

RALEIGH CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE

VOL. XXXII.—NO. 36 THE ORGAN OF THE NORTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH. ESTABLISHED 1855

REV. FRANK L. REID, Editor and Publisher.

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 7, 1887.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM Payable in Advance

For the Advocate. Dr. J. E. Edwards and His Query on Holiness.

BY REV. L. L. NASH.

I noticed a card from the Rev. J. E. Edwards, D. D., asking those who believe in the doctrine of entire sanctification as taught by Mr. Wesley and the founders of Methodism, a question as to whether conversion is enough to secure the salvation of a soul or not. I am a believer in the doctrine of Christian perfection as taught by the Methodist Church from the first, and never questioned by any of her ministers as I am aware of until within the last few years. And I hope I shall not be considered presumptuous in attempting to answer Dr. Edwards' question. I am aware of the fact that those who hold to the views of Mr. Wesley on this subject, are regarded by their brethren who differ with them, (I use the term *with them* advisedly; for it is correct. A man differs with me when we disagree; he differs from me when he does not look like me) as weak, and far in the rear of progressive thought. But I have honest convictions on this subject; and after much thought and prayer, I am fully persuaded that it is a question of too much importance to be dodged or passed by unnoticed. I presume Dr. Edwards desires a full answer; an answer as full as his problem may appear at the first glance at it. I am persuaded that it can be answered to the satisfaction of all unprejudiced inquirers.

The first thing to be considered in this investigation is: What is necessary to qualify us for heaven? We must go to the Scriptures for an answer to this question. "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. iv. 22, 23, 24.) From the above passage we learn that, it is not this or the other degree of moral good which the soul is to receive by Jesus Christ, but it is the whole image of God, and it is to be formed, according to God; and he is to bear that as fully as Adam bore it in the beginning.

"Follow ye with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." Hebrews (12-14.) Here holiness is made the absolute prerequisite for heaven. Let us ascertain what is implied in holiness. "Applied to human beings, holiness is purity of heart or disposition; sanctified affections; piety; moral goodness, but not perfect." Webster. There is only one absolutely perfect being; but the man who is holy is a perfect Christian.

"Sanctification in this world must be complete; the whole nature must be sanctified, all sin must be utterly abolished, or the soul can never be admitted into the glorious presence of God. Now are all who are justified entirely sanctified? Is every converted person entirely clear of all filthiness of flesh and spirit? Dr. Edwards affirms this. I deny it. It was at this point Mr. Wesley and Count Zinzendorf disagreed.

The Count affirmed that Entire Sanctification and justification are in the same instant; and neither is increased or diminished. He believed in the imputed righteousness of Christ, and returned all mortification of the flesh as being not only unnecessary, but hurtful. Being a Calvinist in faith, he asserted that believers could do whatever they would and nothing more. Mr. Wesley contended that justification was an act of pardon that passed in the mind of God, on the condition of faith in Christ; and that as soon as the sinner believed and became a babe in Christ; but there were still roots of bitterness remaining, and although he might not be conscientious of any sin remaining in him at the time of his conversion, that the experience of Christians affirmed that as a general rule converted persons are painfully conscious of evil in their hearts, even after justification. He affirmed that this sin does not reign in any who are born of God, but they are immediately conscious that they need to be cleansed from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, and to be wholly sanctified, before they are prepared for heaven. Now Zinzendorf is right, John Wesley or Count Zinzendorf? Does it follow, if Mr. Wesley is right, all who die without professing entire sanctification are lost? I think not. Dr. Edwards' *ad hominem* argument is a mere scare-crow.

Mr. Wesley always contended that all who maintained their justification passed into eternity. He urged his people to go on to perfection, as the only sure way to a justified life.

I have no sympathy with some who contend for entire sanctification, as a work entirely separate from justification, and regard all justified persons as sanctified wholly; if there be any such people. Neither have I any sympathy with those who teach the Zinzendorfian theory, that there is no inbred sin in justified persons, that they should seek to be cleansed of. The experience of the children of God contradict the theory that there is no sin in any who are justified; unless they are taught to believe that anger, and lust felt in the heart is not filthiness of flesh or spirit.

