

**John Wesley**  
**and**  
**Cross Currents in Adventism**

An Introductory Survey  
of the Wide Congruence of John Wesley's  
and Ellen White's Views on Character  
Perfection, and its Relevancy to Opposing  
Emphases upon Reformation Theology  
within Contemporary Adventism

by

David Duffie , M. D.

(School of Health, Loma Linda University)

**JOHN WESLEY**  
**and**  
**CROSS CURRENTS in ADVENTISM**

An Introductory Survey of the Wide Congruence of John Wesley's and Ellen White's Views on Perfection, and its Relevancy to opposing Emphases upon Reformation Theology within Contemporary Adventism.

Submitted to

Robert G. Tuttle, Jr.

for his Class on

WESLEY

at Fuller Theological Seminary

by

David Duffie, M.D.  
Loma Linda University  
May, 1978

[Notes by editor of this electronic version, dated December 2009:

1. Beginning with page 2, the original page numbering of this custom sized booklet is preserved by inserting the page number in brackets at the page break location, such as [[2]].
2. Underlined emphases have been changed to italics.
3. The original document was typewritten in a mono-spaced Courier font.
4. Minor punctuation editing and correction of misspelled words has been done.
5. As noted in Footnotes, some references have been corrected.
6. All single brackets are original unless accompanied by "Ed.:".]

# JOHN WESLEY

and

## CROSS CURRENTS in ADVENTISM

An Introductory Survey of the Wide Congruence of John Wesley's and Ellen White's Views on Perfection, and its Relevancy to Opposing Emphases upon Reformation Theology within Contemporary Adventism.

### Introduction

Seventh-day Adventism has strong historical and doctrinal roots in Methodism. Many Adventists have little or no awareness of how strong those roots are, nor of how highly pertinent to the theological controversy presently agitating the SDA church are the enduring convictions and the lifelong struggles of John Wesley in regard to the subjects of sanctification and Christian perfection. Many people harbor distorted and prejudiced conceptions of what Wesley actually believed and taught about perfection. Doubtless many others are totally ignorant of his views on the matter. Time and again I have been impressed with the similarities between the objections and the resistance faced by Wesley in his day and the objections and the resistance currently being faced by those who are defending strains in Adventist theology whose lineage is more Wesleyan than it is Lutheran or Calvinistic. It seems deplorable to me that those who are wanting to further the same Biblical truths regarding sanctification which Wesley championed in his day should have to keep on trying to do so without benefit of familiarity with Wesley's own methods, his logic and his cogent reasonings in defense of those same truths. While it may not always be true that those who ignore history are destined to repeat it, it usually results that a knowledge of history will make one's way smoother and less arduous than would otherwise have been the case. My overarching goal in this paper, therefore, is to bring Wesley's understanding of Christian perfection to bear upon the theological ferment that is actively going on in the Seventh-day Adventist church at the present time.

Pursuant to this goal, I purpose in Part One to consider the enduring outlines of Wesley's own understanding of sanctification and perfection, giving particular attention to those features which are most commonly [[2]] misunderstood or misrepresented. In Part Two, I purpose to compare Wesley's views on perfection with those of Ellen White, a gifted leader and influential writer among Adventists. I shall indicate the many similarities and two apparent differences (or at least *partial* differences) between their views. I shall preface this second part with a brief account of Ellen White's early connection with Methodism. In Part Three, I shall again focus upon Wesley's doctrine of perfection, this time highlighting those passages where Wesley deals with what are essentially the same objections and arguments being raised and discussed in the present doctrinal controversy in the Adventist church. As in Part II, I shall preface Part III with a brief historical sketch, this time of the origin and development of the controversy.

## Part I

### Wesley on Perfection

A succinct definition of Christian Perfection is given by Wesley in a tract published in 1759, in Question and Answer form. In prefacing the tract, he states that the views therein are "just the same as I have entertained for above twenty years, though extremely different from what has been imputed to me; and probably will be so still."<sup>1</sup>

Q. What Is Christian perfection?

A. The loving God with all our heart, mind, soul and strength. This insures that no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remains in the soul, and that all the thoughts, words and actions are governed by pure love.<sup>2</sup>

Farther along in the same tract he reiterates, "Scriptural perfection is pure love filling the heart and governing all the words and actions."<sup>3</sup> Other people may add other ideas of their own imagination, he says, but that this occurs only makes it the more important that we "keep the simple, Scriptural account continually in our eye: pure love reigning alone in our heart and life. This is the whole of Scriptural perfection."<sup>4</sup>

Although perfection, or holiness, is thus primarily and consistently defined by Wesley in positive terms of pure love to God and man, he does not neglect the corresponding negative definition that holiness, or Christian perfection, consists also and at the same time in complete freedom from sinning. He takes pains to explicate just what this "freedom from sinning" means and what it does not mean. He does not like to use the term "sinless perfection," as we shall see, because this term can be too easily misunderstood. To his own question, "Is it sinless?", he answers, "It is salvation from sin."<sup>5</sup>

To understand Wesley's concept of perfection it is necessary first to understand his conception of sin. For Wesley, there is an important distinction between sins "properly so called", and sins "not properly so called." This distinction is brought out in the second and following questions in the tract:

Q. 2 But do you affirm that this perfection excludes all inimities, ignorance and mistake?

A. I continually affirm quite the contrary, and always have done so.

The questioner persists:

Q. 3 But is not this scheme contradictory to itself? How can every thought, word and work be governed by pure love and the man be subject at the same time to ignorance and mistake? This we think is not perfection but imperfection, and is not a pin different from Calvinism.<sup>6</sup>

Wesley disagrees and opines that indeed may a man be "filled with pure love and still be liable to mistake." It is a natural consequence of the soul's dwelling in flesh and blood that a man think wrongly and make mistakes in judgment. "A thousand such instances there may be, even in those who are in the highest state of grace. Yet where every word and action springs from love, such a mistake is not properly a sin."<sup>7</sup> Because this distinction is often blurred in the minds of many, Wesley says, "Therefore 'sinless perfection' is a phrase I never use lest I *seem* to contradict myself."<sup>8</sup> His catholic spirit allows him to let others call mistakes "sins", if they insist upon so doing; but he considers this to be dangerous. He cautions:

Let those who do call them so beware how they confound these defects with sins properly so called. But how will they avoid it? How will these be distinguished from those, if they are all promiscuously called sins? I am much afraid if we should allow any sins to be consistent with perfection, few would confine the idea to those 'defects'...<sup>9</sup> [[4]]

How does Wesley define sin "properly so called"? His preferred definition is that "sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law."<sup>10</sup> That which is not *known to be a sin* is not truly a sin, in Wesley's understanding.

Known sins are further divided, in Wesley's mind, into *outward* sins, and *inward* sins. We shall now consider these two classes of sins (both of them being sins "properly so called") in their relation to the sanctification process. Sanctification, for Wesley, *begins* at the moment of justification and regeneration. Justification occurs when the self says Yes to the wooing of the Spirit, which is the act of faith that appropriates the merits of Christ's atonement and accepts the gracious provision of pardon and salvation. Christ's righteousness is imputed to the repentant believer, and there is a change in his relationship to God. By faith he becomes a child of God. At the same time, regeneration, or the new birth, brings about a *real* change in man (not merely a relational change), and this change marks the beginning of the process of sanctification, or the impartation of Christ's righteousness to the believer, mediated through the work of the Holy Spirit.

Wesley maintains that freedom from all outward sins, i.e., freedom from overt committal of sinful actions, may be, and should be, the glorious privilege of even the newly-born Christian. "Even babes in Christ are in such a sense perfect, or 'born of God' ... as, first, not to commit sin."<sup>11</sup> He appeals to the sixth chapter of the book of Romans as proof of this assertion that "even those who are justified, who are born again in the lowest sense, do not continue in sin." He quotes verses, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 14 and 18. He then states:

The very least which can be implied in these words is that persons spoken of therein, namely, all real Christians, or believers in Christ, are made free from outward sin....

This 'ceasing from sin', if it be interpreted in the lowest sense as regarding only the outward behaviour, must denote ceasing from outward act, from any outward transgression of the law.<sup>12</sup>

He then quotes 1 John 3:9, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," and verse 18, "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not."

Next, in typically Wesleyan style, he brings up, and deals with, a common objection: [[5]]

Indeed, it is said this means only, he sinneth not "willfully," or he doth not commit sin "habitually", or "not as other men do", or, "not as he did before". But by whom is this said? By St. John? No; there is no such word in the text nor in the whole chapter, nor in all his Epistle nor in any part of his writings whatsoever. Why, then, the best way to answer a bold assertion is to deny it. And if any man can prove it from the Word of God, let him bring forth his strong reasons.<sup>13</sup>

Wesley next brings up the objection that certain revered Bible characters, such as Abraham, Moses and David, committed sin. He readily admits this, that the holiest men among the Jews did sometimes commit sin. "But", he insists, "if you would hence infer that *all Christians do and must commit sin as long as they live*, this consequence we utterly deny. It will never follow from these premises."<sup>14</sup>

After discussing at some length certain Bible texts in both the Old Testament and the New Testament that are sometimes used by his opponents to teach otherwise, he concludes by stating, "In conformity, therefore, both to the doctrine of St. John, and to the whole tenor of the New Testament, we fix this conclusion: *A Christian is so far perfect as not to commit sin*. This is the glorious privilege of every Christian, yea, though he be but a babe in Christ."<sup>15</sup>

Wesley is here speaking of what he terms "outward sins", of sinful *acting* or *speaking*. But sins (sins "properly so called") include more than these mere outward sins. They include sinful dispositions and tempers, or what Wesley calls "inward sins." These inward sins, such as feelings of pride and anger, are not, like the outward sins, totally eliminated from the believer's heart at regeneration. At the new birth there begins a process of subduing these inward sins, which meanwhile remain but do not reign within the believer. His sermon on "Sin in Believers" makes this clear. Although his text for this sermon is 2 Cor. 5:17, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature," he makes clear that in his understanding this does not mean that sin does not remain in the believer, nor that he is wholly delivered from sin at the time of the new birth.\* [[6]]

It can be helpful to look more closely at just what Wesley means when he says that sin *remains* although it does not *reign*. He is describing the condition of the believer

---

\* Note: This sermon on Sin in the Believer sheds a fascinating sidelight on the historical vicissitudes of this concept. At first, Count Zinzendorf and the Moravians, in order to avoid the extreme of those who painted remaining sin in the believer so strong as to imply little difference between a believer and an unbeliever, taught that the newborn Christian was freed [6] not only from outward sins, but all inward ones as well. Wesley sees the Germans as subsequently having repudiated this idea, but that some of the English who had initially learned it from them, "were not so easily prevailed upon to part with a favorite opinion: And even when the generality of them were convinced it was utterly indefensible, a few could not be persuaded to give it up; but maintain it to this day." (WW5, 145f)

during his progression from regeneration to entire sanctification, a process which may require most, if not all of a lifetime. Wesley, in the following passage, is in dialogue with an opponent of his views:

"But in the very nature of things, can a man have pride in him, and not be proud; anger, and yet not be angry?"

