of man or of holiness.

There is no controversy about the original literal meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words that stand for holiness. They mean *cleanness*. Properly dilated, to suit the known facts of the subject to which they are applied, that meaning is ample now. But in nothing, perhaps, is the progress of uninspired thinking more impressively manifest, than in reference to that idea, spiritual purity. It has gained a depth, and thus a dignity, unknown in ancient time, except to souls specially enlightened from above. The ceremonial cleanness of the early Jew was well symbolized in his white linen robes. The ethical cleanness of the later Jew—confined to trivial rites and traditionary virtues,—equally well by the washing of hands and feet. The stricter personal purity enjoined upon Christians in the ages that first succeeded the age of inspiration, found its type in the immersions and anointings that then prevailed. And we, on whom the Sun of Righteousness has risen higher and shone more brightly; not through any penetration of our own, but possessing the accumulated wisdom of the descending centuries; we, for whom the slow ripening conceptions of mankind are mellowing at last, though we have almost forgotten how to symbolize them; we feel there is a *cleanness of soul*, conceivable by man, commanded in the Scriptures, granted its crude beginnings here, and its fulness in glory, to which all other purities are as filmy wrappings; rather, perhaps, as the transient flush upon the cheek, which betrays the glowing blood within.

The most sublime of general ideas is—Life. That vast word includes infinite gradations. We begin with that wondrous, vague coil of magnetic pulsations which arm the blind round world itself with a certain vitalizing energy, and we ascend to the indiscriminable monads of the vegetable and animal king-

doms. Presently we begin to disengage ourselves from the tangled morasses of merely physical life; and as *reason* begins to appear in the more highly organised animals, we feel that we are upon rapidly ascending ground. Still, we only walk the clod; let philosophers boast themselves never so loudly, mere intellect will never take the highest place. That is reserved for goodness. When conscience, when faith, when self-conquering and therefore all-conquering love, appear, then is the heavenly glory seen. And the light is the life of men. The heart in which living goodness is, swings loose from the earth. Its best, its immortal affinities are with heaven.

Now, holiness, as enjoined and honored in the Scriptures, is just that inward cleanness of soul. It is *being right*, in the depths of life. It is not love, but it grows by love. It is not faith, but it gets the blessing by faith. That, in the saint, which loathes sin, which finds it a deadly evil, which would cut off or crucify every member, if it "offended;" that fixed bent of the heart, which is not a purpose, because it is the spring and life of every purpose; that whiteness of the spiritual man, out of which the grace of God dissolves the stain, obliterates the deep-graven lines of unlawful passions—that is holiness.

It is not a mask, but a transfiguration. It has climbed the mount and looked with eyes of faith upon the glory of God: God, before whose infinite loftiness, the highest heights of man are mere abysses. There the rapt believer confesses, with irrepressible yearnings—"hungering and thirsting," the Master called it—"Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come!" And while in his lowliness and his longing, he "steadfastly gazes" upon the King's beauty, he is changed. Even on earth, and looking by faith, he is changed; how much more in heaven, beholding face to face!

Now, beyond all question, the profoundest impulses of the believer answer to this idea of holiness—an inward, central purity of soul, of which a right will is born, and right affections flow. Holiness of the outward life is not a dress, or a reflexion of some radiance without. The better class of sinners are arrayed in that way; but the saint's outward light is the glow of

a light within. And when a sound thinker talks of "perfect holiness," or "entire sanctification," he means not that poor, precarious, spotted, halting thing the Perfectionists flatter with that title, but *an absolute conformity of the whole heart to the purity of Christ.**

Prof. Upham is too devout a Christian to apply his description of "evangelical holiness" to our Lord; and yet He is our pattern, and none but He. Why, then, should men put up, between themselves and Christ, a pattern of human invention, void of his beauty, stripped of his sanction, discrowned of his promises? With all the attractions of his transcendent and divine excellence, with what a miserable leaden tardiness we rise! And what purpose can a lowering of the standard serve, but the comforting of spiritual indolence, or flattering a vain ambition? The process of sanctification is the gradual evolution in the soul—and to some extent in its consciousness also—of the fair ideal of perfect purity, a slow reproduction in the forming saint of "the face of Christ." In him, "those lips have language;" the glow of immortal life is on his brow; and by that wonderful transfusion of the Holy Ghost, his life pulsates in us, now feebly, and then triumphantly.