If there is nothing more than pardon necessary to fit us for heaven, a great many exhortations in the New Testament are meaningless. I presume Dr. Edwards has forgotten the Methodist doctrine at this point, and has been so

long in his own life and experience cleansed from all sin, that he does not fully sympathize with babes in Christ. Pause a moment, my dear brother, and let a younger Christian tell you how it is with us, who are at war with evil affections, and who feel the necessity of going on to perfection, and are praying that the "very God of peace would sanctify us wholly, throughout, spirit, soul and body, and preserve us blameless to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Although we are conscious we have not attained, yet we rejoice in hope, because He who hath called us is faithful, and will do it according to His promise.

If what I have written is unsatisfactory, the following taken from some conversations between the Rev. Messrs Wesley, and others, may throw light on the subject:

Q. 1. When does inward Sanctification begin?

A. In the moment we are justified. The seed of every virtue is then sown in the soul. From that time the believer gradually dies to sin and grows in grace. Yet sin remains in him; yea, the seed of all sin, till he is sanctified throughout in spirit, soul, and body.

Q. 2. What will become of a heathen, a Papist, a Church of England man, if he dies without being thus sanctified?

A. He cannot see the Lord. But none who seek it sincerely shall or can die without it; though possibly he may not attain it, till the very article of death.

Q. 3. Is it ordinarily given till a little before death?

A. It is not to those who expect it no sooner, nor consequently ask for it, at least, not in faith.

Q. 4. But ought we to expect it sooner?

A. Why not? For although we grant: (1.) That the generality of believers whom we have hitherto known were not so sanctified till near death; (2.) That few of those to whom St. Paul wrote his Epistles were so at the time he wrote; (3.) Nor he himself at the time of writing his former Epistle: yet this does not prove we may not be today.

Q. 5. But would not one who was thus sanctified be incapable of worldly business?

A. He would be far more capable of it than ever, as going through all without distraction.

The above extract is about as satisfactory to me as anything I have seen; but I do not claim to be ahead of the founders of Methodism in these matters. I give them, with all I have written for what they are worth, with no feeling of unkindness for those who differ with me, and with the hope that they may burn nobody's fingers.

I understand the above to be the teaching of the Holiness brethren whom Dr. E. condemns.

Leasburg, N. C., Aug. 27th, 1887.

For the Advocate.
Our Letter From Gilderoy.

It has been too hot for anything. The nights are cooler now and longer too. "Blessed is the man who invented sleep." What a restorer of vital powers it is. When I want a good night's rest I let supper alone, terribly alone, and then sleep, deep, sweet, refreshing sleep comes down all over me and locks me in its arms all night long. I get up refreshed, renewed, invigorated. There is no bad taste in my mouth, no dullness in my head, no soreness, no sourness in my stomach. Supper is death to most dyspeptics. It drives sleep away from the eyes and slumber from the eye lids. Supper and sleep will not go together in my case. I see many others who lose sleep from too much supper. They take this, that and the other drug for nerve or heart disease, as I used to do, but the whole trouble comes of having put the stomach on a strain. Give it rest. If you must eat and will eat, do, for your "stomach's sake," eat but little, and let that be very light—as light as popcorn, or lighter if you can.

Eating is, after all, largely, a habit. More people kill themselves from "stuffing" than ever starve to death. Preachers are particularly liable to sin along this line. They eat too much, too often, at too many places, too rich food and too many condiments. Brethren don't, for the love of Christ, don't let the good sisters kill you. They'll do it, dead sure, if you give them half a chance. They'll make you eat yourself to death. They mean it for goodness, but it will prove a dangerous and delusive snare, if not death, if you yield to them. Keep a tight grip on your appetite as you go round from house. There is both health and grace in eating little—there is to most men, particularly to dyspeptic men.