[Wesley answers] A man may have *pride* in him, may think of himself in some particulars above what he ought to think, (and so be proud in that particular,) and yet not be a proud man in his general character. He may have *anger* in him, yes, and a strong propensity to furious anger, without *giving way* to it.

"But can anger and pride be in that heart, where *only* meekness and humility are felt?"

No: But *some* pride and anger may be in that heart, where there is much humility and meekness.

"It avails not to say, These tempers are there, but they do not reign: For sin cannot, in any kind or degree, exist where it does not reign; for *guilt* and *power* are essential properties of sin. Therefore, where one of them is, all must be." [Thus reasons his opponent.]

[Wesley answers] Strange indeed! "Sin cannot, in any kind or degree *exist* where it does not *reign*? Absolutely contrary this to all experience, all Scripture, all common sense. Resentment of an affront is sin; it is ... disconformity to the 'law of love. This has existed in me a thousand times. Yet it did not, and does not reign.

"But *guilt* and *power* are essential properties of sin; therefore, where one is, all must be."

No: In the instance before us, if the resentment I feel is not yielded to, even for a moment, there is no guilt at all, no condemnation from God upon that account. And in this case, it has no *power*: Though it "lusteth against the Spirit," it cannot prevail. Here, therefore, as in ten thousand instances, there is *sin* without either *guilt*, or *power*. [[7]]

One further objection is considered, and Wesley's answer to it is well worth noticing, for it summarizes his understanding of the process of sanctification *prior to reaching entire* sanctification.

"But this doctrine, that sin remains in a believer; that a man may be in the favour of God, while he has sin in his heart; certainly tends to encourage men in sin."

[Wesley answers] Understand the proposition right, and no such consequence follows. A man may be in God's favour though he feel sin; but not if he *yields* to it. *Having sin* does not forfeit the favour of God; *giving way to sin* does. Though the

flesh in you "lust against the Spirit," you may still be a child of God; but if you "walk after the flesh," you are a child of the devil. Now this doctrine does not encourage to *obey* sin, but to resist it with all our might.

The sum of all is this: There are in every person, even after he is justified, two contrary principles, nature and grace, termed by St. Paul, the *flesh* and the *Spirit*. Hence, although even babes in Christ are *sanctified*, yet it is only in part. In a degree, according to the measure of their faith, they are spiritual; yet, in a degree they are carnal. Accordingly, believers are continually exhorted to watch against the flesh, as well as the world and the devil. And to this agrees the constant experience of the children of God. While they feel this witness in themselves, they feel a will not wholly resigned to the will of God. They know they are in him; and yet find an heart ready to depart from him, a proneness to evil in many instances, and a backwardness to that which is good.<sup>16</sup>

In this "in between state" (i.e., between regeneration and "entire sanctification") there is continual striving against inward sins, continual resisting of them "with all our might." There is deliverance from both the *guilt* of sin, and the *power* of sin, but not from the *being* or the presence of sin.

Returning now to consider the sermon on Christian Perfection: Wesley has stated, first, that freedom from *outward sins* is an immediate result of the new birth. He then goes on to maintain that eventually it can be affirmed that believers are in such a sense perfect as, secondly, "to be freed from evil thoughts and tempers."<sup>17</sup>

He, therefore, who liveth in true believers hath "purified their hearts by faith," insomuch that "every one that hath Christ in him, the hope of glory"<sup>18</sup> "purifieth himself even as he is pure."<sup>19</sup> He is purified from pride, for Christ was lowly of heart. He is pure from self-will or desire, for Christ desired only to do the will of his Father and to finish his work. And he is pure from anger, in the common sense of the word, for Christ was meek and gentle, patient [[8]] and long-suffering. I say "in the common sense of the word," for all anger is not evil.

Thus doth Jesus "save his people from their sins", and not only from outward sins but also from the sins of their hearts, from evil thoughts and from evil tempers. "True," say some, "we shall thus be saved from our sins, but not till death, not in this world." But how are we to reconcile this with the express words of St. John? "Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment. Because as he is, so are we *in this world*." The apostle here, beyond all contradiction, speaks of himself and other living Christians, of whom (as though he had foreseen this very evasion and set himself to overturn it from the foundation) he flatly affirms that not only at or after death, but *in this world*, they are as their Master.

It remains, then, that Christians are saved in this world from all sin, from all unrighteousness; that they are now in such a sense perfect as [1] not to commit sin, and [2] to be freed from evil thoughts and evil tempers.<sup>20</sup>



Wesley concludes his Sermon on Perfection with this appeal to Scripture:  
[continuing the above passage]

Thus hath the Lord fulfilled the things he spake by his holy prophets, which have been since the world began—by Moses in particular, saying, "I will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul"—by David, crying out, "Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me"—and most remarkably by Ezekiel in those words, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean. From all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you;. . . and cause you to walk in my statutes and ye shall keep my judgments and do them . Ye shall be my people and I will be your God. I will also save you from all your uncleanness."<sup>21</sup>

It is only after the attainment of "entire sanctification" that the believer is freed from all sinful tempers, i.e., from all inward sins. Thereafter there will be continued growth in perfection, just as previously there had been a gradual process of dying to sin, or the conquering of inbred sin. When in a condition of entire sanctification, the believer will feel no inward sins, i.e., he will be conscious of no pride, or anger, or resentment, or any other evil temper. This happy state is amissible, i.e., capable of being lost. There is no "once saved, always saved" strand in Wesley's theology.

There are two important facets of Wesley's understanding of Christian perfection which we shall consider at a later time, in Part II, [[9]] where Wesley's and Ellen White's views will be compared: (1) the question of whether one who is entirely sanctified will be conscious of the fact, and perhaps even be testifying to it. (2) the question of whether and to what extent there might be any sudden or instantaneous change involved in the reception of entire sanctification. These questions will be discussed later. The point to be made here and now is that, for Wesley, the experience of entire sanctification was not only *possible* in this life, but it is to be *expected* and earnestly *sought after* by all Christians. Outler, in his editor's introduction to Wesley's Sermon on Perfection, observes:

These objectors would have been fewer and less clamant if "perfection" had been urged merely as the Christian ideal to be realized *in statu gloriae*--or if the doctrine had followed the classical Protestant line that justification and sanctification are two aspects of the same thing: God's pardoning grace. Wesley, however, was adamant on the point that if "perfection" is a human possibility at all, it must at least be possible *in the span of human life* and, consequently, correlated with the whole process of Christian maturation and hope. He firmly rejected the phrase, "sinless perfection," but promptly proceeded to deny that you can rightly argue from the residue of sin in human life to its invincibility. For Wesley, the doctrine of perfection was yet another way of celebrating the *sovereignty* of grace!<sup>22</sup>

Temporarily leaving aside the questions of the instantaneousness and the claimability of perfection, we may now summarize the main features of Wesley's views on Sanctification as follows:

- (1) He defines perfection primarily in positive terms of perfect love to God and man.
- (2) He distinguishes between mistakes and defects on the one hand, and "sins properly so called" on the other. The former can never completely be eliminated in this life.
- (3) Of sins properly so called, he distinguishes between "outward" and "inward" sins. As a consequence of the Spirit's work of regeneration, the believer is freed from the former—from the committal of overt sins—at the new birth. He is not freed from inward sins, however, until by means of a further and usually gradual work of the Spirit, in which he diligently cooperates, there is reached a plane of entire sanctification, i.e., entire freedom from both kinds of sin properly so called, vis., outward and inward sins. [[10]]
- (4) Beyond this, there will be still further growth in love and in knowledge.
- (5) This state of entire sanctification can be lost, through negligence. It is not necessarily a permanent possession; although it *may* be.

The foregoing summarizes the main thrust of Wesley's understanding of sanctification and character perfection.

## **Part II**

### **Ellen White and John Wesley on Character Perfection**

#### Preface

Ellen White was born in Gorham, Maine, on November 26, 1827, and died in St. Helena, California, on July 16, 1915. Her parents were Methodists; and her conversion occurred at a Methodist campmeeting when Ellen was 13 years old. She had been wandering "needlessly in darkness and despair" while a "terrible sadness" rested upon her heart, for fear that God would never accept her. Then the sermons at the campmeeting came as a ray of light to her troubled soul.

