





**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic
Sciences
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N. Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

28
22
22
20

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**

10



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions

Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

1980

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:




Izaak Walton Killam Memorial Library
Dalhousie University

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

Izaak Walton Killam Memorial Library
Dalhousie University

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

O. O. MORTON & Co.
152 BARRINGTON STREET

3
B6.7
875

→ THE DOCTRINES ←

—OF THE—

SALVATION ARMY

—AND THE—

BIBLE COMPARED;

OR,

Why I left the Salvation Army.

BY

JOHN T. CUDMORE.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND:

1889.



➤THE DOCTRINES◀

—OF THE—

SALVATION ARMY

—AND THE—

BIBLE COMPARED;

OR,

Why I left the Salvation Army.

BY

JOHN T. CUDMORE.

...



CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND:

1880.

T
S
no
te
no
th

id
is
th
th

w
w
th
re
h
p

o
th
p
a
m
p
e
th
th
m
d

u
th

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE author of this little book promised the public some time ago to give them his reasons for leaving the Salvation Army. I would have done so before this, had I not been detained by other engagements. I make no pretensions whatever to literary attainments. Bookmaking is not my profession, and I am conscious of the many defects there are in the composition of this work.

There is considerable repetition both in the language and ideas used, especially on the subject of "Justification." This is intentional, as by continually stating the way of salvation the reader that is in darkness may be led into the light on the subject.

My object in writing this pamphlet is to make men and women happy, and bring honor and glory to God. If I were actuated by any other motives I would have given up the idea of writing it long ago; and I believe that if those readers who are unsaved will only accept Christ as directed herein, they cannot fail to have the peace in their souls that passeth all understanding.

I honestly and firmly believe that the Salvation Army is of the devil, and as such I do not hesitate to denounce it in the strongest terms. If I thought it was of God, or that it preached the right way of salvation, I would tremble to say a word against it,—no amount of persuasion would induce me to do it. I do not say there are no earnest or sincere people in it, but I do not hesitate to say that with all their earnestness and zeal, the vast majority of them are still in the dark; otherwise they could not but see the glaring errors that are preached to them, day after day, and the bible tells me "if the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch."

In order to make my arguments more weighty, I have used the opinions of some of the most prominent men on the side of Christianity that the world has ever known, and on

the subject of Justification, my object has been to give to the public the ideas of those men whose opinions would have far more weight than my own. And even if the public will not take any notice of my opinion, I ask them to consider the opinions of those who have suffered to maintain the cause of truth, and above all to pay attention to the Word of God.

This book is written in the plainest and simplest language possible, so that the most unlearned can understand and be benefitted by it. And if souls are only led from darkness to light by its perusal the author will be amply repaid for his labor.

JOHN T. CUDMORE.

it
to
be
dis
in
cu
jus
ern
the
sur
ha
thi

spe
alr
on
so
the
to
oth
is
Go
ma
Sa

inf
are
the
giv
Cl
de
fa
go

JUSTIFICATION.

NOTHING in this world is more important than for a soul to know how it is justified before God. How it is freed from condemnation; on what grounds it is going to be acquitted when it stands before the great white throne, before which we must all appear. Mistakes here are disastrous in the extreme. We believe there is no doctrine in the bible that Satan seeks to pervert with so much cunning and craftiness, as he does the doctrine of justification. He knows that if he can only get souls to err on this point, he is sure of them, no matter how zealous they may be, or how full of apparent good works, just as sure he is of them as of the thief, the drunkard, or the harlot. How important then that we rightly understand this, because our eternal destiny hangs on it.

How sad to think, that, notwithstanding all that has been spoken and written, the world is, comparatively speaking, in almost total darkness on this point. Men talk and preach on minor points, and to a large extent fail to shew perishing souls how they are freed from condemnation. Yet this is the very thing that every unsaved man that is at all anxious to be saved, is desirous of knowing. The question above all others with them is, "what must I do to be saved?" and it is to the answer of this question that this chapter is devoted. God grant, that I may be the means in his hands, of leading many souls from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

The Church of Rome teaches that we are justified by an infused or inherent righteousness, or in other words, that we are justified by the righteousness that is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit. They claim also, that the Holy Spirit is given to work this inward righteousness, on account of Christ's having satisfied the demands of justice by His death, and also that the Holy Spirit is received through faith. They claim that the righteousness for which we are going to be accepted when we stand before the Throne of

God, is a real and substantial purification of soul and body. Of course this inward righteousness follows faith, but it is not this righteousness that we are going to be accepted for. The righteousness for which we are going to be accepted, and for which we are accepted now, is the righteousness of Jesus imputed to us.

The teaching of the Salvation Army, and the Romish Church, on the doctrine of justification, are one and the same. They both teach justification by inherent righteousness, wrought in us through faith in God, by the Holy Spirit. To prove this we refer our readers to the doctrine and discipline of the Salvation Army, page 91, which reads as follows: "only a holy life, the outcome of love to God and man, attained and maintained by the power of the Holy Spirit, through faith in the blood of Christ, is essential to salvation." This teaches justification by inherent righteousness. It places justification in the holy lives we are enabled to live by the spirit of God, or in other words, the good works that God enables us to do. If this is not justification by works what is it? Instead of taking faith in what Christ has done, as the only essential salvation, it takes a holy life as the only essential, still, General Booth says that we can do nothing either before or after we are converted, to merit salvation, yet he says that our final justification, or our acquittal before God's Throne, depends on our holy lives. Such nonsense. Again, in page 78 of Doctrine & Discipline, he says, "our final salvation is made to depend on our continued obedience and faith." I submit it does not depend on our continued obedience, that would be justification by works, but it depends wholly and solely on our continued faith, or in other words our continuing to depend on the *blood* and *righteousness* of Jesus: our works are only the outcome or evidence of our faith. They bear no part in our justification. We are not going to be acquitted by them. A soul is not justified by its works any more when it stands before God's Throne, than it is when it first comes to God, a hell-deserving creature, laden with sin. If it were so the ground of our justification would be changed, we would not be justified on the same grounds when we stand before the Throne, as when we come to God, laden with our sin and guilt. Who authorizes this

cha
diffe
it, i
dev
mor
any

A
Ger
righ
foll
app
dail
the
cha
wor
sins
to t
out
Chr
He
or v
of t
(Go
be,
Boo
ans
"I
Yea
in t
ove
way
Th
so
rig
bel
an
fol

ou
hi

change in the ground of our justification, at these two different periods? Not God. His word is positively against it, it is purely from beginning to end an invention of the devil, by which we believe he has deceived and destroyed more souls since the days of the Blessed Saviour, than by any other means.

Again, on page 73 of *Doctrine and Discipline of S. A.*, General Booth, in speaking of the doctrine of imputed righteousness, treats it with contempt. He explains it as follows: "This passage (*1st John: 1-8*) is descriptive of and applicable to those who, while acknowledging that they are daily and hourly committing sin, yet delude themselves with the notion that their sins are imputed to Christ and not charged to them. By this they mean that no matter how worldly, selfish, or even devilish they may actually be, their sins were so dealt with by Christ that they are not imputed to them, and that therefore while full of sin they are without sin. Actually this doctrine is known as perfection in Christ; and it states that when God looks at His children, He looks at them through His Son, and cannot or does not, or will not see their sins, neither does he take any account of them, nor hold them responsible for them; that He (God) looks at them not as they are, but as they ought to be, and deals with them accordingly." We reply to General Booth, in the words that "Christian" is said to have answered "Ignorance" in Bunyan's "Pilgrims' Progress," "Ignorance is thy name, and as thy name is so art thou. Yea, thou also art ignorant of the true effect of saving faith in this righteousness of Christ; which is to bow and win over the heart to God in Christ; to love his name, words, ways and people, and not as thou ignorantly imaginest." This dialogue, between "Christian" and "Ignorance," bears so directly on these two doctrines of imputed and inherent righteousness that we will insert part of it here. "Christian" believed in justification by imputed righteousness, "Ignorance" by inherent righteousness. The dialogue is as follows:

"Ignorance. What are good thoughts concerning God?

Chr. Even, as I have said concerning ourselves, when our thoughts of God do agree with what the word saith of him; and that is, when we think of his being and attributes

as the word hath taught, of which I cannot now discourse at large. But to speak of him in reference to us ; then have we right thoughts of God, when we think that He knows us better than we know ourselves, and can see sin in us when and where we can see none in ourselves ; when we think He knows our inmost thoughts, and that our heart, with all its depths, is always open unto his eyes. Also, when we think that all our righteousness stinks in His nostrils, and that therefore he cannot abide to see us stand before Him in any confidence, even of all our best performances.

Ignor. Do you think that I am such a fool as to think that God can see no further than I ; or that I would come to God in the best of my performances ?

Chr. Why how dost thou think in this matter ?

Ignor. Why to be short, I think I must believe in Christ for justification.

Chr. How ? Think thou must believe in Christ, when thou seest not thy need of Him ! Thou neither seest thy original or actual infirmities ; but hast such an opinion of thyself, and of what thou doest, as plainly renders thee to be one that did never see a necessity of Christ's personal righteousness to justify thee before God. How then dost thou say, I believe in Christ.

Ignor. I believe well enough for all that.

Chr. How dost thou believe ?

Ignor. I believe that Christ died for sinners, and that I shall be justified before God from the curse, through his gracious acceptance of my obedience to His law. Or thus : Christ makes my duties that are religious, acceptable to his Father by virtue of His merits, and so shall I be justified.

Chr. Let me give an answer to this confession of thy faith :

1st. Thou believest with a fantastical faith ; for this faith is nowhere described in the word.

2d. Thou believest with a false faith ; because it taketh justification from the personal righteousness of Christ, and applies it to thy own.

3d. This faith maketh not Christ a justifier of thy person, but of thy actions, and of thy person for thy action's sake, which is false.

4th. Therefore this faith is deceitful, even such as will

leave thee under wrath in the day of God Almighty; for true justifying faith puts the soul, as sensible of its lost condition by the law, upon flying for refuge unto Christ's righteousness, which righteousness of his is not an act of grace by which he maketh for justification thy obedience accepted with God, but his personal obedience to the law, in doing and suffering for us, what that requireth at our hands; this righteousness I say true faith accepteth; under the skirt of which the soul being shrouded, and by it presented as spotless before God, it is accepted and acquitted from condemnation.

Ignor. What? Would you have us trust to what Christ in his own person has done without us? This conceit would loosen the reins of our lust, and tolerate us to live as we list; for what matter how we live, if we may be justified by Christ's personal righteousness from all, when we believe it.

Chr. Ignorance is thy name, and as thy name is so art thou; even this thy answer demonstrateth what I say. Ignorant thou art of what justifying righteousness is, and as ignorant how to secure thy soul through the faith of it, from the heavy wrath of God. Yea, thou also art ignorant of the true effects of saving faith in this righteousness of Christ, which is to bow and win over the heart to God in Christ, to love his name, his word, ways and people, and not as thou ignorantly imaginest. The working of this faith, I perceive poor Ignorance, thou art ignorant of. Be awakened then, see thine own wretchedness, and fly to the Lord Jesus, and by his righteousness, which is the righteousness of God, thou shalt be delivered from condemnation.

Ignor. You go too fast, I cannot keep pace with you; do you go on before: I must stay a while behind.

Then said Christian to his companion, Hopeful, I much pity this poor man; it will certainly go ill with him at last.

Alas! said Hopeful, there are abundance in our town in his condition, whole families, yea, whole streets, and that of pilgrims too."

Yes, and go ill with Ignorance it did; he was carried from the gate of Heaven, to the pit of hell. General Booth is just in the same state of mind as Ignorance was. He (Ignorance) thought that to be justified by

Christ's personal righteousness, would loosen the reins of his lust, and tolerate him to live as he pleased. He was ignorant of the true effect of faith in Christ's righteousness. So General Booth believes, that a person may accept Christ as his Saviour, may believe that his sins are charged to Christ, and that Christ's righteousness is charged to him, and yet be *worldly, selfish, and even devilish*. He is just as ignorant of the effects of saving faith, as poor "Ignorance" was, and we doubt not, that unless he repent, and clothe himself in the garment of Christ's righteousness, his end will be the same. Yea, and the sad and bitter end of millions more. John Bunyan could not have given us a better description of the character and belief of the Salvation Army, had he seen them, and heard them, than he has given us in the character of "Ignorance." He (Ignorance) believed in justification by inherent righteousness; so does the Salvation Army. He spurned the idea of justification by imputed righteousness; so does the Salvation Army. He thought that to be justified by Christ's personal righteousness being charged to us was an encouragement to sin. General Booth thinks the same.

Again, to prove to our readers that the Salvation Army does not believe in the doctrine of imputed righteousness, we refer them to the "War Cry" issue of December 10th, 1887, where Mrs. Booth speaking of the doctrine, brands it as one of the false Christs of the present day. She says, another modern representation of the Christ is that of a substitutionary Saviour, not in the sense of the atonement, but in the way of obedience. This Christ is held up as embodying in Himself the sum and substance of the sinners' salvation, needed only to be believed in, that is, accepted by the mind as the atoning sacrifice, and trusted in as securing for the sinner all the benefits involved in his death, without respect to any in-wrought change in the sinner himself. Mrs. Booth too in this passage shows most conspicuously her ignorance of the effect of saving faith. We defy Mrs. Booth to find a person on this earth that has accepted Christ as his substitute, and is trusting in the blood and righteousness of that substitute, in whose heart there is no change. Why it is through accepting Christ this way that the change is wrought. Whenever a soul is led to see that all its righteousness is only as filthy rags, that

salvation comes to them solely through the righteousness of Jesus, that the righteousness of the Saviour is charged to them, and their sins charged to him, that moment is the heart filled with a love that cannot be expressed, and with a joy that knows no bounds. When people behold the boundless love of God, their hearts are changed from hating Him to loving Him, and, as the result of loving Him, their desire is to do his will, the language of their heart is, "the love of Christ constraineth me." No other representation of Christ inspires me with a thousandth part of the love to him, as the representation of Him as a substitutionary Saviour, and to believe that it is for his personal righteousness that I am going to be accepted, when I stand before the throne. Mrs. Booth goes on to say, "the idea of a substitutionary Christ, accepted as an outward covering or refuge, instead of the power of an endless life, is a cheat of the devil, and has been the ruin of thousands of souls." Sad and woful ignorance of the effects of faith in Christ. We need not quote any more to show to our readers that the Salvation Army, or their leaders at any rate, do not believe in justification by imputed righteousness. They scorn the idea and treat it with contempt. Well, if they do not believe in justification by imputed righteousness, they must believe in justification by inherent righteousness. These are the only two ways in which it is possible for a soul to be justified before God. I must either be justified by the righteousness of another person being charged to me, or, I must stand on my own ground and be justified by my own righteousness or the righteousness wrought in me by the Holy Spirit. These are the only two ways. To suppose that I am justified by the latter way is to contradict Scripture, for it makes my justification depend on the Spirit's work in me instead of Christ's work for me. If I am justified this way, I would need to be entirely sanctified or made holy before I could be justified. This doctrine would really place sanctification before justification, because, if I have not a substitute to stand in my place, or, if the righteousness of another person is not charged to me, then of necessity I must be pure myself before I can be justified in God's sight, because, God cannot look on sin with any degree of allowance, some one must bear the punishment of sin, and if my sins

have been imputed to Christ, then of necessity Christ's righteousness is charged to me, otherwise I could not be set free from the punishment of sin.