* "But man * * * * has lost his original righteousness; and has besides *contracted a defilement*, and reduced his nature to *a state* and habit of sin, precisely opposite to the holiness his nature needs. The process of restoring that original righteousness, and perfecting that true holiness—meantime healing and extirpating that inward state and habit of sin; is that work of grace whereby both the quality and habit of human actions are changed, by acting *radically* and divinely *upon the human soul itself*. This vital progress and steady mutation of the renewed soul, is what we call sanctification. * * * * Considered as a great work of divine grace within the renewed soul, it is the method whereby God renews us completely *in his lost image*, and conforms us entirely to the image of his Son, restoring us to the perfect knowledge and love of his truth, and *the complete fruition of his holiness*. For if we have learned Christ aright, and have been-taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus; we put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and are *renewed in the spirit of our mind*; and put on the new man which after God is *created in righteousness and true holiness*." Breckinridge, Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered. Book II., chap. xi., 1, 5. The italics are ours.

Let us borrow an illustration from zoölogy. Whoever has studied Prof. Agassiz' exquisite illustrations of embryology, will remember the faint, barely discoverable, gauze-like tracery which hints the creature that is to be, in the pulpy mass. Presently we look again; the lines are stronger, but still we see them through a dissolving cloud. As the days wear on, those lines become distinct, and at last decisive; we have traversed the whole tract, from the original blank, to the likeness of the living creature. But then, the shell bursts, and the foetal life is swallowed up of a new life! Now, the controlling principle of that whole marvellous development—speaking of the physical law, and not of the causal power—the controlling principle of that whole development, from undistinguishable pulp to a creature perfect in its kind, is the infusion of a certain life.

Thus is it with us; we begin with nothing; we end with being "like Him," when we "see him as He is." The likeness is long but a cloud-veiled tracery, far more like a shadow than a portrait. But the lines grow firmer; one lineament after another extricates itself from the blank, not painted on us, but formed in us; at last we "stand complete in righteousness"—but not here. Once only has this mournful, sinful earth been honored by the tread of perfect goodness. We shall "be with him, and see his glory," when we share it.

We have preferred this direct appeal to the facts, and to the rooted and necessary judgments of the believer, to any exhaustive argument, as more entirely satisfactory, if less elaborate. And it will be worth while to notice how completely this conception of the nature of holiness resolves the apparent exceptions to the universal belief that perfection is not to be attained in this life, into a confirmation of that doctrine. Suppose it announced, in the Confession of our Faith, that this holiness is "imperfect in life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part, etc.;"* and suppose a voice of opposition to be raised, alleging that perfect sanctification is attainable here. We inquire, what do you mean by perfect sanctification? And the

* Conf. of Faith, chap. xiii., sec. ii.

answer is—such as we drew from Prof. Upham just now. We ask, again, Is that what you mean by your objection? Can *even you* predicate no more of your best saints on earth than that? Then your voice, to all intents and purposes, is with us, as regards the thing treated of; and the only controversy between us at this point is as to the use of certain words—holiness, perfection, and the like.

If now we briefly consider the relations of faith and holiness, we shall reach the other capital error of the work before us, (and only for them have we space,) clear up some of the remaining obscurities of the subject, and introduce the practical counsels on which are founded the author's chief claim to be heard.

Let us begin by disembarassing ourselves of one question, namely, as to the *current inter-relations* of faith and holiness during the Christian's life. They are reciprocally helpful, beyond all doubt. The more faith, the more holiness; the holier, the more believing. They are coëxistent in time and influence, throughout our career.

But which comes first in the order of nature? Which depends upon the other, as the condition precedent of its life? This is not a matter of mere speculative interest, but of the highest practical importance. It includes the question—really includes it, although not in the view of Prof. Upham—whether we, or God, are authors of our holiness.

It will be our duty to show that this fundamental question, and by consequence the included question also, is answered *both ways* in the work before us; and that directly, intelligently, earnestly. But that which we must pronounce the wrong answer is given first, and therefore imparts a coloring to the whole book, as it is read.