The character of the sermon depends largely on the state of the digestion. This is a fact. Many are the scoldings the church has got because the preacher's stomach was out of tune. I've been there, I know how it is. I can tell the state of some men's digestion when I hear them preach. It is a nervous, bitter, vicious, growling kind of people, a gospel that kills, but does not make alive. There is more tongue and temper than grace in it. It does not commend Christ, does not show a Christian spirit in the preacher. There is an inordinate propensity to rebuke people, publicly, for little things. No good comes of this. It does harm, more harm than good. The occasions that justify public rebuke now are few and far between. I knew one man, a strong

man too, who was absolutely terrific on rebukes at night service after eating a hearty supper. An officer of his church asked me: "What on earth makes our preacher do these unlovely things?" "Too much supper—too much supper," was my reply. He was more favorable to the people at eleven A. M. generally. The process of digestion was well advanced. A long walk and fresh air had put the preacher in a gracious mood.

A lady said to me not long ago, "Our pastor is a holy man, fine preacher, and we are devoted to him, but at times he seems to be out of sorts, he scolds the church, thinks everything is wrong and that nobody is doing right. What do you suppose makes him do that way?" "Impaired digestion," I replied. "Well," said she, "he is a confirmed dyspeptic." "Well, my sister, you will have to bear with him, pray for him and be patient with him, for he will have these unlovely spells, those moods, when he will do those unlovely things, involuntarily, and, perhaps, unconsciously to himself. They are infirmities, physical weaknesses, for which your pastor is not morally responsible, unless, indeed, he brought them upon himself by voluntary sin. I've yet to see a man or woman wholly free from infirmity of one kind or another."

Yours,
GILDEROY.
For the Advocate.
Just a Question of Privilege.

BY REV. A. J. JARRELL.

MR. EDITOR: Your Georgia Correspondent is out again on the holiness question. And lest some one should imagine he was writing about things in Georgia, I beg to say he makes not the remotest reference to us or our holiness teachings. He thinks he has found some good brethren from some other clime that are not Wesleyan in their views, and forthwith "unlimbers" six field-pieces, and brings them to bear on them. But why he should want to shoot them through a Southern paper, is beyond my pen. And why he wanted to bring them into his letter at all, when the only matter in hand was Bishop Key and the Georgia Holiness Association, I cannot even imagine. So far as Southern matters and teachings are concerned, he and Dr. Edwards are both, alike, riddling men of straw. There are no such men as they are shooting at, anywhere South. If any elsewhere, they are abundantly able to take care of themselves. But lest some one should still think his remarks apply to us. May I plead "guilty," or "not guilty" to each of his six artillery indictments?

1. DEPRAVITY. "They teach that conversion does not affect it; Wesley, that it does." "Not guilty"—in word, thought, or deed—neither have we ever been.

2. JUSTIFICATION. "They teach that it is mere pardon; Wesley, that it is complete renewal." This is exactly what we teach, and what have always been said. "mere pardon," for it is "free" pardon—but nevertheless pardon—it never touches the nature of a man. But stop. Was your correspondent dreaming when he said, Wesley taught that "justification was complete renewal?" Was he? Wesley taught renewal, and profound renewal, but never as involved in justification. We always put that mighty renewal in Regeneration, and have one of our hardest fought battles to get the church to put the standard of Regeneration as high as it ought to be. I wish the church did but know how high we lift that standard. We believe mightily in Regeneration.

3. GROWTH. "They teach that sanctification is merely gradual growth" (merely); "Wesley, that it is." This is our uniform teaching. Only we say there ought to be a "gradual growth" before sanctification, and we know there is a rapid one after it. Let us hear from Mr. Wesley on gradual sanctification: "In London alone I found 652 who were exceedingly clear in their experience. Every one of these (with-out a single exception) has declared that his deliverance from sin was instantaneous; that the change was wrought in a moment. Had half of these, or one-third, or one in twenty declared it was gradually wrought in them, I should have believed this with respect to them, and thought that some were gradually sanctified, and some instantaneously.

But as I have not found, in so long a space of time, a single person speaking thus, I cannot but believe, that sanctification is commonly, if not always, an instantaneous work." Wesley's works vol. vi. p. 464. Tyerman, vol. 1. p. 462.

How does this sound for Wesley on "Gradual Sanctification?" Howbeit, anybody knows there is a gradual work before, and rapid one after it.

4. DEATH TO SIN. "They teach that it is by faith alone; Wesley, by patient, self-denial, to which faith is given as a reward." So we do teach, and teach also that this faith can come only after utter self-renunciation.