Again, justification cannot be by inherent righteousness, because when a sinner first comes to God, he has no righteousness in him at all, hence, in order for him to be justified, the righteousness of another person must be charged or imputed to him, and his sin must be imputed or charged to another. God's law could not be honored in any other way, and the claims of justice could not be met. This every one will acknowledge. Well, if the righteousness of Christ must be imputed to the sinner when he first comes to God, in order that he may be justified, when does the justified man cease to need the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or, when is the ground of his justification changed from imputed to inherent righteousness? at what period in the life of a christian does this transfer take place? does the Scripture give us the slightest reason to suppose that the ground of our acceptance with God is ever changed? Not at all. The idea is absurd and unscriptural. I must be acquitted or justified from condemnation on the same conditions when I stand before the Great White Throne to be judged, as I was when I first came to God, a poor, trembling, hell-deserving sinner. And to suppose that when I first came to God, I could be justified by an inherent righteousness, is to suppose an impossibility, because I had no inherent righteousness to be justified by. I had nothing but sin to bring, and hence to be justified at all, the righteousness of another person (Jesus Christ) had to be charged to me, and I had to be looked upon as righteous, through his obedience to the law instead of my own obedience to it. God punished His Son for my disobedience to His law, that he might be able to reward me for Christ's obedience to that law; in other words, God treated His Son as though He were a sinner, though in reality he was not, that He might be able to treat me as though I were righteous, though in reality I am not. God could not pardon sin in any other way. "He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him"—2nd *Cor.* 5: 21. Then justification is by imputed righteousness, and the grounds

of our justification are never changed from Christ's work for us to the Spirit's work in us. When I stand before the Throne I am not going to be accepted for the holiness of my heart, or for my freedom from sin, any more than I was when I came to God at first, laden with sins. Holiness is only the effect that is produced on the heart by a justifying faith, and to suppose that I am justified by what is only the effect of justification, is very poor logic indeed. Justification by any other way than by imputed righteousness, is nothing more nor less than justification by works. They may call it justification by faith as much as they please. We know there are protestants who claim to preach justification by faith, who do not believe in the doctrine of imputed righteousness. The Salvation Army claims to believe in justification by faith. The way they believe in it is described by General Booth on page 39 of *Doctrine and Discipline of the Salvation Army*. He says, "What is the meaning of the passage, "faith is counted" or "imputed for righteousness?" "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."—*Rom. 4:5*. These expressions simply mean that being without any righteousness of our own, in which to appear before God, He accepts our faith in Christ instead. These and kindred passages also teach that faith is counted for righteousness, because it is God's means of making us actually righteous. In this sense we are justified, that is, made just by faith." General Booth explains this passage in the same way as Romish expositors and Arminian Protestants do, viz:—That God accepted Abraham's act of believing, or faith, as a substitute for complete obedience. But this is in opposition to the whole spirit and letter of the Apostle's teaching. Throughout this whole argument faith is set in direct opposition to works in the matter of justification, and even in the next two verses. The meaning therefore, cannot possibly be, that the mere act of believing, which is as much a work as any other piece of commanded duty, was counted to Abraham for all obedience. *John 6:29* and *1st John 3:23*, goes to prove beyond a doubt that the mere act of believing is a work, therefore, to be justified by faith in this sense, or, the mere act of believing, is to be justified by our works. The

meaning plainly is, that Abraham believed in the promises which embraced Christ, (*Genesis* 12: 3, & 15: 5, 6; & *Gal.* 3: 8) as we believe in Christ himself, and in both cases faith is merely the instrument that puts us in possession of the blessing, gratuitously bestowed.

Christ for us, is the only foundation upon which we can build in safety. Christ our *Substitute* is our one resting-place. Not works, nor love, nor feelings, even though these may be the creation of the Spirit in us; no, nor yet faith, whether as an act of the mind, or as a production of the Spirit, or as a substitute for righteousness; none of these will do to build upon. If we build upon faith in this way (as General Booth would have us do), we shall find at the great reckoning day, that we have been building on sinking sand, and that our souls are still exposed to the wrath of Almighty God, notwithstanding all our zeal and apparent good works.

Saving faith is clearly described by Luther and Melancthon, in their replies to a letter written by Brentius, in the year 1531. Brentius had been much troubled and perplexed about faith. It puzzled him. Christ justifies; faith justifies; how is this? Is faith a merit! Is it a work? Has it some justifying virtue in itself? Does it justify because it is the gift of God and the work of the Holy Spirit? Troubled and perplexed with these questions (as many more since his day have been) he wrote to Luther and Melancthon. Their replies are short and to the point, and are specimens of the way in which these men of might dealt with the perplexed spirits of their time. "I see" writes Melancthon "what is troubling you about *faith*. You stick to the fancy of Agustine, who, though right in rejecting the righteousness of human reason, imagines that we are justified by the fulfilling of the law which the Holy Spirit works in us. So you imagine that men are justified by faith, because it is by faith that we receive the Spirit, that thereafter we may be able to be just by that fulfilment of the law which the Spirit works. This imagination places justification in our fulfilment of the law, in our purity or perfection, although this renewal ought to follow faith. But do ye turn your eyes from that renewal, and from the law altogether, to the promise and to Christ, and think that it is on Christ's account that we become just, that is, accepted before God,

e promises
 6; & Gal.
 both cases
 session of

 ch we can
 sting-place.
 ese may be
 whether as
 irit, or as a
 do to build
 as General
 eat reckon-
 sand, and
 f Almighty
 ood works.
 r and Me-
 Brentius, in
 ed and per-
 tifies; faith
 it a work?
 it justify be-
 Holy Spirit?
 many more
 Melancthon.
 e specimens
 ult with the
 Melancthon
 to the fancy
 ighteousness
 ied by t
 s in us. S
 ause it is by
 r we may be
 ch the Spirit
 in our fulfil-
 lthough this
 rn your eyes
 ether, to the
 Christ's ac-
 before God,

and that it is thus we obtain peace of conscience, and not on account of that renewal. For even this renewing is insufficient for justification. We are justified by faith alone, not because it is a root, as you write, but because it apprehends Christ, on account of whom we are accepted; this renewing, although it necessarily follows, yet does not pacify the conscience. Therefore not even love, though it is the fulfilling of the law, justifies, but only faith; not because it is some excellence in us, but only because it takes hold of Christ; we are justified, not on account of love, not on account of the fulfilling of the law, not on account of our renewal, although these are the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but on account of Christ; and Him we take hold of by faith alone. Believe me, my Brentius, this controversy regarding the righteousness which is by faith is a mighty one, and little understood; and you can only rightly comprehend it by turning your eyes entirely away from the law, and from Augustine's idea about our fulfilling the law, and fixing them wholly upon the free promise, so as to see that it is on account of that promise, and for Christ's sake, that we are justified, that is, accepted and obtain peace. This is the true doctrine, and that which glorifies Christ, and wonderfully lifts up the conscience. I endeavoured to explain this in my *Apology*, but on account of the misrepresentations of adversaries, could not speak out so freely as I do now with you, though saying the very same thing. When could the conscience have peace and assured hope, if we are not justified till our renewal is perfected? What is this but to be justified by the law, and not by the free promise? In that discussion, I said that to ascribe our justification to love is to ascribe it to our own work; understanding by that a work done in us by the Holy Ghost. For faith justifies, not because it is a new work of the Spirit in us, but because it apprehends Christ on account of whom we are accepted, and not on account of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in us. Turn away from Augustine's idea, and you will easily see the reason of this; and I hope our *Apology* will somewhat help you, though I speak cautiously respecting matters so great, which are only to be understood in the conflict of the conscience. By all means preach law and repentance to the people, but let not this true doctrine of the gospel be

overlooked." In the same strain writes Luther: "I am accustomed my Brentius, for the better understanding of this point, to conceive this idea, that there is no quality in my heart at all, call it either faith or charity; but instead of these I set Christ himself, and I say this is my righteousness, He is my quality, and my formal righteousness as they call it, so as to free myself from looking into law or works; nay, from looking at Christ himself as a teacher or a giver. But I look at him as a gift and as a doctrine to me, in himself, so that in him I have all things. He says, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life.' He says not, 'I give thee the way, the truth, and the life,' as if he were working on me from without. All these things *He* must be *in me*, not through me or to me; that we may be 'the righteousness of God *in him*' (2nd *Cor.* 5: 21), not in love nor in the gifts and graces which follow."

To these letters Brentius replies, unfolding his conflicts to his beloved Philip: "Is not faith itself a work? Does not the Lord say, 'This is the work of God that ye believe.' Justification then cannot be either by works or by faith. Is it so? Therefore justification must be on account of Christ alone, and not the excellence of our works * * * But how can all this be? * * * From childhood I had not been able to clear my thoughts on these points. Your letter and that of Luther shewed me the truth * * * Justification comes to us neither on account of our love nor our faith, but solely on account of Christ; and yet it comes through (by means of) faith. Faith does not justify as a work of goodness, but simply as a receiver of promised mercy * * * We do not *merit* we only obtain justification * * * Faith is but the organ, the instrument, the medium; Christ alone is the satisfaction and the merit. Works are not satisfaction, nor merit, nor instrument; they are the utterance of a justification already received by faith." Thus does Brentius explain Melancthon's letter, and then adds some thoughts of his own. He fears lest, as Popery perverted love, so the Reformation might come to pervert faith, putting it in the room of Christ, as a work or merit or quality; *something in itself*. Having finished his letter, and signed it, he added a postscript, "Just as I was finishing my letter, I remembered an argument of yours about works, to

“I am
 ing of this
 ity in my
 instead of
 eousness,
 they call
 orks; nay,
 ver. But
 n himself,
 n the way,
 the way,
 me from
 t through
 of God in
 and graces

conflicts to
 Does not
 ve believe.’
 faith. Is
 t of Christ
 * * But
 I had not
 Your letter
 Justifica-
 e nor our
 t it comes
 ustify as a
 promised
 n justifica-
 ment, the
 the merit.
 ment; they
 d by faith.”
 , and then
 as Popery
 to pervert
 or merit or
 letter, and
 nishing my
 t works, to

the effect that if we are justified by *love we can never have assurance*, because we can never love as we ought. In like manner I argue regarding faith as a work; if justification comes to us through faith as a work or merit, or excellence, we can never be assured about it, because we can never believe as we ought”—(Bonar’s “God’s Way of Holiness”). The Salvation Army has done just what Brentius feared the Reformation would do. They have perverted faith, putting it in the room of Christ as a work or merit. They may deny this—no doubt they will. Well if this is not so, will they tell us how they are justified. They deny justification by imputed righteousness. Then they must be justified by faith as a work; there must be some merit or virtue or excellence in faith that God honors, and for which he justifies them. Luther is said to have often reiterated this statement, “Faith justifies us, no *not even as a gift of the Holy Ghost*, but solely on account of its reference to Christ, faith does not justify for its own sake, or because of any inherent virtue belonging to it.” Dr. Horatius Bonar in speaking of faith, says, “So long as this confusion exists—so long as men do not distinguish between Christ’s work and the Spirit’s work—so long as they lay any stress upon the quality or quantity of their act of faith, there can be not only no peace of conscience, but no progress in holiness—no bringing forth of good works * * * For while men think to be justified by faith as a work, or as an act of the mind, or as a gift of the Spirit, they are seeking justification by something *inherent*, not by something *imputed*; and to deny that it is *inherent*, because *infused* into them by the Spirit, is simply to cheat themselves with a play upon words; to cheat themselves all the more effectually, because professing to honor the Spirit by ascribing to him the infused quality, out of which they seek to extract their justification. In seeking justification or peace of conscience from something wrought in them by the Spirit, they are seeking these from that which is confessedly imperfect, and which God never gave for such a purpose, nay, they are rejecting the perfect righteousness of the substitute, and so preventing the possibility of their doing any acceptable work at all. For if ‘the righteousness of the law can only be fulfilled in us’ through our acceptance of the imputed righteousness of the Son of God, then there

can be *no righteous thing done by us* till we have reached the position of men to whom the great truth of 'Christ for us,' 'Jehovah our righteousness' has become the basis of all reconciliation with God. This form of error is the more subtle, because its victims are not walking in sin, but doing all manner of outward service, and exhibiting outward goodness in many forms, regarding which we shall only say, that they are not pleasant to God, and as they are not done as God hath willed we doubt not but they have the nature of sin." Ralph Erskine says, "True faith gives Christ his own room, and will not take a bit of his glory. It makes Christ's perfect obedience and satisfaction, the alone condition of eternal life, and as it cleaves to Christ's righteousness as the ground of its title to heaven, so it employs His Spirit as the only author of its meetness for Heaven. In a word it gives itself room nowhere, that Christ may have room everywhere, it makes itself nothing at all, that Christ may be all in all. God has put honor upon it as the instrument of justification, because it puts all the honor of justification upon God in Christ by the Holy Ghost; or upon Christ's righteousness, imputed by the Father, brought in by the Son, and applied by the Spirit. Faith gives all the honor to God, and takes none to itself. God has eminently connected it with salvation, saying, 'he that believeth shall be saved,' because it disclaims even itself, as well as all things else, from having any title to the praise of any part of salvation, that Christ may have all the glory of it; and be the centre of our praises, and that salvation may not be by works evangelical any more than legal, but by grace. Thus all boasting is excluded, while faith first excludes itself as a work and then all legal and gospel works too, as the grounds of salvation and justification; while at the same time it produces natively, all gospel works, as fruits and evidences of justification, and so we show our faith of free justification by our works of sanctification. As the same thread is winded up upon one clew, by being winded off from another, so the same work of holiness which faith winds off and disclaims in the matter of justification, it winds up upon the clew of sanctification, to evidence that justifying faith is a sanctifying thing, and that the more a man is dead to the law the more he is alive unto God." The sole reason why men reject this doctrine of justification by im-

e reached the
 Christ for us,
 basis of all
 is the more
 in, but doing
 outward good-
 only say, that
 not done as
 the nature of
 Christ his own
 makes Christ's
 condition of
 usness as the
 s Spirit as the
 word it gives
 n everywhere,
 be all in all.
 f justification,
 upon God in
 righteousness,
 , and applied
 od, and takes
 with salvation,
 use it disclaims
 ng any title to
 t may have all
 aises, and that
 ny more than
 cluded, while
 all legal and
 and justifica-
 rely, all gospel
 and so we show
 sanctification.
 clew, by being
 holiness which
 f justification,
 o evidence that
 he more a man
 God." The sole
 ication by im-

puted righteousness is, because they are ignorant of the effect of faith on the hearts and lives of men. This is why the Church of Rome rejects it, and also why the Salvation Army rejects it. It seems to me that men are very slow to learn a lesson on this point. Our forefathers, the reformers, had to wade through seas of blood to uphold the doctrine of imputed righteousness, they suffered the tortures of the rack and the stake to defend it, and to-day I believe they are nearest the Throne; and still the Salvation Army and some others are trying to take it from us, and to give us a doctrine in its place, that at best can only produce self-righteousness, darkness, confusion and misery. We have proved it to be so, by sad and bitter experience. The very doctrine that fills me with joy unspeakable and full of glory, and love to God that cannot be expressed, General Booth denounces as a cheat of the devil. So did the Church of Rome in the days of the Reformation, and so it does to day. The error into which the Salvation Army, and many others have fallen, is precisely the same error into which the whole of the Galatian Church fell, Paul's Epistle to them goes to shew. And the devil has attacked the Church in all ages on this point, and led it astray. He attacked Peter and he fell a victim to his wiles, Barnabas too was "carried away with their dissimulation." Paul upheld the truth, (viz: justification by imputed righteousness) and withstood Peter to the face.—(*Gal. 2: 11—21*). He said to Peter, "I do not frustrate the grace of God, for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain," (*Gal. 2: 21*), meaning that if he could only be accounted righteous through keeping God's perfect law, then Christ was dead in vain, but Paul boldly asserts that we are accounted righteous in no such a way, but simply by depending on the righteousness of another (Jesus Christ). James too, seems to have been carried away with the same error as Peter, because it was upon the arrival of certain men who came from James, that Peter was led astray (*Gal. 2: 12*). And how many more since their day has the devil led astray in the same way. The Church of God in all ages has had to wade through seas of blood and bitter persecutions, to uphold the cause of truth. Sometimes she has had to fight almost single-handed, but nevertheless, the truth has still been preserved and brought

down to us to gladden our hearts. General Booth may say "there are none so persecuted as his followers. That we doubt. Where there is one man who believes in justification by imputed righteousness, there are five we believe, who believe in justification by inherent righteousness; for instance, there is all the Church of Rome, and at least three-fourths of so-called Protestants, the Salvation Army included. General Booth may think that he is in the minority, but he is in the majority by a vast number. The road in which he travels is thronged with countless millions; w^h wisdom shows a happier way with here and there a tra^g

The Salvation Army pretends to preach the same doctrine as did John Wesley. This is not correct.