While bowed at the altar with others who were seeking the Lord, all the language of my heart was: "Help, Jesus, save me or I perish! I will never cease to entreat till my prayer is heard and my sins forgiven!" I felt my needy, helpless condition as never before. As I knelt and prayed, suddenly my burden left me, and my heart was light. At first a feeling of alarm came over me, and I tried to resume my load of distress. It seemed to me that I had no right to feel joyous and happy. But Jesus seemed very near to me; I felt able to come to Him with all my griefs, misfortunes, and trials, even as the needy ones came to Him for relief when He was upon earth. There was a surety in my heart that He understood my peculiar trials and sympathized with me. I can never forget this precious assurance of the pitying tenderness of Jesus toward one so

unworthy of His notice. I learned more of the divine character of Christ in that short period when bowed among the praying ones than ever before.<sup>23</sup>

Following the campmeeting, she reports, "My mind was full of the sermons, exhortations, and prayers we had heard. Everything in nature seemed changed.... The trees were more beautiful, and the birds sang more sweetly than ever before; they seemed to be praising the Creator in their songs. I did not care to talk for fear this happiness might pass away, and I should lose the precious evidence of Jesus' love for me."<sup>24</sup> [[11]]

Two years later she was baptized by a Methodist minister, who consented to perform the act by immersion. Later, she described some of her early struggles over the meaning and the experience of sanctification:

Among the Methodists I had heard much in regard to sanctification. I had seen persons lose their physical strength under the influence of strong mental excitement, and had heard this pronounced the evidence of sanctification. But I could not comprehend what was necessary in order to be fully consecrated to God. My Christian friends said to me: "Believe in Jesus *now*! Believe that He accepts you *now*!" This I tried to do, but found it impossible to believe that I had received a blessing which, it seemed to me, should electrify my whole being. I wondered at my own hardness of heart in being unable to experience the exaltation of spirit that others manifested. It seemed to me that I was different from them and forever shut out from the perfect joy of holiness or heart."<sup>25</sup>

It is evident that from her earliest years Ellen was possessed of a burning desire to experience the full assurance of salvation. It was not only in her conversion experience, but also throughout her later writings that Wesleyan influences are evident. For example, the following statement is virtually a direct quotation from Wesley: "The righteousness by which we are justified is imputed; the righteousness by which we are sanctified is imparted. The first is our title to heaven, the second is our fitness for heaven."<sup>26</sup>

In her history of the true church of God through the centuries, encompassed in a book called *The Great Controversy* Ellen White devotes a dozen pages to a very sympathetic portrayal of the Wesleyan revival. The concluding paragraph reads as follows:

Thus while preaching the gospel of the grace of God, Wesley, like his Master, sought to "magnify the law, and make it honorable." Faithfully did he accomplish the work given him of God, and glorious were the results which he was permitted to behold. At the close of his long life of more than fourscore years--above half a century spent in itinerant ministry--his avowed adherents numbered more than half a million souls. But the multitude that through his labors had been lifted from the ruin and degradation of sin to a higher and a purer life, and the number who by his teaching had attained to a deeper and richer experience, will never be known till the whole family of the redeemed shall be gathered into the kingdom of God. His life presents a lesson of priceless worth to every Christian. Would that the faith and humility, the

untiring zeal, self-sacrifice, and devotion of this servant of Christ, might be reflected in the churches of today!<sup>27</sup>

What, then, were Ellen White's views on sanctification? and how do they compare with those of John Wesley?[[12]]

### Ellen White's Views on Sanctification

The following brief quotations will help to crystallize what Ellen White believes about sanctification. Like Wesley, she is fond of defining sanctification in positive terms:

"To love God supremely and your neighbor as yourself, is true sanctification."<sup>28</sup>

"Genuine sanctification ... is nothing less than a daily dying to self and daily conformity to the will of God."<sup>29</sup>

"True sanctification means perfect love, perfect obedience, perfect conformity to the Word of God."<sup>30</sup>

"The sanctification of the Spirit is seen in thought, word and deed."<sup>31</sup>

"Holiness is wholeness to God. The soul is surrendered to God. The will and even the thoughts are brought into subjection to Christ. The love of Jesus fills the soul."<sup>32</sup>

"Sanctification is a state of holiness, within and without, being holy and without reserve the Lord's--not in form but in truth."<sup>33</sup>

"True sanctification unites believers to Christ and to one another in bonds of tenderest sympathy. This union causes to flow continually into the heart rich currents of Christ-like love, which flows forth again in love for one another."<sup>34</sup>

There are literally hundreds and hundreds of similar statements concerning sanctification and character perfection to be found in Ellen White's writings. Let us notice one longer quotation, which goes into more detail regarding justification and sanctification:

The Lord would have His people sound in the faith--not ignorant of the great salvation so abundantly provided for them. They are not to look forward, thinking that at some future time a great work is to be done for them; for the work is now complete. The believer is not called upon to make his peace with God; he never has nor ever can do this. He is to accept Christ as his peace, for with Christ is God end peace. Christ made an end of sin, bearing its heavy curse in His own body on the tree, and He hath taken sway the curse from all those who believe in Him as a personal Saviour. He makes an end of the controlling power of sin in the heart, end the life end character of the believer testify to the genuine character of the grace of Christ.

To those that ask Him, Jesus imparts the Holy Spirit; for it is necessary that every believer should be delivered from pollution, as well as from the curse and condemnation of the law. Through the work of the Holy Spirit, the sanctification of the truth, the believer becomes fitted for the courts of heaven; for Christ works within us, and His righteousness is upon us. Without this no soul will be entitled to heaven. [[13]] We would not enjoy heaven unless qualified for its holy atmosphere by the influence of the Spirit and the righteousness of Christ.

In order to be candidates for heaven we must meet the requirement of the law: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and will, all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself" (Luke 10:27). We can do this only as we grasp by faith the righteousness of Christ. By beholding Jesus we receive a living, expanding principle in the heart, and the Holy Spirit carries on the work, and the believer advances from grace to grace, from strength to strength, from character to character. He conforms to the image of Christ, until in spiritual growth he attains unto the measure of the full stature in Christ Jesus. Thus Christ makes an end of the curse of sin, and sets the believing soul free from its action and effect.<sup>34</sup>

Ellen White's views on justification are essentially the same as Wesley's; and the latter has stated that his view of justification departs "scarcely a hair's breadth" from that of John Calvin.<sup>35</sup> White is insistent, however, that justification must be followed immediately by the progressive work of sanctification: "God requires the entire surrender of the heart before justification can take place; and in order for man to retain justification, there must be continual obedience, through active, living faith that works by love and purifies the soul."<sup>36</sup>

No repentance is genuine that does not work reformation. The righteousness of Christ is not a cloak to cover unconfessed and unforsaken sin; it is a principle of life that *transforms the character*, and *controls the conduct*. Holiness is wholeness for God; it is the entire surrender of the heart and life to the indwelling of the principles of heaven.<sup>37</sup>

When the gist of the foregoing statements is compared with what we have seen to be the essence of Wesley's understanding of sanctification, the close similarity between the two positions becomes abundantly apparent. Like Wesley, she sees sanctification as being a progressive work of purification which *starts* with regeneration and continues until all sins, *both outward and inward* have been purged away, and the soul is fitted for the finishing touches of immortality. Like Wesley, she defines perfection in terms of perfect love to God and man. Like Wesley, she believes that this work is made possible only by the indwelling Christ. Like Wesley, she believes that the blessing is amissible, i.e., that it can be lost again. Like Wesley, she believes that man is liable to making mistakes as long as he is mortal. She writes: "We have [[14]] many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and heaven alone are infallible."<sup>38</sup> Like Wesley, she shuns a static conception of a perfection, and believes that even an entire sanctification is improvable. In the concluding chapter of the *Great Controversy*, describing the new Earth state, she writes: "And the years of eternity as they roll will

bring richer and still more glorious revelations of God and Christ . As knowledge is progressive, so will love, reverence and happiness increase. The more men learn of God, the greater will be their admiration of His character."<sup>39</sup>

Compared with the wide area of congruence between White's and Wesley's views, the areas of disagreement between them are relatively small; and they pertain to positions which have often been misunderstood, or which have been modified with the passage of time.

One area of at least apparent disagreement concerns the claim to be sinless, which Ellen White insists must never be made by mortals. Her difference with Wesley may be smaller than commonly supposed, however. Part at what she says may be referring to what Wesley would call mistakes or defects, and not to sins "properly so called," and to that extent Wesley would agree that no one should ever claim such a degree of "sinlessness." Another part of what she says about not claiming to be sinless was in the context of her combating what in SDA circles has come to be called "the holy flesh heresy." There were those claimed that they could not sin, that they were beyond temptation, and that all of their actions were consequently sinless and holy. Ellen White naturally reacted strongly against this error. (I believe that in this Wesley would have agreed with her.) She made the important distinction, however, that while it would never be possible this side of glorification for Christians to attain to perfection of the *flesh*, they could be, and would be, expected to reach unto Christian perfection of the *soul*. In this context, she was speaking principally against a supposed state of freedom from temptation and from the possibility of sinning. Still another part of what she said on this subject pertained to what Wesley would also condemn, *vis.*, a boastful or proud attitude, which would immediately negate the genuineness of the claim. Let us consider some of her ideas on this subject in the light of the foregoing: [[15]]

There can be no self-exaltation, no boastful claim to freedom from sin, on the part of those who walk in the shadow of Calvary's cross. They feel that it was their sin which caused the agony that broke the heart of the Son of God, and this thought will lead them to self-abasement. Those who live nearest to Jesus discern most clearly the frailty and sinfulness of humanity, and their only hope is in the merit of a crucified and risen Saviour.... And the claim to be without sin is, in itself, evidence that he who makes this claim is far from holy. It is because he has no true conception of the infinite purity and holiness of God or of what they must become who shall be in harmony with His character; because he has no true conception of the purity and exalted loveliness of Jesus, and the malignity and evil of sin, that man can regard himself as holy.<sup>40</sup>