Chapter Third, entitled "Directions to aid in the Attainment of Holiness," is perfectly explicit as to the order of events; though even here casual saving clauses occur, looking the other way. We will quote largely enough to make his meaning certain. Take first a passage already referred to; but this time given at length. "(An act of personal consecration) is necessary, first, because we can have no available faith in the promises of

God without it. It is a great complaint in the Christian Church, at the present day, that there is want of faith. If we may take the statements of Christians themselves, they do not believe; certainly not as they should do. And why is it? It is because they have not fully consecrated themselves to God; in other words, they continue to indulge in some known sins. **** The Saviour himself has distinctly recognised the principle, that faith under such circumstances is an impossibility. "How can ye believe, who receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?"* If we seek the honor that cometh from God, in other words, if in the fixed purpose of our minds we consecrate ourselves to him, to do as far as in us lies his whole will, *then, and not otherwise, we can believe* that he will be to us, and do for us, all that he has promised in his Holy Word. It is precisely here as it is in common life. **** The principle will be found to hold good in regard to God as well as man. **** *If we would have faith, therefore, we must endeavor by consecration to cease from all known voluntary sin."* Pp. 28, 29.

"*It is at this point, when we have put forth, with all the energy and sincerity of our being, the unalterable determination, relying upon divine assistance, that we will be wholly his, that he meets us.*" "Having believed, *first*, that holiness is a duty * * * * ; and having, *secondly*, consecrated ourselves to God in all things to do his will; we are *now, in the third place, to have faith in him.*" P. 30. "He who breaks off from every known sin, and at the same time, in full reliance upon the word of God, and with childlike simplicity, leaves himself entirely and in all things in the hands of God * * * * necessarily becomes a sanctified person. **** God necessarily receives him: in other words, *he passes from a state of rebellion to one of submission; from a state of unbelief to one of childlike confidence; and from himself, and out of himself, into God.*"† P. 31. When he has

* Let it be noted here, that our Lord is rebuking the impenitent Pharisees; but Prof. U. has expressly excluded the unregenerate from his argument. The quotation is irrelevant.

† The italics in all these excerpts are ours.

done all this, *after that* he shall have faith! Only let the lungs resume their play, and the heart its pulsations, and all the organs their functions, and the senses their several powers; and the consequence will necessarily ensue that the dead man will come to life!

Now, will it not be wonderful to find language so explicit, and in its utterance at least so well considered, set aside by language on the other side still more express? Surprising as it may seem, Chapter Ninth, on the "Relation of Assurance of Faith and Perfect Love," is a clear, forcible, manful setting forth of the precious truth, which the previous accounts had obscured or denied. Let us frankly say, we are glad it is so. We rejoice, not *against* our brother; but *in* him, when the truth in his heart masters him, and "will out."

Having laid down the proposition, that "assurance or perfection of faith, and perfection of love, are closely and inseparably connected," he inquires, "What is the precise relation which they sustain to each other?" He answers, "In the first place, that they hold the relation of ANTECEDENCE and SEQUENCE. Assurance of faith naturally and necessarily precedes assurance or perfection of love. **** How is it possible, looking at the subject in the light of nature merely, if we have no confidence in God, no faith in his character, that we should love him?" P. 81. "And I think it is obvious, from what has been said, that we may go further, and say that faith * * * sustains also the relation of a CAUSE." P. 82.

He observes further, that love will not only "follow faith, but will be *in proportion to faith*." He quotes Leighton's wise apothegm: "BELIEVE, AND YOU SHALL LOVE; BELIEVE MUCH, AND YOU SHALL LOVE MUCH." Pp. 82, 83. The emphatic italics and capitals in these sentences are his own. And with all this we heartily agree. And we coincide also with the explanation in the conclusion of the same chapter, that faith and love are different aspects and expressions of the same state of heart, and act and react upon each other.

"By grace are ye saved, *through faith*; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." That is, grace operates for our

salvation by means of faith; and that faith is itself the necessary first gift of grace. To elaborate this doctrine fully would require a volume; nor can we think it necessary, in the case of a truth which perhaps not one reader of this Review would deny, to go at large into it. But we desire to clear it up a little, and let it shine by its own light.

A beautiful experiment reported to have been made in optics, will illustrate the subject. A daguerreotype was suspended, face downward, over a vessel filled with mercury, and put in a thoroughly darkened place. Upon examination, after some time, the mercury showed no change until it was breathed upon. Then a distinct copy of the portrait started into view. So—not in the glow of sight, but under the action of faith, which is “a lively sense of things not seen,”*—the likeness of a Heavenly Face is formed in us, as the Spirit of the Lord breathes upon us.