John Wesley believed in justification by imputed righteousness, the doctrine that Mrs. Booth calls a cheat of the devil.

In that beautiful Hymn that he translated from the German (and which he must have sanctioned, otherwise he would not have used it,) he says:—

"Jesus, thy blood and righteousness,
My beauty are, my glorious dress,
Midst flaming worlds, in *these* arrayed,
With joy shall I lift up my head.

Bold shall I stand in that great day,
For who aught to my charge shall lay,
Fully absolved through *these* I am
From sin and fear, from guilt and shame.

When from the dust of death I rise,
And claim my mansion in the skies,
Even then this shall be all my plea,
Jesus hath *lived* hath *died* for me."

If this is not justification by imputed righteousness, what is it? This shows beyond a doubt; that all his trust was in Jesus' blood and righteousness, and not in the holiness wrought in us by the Holy Spirit. Charles Wesley too, believed the same thing. He says:

"Their daily delight shall be in Thy name,
They shall as their right Thy righteousness claim,
Thy righteousness wearing, and cleansed by Thy blood,
Bold shall they appear in the presence of God."

And again:

Booth may say "No condemnation now I dread, Jesus and all in him is mine,
 ers. That we Alive in him my living Head, and clothed in righteousness divine,
 es in justifica- Bold I approach the eternal throne, and claim the crown through
 ve we believe, Christ my own."

And again John Wesley says:

"O love thou bottomless abyss!
 My sins are swallowed up in thee;
 Covered is my unrighteousness,
 Nor spot of guilt remains on me,
 While Jesus' blood thro' earth and skies,
 Mercy, free, boundless mercy, cries."

Mark his words: "covered is my unrighteousness,"
 ainly showing that he knew that in him there was sin, and
 imputed right- righteousness, but he rejoiced to know that that unright-
 s a cheat of the ousness was covered. How was it covered? By Christ's
 ighteousness, in which by faith he clothed himself, and so
 elated from the od really looked upon him as being without sin, and dealt
 ed, otherwise he ith him accordingly. John Wesley does not say here that
 a him there was no sin; nay, his words plainly show that he
 realized that there was sin in him.

He does not say that his sin was exterminated, but simply
 overed. If it was exterminated, there would be no need
 or it to be covered; in short he would have no unright-
 ousness to be covered.

If the doctrine of justification by imputed righteousness
 a "cheat of the devil," as Mrs. Booth says, then John
 nd Charles Wesley were deluded by it, and no doubt lived
 nd died in the blissful delusion. And how many more
 f the humblest and best men this world has ever seen,
 ave lived and died in the same faith, viz; Luther,
 elancthon, Tyndale, Calvin, Bunyan, Traill, Baxter,
 eCheyne, James, Chalmers, and a host of others. Am I
 suppose that all these men were deluded? If they were I
 ight as well go back to Popery, because some of these
 en were leaders in the reformation, and this doctrine of
 nputed righteousness was one of the chief doctrines for
 hich they suffered the loss of all things to uphold and
 fend; and the doctrine above all others that filled them
 ith joy unspeakable and full of glory. It is said that when
 uther first saw the plan of salvation by imputed righteous-
 ess, through faith, his joy knew no bounds; he was like a

man let out of the darkest dungeon, into the light of the noonday sun. The devil however did not leave him alone here, he tempted him to believe that this was too easy a way to be the right way of salvation; so Luther went back to bondage again, or to the doctrine of justification by inherent righteousness; and, as a consequence, all his peace and joy departed, and he was left again in midnight darkness, and like Noah's dove, he found no rest for the sole of his foot, until he returned again and clothed himself afresh by faith, in the garments of Christ's righteousness. Then again his peace and joy returned, and he was wiser than ever again to give up the doctrine of justification by imputed righteousness. Tyndale says, "If any man ask me seeing faith justifies me, why I work, I answer, love compelleth me; for as long as my soul feeleth what love God hath showed me in Christ, I cannot but love God again and his will and commandments, and of love work therefore nor can they seem hard to me. (Pref. to *Exodus*)" Chalmers says "that our sins might not lose their awar- eousness might not lose its award, it was all accounted to those who believe." John Angell James says "*believing* to rest upon the word and work of Christ for salvation; to depend upon his atonement and righteousness, and upon nothing else for acceptance with God." Baxter says "the works of the Son for us were these, to ransom and redeem us by his sufferings and righteousness." Traill says, "some men seem to be jealous lest God's graces and Christ's righteousness, have too much room, and men's works too little in the business of justification. If we say that faith in Jesus Christ, is neither work, nor condition, nor qualification in justification, and that in its very act, it is the renouncing of all things but the gift of grace, the fire kindled; so that it is come to this, that he that will not be anti-christian, must be called an anti-nomian. Believing on Jesus Christ is no work, but a resting on Jesus Christ." Horatius Bonar says, "against transforming faith into work, the whole theology of the Reformation protested, that either a worthless verbal quibble, or as the subtlest dregs of Popery." McCheyne says, "my righteousness is in heaven."

But not only have we the testimony of great men

modern days, to substantiate the doctrine of justification by imputed righteousness, but we have the authority of God's word. We refer our readers to the testimony of God's word.

Since the day that God created man, He has made two covenants with him—the old and the new. The old covenant was made with Adam. The conditions of that covenant were, "Adam's perfect obedience." God gave Adam to understand that if he obeyed Him he should live, but if he disobeyed, even in one point, he should die. Adam broke the covenant that God made with him. He disobeyed and fell, and entailed ruin on all his posterity. And God seeing that all flesh was corrupted, and that by this covenant no flesh could be saved, makes a new covenant, the conditions of which are: Christ fulfilling all righteousness for us. The first covenant was a covenant of works. The second is a covenant of grace or favor. The first covenant said "obey and live;" the second says "live and obey." The first covenant said, "the soul that sinneth it shall die." The second covenant gives us to understand that "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," and to the believer in Christ the law cannot now say, "disobey and perish." The believer is not under the covenant of works, or in other words, he is not under the law but under grace. True, the law still says obey, but it has not the power to say to the believer, disobey and die, because Christ has perfectly satisfied the demands of the law for him, and by faith the believer appropriates it to himself. God has taken away the covenant of works that He may establish the covenant of grace: "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

The Salvation Army is still under the old covenant, because they maintain that obedience is necessary in order to eternal life. They are still under the law and not under grace, hence they are still under the curse. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse."—*Gal. 3: 10*. Paul says in *Rom. 3: 20-28*, "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith

of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare *His righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time *His righteousness*: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith *without the deeds of the law*" Marks his words: "without the deeds of the law." Again, in *Rom. 4: 1-8*, we read, "What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." *Rom. 5: 1*—"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." And in *Rom. 5: 17-19*—"For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the *free gift* came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the *obedience of one* shall many be made righteous." Paul in describing how Israel of old came to miss salvation, says, "what shall we say then that the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, not even the righteousness which is of faith: but Israel which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to

believe, for the law of righteousness. Wherefore? because they sought
 some short of it not by faith, but as it were, by the works of the law; for
 grace through they stumbled at that stumbling stone; as it is written,
 God hath set behold I lay in Zion a stumbling stone and rock of offence,
 and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."
 and, to declare And (*Rom. 10: 4*), "for Christ is the end of the law for
 that are past righteousness to every one that believeth." "With the
 say, at this heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the
 and the justi- mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture
 asting then? saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."
 : but by the —*Rom. 10: 10-11*. And again in *2nd Cor. 5: 19-21*, we read,
 n is justified his words: "to wit that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto
 s his words: himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. For he
 . 4: 1-8, we hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we
 ur father, as might be made the righteousness of God in him." And
 abraham were *Phil. 3: 9*—"And he found in him not having mine own
 t not before righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through
 lieved God, the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by
 Now to him faith." *Gal. 2: 16-21*—Knowing that a man is not justified
 grace, but of by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ,
 eth on him even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be
 or righteous- justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the
 edness of the law, for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.
 thout works, I do not frustrate the grace of God, for if righteousness
 orgiven, and come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." And again
 o whom the in *Gal. 3: 26*—"For ye are all the children of God by faith
 before being in Christ Jesus. And *Gal. 5: 4-5*—"Christ is become of
 gh our Lord no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law,
 by one man's ye are fallen from grace. For we through the spirit, wait
 they which for the hope of righteousness by faith." Paul in answer
 ghteousness, to the question of the Philippian jailor, says, "believe on
 before as by the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.
 to condem- Our blessed Lord when describing to Nicodemus the way
 the free gift of salvation, said, "and as Moses lifted up the serpent in the
 For as by wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that
 nners, so by whosoever believeth in him should not perish; but have
 ous." Paul eternal life. For God so loved the world that he gave His
 vation, says, only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should
 ich followed not perish, but have everlasting life. He that believeth on
 ghteousness, him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is con-
 srael which demned already, because he hath not believed in the name
 t attained to

of the only begotten Son of God. He that belivieth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that *believeth not* the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." I remember one time of hearing a Salvation Army officer say something like this, "some people ask us where is God going to draw the line between those who are saved and those who are lost," and, said he, "this is where God is going to draw the line of separation, 'He that committeth sin is of the Devil.'" That officer drew the line of separation between obedience and disobedience, but Jesus Christ draws it between faith and unbelief, "he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, he that *believeth not* the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." *John* 5: 24—"Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth my word and *believeth* on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." *John* 6: 40-47—"And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and *believeth* on him, may have everlasting life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life." *Mark* 16: 16—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." *John* 1: 12—"But as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe in his name." *John* 6: 29—"Jesus answered, this is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

Our Blessed Lord, in the 22nd chapter of Matthew, tells us plainly who will be saved and who will be lost. Only those will be saved who have on the wedding garment. What was this wedding garment? It was a garment that was prepared for every one that was bidden to the feast. The guests had no part whatever in preparing that garment. It was prepared free for them. All they had to do was to put it on. The richer guests were expected to put it on as well as the poorer. In fact no matter how well they were arrayed, they had to put on this wedding garment or be excluded from the feast. Our Lord tells us there was a man came in who had not on this garment. Probably he thought, the garments that I have already on are just as good as that wedding garment, there is no need that I should put it on, I shall be admitted all right without it. But he made a sad mistake. What does Our

livieth on the
 th not the Son
 leth on him."
 Army officer
 where is God
 re saved and
 where God is
 t committeth
 line of separa-
 t Jesus Christ
 t believeth on
 th not the Son
 leth on him."
 that heareth
 th everlasting
 but is passed
 d this is the
 ich seeth the
 life. Verily,
 hath everlast-
 nd is baptized
 be damned."
 to them gave
 to them that
 wered, this is
 he hath sent."
 Matthew, tells
 . Only those
 t. What was
 was prepared
 e guests had
 was prepared
 it on. The
 as the poorer.
 ey had to put
 e feast. Our
 not on this
 that I have
 ment, there is
 tted all right
 at does Our

Lord design to teach us by this parable? That none, no matter how good they may imagine themselves to be, will be admitted into Heaven unless they have clothed themselves in the garment of Christ's righteousness, that has been prepared for them, and none will be excluded from Heaven, no matter how unworthy they may feel themselves to be, if they have put on this garment by faith. The dying thief wrapped this garment around him, and was admitted with all his unworthiness into the marriage supper of the Lamb. But sad to say, to-day as of old, there are some who don't think they need this garment. There are some who say, "I don't commit sin, the garment that I have already on is just as good as the one that Christ has prepared." Poor deluded soul. If you do not sin you do not need this garment; your own garments will do for you in which to appear before the King. But we are sadly afraid that notwithstanding all your fancied righteousness, when you appear before the King there will be spots found on your garments. Poor, deluded, self-righteous soul! it was not you that Jesus came to save. It was only those who feel that all they do is only as filthy rags before God. And it is only those who will be persuaded to put on the garment that Christ has prepared. Let us take a look at that garment. How beautiful and spotless it is! In vain do we search for a spot on it. "In Him was no sin." He fulfilled the law in every point and perfectly satisfied the demands of justice. What a beautiful garment! And will the Blessed Lord consent to let us wear it? He will. He offers to strip us of our rags, for in reality we have nothing but rags whether we think so or not, and He offers us the robe of His good works to wrap around us and so shield ourselves from the storm of God's wrath, which will eventually fall on the head of every Christ-rejecter. Let us put on the Lord Jesus Christ, for His righteousness alone will shield us from this storm. We have broken God's law and the avenger of blood is on our track; let us fly to the City of Refuge, which is Jesus; make Him our hiding place and we shall be safe. Listen to the name which *Jeremiah* gives to the Blessed Saviour: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall

dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.—*Jer.* 23: 56. Again, listen to the name that Jeremiah gives the Church of God. He says in chap. 33: 15, 16: “In those days and at that time will I cause the Branch of Righteousness to grow up unto David: and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days Judah shall be saved and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name whereby *she* shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.” The name given to the Blessed Saviour and the Church is one. Why is this? Because the Saviour and the Church are one; whatever belongs to Christ belongs to all those who are in Him. Whatever belongs to the Head, belongs also to the members. *Isaiah* says, “Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength, even to him shall men come. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory.”—*Isa.* 45: 24, 25. “The righteousness of Jesus Christ stands on our side, for God’s righteousness is in Jesus Christ ours.”—*Luther*. What a blessed soul-cheering thought. The sole reason why men do not love God more, is because they do not realize their completeness in Christ. This is why there is no more fruit brought forth to the honor and glory of God. Men may talk about people getting gospel-hardened, but we very much doubt whether such a thing can be. Men get law-hardened, “because the law worketh wrath”—*Rom.* 4: 15, but gospel-hardened they will not, because Christ says, “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw *all* men unto me.”—*John* 12: 32. How is it then that all men are not drawn to him? Simply because He is not lifted up; otherwise Christ’s words cannot be true. We may rest assured that when men are not affected, the gospel is not preached. It is law, law, law, and salvation by law, instead of softening men’s hearts, only hardens them; “for the law worketh wrath.” But the tendency of the gospel is to soften men’s hearts, as Christ positively affirms. There is a lot of preaching to-day with very little result, simply because it is not gospel that is preached. And the devil does not care a straw how much preaching there is as long as it is not gospel; he knows that it will only drive men farther from God. And it is salvation by law that the Salvation Army preaches. With them it is “obey and live—disobey and die,” and if this is not law, I

shall be called,

Again, listen of God. He d at that time grow up unto righteousness in and Jerusalem by *she* shall be name given to

Why is this? one; whatever in Him. What-embers. *Isaiah*

I righteousness

In the Lord all glory."—*Isa.* Christ stands on Christ ours."—ght. The sole ecause they do is is why there d glory of God. rdened, but we be. Men get

"—*Rom.* 4: 15,

Christ says, "And

all men unto

l men are not

fted up; other-ay rest assured

not preached.

ad of softening

orketh wrath."

en's hearts, as

eaching to-day

gospel that is

would like them to tell me what law is. Is it any wonder that there are so many backsliders among them? For they not realizing that it is the righteousness of another that saves them, and believing that a perfect obedience is necessary in order to life, after trying again and again, and realizing that they fail, at last get discouraged, and give it up with the thought that God is a hard master. Truly, "the law worketh wrath." How different from this the effect that the gospel produces. Whenever souls are led to see that God is willing to accept the good works of Jesus instead of their good works; if they are willing to depend on them and be saved on these conditions, then are they filled with wonder, love and praise. The love of God so manifested astonishes them.