We may always be startled and indignant when we hear a poor, fallen mortal exclaiming, "I am holy; I am sinless!" Not one soul to whom God has granted the wonderful view of His greatness and majesty, has ever uttered one word like this. On the contrary, they have felt like sinking down in the deepest humiliation of soul, as they have viewed the purity of God, and contrasted with it their own imperfection of life and character. One ray of the glory of God, one gleam of the purity of Christ, penetrating the soul, makes every spot of defilement painfully distinct, and lays bare

the deformity and defects of the human character.... He loathes himself, as he views the greatness, the majesty, the pure and spotless character of Jesus Christ.<sup>41</sup>

... Let not God be dishonored by the declaration from human lips: "I am sinless; I am holy." Sanctified lips will never give utterance to such presumptuous words.<sup>42</sup>

If the above statements be compared with Wesley's sermon on "Repentance in Believers" considerable agreement in substance between the two writers will become apparent--even though it must be acknowledged that Wesley, in that particular sermon, is speaking primarily of believers *prior to* the attainment of what he calls "entire sanctification." One paragraph of the sermon will suffice to indicate the flavor of the whole:

But, besides those outward omissions, may they not find in themselves *inward defects* without number? Defects of every kind: They have not the love, the fear, the confidence they ought to have, toward God. They have not the love which is due to their neighbour, to every child of man; no, nor even that which is due to their brethren, to every child of God, whether those that are at a distance from them, or those with whom they are immediately connected. They have no holy temper in the degree they ought; they are defective in every thing;--in a deep consciousness of which they are ready to cry out, with H. De Renty, "I am a ground all overrun with thorns;" or, with Job, "I am vile: I abhor myself, and repent as in duet and ashes."<sup>43</sup>  
[[16]]

It is well known that among the Methodists were some who made the claim of sinless perfection boastfully and therefore falsely. These fanatical elements were a great discredit to the movement, and a source of trial and embarrassment to Wesley. Wesley himself never claimed to be without sin. But he felt that it was important that there be *some* living witnesses that the perfection which he advocated was in fact attainable. He himself did not claim to be able to discern infallibly whether a given individual had attained to such a state or not; but if he could be convinced that *no one had*, he said that he would give up his life-long preaching on the subject. Wesley treats of this matter at length in the latter part of his Question and Answer tract on Perfection, to which we referred earlier. Because of its importance, I shall reproduce several passages from the dialogue, in order to show that Wesley's own handling of this question is sensitive, and charitable, and demonstrative of considerable psychological astuteness. Yet at the same time it displays an almost child-like simplicity and ingenuousness.

Q. 17. Suppose, then, one had attained to this. Would you advise him to speak of it?

A. At first, perhaps, he would scarce be able to refrain, the fire would be so hot within him; his desire to declare the loving kindness of the Lord carrying him away like a torrent. But afterwards he might; and then it would be advisable not to speak of it to them who know not God. It is most likely it would only provoke them to contradict and blaspheme. Nor to others without some particular reason, without some particular good in view. And then he should

have especial care to avoid all appearance of boasting, to speak with the deepest humility and reverence, giving all the glory to God. Meantime, let him speak more convincingly by his life than he can do by his tongue.

Q. 18. But would it not be better to be entirely silent? Ought he to speak of it at all?

A. By silence he might avoid many crosses which will naturally and necessarily ensue, if he simply declare, even among believers, what God has wrought in his soul. If, therefore, such an one were to confer with flesh and blood, he would be entirely silent. But this could not be done with a clear conscience, for undoubtedly he ought to speak. Men do not light a candle to put it under a bushel [cf. Mt. 5:15]; much less does the all-wise God. He does not raise such a monument of his power and love to hide it from all mankind. Rather he intends it as a general blessing to those that are simple of heart. He designs thereby not barely the happiness of that individual person, but the animating and encouraging others to follow after the same blessing. His will is that many should see it and rejoice and put their trust in the Lord. Nor does any thing under heaven more quicken the desires of those who "are saved by faith" [cf. Eph. 2:8], than to converse with those whom they believe to have experienced a still higher salvation. This places that salvation full in their view and [Ed.: Duffie did not have the completion of this sentence.] [[17]]

Q. 29. How are we to wait for this change?

A. Not in careless indifference or indolent inactivity, but in vigorous and universal obedience; in a zealous keeping of all the commandments; in watchfulness and painfulness; in denying ourselves and taking up our cross daily; as well as in earnest prayer and fasting and a close attendance on all the ordinances of God. And if any man dream of attaining it any other way, he deceiveth his own soul. It is true we receive it by simple faith; but God does not, will not, give that faith unless we seek it with all diligence in the way which he hath ordained. This consideration may satisfy those who inquire why so few have received the blessing. Inquire how many are seeking it this way and you have a sufficient answer.

Prayer especially is wanting. Who continues instant therein? Who wrestles with God for this very thing? So "ye have not because ye ask not" or because ye ask amiss—namely, "that you may be renewed before you die." Before you die? Will that content you? Nay, but ask that it may be done now, today, while it is called today [cf. Heb 3:13]. Do not call this "setting God a time." Certainly *today* is his time, as well as tomorrow. Make haste, man, make haste! Let

Thy soul break out in strong desire  
Thy perfect bliss to prove!  
Thy longing heart be all on fire,



To be dissolv'd in love!<sup>9</sup>

Q. 30. But may we continue in peace and joy *till* we are perfected in love?

A. Certainly we may, for the kingdom of God is not divided against itself. Therefore let not believers be discouraged from "rejoicing in the Lord always" [cf. Phil. 4:4]. Let them all their life rejoice unto God, provided it be with reverence. Neither need we be anxiously careful about perfection lest we should die before we have attained it. We ought to be "thus careful for nothing," but cheerfully to "make our request known to God" [cf. Phil. 4:6]. And yet we may be, in a sense, pained at the sinful nature which still remains in us. It is good for us to have a piercing sense of this and a vehement desire to be delivered from it. But this should only incite us the more zealously to fly every moment to our strong helper, the more earnestly to "press forward to the prize of our high calling in Christ Jesus" [cf. Phil. 3:14]. And when the sense of our sin most abounds, the sense of his love would much more abound.

Q. 31. How should we treat those who think they have attained?

A. Examine them as closely as possible and exhort them to pray fervently that God would show them all that is in their heart. The most earnest exhortations to abound in every grace and the strongest cautions to avoid all evil are given throughout the New Testament to those who are in the highest state of grace. But this should be done with the utmost tenderness, without any harshness, sternness or sourness. We should carefully avoid the very appearance of anger, unkindness or contempt. Leave it to Satan thus to tempt and to his children to cry out, "Let us examine him with despitefulness and torture, that we may know his meekness and [[18]] prove his patience." If they are faithful to the grace given, even though they mistake, they are in no danger of perishing thereby. No, not if they remain in that mistake till their spirit is returning to God.

Q. 32. But what hurt can it do to deal harshly with them?

A. Either they are mistaken or they are not. If they are, it may destroy their souls; this is nothing impossible, no, nor improbable. It may so enrage or so discourage them that they will sink and rise no more. If they are not mistaken, it may grieve those whom God has not grieved and do much hurt to our own souls. For undoubtedly he that touches them touches, as it were, the apple of God's eye [cf. Zech. 2:8]. If they are indeed full of his Spirit—his peculiar possession, the excellent ones of the earth—to behave unkindly or contemptuously to them is doing no little "despite to the Spirit of grace" [cf.

---

<sup>9</sup> [Ed.: Original footnote number] Cf. *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1742), in G. Osborn, ed., *Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley* (1872), II, 150 (v. 11); see also *The Methodist Hymn Book* (1933), 560, v. 3.

Heb. 10:29]. Hereby likewise we feed and increase in ourselves evil surmising and many wrong tempers. To instance only in one: what self-sufficiency is this to set ourselves up for inquisitors-general, for peremptory judges in these deep things of God? Are we really qualified for the office? Can we pronounce in all cases how far infirmity reaches; what may, and what may not, be resolved into it; what may, in all circumstances, and what may not, consist with perfect love? Can we precisely determine how it will influence the look, the gesture, the tone of voice? If we can, doubtless, "we are the men and wisdom shall die with us" [cf. Job 12:2]!

Q. 33 Are we not apt to have a secret distaste to any who say they are saved from sin?

A. It is very possible we may, and that on several grounds: partly from a concern for the honour of God and a fear lest others should be hurt if these deceive their own souls; partly from a secret envy of those who speak of higher attainments than our own (although they who act from this principle are very rarely conscious of it) partly, from our natural slowness and unreadiness to believe the work of God. Accordingly, they who are most unready to believe them that testify entire sanctification, are likewise remarkably unready to believe the witnesses of justification; and frequently use as harsh and unkind speeches in the one case as in the other.

Q. 34. But if they are *displeased* at our not believing them, is this not full proof against them?

A. According as that displeasure is. If they are angry, it is a proof against them. If they are grieved, it is not. They ought to be grieved if we disbelieve a real word of God and thereby deprive ourselves of the advantage [[19]] we might have received from it. And we may easily mistake this grief for anger, as the outward expressions of both are much alike.

Q. 35. But is it not well to find out those who fancy they have attained when they have not?

A. It is well to do it by mild, close, loving examination. But it is not well to triumph even over these. It is extremely wrong, if we find such an instance, to rejoice, as if we had found great spoils. Ought we not rather to grieve, to be deeply concerned, to let eyes run down with tears? Here is one who seemed to be a living proof of God's power to save to the uttermost. But alas, it is not as we hoped: he has been "weighed in the balance and found wanting" [cf. Dan. 5:27]. And is this a matter of joy? Ought we not to rejoice a thousand times more if we can find nothing but pure love?