Just in proportion as—and only as—the divine Agents in our redemption become known to the soul, is this transcendent change wrought in it from the natural to the spiritual man. If religion, or holiness, which is very much the same thing, were a natural product, Prof. Upham’s argument would be relevant. “It is impossible for us, in our intercourse of man with man, to believe that a man whom we deliberately sin against and injure * * * * loves us, provided that we are certain that he has knowledge of the fact. The principle will be found to hold good in regard to God as well as man.” Precisely so; and yet that impossible thing is exactly what we are commanded to do, and will be eternally lost if we do not do. We *must* “believe that a” God “we deliberately sin against loves us,” calls us, sent his Son to save us, with the full “knowledge” of our sin, or we cannot be saved. God has seen fit, in his wisdom as well as in his sovereign right, to make just that “impossible” faith the indispensable first step! †

* See Heb. xi. 1. The cause (evidence) put by a figure of speech for the effect of evidence—a realising sense.

† “As without holiness no man shall (or can) see the Lord, must not Christ be much more earnestly anxious to make us holy, than we can be to be made so? If we do not believe in this earnest desire of his, do we

We need not stop to solve the dilemma. Faith, as we have just read, "is the gift of God." He brings us face to face with this dreadful extremity, and makes it his opportunity.

Neither is it necessary here to argue the wisdom of appointing this order, or of selecting this particular interposition. It will suffice to point out its admirable fitness and efficiency for the production of holiness by producing faith.

The *grasp of the fact of redemption*, taken by the freshly believing heart, awakens intense gratitude to the Redeemer, and a sense, alike tender and profound, of obligation to him. The sense of narrow escape from utter destruction by sin; and the rising hope of life in a holy world by grace, both of which are intended in the Scripture by being "under the powers of the world to come," make the issue, of obedience or disobedience, more clear, the bearing of them more sure, and the duty more binding. But *the direct vision of the Lord* by faith, is mightier still. The contrast between our foul helplessness and his serene and beautiful strength, "the saving strength of God's Anointed," draws the soul to him. Our contrition, and thankfulness, and wonder, and love, all combine to enhance the impressibility of our hearts, just when they are most under *his* influence. The very conviction that we cannot repay him, lends a charm to that obedience by which alone we can testify how infinitely we are bound to him. Oh, the pathos and the power of that word, "If ye love me, keep my commandments!"

Then the *yearnings of our spirit after him*, which are born of faith, have themselves, in the order of grace, a refining and exalting tendency. As the desiring heaven is better than possessing earth, so the hungering after Christ is better than being filled with any thing else. "Steadfastly to gaze upon him," is to be "changed into his image, from glory to glory."

To crown all, we have the Scripture, *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος*; grace given as a reward of grace enjoyed. Having blessed us with

believe in his love at all? Have we ever really apprehended it; or has it been merely a tale recited to our ears, which we do not care indeed to contradict, but which has never at all taken hold of, or touched, our hearts?" Goulburn, Thoughts on Personal Religion. Pp. 31, 32.

faith, our Lord proceeds as a rich man who has invested part of his fortune in a great enterprise not yet completed; he pays instalment after instalment, until the glorious work is done. He builds love upon faith, and purity upon love; and faith "worketh by love," and "he that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger." And thus the powers of the soul are set to a happy play upon each other, like that of the members and organs of the body. The cheek is indebted for its glow to the swift foot and stalwart arm. The arm is debtor for its stoutness in part to the eye, blessed with light; and so through the whole round of the bodily frame.

Similarly, faith (among its other works) furnishes food to the imagination; imagination applies new stimulus to hope; hope crowds out temptation, and pours light and courage into the conscience; conscience, quickened, finds voice in prayer; prayer, drawing nigh a waiting Saviour, and trying all his grace, and testing his infinite sweetness, transmutes patience into gladness, and warms love into a passion. Or we might arrange the faculties and graces of the Christian in any other order—only beginning with faith—and find the life that enters there sinking through every fibre of the man, and penetrating to his very heart's core with a heavenly blessing: such is the interdependence of our powers.

In looking back upon the three principal parts of this general discussion, now drawing to a close, we call attention to one thought connected with them all. Under the first head—the Method of the Inner Life,—we saw that one great characteristic was its indefinite, indeed its eternal, progression. But under the second head, the Nature of Holiness, we saw that holiness is inward purity, and that this was to be attained at death. It appears, therefore, that "the Inner Life," and "Holiness," are not exactly convertible terms: the latter attaining completeness with the close of this life; the former, *never*. Sanctification, or the process of becoming complete in holiness, thus appears as the first stage of the Inner Life. Now, under the third head, we saw that faith was the indispensable means and subjective agent of sanctification; whence we easily dis-

cover that there is a correlation between them in time, as well as in action. Faith seals the graft to the Vine; its office endures while the knitting of the fibres is incomplete; when the Vine and the branch are altogether one, its work is over. Faith

"Is sweetly lost in sight,
And hope in full, supreme delight,
And everlasting love."