In spite of all contradiction, the doctrine of justification by imputed righteousness must be true, because it is the only doctrine that perfectly excludes boasting. It is the only doctrine that propagates love and true humility in the soul. It is the only doctrine that gives a real and an abiding peace. Other peace (worthy of the name) there is none. This doctrine gives us an uninterrupted peace as long as we continue to believe, even though we may have many shortcomings and many failings. It is not the failures or shortcomings, or sins of christians that separate them from God. Some may say this is strange doctrine. Well, strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless true. What, I ask, is the link that unites God and man? Faith you say. Well, if faith is the connecting link, then of necessity ceasing to believe, and that alone, can separate a christian from his God. To illustrate this point, suppose a ship is moored to a wharf with a rope. It is the rope that connects the ship and the wharf. What will disunite them? Severing the rope, and that alone. It is therefore ceasing to believe, and not our failings and shortcomings that separates from God. If our failings and defects separate us from God, then of necessity we must be justified by our works. "What then, shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" God forbid. We are not to sin because grace abounds. We have been called to liberty, but we are not to use our liberty for an occasion to the flesh. No other way of justification but by imputed righteousness would ever lead a soul to say "What then, shall we continue in sin that

grace may abound.”—*Rom. 6: 1*. Hence this ought to prove beyond a doubt, that it is the very doctrine that Paul taught. The guarded, restricted, conditional, fenced-around gospel that some men give us would never suggest such a thought. Some men fence the gospel around with conditions, such as you must do this, and you must do that, and you must do the other thing, until they have turned gospel into law, and justification by faith into justification by works. They take all the good news out of the gospel, and rob it of its power, forgetting, or not knowing, that it is in its very freeness that its power lies. It is all right and well to preach God’s law to men, because his law is the revelation of His will to us, and without it we would not know what to do to please Him, but to preach that we *must* perfectly obey that law in order to be saved, is to bring us again under the curse that Christ has redeemed us from. “Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us.”—*Gal. 3: 13*. God’s word tells us that if we build upon the right foundation, which is the blood and righteousness of Jesus, we shall be saved, even though our works are not all that they should be. All our works may not be like gold, silver, and precious stones, that will stand the test of the fire; there may be, and no doubt will be in the works of the best men some wood, hay, and stubble, that will be burned up. “For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man’s work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire: and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is. If any man’s work abide which he hath built thereupon he shall receive a reward. If any man’s work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.”—*1st Cor. 3: 11-15*. “He himself shall be saved.” Notice that reader. Yes, be saved, even though his works have been destroyed, because he has built upon the solid rock, Christ Jesus. Do you say that it will not do to preach that doctrine. I answer, it will do for me to preach it as well as it would for Paul to preach it, and if it is not right, the Lord made a great mistake when He inspired Paul to write it, and scatter it broadcast over the

face of the earth, for every christian in every land since his day to read. Paul was not afraid to preach it. Why should I be? Why should any other christian be? God undoubtedly meant that it should be preached, otherwise He would not have inspired Paul to write it.

How slow men are to learn that their works have no part in their salvation, and that it is Christ's works that save them and His alone.

Men will try every other way, and as a rule not until they are foiled in every other way, will they consent to be saved by Christ alone.

Men make resolutions to give up this sin and that sin and live right, but their resolutions are only ropes of sand, they try to save themselves by living right, but they only make a miserable failure of it. They labor, and labor, and labor to be saved, not knowing that God does not want them to do anything to be saved, but simply to depend on what another has done. And this is rest not labor. Christ says "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." And oh! what a blessed rest it is to the soul who has tried to save itself by keeping God's perfect law and has failed, just to rest on what another has done. I may be mistaken, but I greatly fear that the majority of professing christians to-day are in this laboring heavy-laden condition, and all because the way of salvation is not preached as it should be. Ministers, fearing the influence which strong statements on justification may have on the lives of their flock, are apt to qualify their assertions in some such way as follows: "We know that we are justified by faith alone, but then we *must* give ourselves up to be led by the Spirit, and we *must* live right in order to be saved." There is no *must* about it. Salvation is by grace alone. "The gift of God is eternal life."—*Rom. 6: 23.* *Must* in that case is law, not gospel. And so in order to keep men out of the frying-pan, they have been left in the fire. How many are there to-day in this sad, deplorable condition, clinging partly to their own works and partly to Christ. Christ never will save a soul on any such conditions. Not until we let go everything else, and just fall into the arms of redeeming love will he save us. To use the words of the Rev. James Proctor:

"Cast your deadly doing down, down at Jesus' feet,
Stand in Him, in Him alone, gloriously complete."

S. M. Houghton, in his little book entitled "Faith, what it is, and what it does," relates the following incident: "During a late revival a lady who was awakened went to a minister and told him how unhappy she was. He said he was glad to hear it. She was amazed and hurt, and related to him how she had *read* and *prayed* and yet could find no peace. He told her it was not by anything she could do, but by what Christ had done long, long ago, and finished on the cross, that she could be saved. Nothing relieved, she went to a recently converted friend, and said, "what have you done to get peace." "*Done,*" said her friend, "I have done nothing. It is by *what Christ has done* I have peace with God." In yet greater distress she went home, shut herself in her room, resolving not to rise from her knees till she had peace. She remained on her knees till, worn out, she fell into a slumber, and dreamt she was falling over a frightful precipice, but had caught a twig by which she hung over the gulf. "Oh save me," she cried; and a voice from below which she knew to be Christ's said "Let go the twig, and I will save you." "Lord, save me!" again and again she cried, and again and again the same answer was returned. "Let go the twig and I will save you." She must perish she thought if she let go the twig. At length he said in tones most solemn and tender, "I cannot save you unless you let go the twig." She let it go, and fell into the Saviour's arms, and in the joy of feeling herself safe, awoke. In her sleep she had learned the needed lesson. *Her own doings were the twig. She saw she must let this go, and fall into the arms of the Redeemer.* She did so and had peace." And every soul, before Christ will save them, must do as she did.

Some people imagine that they must weep and mourn, and lament a long time, and try and get themselves worked up into a state of great sorrow for sin, before Christ will be willing to accept them. This is a delusion of the devil. The Spirit does not work in men to fit them to come to Christ, but it works to show men they are sinners, and to bring them to Christ just as they are. Whenever a soul realizes that it is lost, then it is ready for Christ to save.

et,
ete."

"Faith, what
ng incident:
ed went to a
e said he was
nd related to
could find no
he could do,
d finished on
relieved, she
"what have
nd, "I have
I have peace
home, shut
her knees till
ill, worn out,
falling over a
ich she hung
a voice from
go the twig,
n and again
swer was re-
" She must
ngth he said
ve you unless
fell into the
herself safe,
eded lesson.
st let this go,
so and had
e them, must

and mourn,
lves worked
hrist will be
f the devil.
m to come
ners, and to
ever a soul
rist to save.

Whenever a person realizes that all his own righteousness is only filthy rags, then he is welcome to put on the robe of Christ's righteousness to cover his nakedness. No matter how bad he may be, or how unworthy he may feel himself, the Word of God says to him, "Put ye on the Lord Jesus."—*Rom. 13: 14.* "That thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear."—*Rev 3: 18.* Those who wrap the mantle of Christ's righteousness around them are safe for time, safe for eternity. And all the fitness that is required, is to feel our need of this garment. As the Rev. Jos. Hart beautifully expresses it, "All the fitness he requireth, is to feel your need of Him." Our hearts may be hard—that makes no difference to Christ. If they were a thousand times harder, we would be welcome to Him. We may have been great sinners, but if we were a million times greater we would be welcome, and welcome just as we are, without one solitary indication of goodness about us. We do not need tears, and sighs, and groans, to fit us to go to Christ. Some people think, oh if I could only feel very sorry for my sins, then I might have some hope that Christ would receive me. Poor deluded soul! you think there must be some sign of goodness in you before Christ will receive you, but dost thou not know, that it was not the righteous, but sinners Jesus came to save. "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick."—*Luke 5: 31.* If you were worthy you would not need him. It is your very unworthiness that makes you need him.

In concluding this subject I may say, men need not talk to me about justification by inherent or infused righteousness. I have travelled that road far enough to prove that their is no peace in it. I remember some years ago of reading a book entitled, "the Blood of Jesus," which showed me the real way of salvation, and I was led to accept it, but like Luther, the devil tempted me that it was too easy a way to be the right way of salvation, so I forsook it, and went back again to bondage, and for years, I regret to say, notwithstanding all my prayers, and tears, and works, and fancied righteousness, peace, worthy of the name, I did not know. The Salvation Army instead of helping me, only led me farther from right and truth, although when I

belonged to it I believed in its doctrines with all my heart and I really consider it a miracle of grace that I was shown my error. No one used to defend the members of the Army with more warmth than I; their zeal captivated me. I thought because they were so zealous they must be right. I inwardly despised other denominations for their lack of zeal and apparent coldness, forgetting that it was very possible to be zealously affected, but not well affected for all.—*Gal. 4: 17.* Possible to be like the Jews of old, to “compass sea and land to make one proselyte,” and yet to be on the wrong road. In this state of mind, I got hold of a book written by Dr. Horatius Bonar, entitled, “God’s Way of Holiness,” and I thank God it showed me the error of the Salvation Army so clearly that I could not help but see them, and it laid before me the way of salvation so plain and simple that I could not err, and again I accepted it and went on my way rejoicing. And since then I have felt a thousand times like saying, God bless Dr. Horatius Bonar for showing me my error, and putting me in the right way; and I often think that when I get to heaven, next to the Blessed Lord himself, he will be the one I shall want to see. I recommend every one to read his book, “God’s Way of Holiness.” I remained in the Salvation Army some three or four weeks after this, and went to the meetings as usual, but the Gospel was so torn to pieces, and the truth so much perverted, that I could not bear to listen to it, and so resolved to leave it. I knew persecution awaited me, but I did not care. I knew God was on my side. I knew that I would be branded as a hypocrite or a backslider, but I could not help it. I knew that wrong motives would be imputed to me for leaving, as their have been, but I left it all in the hands of God; and had there been ten times as many difficulties in coming out, I would not have stayed there, because it is Popery almost from beginning to end. And since I have accepted the doctrine that Mrs. Booth calls a “cheat of the devil,” viz: justification by imputed righteousness, I can say my peace has been uninterrupted and I say again men need not talk to me about justification by inherent righteousness, I have suffered too much that path ever to be beguiled into it again. It drove me almost to despair. It made me hate God and think Him

hard master. But now by the help of God, my song shall ever be:—

“Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in thee.
While I draw this fleeting breath,
When my eyes shall close in death,
When I rise to worlds unknown,
See Thee on thy judgment throne ;
Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in thee.”

And with the Rev. Edward Mote I delight to sing—

“My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus’ blood and righteousness,
I dare not trust the sweetest frame,
But wholly lean on Jesus’ name.
When He shall come with trumpet sound,
O may I then *in Him* be found,
Drest in *His righteousness* alone,
Faultless to stand before the throne.”

Probably the Salvation Army will say Oh, its all very well to preach salvation by faith alone, but God’s word says “faith without works is dead.”—*James 2: 20*. Well, let us see what kind of faith it is that is dead, and that brings forth no good works. James describes this faith in ch. 2: 19, “Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well, the devils also believe and tremble.” This then is the faith that is dead, simply believing there is one God. This faith can save no one, because it produces no effect for good on the soul. It is possible for a person to believe there is one God, and yet hate and dread that God; and indeed, unless we have appropriated to ourselves the benefits of Christ’s death, this is the only effect that such a faith can have. What makes the devils tremble? because they look on God simply as the punisher of sin, and so they dread and hate Him. This faith produces no good effect either on the heart of man or devils. But the faith by which we appropriate to ourselves the benefits of Christ’s death, and by which we clothe ourselves in the garments of Christ’s righteousness, produces quite a different effect to this altogether. It produces love, joy, and peace, hence it is not a dead faith, while it produces these fruits of the spirit.

SANCTIFICATION.

