

PSEUDO HOLINESS.

(Continued from Page Two)

soon discovered that they knew nothing of the experience of entire sanctification, in which one is delivered from the inbeing of sin; that by being "sanctified to God" they simply meant that they were "set apart" to God's service. Indeed, they insisted that no one could be entirely freed from the inherited depravity of our nature—and thus set themselves in direct opposition to the Wesleyan teaching of holiness. One of their ministers, who was a leader among them, contended that if both parents were made free from inbred sin, the principle of sin could no longer be transmitted to posterity; that because the children of sanctified parents were still born with "original sin," this must be taken as conclusive evidence that the doctrine of eradication or complete cleansing from inbred sin was not true, etc. So that the reader will see that this teaching was not an accident, but an adroit attempt to avoid the true teaching of holiness.

The sanctification of Bible holiness implies and includes a "setting apart" from common to holy use, we readily admit. But it would seem to us that any minister who would teach that sanctification meant only that, and nothing more, must either be woefully ignorant concerning this subject, or else he is willfully and purposely withholding the truth; for he cannot consult either etymology of the word, or any reputable authoritative dictionary, but what will give him another definition—or a two-fold definition. The Webster Dictionary will tell him that "sanctify" means, "1. To make sacred or holy; to set apart for a holy or religious use; to consecrate by appropriate rites: to hallow. 2. To make free from sin; to cleanse from moral corruption and pollution; to purify, John 17:17. (Esp. Theol.); the act of God's grace by which the affections of men are purified or alienated from sin and the world and exalted to a supreme love to God." To this two-fold definition all other dictionaries agree. Then why should a minister or any one say that sanctification simply means "setting apart," and fail to give the other definition, telling of the "divine act" in which we are "made free from sin" and made holy? Consecration, or setting one's self apart, is a purely human act, and can avail but little, unless God accepts the consecration made; but in His acceptance of the same He will cleanse the soul "from moral corruption and pollution," and thus make us "free from sin" and make us holy.

Touching the objection that inbred sin could then no longer be transmitted to posterity, we would respectfully say, that were such the case, we should not regard it as any great calamity. However, seeing that holiness is not ours by nature, but is obtained through the all-cleansing blood of Jesus, we may reasonably suppose that nature in the breed will continue to reproduce itself; for nothing that is acquired can be transmitted to posterity. Just as both parents, by an accident might lose a certain member of the body, and yet their children be born with a perfect body, because nature reproduces itself, so in like manner, every one who is naturally engendered of the off-spring of Adam, will have the Adamic nature, and on their own

account will need to be "born again," and subsequently to be cleansed from "original sin." Our children are born with the Adamic nature not because parents have been pure or impure, but because they come from the Adamic stock. Hence this principle is called, "our old man," seeing it is as old as the fall of the racial head. And parents can no more transmit their holiness to their off-spring than they can transmit their education, or any other acquired accomplishment to their children. Might as well argue that since both parents were highly educated their children must be born highly educated. That there is large advantage in being well born—born of holy parents—we fully believe; but however godly the parents may be, no measure of divine grace, and no phase of Christian experience, divinely wrought, can be transmitted to off-spring. Hence each child, as it comes to years of accountability, must personally avail itself of the atoning blood of Cavalry's cross.

3. Another subtle form of "pseudo-holiness" is what is called "imputed holiness." This is a heresy known as "Antinomianism," and so nearly resembles the genuine, that we fear multitudes are deceived by its teaching although, when thoroughly investigated in the light of Scripture, it is not holiness at all—it is mere "make believe." Says one of their leaders, writing on the subject, "A believer is never sanctified or holy in himself, but in Christ only. He has no holiness in himself at all; all his holiness being imputed, and not inherent." They teach that God only sees the believer in Christ; and since Christ is holy, we are accounted holy in Him, because Christ is holy, etc. All this delusion seems to be swallowed by a multitude of professors in these days, regardless of the fact that it is wholly unscriptural. The Bible does not deal in such deception—pronouncing men holy while they yet remain unholy. While it is true that no man has inherent holiness, that is, no man is holy by nature, within himself, or by reason of anything that he can do to merit holiness, the Bible plainly teaches that Jesus can take a polluted, sinful man and pardon and save him from sinning in the outward life, and then with His own blood sanctify and cleanse him from the inbeing of sin—original sin—thus make him entirely "free from sin" and make him holy, even as He is holy. That Christ's holiness is not simply to be "imputed" to us, but that we are to be made "pure as He is pure" through the all-cleansing blood: for the "blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth (in the present tense) us from all sin." I. John 1:7. While our holiness is derived from Christ, and imparted to us by Him, it is not a mere covering, but a washing and a cleansing of our hearts, until we are made white and clean—and are "without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." That innumerable company around the great white throne did not simply have white robes as a covering, while underneath there remained impurity and sin, but they "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Rev. 7:14. The best that imputed holiness can offer is the repression of the carnal mind; whereas, in Jesus we have the complete eradication

of the same. According to their teaching the "old man" is simply dead "figuratively" and "judicially," whereas, in the true experience of Sanctification or Bible Holiness, "our old man" is dead in reality, and actually; he is crucified," "that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Rom. 6:6. That we are not simply accounted holy for Christ's sake, but are made "free from sin" and thus made holy through His sanctifying blood. "Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it . . . that it should be holy and without blemish." Eph. 5:25-27. These repressionists will tell you that it is not "the blessing" but the Blesser: not "it" (meaning the experience of sanctification) but Him, they want. This all sounds very pious, but in its last analysis, is evasive and meaningless. They might as well say they had no use for the water: they simply want the well; it is not the sunshine, but simply the sun they want. What is the well for but to supply the water? What is the sun for but to give the sunshine? What is the "Blesser" for but to give "the blessing?" Paul testified to having "the fulness of the blessing." And praying for the sanctification of the Thessalonians, he concluded by saying, "Faithful is he that calleth you who also will do it." I. Thess. 5:23. So it is entirely Scriptural to speak of "the blessing," and of the experience of entire sanctification, as "it."

In order to have "True Holiness" we are to "put off" "the old man;" and if he is "put off" we shall cease to have him on, and therefore shall not need to suppress, repress, regulate, and control him; but we shall instead "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. 4:24. Thus, we shall have holiness in truth; and not simply have a theory; but a glorious, Scriptural experience of complete deliverance from all sin. Praise God!—Christian Witness.

MEMORIAL.

In Loving Memory of F. W. Nixon, by
His Wife and Family.

REMEMBERED

By Horatio Bonar.

Fading away like the stars of the morning,

Losing their light in the glorious sun;
So let me steal away, gently and lovingly,
Only remembered by what I have done,

Only remembered by what I have done,

Chorus—

Ever remembered, forever remembered.
Ever remembered while the years are rolling on;

Ever remembered, forever remembered,
Only remembered by what I have done.

So in the harvest, if others may gather
Sheaves from the fields that in spring
I have sown;

Who sowed or plowed matter not to the reaper;

I'm only remembered by what I have done.