How, then—for this is the great question, after all—how shall the Christian set out to be holy? Prof. Upham treats of this as a sort of second chapter of the Christian life; and so, as regards our conscious efforts, it too often (though not always) is; and he makes the first step to be an act of solemn personal consecration to God; p. 28; (the nominal first step, *i. e.* a belief that holiness is attainable in this life, being a logical and not an actual preliminary.) And he quotes a form of consecration from Dr. Doddridge, who was treating of the repenting sinner, and not the striving Christian; and who makes it not a first step, but among the very last.

The fatal fault in this prescription is that it puts *man's work first*, instead of God's. It impresses upon the mind, despite all casual caveats, the idea that we are to lead, and he is to follow: the error of all errors, which man is most prone to commit, and most hard to be warned off from. Well has a late excellent writer characterised it, though without reference to this book: "Ah, what if these struggles to be holy should themselves be in a certain sense tokens of unbelief? What if the poor bird imprisoned in the cage should be thinking that, if it is ever to gain its liberty, it must be by its own exertions, and by vigorous and frequent strokes of its wings against the bars? If it did so, it would ere long fall back breathless and exhausted, faint and sore and despairing. And the soul will have a similar experience, which thinks that Christ has indeed won pardon and acceptance for her, but that sanctification she must win for herself; and under this delusion beats herself sore in vain efforts to correct the propensities of a heart which the word of God pronounces to be desperately wicked. That heart—you can make nothing of it yourself—leave it to Christ, in quiet dependence upon his

grace. Suffer him to open the prison-doors for you, and then you shall fly out and hide yourself in your Lord's bosom, and there find rest. Yield up the soul to him, and place it in his hands; and you shall at once begin to have the delightful experience of his power in sanctifying.*

Indeed, how is this consecration to be made, as we are truly told it should be, with all the energy of the soul—as a “volition, a fixed, unalterable purpose,”—unless the Spirit has revealed to us *by faith* the motives, dangers, glories, of the world to come? Put the Christian back among the illusions of his late worldliness; let God and a crucified Saviour retire again into the distance and dimness of his unbelief; and such action on his part becomes *impossible*. He must “see him who is invisible,” or he will neither resolve boldly, nor “endure” patiently.

Nor is it an unimportant mistake, to treat this act of consecration as a thing to be done once, and at the entrance upon the stage of the Christian life. We would like to ask Prof. Upham, what is the plain meaning of that phrase his theological congeners employ so incessantly: “Give your heart to God?” But we need not narrow the discussion to an argument *ad hominem*. What is that, to which, in connexion with the supreme act of believing, every right-minded minister and laborer tries to bring awakened sinners? What, but *to devote themselves to God*? And how does that self-devotion differ from self-consecration?

True, this effort, even when successful in the case of the soundly converted, is not perfectly successful. The work of devoting one's self to God (*i. e.* of sanctification) “proceeds by degrees,” as Fisher says.† One of the most wholesome, efficient, happy, of the means to be used to procure its advance, is the occasional solemn renewing our covenant with God—“acting faith,” and renewing consecration.

The effect, therefore, of such language as is used in this work on this subject, is, first, to exalt man's idea of the efficacy of his own determinations; secondly, to discourage from attempting to

* Goulburn, Thoughts on Personal Religion, p. 32.

† Catechism, Sanctification, Q. 26.

consecrate themselves to God, all who do not believe that perfect holiness is attainable in this life; and thirdly, to deter ordinary Christians from using a powerful and salutary means of grace.

We limit ourselves to one other stricture; one, however, which we find it difficult so to make as not to match his error with a more dangerous one of our own. And we select a sentence which conveys intensely the impression which whole chapters make more or less forcibly. "But it is a painful truth that multitudes of persons, and some even of those who claim to be the Saviour's followers, pollute themselves by taking food, not for the sake of the food, and in the fulfilment of the intentions of nature, but *for the pleasure which it gives*; making the pleasure the ultimate, and oftentimes the sole object." This passage clearly teaches that all pursuit of pleasures which are not spiritual, is sinful. But what right has the author to draw any such distinction between spiritual and other pleasures? May not a man who is not thirsty sip a little water, just for the pleasure of it? If not, it can only be because it *is* pleasant. But if pleasures, as such, are sinful, why is spiritual pleasure—which yet *is* pleasure—innocent?