I do not believe in the way the Salvation Army preaches sanctification. If we turn to page 54 of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Salvation Army, we find the way that General Booth teaches sanctification. He says: "Does the Army teach what is understood by the doctrine of sinless perfection? Certainly not. What is sinless perfection? Such a state as that of Adam before his fall, wherein he being a perfect creature, was enabled to render a perfect obedience to the perfect Law of God. Is it possible to attain to sinless perfection in this life? No. An imperfect creature cannot perfectly obey a perfect law, and man being imperfect both in body and mind, is plainly unable to keep the perfect law of God." And yet he preaches that a man can live without sin, but he can't keep God's perfect law. I would like to ask General Booth what sin is. God's Word tells me, "Sin is the transgression of the law,"—*1st John*, 3: 4. I would like to know which of God's moral laws I can break and not commit sin? Can I steal? Can I lie? Can I take God's name in vain? Can I covet? Can I worship idols? Can I commit adultery? No, I can't do any of these without committing sin. Can I leave undone anything that God's moral law enjoins me to do without committing sin? No, I can't. I would like to know which of God's moral laws General Booth breaks without committing sin? He goes on to say: "Does God require obedience to a law the keeping of which He knows to be utterly impossible? No. We cannot imagine a benevolent being requiring from us that which is impossible, and then condemning us for not doing it. His service is a reasonable service and His commandments are not grievous. What then is the law that He expects us to keep? The law of love." I should like to know what General Booth means by the law of love. To talk of love being a law is nonsense. It is one of the most absurd and foolish arguments ever invented by the devil. Love is not a law,—it is a motive. It is not a rule to guide my footsteps. I might love God

with a
unless
would
pleasur
Book,
concer
here t
Divine
here t
by law
not la
not a
it tell
of the
go els
one,
woul
It mi
want
house
law
wors
inwa
Love
light
says
save
has
and
out
enti
that
can
hot
wit
rid
the
pat
mi
Go
bo

with all my heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, but unless I had God's moral law to guide me in my actions, I would not know when I was doing the things that were pleasing in His sight. Blot God's moral law out of His Book, and you leave man in ignorance of his Creator's will concerning him. We cannot do better than to insert just here the opinion of Dr. Horatius Bonar, one of the leading Divines of modern times. He says, "Some will tell us here that it is not service they object to, but service regulated by law. But will they tell us what is to regulate service if not law? Love they say. This is a pure fallacy. Love is not a rule but a motive. Love does not tell me what to do; it tells me how to do it. Love constrains me to do the will of the beloved one; but to know what that will is, I must go elsewhere. The law of our God is the will of the beloved one, and were that expression of his will withdrawn, love would be utterly in the dark, it would not know what to do. It might say, I love my master, and I love his service, and I want to do his bidding, but I must know *the rules of his house*, that I may know how to serve him. Love, without law to guide its impulses, would be the parent of will-worship and confusion, unless upon the supposition of an inward miraculous illumination, as an equivalent for law. Love goes to the law to learn the divine will, and love delights in the law as the exponent of that will; and he who says that a believing man has nothing more to do with law, save to shun it as an old enemy, might as well say that he has nothing to do with the will of God. For the divine law and the divine will are substantially one; the former, the outward manifestation of the latter." (Bonar, in his book entitled "God's way of holiness," page 100.)—We think that General Booth is right in saying that the reason why we cannot keep God's perfect law is, because we are imperfect both in body and mind. But to say that we can live without sin, and yet not keep God's perfect law, is a ridiculous absurdity. Yes, man is imperfect. There are the imperfections of the body, which he inherits from his parents, and as the body wields its influence over the mind, so the mind as a consequence is imperfect. When God created man, He created him perfect both in body and mind. He had an immortal body, in which there

was no tendency to sin. When man fell he was changed from immortal to mortal, and from possessing a body in which there was no tendency to sin, to a body whose every tendency is to sin, and that continually. This tendency to sin, which is inherited by all of Adam's posterity, is called original sin. We see this original or inbred sin manifesting itself in the various actions of men, such as pride, anger, jealousy, envyings, murders, sloth, drunkenness, hatred, and many other ways. We think we can safely say that there is no man on earth, in whose nature there is no tendency to sin, and we think that God's word will uphold us in this assertion. We find that Paul in writing to the Romans some 26 years after his conversion, and only 6 years before his death, in the 7th Chapter, from the 15th to the 23rd verses, makes use of this language: "For that which I do allow not, for what I would, that do I not, but what I hate that do I. For I know that in me [that is, in my flesh] dwelleth no good thing, for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not, for the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that do I. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man, but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." We know that General Booth says that this chapter is descriptive of the struggle that goes on in the heart of every unsaved person who is trying to do right. But I ask does an unsaved person delight in the law of God? Impossible! Why? Because it is the law of God that seals his doom. It is the law of God that tells him of the vengeance of Jehovah, which is hanging over his guilty head, and delight in it he never can and never will, until he sees that on his behalf the demands of the law has been satisfied, and he is free. Besides, Paul uses the present tense here, from the fifteenth verse to the end of the chapter. He says, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but [mark his words] I find another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of s

was changed
 a body in
 whose ever
 tendency to
 rity, is called
 manifesting
 pride, anger
 s, hatred, and
 y that there i
 b tendency to
 old us in thi
 the Romans
 5 years befor
 to the 23rd
 which I do
 t what I hate
 in my flesh
 with me; bu
 for the goo
 ould not, th
 b more I th
 hen a law th
 h me. For
 man, but I se
 the law of m
 e law of si
 General Boo
 ggle that go
 s trying to c
 ght in the la
 s the law
 God that tel
 hanging ov
 an and nev
 ands of th
 es, Paul us
 to the end
 of God aft
 find anoth
 law of m
 e law of s

which is in my members." What was this other law that Paul found in his members? It could be nothing else but original or inbred sin. He says it was in his members, and that it sometimes brought him into captivity. He deplored its presence, yet there it was, causing him sometimes to do the things that he did not want to do, and to leave undone the things that he should do. I want you to mark that this was twenty-six years after his conversion and only six before his death. Dare anyone say that Paul, the christian hero, the consecrated apostle, the man who suffered so much and went through so many hardships for the love he bore his Master, was not as good as many christians of modern times? We think there is no one that looks at his consecrated life that would say such a thing. Again, in *1st John*, 1: 8, we read, "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." General Booth, on page 73 of *Doctrine and Discipline of the S. A.*, twists and perverts this passage of scripture, and makes it say things which I defy any sane man to find in it. John is here talking about the principle of sin within him; inbred sin, not his actual transgressions, they were forgiven,—notice that sin is used in the singular. He says if *we* say [not if *you* say] *we have* [present tense] no *sin* we deceive *ourselves* and the truth is not in *us*. He includes himself as well as everyone else, and he concludes by saying that if we say such a thing as "we have no sin," *we deceive ourselves* and the *truth* is not in us. And if the *truth* is not in us we are not saved, we are not converted, because it is truth that saves and error that damns. I would say to the reader, if you profess to be holy, the next time you think about getting up and saying that in your heart there is no inbred sin, think on the judgment that John passes on you, "you *deceive* yourself and the *truth* is not in you." John wrote these words fifty-six years at least after his conversion, and only a short time before his death. Yes, if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and no one but ourselves; we do not deceive our neighbors. They can see our inconsistencies. We do not deceive God; our hearts are all open to Him. We simply deceive ourselves. In *James* 1: 14, we read, "But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed:" plainly showing that in every man there is a natural tendency to sin. In man there is inbred

sin, and he says that *every* man is tempted by these inward foes. Temptation comes to every man from within, as well as from without. Again, James says in ch. 3: 2, "In many things we offend all." He includes himself here; he says *we* [not you] offend *all*. That takes me in and General Booth too. Nor does he say, we *used* to offend all, but we *offend* all, plainly showing that it was the present he was speaking of, and that was twenty-six years at least after he was converted. David says in *Ps.* 51: 5, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me." David spake these words just after he had committed the double sin of adultery and murder, and it was in looking at the evil tendency of his nature that he was led to utter these words. Solomon, the wisest of men, of whom it is said that there was none like unto him before him, neither should there any arise after him like unto him, says in *1st Kings*, 8: 46, "There is no man that sinneth not." Solomon used these words in that remarkable prayer that he offered at the dedication of the temple, at the end of which fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offerings, and the sacrifices, and the glory of the Lord filled the house. Dare anyone say that Solomon in using these words told an untruth, or that he is only referring to unconverted people, when he positively says *no man*? Again, in *Prov.* 20: 9, he says, "Who can say I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" And in *Ecdl.* 7: 20, "For there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not." We do not see how anyone without utterly perverting scripture, can say that this refers solely to the unconverted. The meaning is obvious and plain, there is not a man upon earth so just, but commits sin. These are the sayings of the wisest man, of whose goodness at the time he wrote these words there cannot be the shadow of a doubt.

My opinion is, that those people who say they don't commit sin, understand but little of God's word, and less of their own hearts. We would like to ask them, do they never speak one idle word? Well, idle words are sin. Do you never leave undone any thing you should do? If you do it is sin. Do you pray as much as you ought? Do you speak to as many people about their souls as you ought to? If you don't, you commit sin.

We know that to contradict these arguments, a lot of

people will quote the passage of Scripture, "he that committeth sin is of the devil,"—(1st *John* 3: 8), and "he that is born of God, sinneth not."—He that sinneth hath not seen Him nor known Him,"—(1st *John*, 5: 6). These passages cannot mean that a man once born of God, never commits a sin. In that case there is not a christian man upon earth. Where is the man who has been converted but for one year only, who will say that in that year he has never committed a sin, that he has done all he should do, and left undone all that he should not do? Well, if you have not done this, and if I am to take this passage, "whosoever sinneth hath not seen him nor known him," as it reads, you were not converted at all, and were simply deceiving yourself to think so, because this passage says, "whosoever sinneth *hath not seen Him nor known Him.*" Again, take 1st *John* 3: 9—Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." Does this passage mean that it is an impossibility for a man who is born of God to sin? for it positively says, "he *cannot* sin." Cannot, in Scripture, does not always mean an impossibility, it simply means going contrary to the nature of things. Take for instance *Mark* 2: 19—"And Jesus said unto them, can the children of the Bride Chamber fast, while the Bridegroom is with them, as long as they have the Bridegroom with them, they *cannot* fast." Did Jesus mean that it was impossible for them to fast while He was with them? No. He simply meant that it would be incongruous and contrary to the nature of things, for them to do so. "And he from within shall answer and say, trouble me not, the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee."—*Luke* 11: 7. Does this passage mean that it was impossible for him to rise and do as his neighbor required? not at all. It simply means that it would be going against his will and his inclinations to do so. "And another said I have married a wife, and therefore I *cannot* come."—*Luke* 4: 20. "Why do ye not understand my speech, even because ye cannot hear my word."—*John* 8: 43. Did Jesus mean that they could not hear his word? that it was impossible for them to do so? No. He meant that they were not disposed to hear it. It was contrary to

their nature to hear it. "For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."—*Acts* 4: 20. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils."—*1st Cor.* 10: 20. Does this mean that it is impossible for a person to drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils? Not at all. Did not Judas do this and hundreds more since his day. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit."—*Matt.* 7: 18. This does not mean that a good tree never brings forth evil fruit. Where is the tree that brings forth no bad fruit? It cannot be found. These passages simply mean that the thing alleged would be an incongruity or contrary to the nature of things. And such passages as "He that is born of God doth not commit sin," &c., simply mean that he that is born of God does not wilfully commit sin; he hates sin, and all his desire is to do the will of Him who loved him, and gave Himself for him.

Jesus said to the young ruler, "There is none good but one, that is God."—*Luke* 18: 19. We fail to see wherein a man would not be good, if in his heart there was no inbred sin, in his nature no tendency to sin, and he lived daily without committing sin. But Jesus positively says, "there is none good," and that excludes all.

Job made a solemn protestation of his integrity and tried to justify himself before God, as many do to-day, but when God spoke to him, and showed him his real state, he cried out, "behold I am vile."—*Job* 40: 4. "I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."—*Job* 42: 6.

Isaiah says (40 years after General Booth says he (*Isaiah*) got the blessing of holiness) "we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags."—*Isaiah* 64: 6. And so every real christian, with *Isaiah*, in casting a glance back over his life, is led to the same conclusion; and the nearer a man gets to God, the less will he think of himself, and the worse and more unworthy will he feel himself to be. And when he comes down to the bed of death; if ever he felt his own unworthiness, and if ever he felt that nothing less than "Jesus' blood and righteousness" will avail for him, he will feel it then.

But it is needless for us to multiply words to show that

the conduct of no one is perfect, because General Booth himself admits that "man being an imperfect creature, is plainly unable to keep the perfect law of God," yet he says we can live without sin. Such ridiculous nonsense by one who is the leader of thousands, is terrible in the extreme.

Again, there are some who say that "holiness does not mean perfection of conduct, but perfection of love." Well, admitting that it is perfection of love, it is very absurd to suppose that it can be instantaneously attained. Why? Because my love to God depends on my knowledge of God, and unless I can be made perfect in the knowledge of God, all at once (which no sane man will admit), I cannot be made perfect in the law of God instantaneously. If I can be made perfect in the knowledge of God all at once, what does Paul mean when he says, "grow in grace, and in the *knowledge* of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ? Paul saw that it was necessary in order to grow in love to God, to grow in the knowledge of God.

Growth implies gradual development. An infant does not become a man in one day. Seed sown does not bring forth fruit to perfection in one hour.

Sanctification is not a second blessing, apart from justification. It is simply the result of a justifying faith. Sanctification is begun in the heart of every one who has accepted Christ as his substitute, and that work is carried on to perfection in the heart of every one who abides in Christ by a justifying faith, carried on we know not how.

Some people run away with the idea that it is only the entirely sanctified person who abides in Christ. This is sheer nonsense, because it is through the act of abiding in Christ that we are justified. It is impossible for us to be justified and not to be abiding in Christ. The very moment I cease to abide in Christ by a living faith, and to be clothed in the garment of His righteousness; that very moment do I cease to be justified in His sight. But to answer the question: how are we to grow in the knowledge of God? Simply by studying God's Word, or hearing it expounded. There is no other way. The spirit of God does not work in the heart of man apart from the word of God. The word of God is called the sword of the spirit. And just in proportion as I advance in the knowledge of God, through his

Word, will I love Him. To know God is to love Him. And the more I know of Him the more will I love Him. Paul, in speaking of the effect of the Word of God on the heart of the believer says, in *2nd Cor. 3: 18*, "But we all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." This passage, if there were no other in the Bible, ought to be sufficient to prove that holiness is not instantaneously wrought. He says, "we are changed from *glory to glory*" into the image of God. Not all at once. If Paul is not here describing the process of sanctification in the soul, what is he describing? He tells us here how the work is carried on, viz : by beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord. The glass he refers to is undoubtedly the word of God; through which the love of God is revealed to us, and by beholding the love of God our hearts are changed into the same image. Men grow holy by gazing at a holy object. Man becomes assimilated by degrees to the object of his worship. This has been the case in all ages, and always will be, because man always tries to imitate the object of his adoration, and by degrees he becomes transformed into the same image.

Again, Paul says in *Phil. 3: 12*, "not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect." The word "attained" here refers to the resurrection of the dead. Paul says that he had not attained to the resurrection of the dead, neither was he already perfect; he had not attained to either of these conditions. He goes on to say in verses 13-14, "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things that are behind; and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." What was this high calling of God? It was a calling to holiness, and Paul says he reached forward to it, he pressed towards it, but that he had not yet attained to it. This was only about two years before his death.

Again the blessed Saviour himself teaches that the work of Holiness is gradual. He says in *Mark 4: 26-29*, "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the

seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of itself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come." The kingdom which Jesus refers to here is beyond a doubt the kingdom of grace; the kingdom which Jesus says is within you. And He compares this work of grace, to seed sown in the ground, which progresses from one stage to another, until fruit is brought forth, and then immediately the sickle is put in because the harvest is come. The sickle here means the messenger of death, which transplants the soul from an earthly to a heavenly atmosphere. And He says that this sickle is *immediately* put in, when the fruit is brought forth.