But Wesley don't need an interpreter here either. "All who think so" (that long time and course of self-denial must go before sanctification) "must think we are sanctified by works, or what is the same thing, by suffering. For otherwise, what is time necessary for? It must be either to do, or to suffer, whereas if nothing be required, but simple faith, a moment is as good as an age." 1764.

5. PROFESSOR. "They teach that

we must tell it to the world or lose it; Wesley, that we must be careful in speaking of ourselves, and call this blessing by no special name." We teach that it must be told, or be lost, but we also teach that it must be done with care and great humility; both of which Mr. Wesley taught us to do. Will the reader turn to plain account—pamphlet—pp. 17-18 and read Wesley without an interpreter? Do read for yourselves.

6. TOO COMMON. "They teach that it is very common and easily secured; Wesley, that is rare and difficult." Alas! alas! how uncommon this experience is! Would to God it were common! Our beloved Zion would no longer languish if it were. No such hope in the very near future. Too many good men fighting it for that. Sanctification "easy?" "Crucifixion" easy? The man that said it, surely never hung on the cross: surely not.

O, why will not beloved brethren spend all their time and brain and ink in helping us utterly "to destroy the works of the devil?" How can they get their consent to pull anybody back? How can they help from pushing all men on and up? How?

LaGrange, Ga., Aug. 25th, 1887.

For the Advocate.
Vacation Notes. From Our New
York Correspondent.

BY JOSEPH S. TAYOR.

Not having seen New York for seven weeks, I can not write a letter from that city, as usual, but shall give instead some account of places I have visited during my absence.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

This town is leading all other summer resorts along the Atlantic Coast in point of population and prosperity. It is the only breathing spot Philadelphia has, and is chiefly patronized by Quaker City's sweltering thousands. Pittsburg, Baltimore, and New York, also contribute largely to the success of the place. The present population numbers at least 100,000, and the resident population is about one-tenth of this number. There are daily excursions, sometimes as many as ten or a dozen, from all the neighboring country. There are numerous Sunday excursions from Philadelphia for clerks and others unable or unwilling to go, on Saturday. Never in the history of the place has there been such a rush of visitors; and this in spite of the mosquito! What a pest he is—constantly presenting his bill and as constantly meeting destruction in lieu of payment.

The town is laid out in the form of a rectangle whose shortest sides face North and South nearly. The long avenues, parallel to the ocean, are called Pacific, Atlantic, Arctic, and Baltic. The cross avenues are named after the Atlantic States beginning with Maine on the North. The City is built on a sand bar which has become an island, the highest part of which is scarcely ten feet above the ocean level. It makes every resident pale to think of a tidal wave, which, if it ever comes, must swamp the entire city and make exit impossible.

Atlantic City is a goddess town. It has churches, of course, but they are for the most part empty, and even were they full, unable to accommodate a fourth part of the population. There is no Sabbath to speak of. The Mayor does indeed make some show of forcing an observance of the sacred day, but the city executive feels somewhat like managers of a boarding school: they have to look out for the success of the concern first; and if the majority do not demand or desire, rigid morality, must go by the board. The noisy merry-go-rounds of Atlantic are closed on Sunday and the theatrical beer pavilions do not furnish the usual entertainment. But the saloons, the hotels, and many of the stores and booths make more money on Sunday than on any other day of the week, save perhaps Saturday.

It is not an exclusive place. All classes go there. Every color, race, and circumstance is represented. Ocean Grove is distinctively religious, Spring Lake intellectual and blue-blooded, Long Branch and Newport fashionable, but Atlantic City is all of these to some extent, and none of them in a marked degree.

As a health resort it is unquestionably desirable. It is the paradise of invalid babes. From all over the country people come to draw the inspiring air of the sea. It is the best tonic for a debilitated system. Better than all Physicians, surer than all medicines, to hundreds and thousands, is a daily stroll on the beach or both in the surf. No man can say, however dogmatical, what climate or locality is going to be safe or beneficial to a given case of sickness. What cures in one case kills in another; and this is the reason why so many people go annually to die thousands of miles away from home and all else most dear on earth. Physicians too frequently recommend these death-journeys in the case of consumptives who have passed the curable stage of the disease. It seems to be deliberate cruelty to permit, much more to order, such people to go from home. But it may safely be said that very many people, and especially children, owe their lives to Atlantic City's salubrious climate.