"But he is deceived." What then? It is an harmless mistake while he feels nothing but love in his heart. It is a mistake which generally argues great

grace, an high degree both of holiness and happiness. This then should be a matter of real joy to all that are simple of heart; not the mistake itself but that height of grace which for a time occasions it. I rejoice that this soul is always happy, always full of prayer and thanksgiving. I rejoice that he feels no unholy temper, but the pure love of God continually. And I will rejoice if sin is suspended till it is totally destroyed.

Q. 36. Is there then no danger in a man's being thus deceived?

A. Not at the time that he feels no sin. There was danger before, and there will be again, when he comes into fresh trials. But, so long as he feels nothing but love animating all his thoughts and words and actions, he is in no danger. He is not only happy, but safe, under the shadow of the Almighty. And for God's sake let him continue in that love as long as he can. Meantime you may do well to warn him of the danger that will be if his love grow cold and sin revive: even the danger of casting away hope, of being sorrowful above measure and supposing that, because he has not attained yet, therefore he never shall.

Q. 37. But what if none have attained it yet? What if all who think so are deceived?

A. Convince me of this and I will preach it no more. But understand me right. I do not build any doctrine on this or that person. This or any other may be deceived and I am not moved. But if there are none made perfect yet, God has not sent me to preach perfection.<sup>44</sup> [[20]]

Wesley's tender and loving spirit shines through the above dialogue, as does his keen insight into human nature, both unregenerate and regenerate. I surmise that the substantive differences between White's views and Wesley's views on this topic would have been found to be much less than commonly has been supposed had they lived contemporaneously and been able to dialogue together about the subject. I believe that John would have agreed with Ellen that any boastful or prideful claim that "I am sinless!" would be totally out of place, as well as being repugnant. He would also agree that the Christian is never in this life beyond the necessity of exercising eternal vigilance. On her part, I believe that Ellen would have empathized with John's evident desire not to stifle the expression of a sincere soul who testifies, "I feel no anger or resentment in my heart, but only love and praise." (This is a much more modest claim than to say, "I am sinless!") She would agree that even this should not be done "without some particular reason, without some particular good in view." Most surely would she agree with his next two sentences in the above-quoted tract: "And then [when he *does* speak] he should have special care to avoid all appearance of boasting, to speak with the deepest humility and reverence, giving all the glory to God. Meanwhile, let him speak more convincingly by his life than he can do by his tongue."

The matter of *testifying* to the fact when one feels no sinful tempers within one is not a central part of Wesley's reaching about perfection. It is hardly mentioned in the eleven short propositions in which he summed up his essential teaching on the subject,

published in 1764, and about which he stated, "Now, this is all that I mean by perfection." Ellen White would have agreed with the first ten of the eleven propositions, including No.6, which reads, "Is it sinless? It is not worthwhile to contend for a term. It is 'salvation from sin'." Prior to considering No.11—the only one on which there is disagreement—and in order not to miss the perspective of the entire summary, I shall enumerate the first ten points. I shall do so in an even more abbreviated form than Wesley has succinctly put them:

- (1) "There is such a thing as perfection...."
- (2) "It is not so early as justification...."
- (3) "It is not so late as death...." [[21]]
- (4) "It is not absolute. Absolute perfection belongs not to man, nor to angels, but to God alone."
- (5) "It does not make a man infallible; none is infallible while he remains in the body."
- (6) "... It is 'salvation from sin.'"
- (7) "It is 'perfect love' (1 John 4:18).
- (8) "It is improvable.
- (9) "It is amissible, capable of being lost.
- (10) "It is constantly preceded and followed by a gradual work."

Up to this point Ellen White would agree with Wesley on all ten counts (if I understand her correctly, and him correctly). Now, the last one:

- (11) "But is it in itself *instantaneous* or not? ...<sup>45</sup>

Wesley addresses himself to answer this question in two other passages, both of which we shall look at briefly.

Q. 28. Is this death to sin and renewal in love gradual or instantaneous?

- A. A man may be "dying" for some time, yet he does not, properly speaking, "die" til the instant the soul is separated from the body. And in that instant he lives the life of eternity. In like manner he may be "dying to sin" for some time; yet he is not "dead to sin" 'til sin is separated from the soul. And in that instant he lives the full life of love....<sup>46</sup>

Leaving completely aside both (1) recent scientific findings that the "moment of death" is not all that exact, and (2) the belief of some, including this writer, that the soul does not leave the body at the instant of death (both of which considerations are largely irrelevant to the point Wesley is making) it seems to me that Wesley is here speaking of a remarkably non-instantaneous kind of instantaneousness! In *any* gradual process that reaches completion there is an instant at which the process becomes complete. The same could be said of the permeation of an enclosed space with a gas, or the leavening of a lump. There comes an instant when the space is completely permeated, or the lump fully leavened. In this sense it could even be said of a side-track meeting the main line of rails: there is a gradual approximation, and then a final instant of joining together as one. In this sense--and Wesley himself has used this [[22]] sense in the figure of the dying process--the ides of "instantaneous second blessing," for which the Methodists have been so often maligned, takes on a much more benign aspect. It need not imply any sudden "quantum jump," so to speak, as has often been assumed that it must. This understanding of the matter is in line with Wesley's admission that very often "entire sanctification" is attained only very shortly before death. This would also accord with Ellen White's statement that "sanctification is the work of a lifetime," with which idea Wesley, I believe, could agree.

Wesley does not believe, however, that the blessing of complete liberation from sinning--both outward and inward--need be postponed 'til near the death bed. No. Expect it now, for it is by faith and not of works, and God can bestow the gift when He wills, so long as it be earnestly sought after in faith. "Why not?" Wesley would ask. In this sense, he *does* seem to refer to an instantaneous, or even miraculous, work in the soul, performed by God's Spirit. This is how he describes it in another setting:

But does God work this great work in the soul *gradually* or *instantaneously*?" Perhaps it may be gradually wrought in some--I mean in this sense, that they do not advert to the particular moment wherein sin ceases to be. But it is infinitely desirable, were it the will of God, that it should be done instantaneously, that the Lord should destroy sin "by the breath of his mouth" [cf. Job 15:30], in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.<sup>47</sup>

He goes on to say that one should expect it *by faith*; expect it *as you are*; and expect it *now*. "To deny one of them is to deny them all. To allow one is to allow them all."<sup>47</sup> Ellen White's view of the degree of character perfection to be reached by Christ's followers in this world was not a whit less high than was Wesley's. An added element which runs through her writings on the subject is a note of eschatological urgency: "Probationary time is running out. The end of all things is at hand. Only the pure in heart will see God." Ellen White consistently taught that character perfection, a fitness for heaven, will have to have been attained *prior to the moment of glorification*:

When He comes He is not to cleanse us of our sins, to remove from us the defects in our characters, or to cure us of the infirmities of our tempers and dispositions. If wrought for us at all, this work will all be accomplished before that time.... We are now in God's workshop. Many of us are rough stones from the quarry. But as we [[23]] lay hold upon the truth of God, its influence affects us. It elevates us and

removes from us every imperfection and sin, of whatever nature. Thus we are prepared to see the King in His beauty and finally to unite with the pure and heavenly angels in the kingdom of glory. It is here that this work is to be accomplished for us, here that our bodies and spirits are to be fitted for immortality. "48

In a doctoral thesis entitled, *Ellen White's Concept of Sanctification* Richard Leshar summarizes his comparison of White's views with those of Wesley and Luther as follows: "It has been noted that White agrees with Luther's strong emphasis on justification, and with Wesley's strong emphasis on sanctification, and holds the equivalent of a synthesis of the two positions."<sup>49</sup> He sees White as "holding the stronger or more emphatic view of these two theological writers on a given point," the only exception being White's rejection of the idea of an instantaneous change.

\* \* \* \* \*

In retrospect, it can be seen that the areas of agreement between White's and Wesley's views on sanctification and character perfection are extensive. On the essentials there is major agreement. On one or two of the less essential elements there is some disagreement, but these are not of central importance, and they should not unduly detract from the impressive over-all congruence of their views.

(End of Part II)

[[24]]

## **PART III**

### **Relevance to Adventism**

Currently there is an earnest controversy going on within the Adventist church pertaining to the role of sanctification in the Christian life. Although it is seldom spoken of, or even thought of, in this historical perspective, the central question being disputed is whether what Wesley would likely have termed "entire sanctification" can be reached, and will be reached, in this present life. Will the power of the indwelling Christ (i.e., the Holy Spirit) be effective enough to fully fill the believer's heart with love to God and man, and completely free him from all conscious sinning, both outward and inward, at any time prior to the moment of glorification at Christ's second coming? To this question, some say No, and some say Yes.

Those who answer negatively, base their position on a strong affirmation of the power of "original sin" remaining in the believer, which, they affirm, makes complete freedom from sinning impossible in this life. Most of them also hold that Christ had an immaculate conception and was thus exempt from a heritage of original sin, and thereby enabled to live a perfectly sinless life. His perfect obedience is imputed to the believer at justification, and this assures his salvation. Good works then follow, as the fruit of faith;

and there is progression *toward*--but there is never reached--what Wesley would have termed entire sanctification. Those holding this position appeal for support to Luther's strong emphasis upon justification by faith. They interpret the phrase "righteousness by faith"--an expression widely used (with different meanings) in the present dialogue--to mean only Christ's righteousness, only the righteousness which He worked out in His life of perfect obedience, and which He imputes to the sinner.