Again, the parable of the mustard seed teaches us the same thing in *Mark 4: 30-32*. These are the words of the blessed Lord himself, and they plainly teach us that the work of transformation or sanctification in the soul is gradual. If they do not teach this, what do they teach? If they do not teach this, they are ambiguous and meaningless. But these words are plain and easy to be understood. Christ is here dealing with the question of sanctification, and He tells us in words that we cannot possibly misunderstand, that it is gradual in development.

Again, in *Matt. 13: 33*, Jesus says, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened." This parable teaches us exactly the same thing as the preceding parables. Paul says in *Heb. 6: 1*, "let us go on unto perfection." Mark his words, "let *us*," plainly showing that *he* had not yet attained unto perfection. These words too were written only about 2 years before his death. The Psalmist too, describing the growth of the christian in holiness, says, "They go from strength to strength," *Psa. 84: 7*. It puzzles me to see what room those people leave for growth in grace, who preach instantaneous perfection; because growth in grace simply means growth in holiness.

Probably there are some people who will say, it will not do to strike low ground on the subject of sanctification. I answer, it will not do to strike any higher ground than God's word permits; and God's word tells me "if we say

we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And if the truth is not in us we are not *justified*, let alone *entire'y sanctified*; and if men are only deceiving themselves, the sooner they are undeceived the better for them.

No doubt there are some people who will say, that I do not know the strength and numbers of the foe that I am attacking. Well, I have some idea, and I would not care if their number were increased ten-fold. I would say to them what I believe to be right. If God be for us who can be against us. "One" with truth on his side can "chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight." I expect to be branded by my enemies as a wolf in sheep's clothing, and as a servant of the devil in christian garb. Although the Salvation Army does not hesitate to denounce the doctrines of other denominations, yet, let another put forth a finger to touch one of their doctrines, and he is generally denounced as a servant of the devil, and as doing his work. We speak what we know, what we have heard and seen.

I believe if there is one abomination in this world greater than another in God's sight, it is a man who says he lives without sin. If these people could only see themselves as God sees them they would come to a very different conclusion. I don't know how such people can get down and pray, "forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us," seeing they do not trespass against God. Yet Jesus positively commanded His disciples to pray after this manner. Did not the Blessed Saviour know that before the end of time there would be a people arise who would be so good that they would not need to pray this prayer? We believe the Saviour lived in blissful ignorance of this important fact. At any rate He makes no provision for such a class of people. He did not say, "you that live without sin need not pray after this manner." But the Salvation Army has given up (to a large extent at any rate) praying after this manner, and have thrown the Lord's prayer to one side. They have got above it, and instead of it their prayer in substance is, "Lord I thank thee that I am not as other men are." In reality, we fail to see any difference between the proud Pharisee who uttered this self-righteous prayer, and the Salvation Army.

The Salvation Army says, "we do not take any glory to

t
I
si
th
m
hi
go
tia
ev
on
th
as
be
the
the
a
oth
of
a
to
tha
dis
aga
Spi
fata
cha

ourselves because we are better than others; we give all the glory to God. It is He who has made us better, and who keeps us better than others." Neither did the Pharisee take any of the glory to himself. He said, "Lord I thank *Thee* that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican; I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess." This Pharisee did not thank *himself* that he was better than other men, he thanked *God* for it; but he failed just where Salvation Army fails, and that was to see anything wrong in himself, and to pray, "forgive us our trespasses." He thought that in him there was no sin. He trusted "that he was righteous and despised others." He did not take his proper place before God, hence he was an abomination in God's sight.

John Bunyan, in "Pilgrims' Progress," has aptly described the Salvation Army in the character of "Ignorance." This Ignorance would not believe that in his heart there was any sin. He said that he was always full of good notions, and that his life was always in accordance with God's commandments. In vain did Christian and Hopeful try to show him his error; he went on self-deceived, and it appears that he got over the river of death without the difficulties that Christian and Hopeful had. Vainhope ferried him across. He even went up to the gate of Heaven, thinking it was all right, only to find that it was all wrong, and Bunyan says, "I saw there was a way to hell, even from the very gate of Heaven, as well as from the City of Destruction." And I will add, I believe that all who deceive themselves in this way will share the same awful fate as poor self-deceived Ignorance. I believe that such people will as surely go to hell, unless they repent, as will the drunkard, the swearer, the thief, the liar, and every other class of sinners. I do not believe that there are any of these self-deluded mortals but at times have doubts about the goodness of their own hearts, and doubts as to whether they do in reality live without sin, but thinking that these doubts come from the devil, they at once dismiss them from their minds, and so shut up their hearts against all the influences of God's spirit. They mistake the Spirit of God for the spirit of the devil, and so go on in the fatal delusion that all is well. God never gives any man a chance in this world to say conscientiously to his fellows,

“stand aside, I am holier than thou.” God’s word positively tells us that we are to esteem others better than ourselves (*Phil. 2: 3*). I would like to know how a man who lives without sin, can esteem others better than himself. Supposing that from now to the time I die, I should live without sin, and supposing that just now every taint of sin was eradicated from my soul, and I should continue to be kept in such a state till I die, how during that period could I esteem others better than myself. Others could be no more holy, and I would be holy. Wherein would they be better than I. I would like to know how General Booth explains this passage, and how he can esteem others better than himself. Does God tell me to esteem others better than myself, when it is impossible for them to be better? Away with such a thought. That would be God telling me to act a lie, in acting contrary to the convictions of my own heart, and acting a lie in God’s sight is telling a lie. Did *Christ* when *He* was on earth esteem others better than Himself? Not at all, he could not do such a thing. Why? Because He was holy and undefiled. He never committed a sin, and hence it was impossible for him to esteem any one else *better* than Himself. They could be no better. The Father never commanded His Son to esteem others better than Himself, but He has commanded every one of us erring mortals to do so. He says, “let each esteem others better than himself,” and each takes all in. Why has God commanded us to do this? Because He knows that there is none of us who live without sin. It can be for no other reason whatever, unless I suppose that God tells me to act a lie. The language of the heart of every one who imagines he lives without sin, must be, “I am just as good as you, and if you don’t live without sin, I am better than you, stand aside, I am holier than thou.” This may not be the language of their lips, but it cannot fail to be the conviction of their hearts; hence it is impossible for them really to esteem others better than themselves.

Guthrie says, “The christian is like the ripening corn; the riper he grows, the more lowly he bends his head.”

General Booth, in order to uphold his theory of living without sin, denies the obligation of the moral law. On page 54 of *Doctrine and Discipline of the Salvation Army*

he says, "God does not require obedience to a law the keeping of which he knows to be impossible." According to this argument, it is a very easy thing to live without sin. If God does not require obedience to His law, then there is not a man on the face of the earth that commits sin. The drunkard, the thief, the adulterer, the swearer, none of these commit sin, if God does not require obedience to His law, because their sin consists in breaking God's law. "Be not drunk with wine."—*Eph. 5: 18*. "Thou shalt not steal."—*Ex. 20: 15*. "Thou shalt not commit adultery."—*Ex. 20: 14*. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."—*Ex. 20: 7*. According to this doctrine, it is very easy for General Booth or any other man to live without sin. What folly to suppose that a breach of God's law is not sin. General Booth, rather than admit that he commits sin, teaches this ridiculous nonsense. He strains at a gnat and swallows a camel.

The Salvation Army is just like Israel of old, as described by Paul in the 10th Chapter of Romans; they had a zeal of God but not according to knowledge. "For they being ignorant of God's righteousness and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth"—*Rom. 10: 1-4*. How General Booth and his followers try to establish their own righteousness. What labor to make people believe that they live without sin. What boasting that they are righteous, and what a miserable failure it all is. Their failures and defects are apparent to all, notwithstanding all their fancied righteousness, and pretended superiority to others. In the Gospel that Paul preached, all boasting was excluded. Not so with the Salvation Army: with them boasting is encouraged, and the more a man tries to establish his own righteousness, with them, the more he is thought of. How different from the spirit manifested by Paul, when he said, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief."—*1st Tim 1: 15*. Mark his words, "I am chief." Not only *was* I the chief of sinners, but in my own opinion, I *am* the chief of sinners still. This is plainly the meaning of his words, and without changing his words, they cannot be made to mean

anything else. And this has been the language of the heart of every christian who has lived since Paul's day, as they have realized their littleness of love to Him who has done so much for them, and their many shortcomings, they have been led to the same conclusion, "I the chief of sinners am." A pious godly Minister was once conversing with a friend; in the course of his conversation he made this remark, "I consider myself the greatest sinner in the world to-day." His friend replied that he could not see how he could think so, because, said he, you do not commit many of the glaring sins that others do, and besides you have in you many good qualities." "Ah!" replied the Minister, "if others had the same light, and the same privileges that I have had, I doubt not but they would have done far better than I have done." This spirit, and this alone, is the spirit of humility. Charles Wesley, many years after he was converted, gave utterance to these words: "false and full of sin I am." No self-righteous boasting with him. No going about to establish his own righteousness. No trying to make people believe that he lived without sin.

How many there are in the world to-day who in Army meetings and elsewhere, have sought for this "blessing of holiness" under the delusion that God bestows it upon those who are willing to surrender their all to Him. With this idea in their minds they have given up one thing and then another; they have tried giving up fashionable dress, feathers, flowers, jewelry and so on; they have given themselves up to go wherever they thought God wanted them to go, and to do what they thought God wanted them to do. They have tried fasting, praying and giving large sums to benevolent purposes. Some have shut themselves up in their rooms, and have said they would never come out till they had received the blessing of holiness. But alas! they have had to come out. Some have been driven to the borders of insanity, and some, we doubt not, to insanity itself. Men have sought for it in all these ways, and have been foiled in every attempt, and have given up in despair, completely discouraged. Some have for a time, tried to believe that all the evil in their nature was gone, but alas, they have been soon led to the conclusion that sin existed in them still. And, we ask, why all this disappointment, and discouragement, and despair? We answer,

one reason is, because these people imagine that it is on account of the freeness of their hearts from sin, that they are going to be accepted at the final day. [This soul-damning error I have tried to refute in the chapter on justification]. And so after having tried every way to live without sin, and having been foiled at every point, they give up in despair. Another reason of their disappointment is, they seek for holiness by the works of the law. That is through something they must do or give up. But Paul positively affirms that we receive the Spirit in no such way. (*Gal. 3: 2*). We do not receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or through the works of the law, but simply by trusting in what Christ has done, or in other words, depending on the perfect obedience of Jesus to the law of God for our salvation, and not in our own obedience to God's law. And whenever we are led to see that our salvation depends not on what we do, but in trusting to what another has done, that moment are we filled with love to God that cannot be expressed, and with joy and peace. "And the fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace," &c. This is how we receive the Spirit and in no other way. What makes me love Jesus so much as the thought that it is His righteousness that saves me and not my own? what other thought gives me such joy and peace? John Angell James says, "The way to have holiness increased is to look to Christ, meditate on the sufficiency of His atonement, the perfection of His righteousness, the riches of His grace. Instead of laboring to love Christ, and becoming dejected that thou dost not love Him more, take another course and dwell upon the love of Christ to thee. Meditate on His amazing grace, His most wonderful compassion. This, this is the way to grow in love to Him, for if we love Him it is because He first loved us. It is a great principle which I am anxious to impress on you, that subjective religion, or religion in us, is produced and sustained by fixing the mind on objective religion." Or in other words, the love of Christ to us. This then is how holiness is promoted in the heart, and any doctrine that teaches that my own works have anything to do with my salvation, necessarily hinders holiness, because it makes me think less of Christ and more of myself, and tends to build me up in self-righteousness and pride. Hence, the more free salvation is preached to men, the more is holiness

promoted in their hearts. Free salvation without works, or without the deeds of the law, is the root and soil in which holiness grows. Ignorance of this fact has led the Church of Rome into many and grievous errors, and it has led Arminian Protestants far, far from right and truth. As a general rule, man in his ignorance is apt to think that it will not do to tell men that God saves without their good works. They fear men will not care how they live, if they know that. They never made a greater blunder. The truth is, no soul is in a position to bring forth good works until he knows his salvation does not depend on his good works. And any work that a person will not do, because he knows that that work is not necessary to salvation, is just as well left undone, because if done, supposing it were necessary to salvation, it would be done with a wrong motive—from fear, not from love. To illustrate this point: suppose I was a slave to a certain man, and that man gave me a piece of work to do, informing me that if I failed to do it, I should be whipped. What would prompt me to do that work? Not love; the thought that he would whip me if I did not do the work would take away all the love for him; and if I did the work, it would simply be to escape punishment. On the other hand: supposing I had a good master that had always treated me well, and he gave me a piece of work to do, and I knew that whether I did it or not I would not be whipped, but that my master would still continue to be good and kind to me, would it not be love that would prompt me to do that work? Even so, those who say they have got to do God's will in order to be saved, are serving God from fear and not from love, and all their works are only an abomination in God's sight, because they spring from fear and not from love. Forced obedience is in reality no obedience at all, hence it is a stumbling-block in the way of holiness. God in His infinite wisdom saw this, and He took another plan from what man would have taken. The decree, "The soul that sinneth it shall die," only made man hate God, and look upon Him as a hard master, and the thought that engaged the mind of God was how to bring back the love of man again to Himself. And how does He do this and yet maintain the honor of His righteous law? He provides a Substitute who fulfils His law in every point, who suffers all that man should have suffered

and perfectly satisfies the demands of justice; and then He comes to man and says "if you will only depend on the perfect righteousness of that Substitute you will be saved, without your good works." You are "justified by faith *without* the deeds of the law."—*Rom. 3: 28*. What effect does this produce on the heart of man? It fills him with astonishment, wonder and love to think that God should offer him eternal life on these terms. Now the aim of God is accomplished. Man's *hatred* to God is gone, and in its place there is *love*. As man looks at the condition on which God saves him, viz: trusting in the righteousness of another, he is filled with *love, joy and peace*. What is the language of his heart now? "I delight in the law of God." "The love of Christ constraineth me." Now he strives to do the will of that God whose boundless love fills him with wonder, love and praise, not because he by so doing may attain eternal life, but because God gives him eternal life *without* his good works. Oh the boundless love and infinite wisdom of Jehovah! how much higher are His ways than man's ways, and His thoughts than man's thoughts. In what a wondrous way did He move, in order to bring back the affections of man to Himself, and to purge his conscience from dead works, to serve the living God. And so God's law is established, and set on a firmer basis than ever—the basis of love.

The Salvation Army, by maintaining that living without sin is necessary to eternal life, has, in reality, defeated its own aim, and the aim of God too. They have tried to force men into obedience, by telling them of the punishment that awaited them if they did not obey, forgetting that everything connected with salvation is absolutely free. And they have built themselves up in self-righteousness and unholliness of the darkest and most hateful kind in the sight of God. General Booth says he does not believe in the doctrine of sinless perfection. Oh no. Well, what is the meaning of the words, "sinless perfection?" The plain meaning of the words is this, "perfection without sin." He says he does not believe in this, but he believes we can live without sin. What sort of sense is this? What is living *without sin* but *sinless perfection*. General Booth is simply trying here to split hairs. If living without sin is not sinless perfection, what is sinless perfection? What

more can a man do than live without sin in order to be sinlessly perfect? What more did Adam do before he fell than live without sin? What more did the Lord Jesus Christ do? They did no more. And I repeat the question, if a man is living without sin, what is the next thing that he has to do in order to be sinlessly perfect? Will General Booth please answer this question. It will evidently take some one with a little more brains than General Booth to formulate a creed unless he wants to show his ignorance.