I attended a Mennointe Sunday-school Convention the other day. It was held

at Schwenksville, Montgomery county, Pa., and represented the schools of the Eastern Pennsylvania Conference.

Among the topics discussed were these:

1. To what extent are Sunday-school "Attractions" conducive of its true object? Distinguish *allowable* and *unallowable* attractions.

2. What claims has the Sunday-school cause upon the individual church member?

3. What is the nature of a good lesson-help? How should helps be used?

4. How to raise money for school and mission purposes?

5. How to train children to become Apostles of the Savior, as well as instruct them?

Several points gave rise to prolonged discussion. Among these were:

1. Are church festivals and fairs Christian modes of giving?

2. Is the tenth demanded by God?

3. What is the tenth? Or the tenth of what is demanded?

The majority inclined to the belief that a "church has no right to go into business;" and therefore fairs, festivals, and the like, are not true modes of giving. If the church desires to give lectures and entertainments for their own sakes, it being so understood by those who patronize them, well and good; but to advertise a package party, or an ice-cream festival "for the benefit of the Mission fund" is to solicit contributions on false grounds. If a man gives to God with the expectation of getting a part of his gift back again in the form of cakes or ice-cream, he is not giving at all. He is simply exchanging. A church can never train its members in Christian giving by any such methods.

The minority contended for the tenth. What this tenth is may be illustrated thus: A manufacturer sells \$100,000 worth of goods in a year. Materials and expenses cost \$90,000. His living is \$5,000. This person has three incomes: \$100,000, \$10,000, and \$5,000—the first gross, the second net including his living, the third net deducting his living. The tenth of his income is either \$10,000, \$1,000, or \$500; which is God's? Rev. C. VanderSmissem thinks \$1,000 belongs to God.

For the Advocate.
The Plan of Endowment.

MR. EDITOR: Please publish the following "Plan for raising endowment fund for Trinity College."

In June last, I sent to each P. E. in our Conference by mail, a number of printed notes and a bundle of this circular. I have been somewhat surprised, that some of the brethren seem never to have seen the Plan, or the printed notes. If any P. E. failed to receive the papers referred to, I shall be glad to know it. I still have a few blank forms of notes on hand.

Very truly,
L. S. BURKHEAD,
for Committee.

Aug. 29th, 1887.

PLAN FOR RAISING ENDOWMENT FUND FOR TRINITY COLLEGE.

The committee appointed by the Board of Trustees, at a called meeting in Raleigh, N. C., under instruction of our last Annual Conference (see Conference min. p. 32.) hereby leave to submit the following plan for raising an Endowment Fund for Trinity College:

1. Your committee believe that an Endowment Fund, of at least one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000), should be raised as soon as possible, and that such an Endowment is essential to the proper growth and the largest prosperity and usefulness of the College, as well as to the proper development and growth of Methodist Christianity in North Carolina.

2. In order, therefore, to secure this Endowment Fund, we most earnestly recommend that a direct and persistent appeal be made, *publicly and privately* to all our people in every pastoral charge—so as to reach all our churches and Sunday Schools within the bounds of the entire Conference, in order to raise at least one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in cash if possible, or in cash, and notes payable in installments of one and two years, and that this public canvass begin the first of June, 1887, and be continued until this matter shall have been effectively brought before all our people. And that each Presiding Elder and Pastor shall labor to bring to the front in this united effort to endow Trinity College, as many of our laymen as possible, in order to interest and arouse all our people to proper effort in behalf of this great work: *provided* every body shall be at liberty to give before the first of June, to this object as much as they please.

3. In order to facilitate the accomplishment of this important object, a sufficient number of printed notes shall be sent to each Presiding Elder and Pastor to be used by such of our brethren and friends, as may not have the ready cash, to pay down, the amounts they are willing to donate to this Endowment Fund.