By contrast, those who answer the above question positively, i.e., those who believe that complete freedom from sinning is actually to be reached in this life, understand this same expression "righteousness by faith" to include not only what Christ has done, and is doing, *for us*, and apart from us, i.e., his "alien" righteousness, but also what, through the Holy Spirit, He does *in us*. It includes not only justification, but regeneration and sanctification. It is not only Christ's [[25]] righteousness *imputed*; it is also His righteousness *imparted*. The latter is the end for which the former is the basis and means. Both are by faith; and both are manifestations of the power and sovereignty of God. Most, but not all, of those who held this position also believe--in company with Karl Barth and others<sup>50</sup>--that Christ in His incarnation condescended to take the nature of Adam as it was affected by the Fall, and that it was in this weakened humanity that He lived his perfectly sinless life, thereby demonstrating that man, too, when similarly connected by faith to the Father, can overcome sin as He did. This Christological issue has roots going back about one hundred years in Adventist history. It is mentioned here only because of its close bearing upon the subject of character perfection, and not in order to pursue the matter further in this paper.

The strong emphasis upon 16th century Reformation theology, which has generally characterized those holding the "perfection not possible" position, has been present among Adventists for about fifteen years. It has been much accentuated in recent months by the publication of a book by an Anglican clergyman from Australia, named Geoffery Paxton. The book is entitled, *The Shaking of Adventists*. The author lauds what he calls the two great "advances" achieved by the Adventist church in the past two decades. These he sees as being (1) "a strong affirmation of original sin, and (2) the rejection of perfection in this life."<sup>51</sup> Correctly sensing strong opposition to these "advances" by some of the church's leadership who are striving to preserve historic Adventist positions, Paxton challenges, "Will the real Adventists please stand up?" This has caused no small stir among the rank and file, as well as much soul searching among the leadership. Right now, the latter is fairly evenly divided; but the "perfection not possible" position appears to be gaining ascendancy. Paxton's recent (April 22, 1978) address and panel discussion (lasting three hours!) at the Loma Linda University Church has lent further impetus to the movement favoring Lutheran above Wesleyan strains in Adventist theology.\* [[26]]

---

\* Note. The Reformation oriented position [Luther and Calvin] has been strongly promoted by an independently published periodical entitled, *Present Truth*. It is beamed especially to the clergy of the Evangelical world. It is edited by Robert Brinsmead; and Paxton is a frequent contributor. A four-authored volume entitled, *Perfection, the Impossible Possibility*, in which both sides of the dialogue are represented, has been published by the Adventist press. Southern Publishing Ass'n. Nashville, Tenn.'75.

The proponents of this movement quote extensively from the 16th century Reformers. They picture themselves as opposing what they consider to be "Tridentine", or even "Pelagian", theology. On the other hand, those who are defending the position that perfection is indeed to be reached in this life, although cognizant of strong support in *Adventist* tradition, have thus far either not been aware of, or have hesitated to enlist the support of, the wealth of historical resources that is present in Wesleyan theology. One factor which may partially account for this hesitancy is the fact that among some Adventist scholars Wesleyan theology has been pictured as being heretical.

### Were Wesley's Views Heretical

An Adventist theologian and seminary professor has published the doctoral thesis which he presented to the Free University of Amsterdam, and which is entitled, *Perfection and Perfectionism*. The latter he defines as being "any form of falsification or religious distortion of the Biblical concept of perfection."<sup>52</sup> His own understanding of the Biblical concept he expounds in the first three-quarters of his thesis. In the final chapter, entitled, "An Analysis and Evaluation of Phenomenal Perfectionism," he answers his introductory question as to "whether there have been individuals or communities in history which *claimed* to follow perfectly the way of Biblical revelation, yet deviated from it fundamentally in one way or another."<sup>53</sup> "In order to stay within prescribed limits" he says, "we can select only some major types of religious perfectionism...." "For the Christian era we will deal with the specific claims of Christian perfection as held by the Encratites, Montanists, Novatians, Pelagius, the Alexandrian Christian Platonists, the medieval monks, and finally with Wesley's concept of perfection."<sup>54</sup> It is in this setting and company that he devotes the final nineteen pages of his thesis to exposing the erroneous "perfectionism" of John Wesley.

### Wesley and Zinzendorf at Gray's Inn Gardens

LaRondelle clearly takes the aide of Zinzendorf in the latter's historic conversation with Wesley on Sept. 3, 1741, in Gray's Inn Gardens, London. An essential portion of the conversation follows:

- Z. I acknowledge no inherent perfection in this life. This is the error of errors. I pursue it through the world with fire and sword.... Christ is our sole perfection. Whoever follows inherent perfection, denies Christ. [[27]]
- W. But I believe that the Spirit of Christ works this perfection in true Christians.
- Z. By no means. All our perfection is in Christ. All Christian perfection is Faith in the blood of Christ. Our whole Christian Perfection is imputed, not inherent. We are perfect in Christ, in ourselves we are never perfect.
- W. I think we strive about words.



LaRondelle comments at this point as follows:

"Wesley obviously did not recognize the basic difference between his own anthropological-empirical perfection and Zinzendorf's Reformation doctrine of Christian perfection. When Zinzendorf continued the dialogue by stating that the Christian is holy in Christ, not in himself (*in se*), Wesley replied, But doesn't he live holy? Doesn't he have a holy heart? Zinzendorf answered, Certainly! Wesley then asked the significant question, Isn't he then, consequently holy *in himself*? To which Zinzendorf replied with the equally significant: "No, no. Only in Christ. He is not holy *in himself*." It can hardly be doubted that Wesley in his position on inherent holiness or righteousness goes fundamentally beyond Luther and Calvin. In this respect he shows a definite affinity to Augustine and the medieval Scholastic tradition in which the sinful nature of men decreases essentially to the proportion that it becomes essentially a holy nature."

[In a footnote, Heick's evaluation is quoted approvingly, "Wesleyism may be called a Protestant version of Franciscan-Jesuit theology."]<sup>55</sup>

In his introduction to the Wesley-Zinzendorf conversation at Gray's Inn Gardens, LaRondelle asks two questions which he apparently considers to be in apposition (i.e., equivalent to each other) but which I believe to be very different questions.

"Did they not live without sin? Were they not essentially, inherently holy? On this vital point Wesley's anthropological thinking clashed with the Lutheran Reformation as represented in Zinzendorf. Wesley had a historic conversation with Zinzendorf ... etc."<sup>56</sup>

The first question in the above passage, "Did they not live without sin?", deals with *performance*, with whether there is actual sinning in the life. The second one, "Were they not essentially, inherently holy?", pertains to *nature* or *state*, and to the presence or absence of *original sin*. LaRondelle treats these two questions as though they were one and the same thing. Zinzendorf similarly fails to distinguish between the two concepts, and *this confusion*, if I mistake not, *lies at the bottom of his dispute with Wesley*. When Wesley asks, "Are they not then righteous in themselves?", he is speaking not about nature or state, but about whether they be acting or behaving righteously or not. Zinzendorf seems to be hearing him as though [[28]] he were talking about some inherent state or condition of sinlessness, which could subsist independently of one's being "in Christ." He naturally rejects this idea which he misperceives Wesley to be expressing. What Wesley is really contending for is the truth that Christ's righteousness becomes actualized in the believer's heart and life, and not merely (but also importantly!) reckoned to his account. He is not denying the "alien righteousness" spoken of by Luther; but he is here insisting that a real righteousness must be manifested in the life--an *imparted* righteousness. This, I believe, is what he means when he says that they will be righteous *in themselves*. He does not mean what Zinzendorf apparently takes him

to mean, that a person could become righteous "in himself," apart from being in Christ. Wesley well knows that this would be impossible. This is not what he is saying.

What relevancy does the foregoing have to the cross currents in Adventism? Why do I include LaRondelle's evaluation of the Wesley-Zinzendorf conversation in this paper? First, because it shows, along with his whole handling of Wesley, a strong rejection of Wesleyan perfection in favor of Reformation emphases. Second, because I believe it reveals wherein this Adventist scholar, in company with Zinzendorf, has fundamentally misunderstood Wesley by not properly distinguishing between *sinning* and a sinful *state*.

Third, because in the current Adventist dialogue objection is frequently raised against the perfection-possible-now position on the grounds that it necessarily leads to an "inherent righteousness apart from Christ", or to a "righteousness that does not depend upon the merits of Christ's atoning sacrifice", or to a down-grading of the all-sufficiency of the work that Christ has done *for us* and apart from us, or to self-glorification, or to works righteousness, or to "navel gazing", etc. All of these *non-sequitur* reproaches, as well as many similar ones, have much in common with, and their roots can be traced back to, the fundamental dispute between Wesley and Zinzendorf in the Gray's Inn Gardens. An awareness of the historical antecedents of current controversies, it seems to me, can be helpful to all concerned. [[29]]

### An Anthropological Dualism

Also relevant to present cross currents in Adventism is LaRondelle's objection to Wesley's "problematic hamartiology"<sup>57</sup> or doctrine of sin.

On the basis of his presupposed substantial dichotomy of body and soul Wesley distinguished sharply (sinless) perfection of the soul and (sinless) perfection of the body....<sup>58</sup>

This essential separation of moral soul-perfection and physical perfection which is based on his unscriptural anthropological dichotomy ... forced Wesley, however, also to postulate a fateful dualism in his hamartiology.

Not satisfied with the deep sin consciousness of the Reformers who only theoretically distinguished between *sins* as acts, and original *Sin* or sinful nature as the wellspring of sinful promptings, Wesley went on to create his dualistic and problematic doctrine of "proper" and "improper" sins. A sin "properly so called" he defined as "a voluntary transgression of a known law". From such sins, Wesley maintained, we could be perfectly freed...<sup>59</sup>

Adventists are naturally receptive to reasoning that is ostensibly based upon the Biblical concept of the unity of man *vs.* the psycho-somatic dualism of Grecian thought, because that concept has a fundamental bearing upon their belief in conditional immortality and the inseparability of body and soul. The dualism which LaRondelle objects to in Wesley's thought, however, is of a different order; and it has little if any

bearing upon what happens to the unity of man at death. The real objection--I believe it can be seen--is to Wesley's insistence that one can be completely free from sinning while still encumbered with a sinful body. Regardless of whether or not this concept can accurately be called a dualism, it lay at the heart of Wesley's life-long passion for entire sanctification, for Christian perfection of character. When he objects to the concept of a "sinful body" as being an unscriptural absurdity, and avers that "only the soul can be the seat of sin"<sup>60</sup> he is thereby attempting to clarify the confusion that is inherent in the charge of dualism. He is not denying that the body is the seat of *imperfections*; but in his understanding imperfections (which may issue in mistakes) are not real sins, i.e., not sins properly so called.