If it be replied that the objection is only to *inordinate* desires for such pleasure, then it is not the taking food because it is pleasant that pollutes, but excess in quantity and circumstances. To this we agree; but then this passage, and many others, are wrongly worded. But it is no accident or oversight that gives them this direction. It is an integral part of the theory, that one half of a man is to be starved, sapped, drained of its life-blood, with the hope thereby of elevating the other half. And this doctrine is closely connected with the feeling that sin is somehow an element of our material rather than our spiritual nature. We know but too well, and by bitter experience, that neither nature has a monopoly of evil. There are sensual sins; but there are also spiritual sins.

The Church must discard that profound and dangerous fallacy, that any pleasure God has given is sinful in itself. "Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun." The breath of fragrant breezes, the murmur of limpid

falling waters, the carol of happy birds, the flavor of fruit: has the Father of all, who is rich unto all, spread these only as snares for our feet, or for refreshment by the way? "EVERY CREATURE OF GOD IS GOOD, AND NOTHING TO BE REFUSED, IF IT BE RECEIVED WITH THANKSGIVING; FOR IT IS SANCTIFIED BY THE WORD OF GOD AND PRAYER."

We turn now, for a moment, to the more pleasant, but less necessary task of praise. The whole book is written in a devout and earnest spirit. The style, though studiously plain and homely, is almost always clear, and occasionally rises, by the mere force of the thought, to genuine eloquence, as in the passage given below.* And the chapters of a practical nature, counsels, and explanations, are singularly wise and good, barring a strong infusion of quietism. This praise is particularly due to the chapters "On Temptations," and "On a Life of Signs and Manifestations, as Compared with a Life of Faith."

But space and time—and perhaps the reader's patience—fail us; though many points of deep interest remain untouched. No subject lies nigher the hearts of God's saints than holiness. None more urgently demands the thought and prayer of the Church in this age than the Inner Life. We have endeavored to make it clear that the life spiritual, which begins with regeneration, is just the opening of the life eternal, and progresses forever. Its grand characteristic, in this its first stage, is the

* "This is one of the unalterable conditions of faith, especially when it exists in a high degree, viz., that it is attended with a pure and tranquil consolation—consolation so sure and permanent, that we can never be deprived of it, whatever else may be taken away. The soul is led up, as it were, into the mountain of God's protection. In the attitude of calm repose, it remains established on that sublime height, with the sunlight of heavenly peace for its companion, while there is nothing but darkness and the roaring of tempests in the valley below. Such was the pure and sublime consolation which our Saviour experienced, when his heavenly Father had withdrawn from him the manifestations of his love, and left him in extreme and inexpressible desolation of spirit. He still possessed, though apparently and terribly forsaken, the consolation and the joy of faith. He could still recognise the bond of union, and still appropriate, as it were, his heavenly Father to himself, and say, '*My God! My God!*'" P. 156.

sanctification of the believer; who may attain *maturity* at some point in his earthly course, but *perfection* only when he lays down this life.

The indispensable sure cause, both instrumental and conditional, of this holiness, is faith. By faith we dare to look at Christ, and by faith we can do it; and looking, we are transformed into his likeness. So transformed, we love him whom we are like, and are animated with a loving sympathy which discards what he abhors, and affects what he delights in. "We hate the sins that made him mourn" and die. We stoop the once proud head gladly to the yoke which he pronounces easy. We welcome the refining fires of affliction. We glory in duties to be done "for his sake." (2 Cor. iv. 5; Rev. ii. 3; and many other places.)

And God "who never works upon mere lines or isolated points," God, who hath "wrought all our works" and graces "in us;" this God, who is our guide forever, pervades immensity with his perfect, unchangeable, triumphant will, that Israel shall be Holiness unto the Lord. The obedient winds and waves of the whole sea of events waft and rock and urge us to that goal—perfect holiness. Toss they their white crests never so passionately; though we "mount up to heaven, and go down again to the depths;" though our soul be "melted because of trouble," even so "he bringeth us unto our desired haven." "All things are ours," unto the end; and we are Christ's, and Christ is God's. And we go presently to him, whose we are. He is the "happy harbor of God's saints."