4. All the cash raised shall be sent forward as speedily as possible to Jas. A. Gray, Esq., Winston, N. C., Treasurer of the Endowment Fund, who shall receipt for the same and also deposit, or invest said amounts of money, as he shall be directed by the Board of Trustees; and all notes taken shall also be placed in the hands of the Treasurer of the endowment fund for safe keeping, and for collection as they fall due.

5. The Treasurer of the Endowment

Fund shall pay over annually to the Treasurer of the faculty of Trinity College, the interest which may accrue on the Endowment Fund, taking his receipt for the same, which interest shall be applied exclusively to the payment of the current expenses of the College.

6. The Endowment Fund shall be forever held by the Board of Trustees of the College and by their successors in office and by the officers of the Board and their successors in office, and by the Faculty of Trinity College, and by the Conference now owning, or the Conference, or Conferences which may own said College, *sacred and inviolate*, and never be applied as a whole, or in any of its parts, to any object, or use whatsoever, but the one and sole purpose for which it was intended by its contributors.

7. In order to secure the Endowment Fund and the annual payment of the interest the Treasurer of the Endowment Fund shall execute and deliver into the hands of the Board of Trustees of the College, and in favor of the college, a bond with good, solvent and approved security, for such sum as the Board of Trustees shall require, which bond and security of the Treasurer shall be annually reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees of Trinity College.

For the Advocate.
A Missquoted Passage.

"What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." Is the unwearied language of God in His providence. He will have credit every step. He will not assign reasons; but cause He will exercise faith.—CECIL.

Reference here is to John 13-7., and the question is, is the usual construction put upon the passage, as stated above, the true one? The doctrine of God's providence is frequently overdone. Some things which ought to be referred to Him, are not, and some things which ought not, are ascribed to his act. Again, the doctrine that in the future world God will explain all the mysteries of His present providence is overdrawn and misleading. One thing is very certain, it is not deduced from the above text. There is no passage made to do so much unnecessary service as this. It is quoted thousands of times to teach, at least, a doubtful doctrine. Faith in God gives the Christian all the reason he requires for providential acts in this world, without any promise, of almost impossible redemption, to occupy future existence with explanations of every single act of the Divine administration. And He nowhere makes any such promise. "The Judge of all the earth will do right" is the substance of every breath that faith draws, and the fullest possible explanation of the government of earth and hell and heaven.

Let us examine the text. There are two questions: (1.) To what fact did Jesus refer when he said to Peter, "thou knowest not what I do now, but thou shalt know hereafter?" and (2) what great principle did he intend to teach?

The original words in the phrase "thou shalt know hereafter," do not remotely refer to a future state of being. Peter objected to so great condescension on the part of Christ as the washing of his feet. Christ reminded him that all the outgoing of grace that cleansed and saved the soul was from Him, and added "after I get through this service I will explain my meaning." "Thou shalt know"—I will tell you my object in conducting this service—"hereafter"—after these acts concluded.

Next, what great doctrine did he intend to teach? Certainly not that of furnishing a reckoning of all His acts to the inhabitants of heaven. I once heard of a woman who said the first thing she wanted to know when she got to heaven was why God had taken her child by death. The very thought is preposterous and absurd. What possible good could it do to know any more than faith knows now of all such things. No; the doctrine taught was *condescension and humility towards one another*. So after Christ had concluded the service he redeemed his promise to Peter: "I have set you an example. If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, you ought to have the same spirit of condescension towards each other." He did not intend to establish a sacrament—for it lacks all the elements of such—but simply by an object lesson to teach them a great principle of religion.

I humbly conceive that heaven will furnish some better employment than calling God to account for the afflictive acts of His providence in this world.

E. A. YATES.

Sometimes a fog will settle over a vessel's deck, yet leave the topmast clear. Then a sailor goes up aloft and gets a lookout like the helmsman on the deck cannot get. So prayer sends the soul aloft; lifts it above the clouds in which our selfishness and egotism be-fog us, and gives us a chance to see which way to steer.

It is the part of wisdom to let worldly cares and enjoyments hang loosely about us, so that when "the inevitable hour" comes we may let them fall like a mantle, and take our departure unregretfully. Ripe fruit falls easily. So when the heart of the Christian is truly weaned from the world, death may come at any time and find him ready.