We defy anyone to produce a single man in scripture, who ever got up in an audience and made this assertion, I live without sin. Why did they not say it? because they realized that they did not live without sin, hence they could not say it. Jesus Christ was the only one that could say, "which of you convinceth me of sin."—*John 8:46*. The proud Pharisee came the nearest to this of any other person mentioned in Scripture. And what was the character of this Pharisee? He was a man that made a great profession, a man that had a great zeal for God, a man that thanked God for keeping him better than other men, and a man that could see no faults in himself. If the Salvation Army of to-day does not answer to this description of the Pharisee, then there are no Pharisees in the world; they have all left, and they cannot be found. Chrysostom says, "he who thinks he hath attained everything, hath attained nothing." The reason why the Salvation Army have erred on sanctification, is because they have erred on the doctrine of justification. One necessarily follows the other.

THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I would like to know what authority General Booth has for throwing aside at least in practice if not in theory, the ordinance of the Lord's Supper? Certainly he has no authority in God's word for so doing, because it positively says, "this do in remembrance of me."—*Luke 22 : 19. 1st Cor. 11 : 24.*

We know that the Lord's Supper is not essential to salvation, but then, are we to disobey a positive command of Jesus, under the plea that it is not necessary to salvation? Are we to sin, because grace abounds? Jesus says, "if ye love me keep my commandments."—*John 14 : 15.* And when did this command of Jesus, cease to be binding on the Church? Paul tells us that this ordinance is to be observed till Jesus comes. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *till He come.*" *1st Cor. 11 : 26.* Jesus says, "This do in remembrance of me."—*Luke 22 : 19.* And Paul admonishes the Church to observe this command, and that *till Jesus comes.* And yet in the face of all this, along comes General Booth and says, there is no need to do it, and practically he throws the whole thing to one side. Evidently, in his own opinion, he is higher authority than either Jesus Christ, or Paul. Such self-conceit is awful in the extreme. General Booth says (in *Doctrine and Discipline of Salvation Army, page 90*), "when this ordinance is helpful to the faith of our soldiers, we recommend its adoption," but it is evident to all, that he never thinks that it is helpful, as his conduct goes to show. If he thought it helpful he would practice it. Did Jesus say, when this ordinance is helpful to you do it, and when it is not, you need not do it? Not at all. His positive command is, "this do." Again, we would like General Booth to tell us *when* this ordinance is helpful, and when it is not? at what particular time and under what circumstances is it helpful, and when not helpful? What was the design of Jesus in instituting this ordinance? Was it not to keep men in remembrance of how His body was broken for them, and how His blood was shed for them in order that

their love to Him might be increased. Where is the soul that has appropriated the benefits of Christ's death to itself, that can sit down to the table of the Lord, and not be forcibly reminded of the agonies and sufferings of its dying Lord, in its behalf. Thus our love to him is increased. It is by beholding the love of Jesus to us, that we are led to love Him in return. "We love Him because He first loved us."—1st *John* 4: 19. "We all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord."—2nd *Cor.* 3: 18.

Why was the feast of the Passover instituted? To keep vividly before the minds of the children of Israel the great goodness of God towards them, the night the destroying angel passed through the land of Egypt, and destroyed the first-born of the Egyptians, and yet spared *them* though perhaps they lived very little better than the Egyptians. And the children of Israel were commanded to keep this Passover, to remind them of the hour when God took vengeance on their enemies, and delivered them from the sword of the destroying angel, and from the yoke of Egyptian bondage. "And it shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, what mean ye by this service? That ye shall say, it is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptian, and delivered our houses."—*Exod.* 12: 26-27. And if the children of Israel were commanded to commemorate this event, in order to keep before their minds the great goodness of God towards them, how much more will not the Blessed Saviour expect us to obey His command, and keep in remembrance the hour when His body was broken for us, when the wrath of God was poured out upon Him in order that we might go free; when in bitterness of soul He was led to exclaim, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?"—(*Mark* 15: 34). How much more should we keep in remembrance the hour when He "redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us." The hour when He was crowned with thorns, when His feet were spiked, His hands and side pierced; when He was made a spectacle to men and devils; and the hour when He made it possible

i
i
g
B
or
st
no
ma
the
in
this
rath
will
Cor
per
it.
does
he s
thro
such
tells
the I
telling
which
to ac
differ
if not
are go
what
than t
not th
there v

for His Father to *pass over* all our sins; and when He purchased for us an inheritance that is incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. The blessed Lord asks us to do this, and can we say in His face "it is not essential to salvation," and that being so, I will not do it. How will it sound at the judgment day, when the Blessed Saviour asks us why we did not observe this command of His, for us to say, Oh, it was not essential to my salvation, or I did not know whether it would be helpful to me or not. Wilfully sinning because grace abounds.

It is as much a sin for us to break this command of the Blessed Lord as any other, that is, if we have the opportunity of obeying it, and almost every christian is placed in circumstances in which he can do this.

The only reason I ever heard the Salvation Army give for not administering the Lord's Supper is this: "We get so many drunkards, and it really would not do to administer the Lord's Supper to them, it would be placing temptation in their way." Let us examine God's word and see whether this is a sufficient reason for neglect in this matter. This is rather a weighty argument, no doubt, but the question is, will it stand the test of God's word. Let us see. In *1st Cor. 11: 20-22*, we read that the church at Corinth had so perverted the Lord's Supper that some even got drunk over it. "One is hungry and another drunken." Well, what does Paul say to them under these circumstances? Does he say, If you are going to get drunk over it you had better throw it to one side entirely. No, he did not dare to say such a thing, but he does just the opposite of this. He tells them that he had received, as a positive command from the Lord, the observance of this ordinance; and instead of telling them to discontinue it, on account of the way in which they had perverted it, he gives them instructions how to administer and partake of it in a proper way. How different to this does General Booth do, at least in practice, if not in theory. He comes along and says, well, if people are going to get drunk over it, throw it to one side, no matter what Paul says, or what Jesus Christ says; I know better than they do. Such self-conceited audacity is terrible! Did not the Lord Jesus know when He gave the command that there would be some drunkards who would believe in Him,

and accept Him as their Saviour? Why then did He not exempt them from obedience to this command? Because in his infinite wisdom He did not see fit to do so. He saw that its power for good was greater than its power for evil. He knew what effect it would have on the human heart better than General Booth knows, though, evidently, General Booth thinks that He did not. Would Jesus in His infinite wisdom, and fore-knowledge, and love, as He glanced down the ages of the future—if He had seen that the observance of this ordinance would be the means of ruining souls—have said, “this do in remembrance of Me?” Away with such a thought. Would the Blessed Saviour in his boundless love and compassion—if He had seen that obedience to this command would bring no blessing to man, and no glory to Himself—have said, “this do in remembrance of Me.” Jesus would never urge obedience to this command, if, by obeying it, no benefit would be brought to man, or no glory to Himself. He is too wise to err, and He saw that man by obeying this command, and so bringing vividly before his mind, all that He had suffered for him, would by so doing be led to love Him more.

May be General Booth is afraid that some of his followers may eat and drink unworthily. Well, what is eating and drinking *unworthily*? Paul says it was to eat and drink, *not discerning the Lord's body*; or in other words, not discerning that the bread and wine, represented the body and blood of Jesus, that was broken and shed for them. It was to bring this to their remembrance that the Blessed Saviour instituted it. And the soul that failed to see what it represented, could not be spiritually benefited by it in any way whatever. They would only be perverting the design the Blessed Saviour had in instituting this ordinance. Paul is not here referring to the *worthiness* or *unworthiness* of the individual who partakes of it, because no one is in reality *worthy*. But he is simply referring to the *object* they have in partaking of it. Whether it is to bring to remembrance the sufferings of Jesus for them, or to eat because it is a rule of the Church, or merely to gratify the desires of the flesh by eating. If the two latter was their object in partaking of it, they ate and drank unworthily. The soul that has accepted Christ and His righteousness as its only hope of salvation,

and discerns what the bread and wine represents, need not fear of eating and drinking unworthily, although it may realize that it has many failings and shortcomings. The Blessed Saviour wants all such to come to His table, and to partake of this ordinance. His injunction to these is, "this do in remembrance of me." Paul does not use the word "*unworthy*" but "*unworthily*." He does not say, "you who are *worthy* may eat of it, but you who are *unworthy* must not," if that were his language we would all be excluded. But his language is, "he that eateth and drinketh *unworthily*," that is, in an *unworthy manner*, "not discerning the Lord's Body," eateth and drinketh damnation to himself. The word "damnation" here, is said on good authority to be a mistranslation. Paul is said not to have meant here, that even they that ate and drank unworthily, ate and drank eternal punishment to themselves, if he did, their sin would be unpardonable, and so instead of there being only one sin unto death, 1st *John* 5: 16, there would be two; unless we suppose that this is the sin unto death, an idea that Scripture will in no wise substantiate. Eating and drinking unworthily would not be sinning against the Holy Ghost, which is the unpardonable sin, but it would be sinning against the Son of Man; and "all manner of sin and blasphemy against the Son of Man shall be forgiven." The right translation of the word "damnation" here, is said to be "judgment," and that "judgment" is described as temporal in v. 30, of the same chapter, which reads as follows: "for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." That is, spiritually weak and sickly; the necessary result of eating and drinking, not discerning the Lord's Body.

But after all, we can hardly suppose that it is the fear of eating and drinking unworthily, that keeps General Booth and his followers from obeying the command of the Blessed Saviour, for surely if there is anyone in the world who would have no fear of eating and drinking unworthily, it would be those who imagine they live without sin. Surely if anyone is worthy they are, so they should have no fears whatever.

Really we are at a loss to know what is the cause of their neglect in this matter; unless it be their self-conceit,—imagining they are wiser than God, and know what will

bring a blessing to man, and honor and glory to God, better than He knows Himself. It must be either this, or wilful and obstinate disobedience to a positive command of the Blessed Saviour.

BAPTISM.

When the Blessed Saviour was about to part from His disciples on Mount Olivet, and ascend to Heaven, He gave them this commission: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded you"—*Matt. 28: 19, 20*. The extent of this commission, as will be observed, is "*all nations*," present and future, from the time the commission was given down to the end of time. The command is to *teach* and *baptize* them. It is not our intention to enter into any dispute whatever as to what baptism is a symbol of, or the exact mode of its performance; we desire simply to confine ourselves to the command, "teach and baptize *all* nations."

In the first place, the baptism that Jesus referred to here must be a *water baptism*, because it is the prerogative of *God alone* to baptize with the *Holy Ghost*. Is there a man on earth so foolish as to suppose that he can baptize one of his fellow-creatures with the *Holy Ghost*? We do not suppose there is. The Church in all ages has always understood this to mean a water baptism, and as such they have performed it. Peter understood this to mean a water baptism, when on the day of Pentecost he baptized three thousand people.—*Acts 2: 41*. Philip understood it to mean a water baptism, when he baptized the people of Samaria (*Acts 8: 12*) and the Ethiopian eunuch. Again, Peter understood it to mean a water baptism, when he baptized Cornelius and his household. He says, "can any man forbid *water*, that these should not be *baptized*, which have received the *Holy Ghost* as well as we."—*Acts 10: 47*. Although those people had received the *Holy Ghost*, yet Peter was careful to obey the command

of his Lord, and to baptize them with *water* also. Ananias understood it to mean a *water* baptism, when he baptized Saul of Tarsus, *Acts* 9: 18. Paul understood it to mean a water baptism, when he baptized the Philipian jailor and his household. *Acts* 16: 33. And our Blessed Lord undoubtedly referred to a water baptism when he said to his Disciples, "go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you." Does General Booth teach men to observe all things that the Blessed Lord commanded His Disciples to do? Not at all. He teaches men that it is no matter how much they disobey the two positive commands of Jesus, viz: the Lord's Supper and Baptism. Hence he is one of the false teachers, that Peter prophesied should arise, whose *lingered* not, and whose *damnation* slumbered not.—2nd *Peter* 2: 3. On page 90 of *Doctrine and Discipline of the Salvation Army*, General Booth says, "does the Army consider baptism as a duty that must be performed? Decidedly not. The Army only considers one baptism essential to salvation, and that is the baptism of the Holy Ghost. But was not baptism by water quite a common rite among the early christians? Yes. And so was circumcision, shaving the head, washing the feet of saints, and many other Jewish ceremonies, which were never intended to be binding on our practice and consciences." Here is the noble General's view of Baptism. He classes it with circumcision, shaving the head, washing the feet of saints and other Jewish ceremonies. I ask were circumcision, shaving the head, or washing the feet of saints; and other Jewish ceremonies, positive commands of the Lord Jesus? Does He say, "go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing¹ them, and circumcising them, and shaving their heads, and washing their feet, and so on? Does He mix them all up together as General Booth does? Not at all. His command is, "go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing* them." He gives his Disciples to understand in plain language, what He wants them to do and makes no allusion whatever to circumcision, shaving the head, and the other Jewish ceremonies. General Booth as good as says that Baptism was "never meant to be binding on our

practice and consciences." Will His Lordship tell us, since he is possessed of so much wisdom, when it ceased to be "binding." Can he give us the exact date. It really is important for us to know, if the command has ceased to be obligatory, *when* it ceased to be so. The Blessed Saviour Himself tells us when this command will cease to be binding, and that is when "all nations" have been baptized, and not before. The command to baptize is just as broad in its application as is the command to *teach*. Jesus did not say, "go ye therefore and *teach* all nations and *baptize* the half of them. The command is *teach all* and *baptize all*. General Booth has just as good a right to tell men that the command to *teach* is not binding, as to tell them that the command to baptize is not binding, one is as broad as the other. It is a wonder that General Booth does not say that none of the commands of the Lord Jesus are binding. He has just as much reason to do this as to tell us that the command to baptize is not "binding." It is a wonder that he does not usurp the throne of Deity, and inform mortals what commands of the Saviour are absolute, and what are not. The best General Booth can do in his present state of mind, is to make a bible for himself and his followers, as the one that God has given us does not suit his whimsical ideas. He appears to know what is good for man and what is not, better than God Himself, and what commands of the Saviour are out of date, and what ones are not, so the best thing that he can do, is to make a new bible for himself and his followers, and throw the old one aside entirely.

We do not profess to believe, that the rite of baptism is essential to salvation; but I ask again, "shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" The plea that General Booth uses as a reason for neglecting the rite of baptism is, "it is not essential to salvation." As well might he say, there is no need that we should refrain from swearing, or stealing, or lying, or cheating, because it was not essential to salvation. The rite of baptism is just as essential to salvation, as any other work we can perform, faith excluded, and it is just as binding as any other precept or command of the Blessed Lord.

A FEW REMARKS ON SILVER COLLECTIONS.