One of the not obvious yet important reasons why the proponents of the position that perfection is impossible in this life strongly object [[30]] to Wesley's distinction between sins properly so called and mistakes is because it is only as all mistakes, imperfections and shortcomings are included in the category of sins that it becomes incontestable that all mortals are bound to be sinning in some degree throughout all of their lives. This is what the anti-perfectionists are wanting to prove, that it is impossible for sinful man not to keep on sinning--at least in some degree. Wesley, on the contrary, felt that it is not necessary for sinful man to keep on sinning in *any* degree, once he has received the gift of entire sanctification. Although to reject Wesley's distinction, and thereby call all imperfections and shortcomings sins, would prove the unattainability of freedom from sinning, the reverse would not be true. To accept as valid Wesley's distinction between sins properly so called and mistakes would not establish in the minds of the anti-perfectionists the attainability of freedom from all sins properly so called, because they do not even believe that all of *this* class of sins can be completely conquered in this life. Thus, while their *ideal* (and unattainable) standard is higher than the Wesleyan, their *attainable* goal is *lower*!

Outler comments that "Wesley often complained against both the Romanists and Calvinists that they 'set Christian perfection *too high*,' i.e., 'in the state of glory only.' From their side, the Calvinists retorted that *he* set it 'too low' ...."<sup>61</sup>

The same charge is repeatedly being made in the Adventist dialogue. Those maintaining that perfection is to be reached in this life are being reproached for holding "too low a concept of sin." A contemporary Nazarene theologian, Mildred Bangs Wynkoop, perceptively "sees through" this charge and reveals it for what it is. In her critical evaluation of "Contemporary Evangelical Perfection Theories" she writes:

But there is another and less obvious form of perfectionism which must be pointed out. It partakes of a dualism just as surely as any of the above views. *It separates between the ideal of legal standing and the practical possibility of human perfectibility.* It cannot relate spiritual realities to the capacities of human nature. It teaches that character can be transferred from one person to another--in this case Christ's character and our own. It redefines and then hides human sin behind the legal sentence of acquittal and supposes that men may continue in sin, yet profess Christ's own righteousness as their own. The dualism between fact and fiction is a serious concern to those who take moral integrity seriously. [[31]]

This kind of perfectionism says that the soul is eternally secure regardless of its involvement in sin because man's legal status has changed in God's mind because of Christ. In effect, it abrogates law and moral obligation so far as soteriology is concerned. Though usually a good moral life is encouraged, it is not considered necessary to salvation.... In the interest of a "serious view of sin" it includes all possible divergence from perfection in its concept of sin.<sup>62</sup>

The above depiction is relevant to certain trends that are developing in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Wynkoop concludes this section of her book, *A Theology of Love*, by stating: "Rather than Christian perfection standing in danger of perfectionism, it is the guard against it. Everything in Christian perfection stands in absolute contradistinction to perfectionism."<sup>63</sup>

### Wesley Faulted for not Relating Sanctification to Original Sin.

Another Adventist writer that has wrestled--rather unsympathetically--with Wesley's views on perfection is Edward W. H. Vick. In an article entitled "John Wesley's Teaching Concerning Perfection", Vick especially faults Wesley for "failure to make explicit the relation between original sin and sanctification."<sup>64</sup> While there is neither time nor space in this paper to deal adequately with Wesley's treatment of original sin, the subject does bear upon cross currents in Adventism, and Vick's observations deserve mention. His point is well taken that "the relating of original sin to the process-state of sanctification had not been carried out by Wesley as it might have been."<sup>65</sup> Vick sees Wesley as primarily concerned with the function of original sin prior to conversion, where it highlights the indispensability of repentance as a solution to the state of man's corruption. Vick sees Wesley as confused and/or non-committal about the role of original sin and what happens to it after conversion and during sanctification. He poses a welter of questions and uncertainties regarding Wesley's understanding of perfection:

This perfection of which Wesley speaks does not allow the individual to be independent of Jesus Christ: it is not a perfection which fulfils the whole law. What, we may ask, is it then? Is Christian perfection a consciousness that he does not need to be forgiven? But Wesley says that one who is sanctified makes mistakes. Is it another name for justification? But Wesley distinguishes between that and perfection. *Is it a way of saying that original sin is eradicated? But Wesley would not commit himself on that question.* Is the doctrine of perfection a way of restating the meaning of Christian assurance? If that is so, why did not Wesley claim it himself? But then, if one is saved, the assurance [[32]] should come at conversion? Or is there a progress toward a conviction of security that presses doubts, which are initially present and continue for a time to persist, out of the consciousness? Is the feeling that there is no known sin a development in the life of the believer later than the experience of conversion? Do we have here a two-stage doctrine of conversion, where at the second stage we reach the plateau level, after having vanquished known sin from the life and so from the consciousness?<sup>66</sup>

Vick then compares Wesley's view of sanctification with that of Schleiermacher, and apparently favors the latter. [!]

Schleiermacher's assertion of the conscious committal of sin after conversion in the state of sanctification is a more adequate one than Wesley's. The latter appears to be creating an abstract ideal which does not take into full consideration the presence and the intermittent manifestation of original sin. That he virtually but vaguely recognizes this is evident in his saying that the faults of the sanctified man, while not sins, still require the blood of the Saviour to atone for them. What can these faults be but the coming to expression of the original sin which Wesley has desired to take so seriously?<sup>67</sup>

Finally, he refers approvingly to Luther's concept of *simul justus et peccator* as being "closer to experience, and thus more realistic."<sup>68</sup> He ends the article with this sentence: "To continue in this condition of faith in spite of conscious sin--a conscious sin which is a diminishing quantity--is sanctification." Vick's concept of sanctification is readily seen to fall short of Wesley's concept of entire sanctification. It is more in line with Luther's understanding--or even Schleiermacher's.

\* \* \* \* \*

It was noted earlier that Wesley was often accused of holding a view of perfection that was "too low." [Too low compared to the ideal, but unattainable, goal held by his accusers.] In actuality, however, the real objection to the standard of perfection upheld by Wesley was not that it was too low, *but that it was too high*. This was the root cause of much of the vehement opposition to his teaching which Wesley endured throughout his long life-time. "Your standard is too high. It discourages us. What's more, we don't want to be that perfect, even if it were possible, which we don't believe that it is, because of our sinful natures." This is why so many people hated the doctrine of perfection, why they found it such an offence. Wesley begins his sermon on Christian Perfection by observing: [[33]]

There is scarce any expression in holy writ, which has given more offence than this. The word *perfect* is what many cannot bear. The very sound of it is an abomination to them; and whosoever *preaches perfection* (as the phrase is) that is, asserts that it is attainable in this life, runs great hazard of being accounted by them worse than a heathen man or a publican.<sup>68</sup>

At the close of his Plain Account of Christian Perfection, Wesley refers to the unreasonable opposition which his teaching evoked, and pleads eloquently for the acceptance of this doctrine which he considered to be not his, but his Lord's. After he has drawn the full picture of his teaching on perfection "without either disguise or covering", he says, "I would now ask any impartial person, What is so frightful therein?

Whence is all this outcry, which, for these twenty years and upwards, has been made throughout the kingdom; as if all Christianity were destroyed, and all religion torn up

by the roots? Why is it, that the very name of perfection has been cast out of the mouths of Christians; yea, exploded and abhorred, as if it contained the most pernicious heresy? Why have the Preachers of it been hooted at, like mad dogs, even by men that fear God...?

They wanted, they sought, occasion against me; and here they found what they sought. "This is Mr. Wesley's doctrine! Ha preaches perfection!" He does; yet this is not his doctrine any more than it is yours, or any one's else, that is a Minister of Christ. For it is His doctrine, peculiarly, emphatically his; it is the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Those are his words, not mine: "Ye shall be perfect, as your Father who is in heaven is perfect." And who says, ye shall not; or, at least, not till your soul is separated from the body? It is the doctrine of St. Paul, the doctrine of St. James, of St. Peter, and St. John; and no otherwise Mr. Wesley's, than as it is the doctrine of every one who preaches the pure and the whole gospel. I tell you, as plain as I can speak, where and when I found this. I found it in the oracles of God, in the Old and New Testament; when I read them with no ether view or desire but to save my own soul. But whosoever this doctrine is, I pray you, what harm is there in it? Look at it again; survey it on every side, and that with the closest attention. In one view, it is purity of intention, dedicating all the life to God. It is the giving God all our heart; it is one desire and design ruling all our tempers. It is the devoting, not a part, but all our soul, body, and substance to God. In another view, it is all the mind which was in Christ, enabling us to walk as Christ walked. It is the circumcision of the heart from all filthiness, all inward as well as outward pollution. It is a renewal of the heart in the whole image of God, the full likeness of him that created it. In yet another, it is the loving God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves. Now, take it in which of these views you please, (for there is no material difference,) and this is the whole and sole perfection which I have believed and taught for these forty years, from the year 1725 to the year 1765.<sup>69</sup> [[34]]

Referring to those who would accuse him of down-playing justification, he continues:

We allow, *we contend* that we are justified freely through the righteousness and blood of Christ. And why are you so hot against us, because we expect likewise to be sanctified wholly through his Spirit?