When the Blessed Lord sent out the twelve disciples to preach the glad news of salvation, He gave this command: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; *freely ye have received, freely give.*"—*Matt. 10: 8.* They were to bestow all the blessings of the gospel freely upon all men, rich and poor, learned or illiterate, black or white, bond or free,—they were all to receive the glad news of salvation without money and without price. I ask the Salvation Army, honestly and candidly, have they obeyed this command of Jesus, "*freely ye have received, freely give?*" When the Blessed Lord empowered His disciples to perform all these wonderful miracles upon the bodies of men, thinking that perhaps they might be tempted to charge for the cures they wrought, He gave them this command to deter them from so doing, so that men could not have the least reason to suspect that it was all a money-making scheme. The Salvation Army, instead of following this golden rule of the Lord Jesus, have taken upon themselves, as they have in other things, to disobey this command, and to follow their own whims and fancies, or the whims and fancies of their leaders. We really are at a loss to see what good the bible in its present state is to such a people. They set up their own ideas in preference to God's word, as their standard of action. I ask General Booth or any other salvationist where in God's word do they find a command to take silver collections in order to let people go in to hear the gospel? (so called). Of course we know that they claim to be led by the Spirit in doing these things. What! led by the Spirit to disobey a positive command of Jesus? What an ideal! If they are led by any spirit to disobey the command of Jesus it is by the spirit of the devil. The Spirit of God never leads in direct opposition to the word of God. In dealing with men it is the word of God that the Spirit uses. Hence, the word of God is called the sword of the Spirit. As well might a man say that he was led by the Spirit to steal or lie, as to say that he was led by the Spirit to charge

a man 10 or 20 cents, as the case may be, to let him in to hear the gospel. If they can find the least shadow of support from God's word for so doing, either by precept or example, then I will confess that I know nothing about God's word. And if the word of God does not positively condemn it both by precept and example then I have never read the word of God.

Suppose the Blessed Lord when he was on earth, going into the Temple or one of the Synagogues, to preach the Gospel, and dispatching one of His Disciples to take up a silver collection at the door. No sane man will suppose that Jesus ever did such a thing. He always acted on the rule he gave to His Disciples, "freely give." The invitation of God to man is, "ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath *no money*; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk *without money and without price.*"—*Isa 55: 1.* The invitation of the Salvation Army in many cases is, come with 10 or 20 cents in your pocket, in order to get in to see the proceedings. And I have known cases where men who have not had the money, or who have been unwilling to pay, have been refused admittance. I remember two cases in particular of this kind. One was that of a civil, well-behaved young man who came to the meeting, not knowing anything about the silver collection, and was refused admittance, because he had not the money to pay. The other was the case of a young man who was a member of a Church that they took possession of without permission, to hold forth in, and for which they paid no rent whatever. This young man came to their meeting one night and was positively denied admittance, because he did not feel like paying to get into the Church that he belonged to, and for which they paid no rent, and which they never had a proper permission to occupy. No doubt cases similar to these could be multiplied by the score. How do such actions as these correspond with the teaching of God's word? How do they correspond with the actions of Christ and his Apostles? Take the example of the Apostle Paul for instance; what does he say about the collection for the saints, when giving orders to the Church at Corinth. Here are his orders, "now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the

Churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by in store as the Lord hath prospered him, that there be *no gatherings* when I come."—1st Cor. 16: 1-2. General Booth's order would be a very different one; it would be something like this: "tell the people to bring 25 cents with them, because when I come, we must take a silver collection at the door." I ask people of common sense which of these two orders is right, Paul's or General Booth's? They both cannot be right; because one is directly in the teeth of the other. If Paul's is right, then of necessity, General Booth's must be wrong. The Holy Ghost inspired Paul to give to the Church a mode of collecting money for the support of the Gospel, which should be binding on the Church in all ages; and this mode is not taking silver collections at the door, and keeping out those who are too poor, or unwilling to pay for admittance. No doubt General Booth will say of Paul's mode of collecting money as he says of some other command of the Blessed Lord, "That it was never intended to be binding on our practice and consciences." We will simply leave such a statement as this to his ignorance.

We do not say that those who preach the Gospel should not live of the gospel, nay, we believe they should. Jesus says, "the laborer is worthy of his hire"—*Luke* 10; 7, and Paul says, "even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel."—1st Cor. 9: 14. But to fix a certain sum that men are exacted to pay, in order to get in to hear the word of God expounded, is decidedly unscriptural and sinful. Paul would have *scorned* the very idea of doing such a thing. He says, "what is my reward then? Verily, that when I preach the Gospel, I may make the Gospel of Christ *without charge*, that I abuse not my power in the Gospel."—1st Cor. 9: 18; and again "For ye remember brethren, our labor and travail: for laboring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the Gospel of God."—1st *Thess.* 2: 9; and again, "neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you: not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us."—2nd *Thess.* 3: 8-9.

Paul did this for an *example* to those that should follow ; but General Booth and his followers ignored his example, and the example of all the other Apostles, and the positive command and example of the Lord Jesus himself, and instead of taking God's word as their guide they follow their own whims and imaginations.

I was once conversing with a captain of the Army on this subject, and said he, "Oh, we could not pay expenses if we did not take silver collections." Why, this very thing ought to show him that there was something wrong in the whole system. God never requires his people to do evil that good may come. God's kingdom cannot be advanced by disobeying His commands. Doing the devil's work won't bring honor and glory to God. And if the Salvation Army cannot be upheld in any other way than by breaking a positive command of the Lord Jesus, then there is something sadly wrong in the whole system, and the sooner it comes down the better.

We do not suppose that many people have been severely injured by being kept out of Salvation Army meetings, because if they were admitted it is not gospel they would hear unless they heard more than ever I did or read in their books and papers; but this is no reason why they should be kept out of a place where the gospel is pretended to be preached.

No doubt the Salvation Army will say to me, "Oh! you're persecuting us." But of course it is not persecution for them to tell a drunkard that it's wrong to get drunk, it is not persecution for them to tell a thief it is wrong to steal, it is not persecution for them to point out the inconsistencies of other people; but for another to tell them that it is wrong *for them* to disobey God's positive commands, is to persecute them. Persecution has come to be a queer thing in these days. Instead of being suffering for the cause of right and truth it is suffering for the cause of wrong. God's word says, "For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for you faults ye take it patiently? but if when ye do well and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." —(*1st Peter, 2: 20*). This is persecution and this alone: "doing well and suffering for it." Doing wrong and suffering for it, is not persecution. No doubt the devil tries to per-

suade the Salvation Army that they are persecuted a great deal, and hence they must be a very good people. Instead of taking God's word as their guide, on a great many points they take General Booth for their guide, and then because christian men denounce them they console themselves with the thought that they are a wonderfully persecuted people, "persecuted for righteousness sake," when all the time they are simply being denounced for their obstinate disobedience to God's commands. How the enemy of their souls must laugh up his sleeve at their ignorance and folly on this point.

We have heard officers of the Army say, "Oh, we take the collection at the door to prevent the confusion there would be by taking it inside." This is "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel," disobeying a positive command of Jesus to prevent a little confusion. And again they say, "Oh we do it to keep out the more disturbing element of the crowd." Why we thought that this was the very class of people they were after. They may make all the excuses they like, and try to make all the false impressions they like on the minds of the people, but the sum and substance of the matter is this: they want money, and they know that if they don't take the collection at the door they will come short. General Booth is evidently fond of money, and he does not appear to care how much he breaks God's commands, or how much his followers break them, in order to get it. I suppose he thinks that "the end will justify the means," which is simply a lie of the enemy of souls. But we suppose it is not a sin for General Booth to break God's commands, since he is Pope of the Salvation Army, which he is in power, if not in name. Of course a Pope can't do wrong; no matter what he does, he must be led by the Spirit, he can break God's commands all he likes and yet live without sin. What a wonderfully favored gentleman he is. What wisdom he is possessed of. What superior knowledge. He is capable of telling men what commands of God they must keep, and what ones they may break at pleasure and yet not sin.

SWEARING-IN SOLDIERS.

This again is something we defy any Salvationist to find Scripture for either by command or exemplification. But on the other hand it is positively denounced both by precept and example. If General Booth can find Scripture for it in *his bible*, we cannot find scripture for it in the bible that was written by the prophets and apostles.

The bible does not in any way encourage rash vowing, and to make the best of this swearing-in business, it is making a *very rash vow*; a vow that Jesus Christ never asked His to make, and a vow that none of the Apostles ever asked their converts to make.

It is plain to be seen that General Booth must think himself and his successors infallible, otherwise he would never try to make men bind themselves to be true to him and them. Even if the Salvation Army was ever so right now would it be impossible for it to go astray? Can General Booth give any pledge to the public, that all his successors will be the kind of men they ought to be? Can he see fifty years into the future and discover what the Army will be like then? Decidedly not. Then why does he try to make men bind themselves to be true to it? It is one of the greatest attempts at tyranny and despotism that can be conceived of. General Booth is one of the greatest tyrants that ever trod the face of the earth. Not content with trying to bind men to be true to himself, he tries to bind them to be true to his successors. He is evidently very much interested in the financial success of his progeny, who for aught he knows may be the greatest tyrants and hypocrites in existence. If General Booth had the foreknowledge of God, it would not be so bad for him to try to bind men, but since he has not, it is villainy for him to attempt it.

It pays General Booth's children to be religious, they get high positions, and lots of money for being so. They are wise enough to know on which side their bread is buttered.

If this "swearing-in business" brought any blessing to man, or any glory to God, it might be tolerated; but it does not; it is not possible for it to do so in the least degree.

And the Blessed Lord positively condemns it. He says in *Matt. 5: 33-37*, "Again ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say unto you *swear not at all*: neither by heaven, for it is God's throne: nor by the earth for it is His footstool: neither by Jerusalem for it is the city of the Great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these, cometh of evil." When Christ said, "ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time" he undoubtedly referred to *Numbers 30: 2*, which reads thus: "if a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth," and to *Deut. 23: 21*: "when thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee." But what says Christ about this matter of vowing. "But I say unto thee swear not at all" which simply means, vow not at all, "neither by heaven nor by earth, nor by the city of the Great King, neither by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black." Jesus Christ referred his disciples here to what Moses said on the subject of vows. Moses never urged men to vow, but simply to pay the vows they made. In *Deut. 23: 22*, he says, "but if thou shalt forbear to vow, it is no sin in thee;" and Jesus Christ makes known his will to us in this matter, and says, "swear not at all," or vow not at all. James undoubtedly refers to the same thing when he says, "but above all things my brethren swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea, be yea, and your nay, be nay; lest ye fall into condemnation."—*James 5: 12*. He admonishes them above all things not to do this. And yet in the face of this command of Jesus, and this admonition of James, along comes General Booth and teaches men to vow and bind themselves upon oath to be true to him and his followers.

But after all, we cannot wonder so very much to see General Booth breaking the commands of God's Word, be-

cause on page 88 of "Doctrine and Discipline of the Salvation Army" he terms the Bible "a dead book," he says, "The *living, active, positive agency of God*, is comparatively shut out of the world, and a *dead book* placed in its stead." This is his view of God's Word. Paul had quite a different opinion to this. He says, "For the word of God is *quick* and *powerful*, and *sharper* than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." It was no dead book with Paul. He represented it as the sword that the Spirit used to convince men of sin, and point them the way to life. The work of the Spirit is not to speak of Himself, but to take of the things of God and reveal them to man. The Spirit uses nothing but God's Word to convince men of sin; nothing but God's Word to show them the way to life, and nothing but God's Word to tell men their duty to their God and their fellow men. The Spirit would be powerless without the Word of God, because it would have no sword to smite with. Yet General Booth calls the very thing that the Spirit uses to convince men of sin, to point them the way to life, and to tell them their duty to God and their followmen, "a dead book." Is it any wonder when this is his opinion of God's Word, that he teaches men to disobey it, and in reality sets himself up as higher authority than that Word?

General Booth has both *added to* and *taken from* the Word of God. He has added "silver collections" and the "swearing-in" business, and he has taken away, practically at least, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the Ordinance of Baptism. And the judgments of the Most High are pronounced against him. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book."—*Rev. 22: 18-19*. Let General Booth remember that these are not our judgments, but the judgments of Almighty God.

How many souls at the great reckoning day will wake up to the fact that they have been terribly befooled by General

Booth and his doctrines. How many souls will curse him through all eternity for calling God's method of justification a "cheat of the devil," and leading them astray on the very point that their soul's salvation hinged on. Like "Christian" of "Pilgrims' Progress," who tried to persuade "Ignorance" of his danger so that he might fly to Jesus and clothe himself in His righteousness, even so, in this little book, have I done my little best to show the self-righteous Salvation Army their danger, before they everlastingly perish in their own deceivings. If they will not take warning I can only say, their blood be upon their own heads. I have warned them because I love them, and because I love Him who redeemed them. It makes me feel sad to think that a people so zealous as they are will at last wake up to find that they have been terribly deceived. I feel confident that if they will still persist in the way they are in, real peace they will never know, a false peace they may have, but an uninterrupted peace they will never have. I do pray that all who read this little book may be led before the messenger of death summons them away, to see their own wretchedness, so that they may fly to the Lord Jesus, and clothe themselves in the garments of His *personal righteousness*, and then, and only then, will they be safe for time and eternity.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion I may say I am of opinion that the downfall of the Salvation Army, and every other denomination that preaches justification by any other way than "*imputed righteousness*," is only a question of time; because in their gospel (so-called) there is no attracting power. They may hold unto their forms, but they are void of power. But in the doctrine of imputed righteousness there is power. A power that carried men in the days of the reformation to the stake, and through the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition. And a power that carried the "Scottish Covenanters"

through seas of blood, and bitter persecutions. A power that carried men through the fires of Smithfield. We ask Mrs. Booth to consider these facts before she again denounces this doctrine as a "cheat of the devil," and to beware lest the blood of souls be found on her garments. The Salvation Army is zealous, but that will not save them. The Church of Rome is just as zealous as they are. Israel of old was zealous enough to compass sea and land to make one proselyte, but it was all of no avail. Nowhere in Scripture do we see zeal represented as a fruit of the Spirit. Zeal without a right knowledge of the way of salvation is worse than useless, because it only leads men the wrong way. Conscience, in order to lead a man the right way, must be rightly informed, otherwise it is only a false guide to him. Let no Salvation Army officer for a moment suppose that it was God who led him to offer himself for the field; it was simply his conscience, and his conscience was misinformed. What leads young women of the Church of Rome to give themselves up to lives of seclusion in convents and nunneries? Is it God's Spirit? Not at all. They think it is, but it is simply their conscience and their conscience misinformed. What led the Hindoo mother to throw her babe into the river Ganges? Was it God's Spirit? Not at all. It was simply her conscience, and her conscience was misinformed. What led Saul of Tarsus to Damascus to hail Christian men and women to prison? Not God's Spirit, although he assuredly thought it was. It was a misinformed conscience.

I have heard Salvation Army officers say, "I remember the very place and time when God called me for the field." So can that young woman remember the time when she thought God called her to a life of seclusion in the convent. Paul could remember the time when something told him to persecute the sect called Christians. Was it God's Spirit led him to do this? Not at all. Neither did God's Spirit ever lead a man to offer himself for Salvation Army work because their doctrines are in direct opposition to the Word of God. It was simply the imaginations of a misinformed mind and conscience.