In similar vein, he concludes his Sermon LXXVI:

"No," says a great man, [Zinzendorf?] "this is the error of errors: I hate it from my heart. I pursue it through all the world with fire and sword." Nay, why so vehement? ... Why are those that oppose salvation from sin (few excepted) so eager,--I had almost said, furious? Are you fighting ... "for God and your country?" for all you have in the world? for all that is near and dear unto you? for your liberty, your life? In God's name, why are you so fond of sin? What good has it ever done you? What good is it ever likely to do you, either in this world, or in the world to come? And why are you so violent against those that hope for a deliverance from it? ... If you could

persuade us to despair of that victory, we should give over the contest.... Bear then with *us*, as we do with *you*; and see whether the Lord will not deliver us! whether he is not able, yea, and willing, "to save them to the uttermost that come unto God through him."<sup>70</sup>

Significantly, Ellen White quotes Wesley extensively in the *Great Controversy* where he is defending his doctrine of perfection. She quotes Wesley in part as follows:

"Others allege, 'Their doctrine is too strict; they make the way to heaven too narrow.' And this is in truth the original objection, (as it was almost the only one for some time,) *and is secretly at the bottom of a thousand more*, which appear in various forms. But do they make the way to heaven any narrower than our Lord and His apostles made it? Is their doctrine stricter than that of the Bible?..."

Still quoting Wesley, Ellen White continues:

"If their doctrine is stricter than this, they are to blame; but you know in your conscience it is not. And who can be one jot less strict without corrupting the word of God? Can any steward of the mysteries of God be found faithful if he change any part of that sacred depositum? No. He can abate nothing, he can soften nothing; he is constrained to declare to all men, 'I may not bring down the Scripture to your taste. You must come up to it, or perish forever.'"<sup>71</sup>

That Ellen White thus chose to quote Wesley extensively on this point reveals clearly that she stood right with him, shoulder to shoulder, in his exaltation of the law of God as an attainable standard for Christ's followers. [[35]]

### Summary and Forward Look

We have looked at Wesley's views on sanctification and compared them with those of Ellen White. Wide areas of agreement have been noted. We have spoken of two diverging trends in contemporary Adventism, an older one having strong affinities with Wesleyan theology, and a newer one claiming greater alignment with the sixteenth century Reformers. Adventists picture themselves as having been commissioned to help carry forward and onward the work of earlier reformers. They believe in a progressive restoration of gospel truths that were largely lost sight of during the dark ages. They are united in their appreciation of the tremendous advances effected by Luther and Calvin in their day, especially in regard to the great Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. This writer deplores the fact that a growing and influential segment of Adventism fails to view the Wesleyan emphasis upon sanctification and character perfection as a further advance, as a balancing corrective to what in some respects had become a unilateral over-emphasis upon justification to the relative neglect of a due co-emphasis upon sanctification. He finds it especially deplorable that some Adventist theologians who have made very valuable contributions in other areas have been led--apparently through the otherwise laudable influence of their study of Luther and Calvin--to where they feel

obliged to downgrade and depreciate Wesley to such a degree that he is classified along with Pelagius and the medieval monks. To the large extent that Ellen White places at least as much emphasis upon entire sanctification, upon complete freedom from all outward and inward sinning in this life, as did John Wesley--to that extent is a depreciation of Wesley at the same time a depreciation of Ellen White, who was one of the guiding spirits of historic Adventism. This writer sees Ellen White standing closer to Wesley, on the subject of character perfection, than she stands to some present-day theologians in her own church.

Adventists have traditionally looked forward to a time, just prior to the *parousia* when all of the truths of apostolic Christianity will have been restored and exemplified in the lives of true Christians of all denominations. At that time, when evil will have come to full fruition, in a world in rebellion against God, the living witness of [[36]] these true Christians will testify to the power and sovereignty of Him who is able to keep them from falling and to present them faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. (Jude 24)

"And in their mouth was found no guile:  
for they are without fault before  
the throne of God." Revelation 14: 5.

David Duffie, M.D.  
12739 Garden Avenue  
Grand Terrace, Calif.  
92324

[Ed.: Address no longer valid] [[37]]

## FOOTNOTES

1. Outler, p. 284. (Only the first clause appears in the WW 11:394 abridgment, not the last two.)
2. Works of Wesley [WW] Vol.11, p. 394.
3. WW 11:401.
4. WW 11:401.
5. WW 11:442.
6. WW 11:394.
7. WW 11:395.
8. WW 11:396.
9. WW 11:396f.
10. WW 6:417.
11. WW 11:375.
12. Outler, p. 259, from *Sermons on Several Occasions*, Vol. III.
13. Outler, p. 260.
14. Outler, p. 260.



15. Outler, p. 267.
16. WW 5:153-5.
17. WW 6:17.
18. Col. 1:27.
19. 1 John 3:3.
20. WW 6:18f.
21. WW 6:19.
22. Outler, p. 253.
23. White, E. G., *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 1. p. 17f.
24. *Ibid.* p. 18.
25. *Ibid.* p. 22f.
26. White, E. G., *Review and Herald*, June 4, 1895. *Messages to Young People*, p. 35.
27. White, E.G., *The Great Controversy*, p. 264. [[38]]
28. *Review and Herald*, Dec. 23, 1884. [Ed.: Correct reference: Oct. 16, 1888, par. 3]
29. *Life Sketches*, p. 237.
30. *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 565.
31. *Counsels to Teachers*, p. 451 [Ed.: Correct page: 491].
32. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, Vol. 6, p. 1076.
33. *Our High Calling*, p. 214.
34. *Sons and Daughters of God*, p. 102. [Ed.: NOTE a second footnote 34 following.]
- 34.(2) *Selected Messages*, Vol. 2, p. 394f. [Ed.: Correct: Vol. 1]
35. In a letter to John Newton, dated May 14, 1765 [Letters IV, pp. 297-300], Wesley states: "I think on justification ... just as Mr. Calvin does. In this respect I do not differ from him an hair's breadth."
36. *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 365. [Ed.: Correct page: 366]
37. *Desire of Ages*, p. 555. [Ed.: Emphases supplied]
38. *Testimonies to Ministers*, p. 30.
39. *The Great Controversy*, p. 678.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 471f. [Ed.: Second portion is p. 473]
41. *Review and Herald*, Oct. 16, 1888.
42. *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 561.
43. WW 5:163.
44. Outler, p. 289 and pp. 294-7.
45. WW 11:441f.
46. Outler, p. 294.
47. Outler, p. 282. [Ed.: Both footnote numbers "47" are apparently from this same source.]
48. *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 3, p. 355. [Ed.: Correct: Vol. 2]
49. Leshner, W. R., *Ellen G. White's Concept of Sanctification*, p. 283f.
50. Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, I, 2, p. 151f. See also,  
Johnson, Harry, *The Humanity of the Saviour*, The Epworth Press, London, '62.
51. Page 119.
52. LaRondelle, H.K., *Perfection and Perfectionism*, p. 246.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 247. [[39]]
54. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 319f.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 319.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 323.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 317.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 318.
60. WW 6:418.
61. Outler, p. 283.
62. Wynkoop, M.B., *A Theology of Love*, p. 279f.
63. Page 283.
64. Vick, E. W. H., "John Wesley's Teaching Concerning Perfection," p. 213.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 214.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 217.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 217. [Ed.: NOTE a second footnote 34 following.]
- 68.(2) WW 6:1.
69. WW 11:443f.
70. WW 6:424.
71. Page 259f. [[40]]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. 1, No. 2, T & T Clark, Edinburgh.
- Johnson, Harry, *The Humanity of the Saviour*, The Epworth Press, London, 1962.
- LaRondelle, H. K., *Perfection and Perfectionism*, Andrews University Press, Berrien Springs, Michigan, 1971.
- Leshner, W. R., *Ellen G. White's Concept of Sanctification*, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970.
- Outler, Albert C., *John Wesley*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1964.
- Paxton, Geoffrey J., *The Shaking of Adventism*, Baker Book Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977.
- Tuttle, Robert G., Jr., *John Wesley, his Life and Theology*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978.
- Vick, E. W. H., "John Wesley's Teaching Concerning Perfection," an article in *Seminary Studies*, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, Vol. IV, No. 2, July, 1966.
- Wesley, John, *Standard Works*, Vol.s 5, 6, 11.
- White, Ellen, G.

The following books, published by Adventist presses:

*Acts of the Apostles*  
*Counsels to Teachers*  
*Desire of Ages*  
*Great Controversy*  
*Life Sketches*  
*Messages to Young People*  
*Our High Calling*

*Selected Messages, Vol.s 1 and 2*  
*Sons and Daughters of God*  
*Testimonies for the Church, Vol.s 1 and 5.*  
*Testimonies to Ministers.*

Wynkoop, Mildred Bangs, *A Theology of Love, the Dynamic of Wesleyanism*, Beacon Hill Press, Kansas City, Missouri, 1972.

[[Back Cover]]

There is scarce any expression in Holy Writ which has given more offence than this. The word *perfect* is what many cannot bear. The very sound of it is an abomination to them; and whosoever *preaches perfection*, that is, asserts that it is attainable in this life, runs great hazard of being accounted by them worse than a heathen man or a publican.

'No,' says a great man [Zindendorf] 'this is the error of errors. I hate it from my heart. I pursue it through all the world with fire and sword.'

Nay, why so vehement? ... Why are those that oppose salvation from sin (few excepted) so eager,--I had almost said, furious? ... In God's name, why are you so fond of sin? What good has it ever done you? What good is it ever likely to do you, either in this world, or in the world to come? And why are you so violent against those that hope for a deliverance from it?...

If you could persuade us to despair of that victory, we should give over the contest. . Bear then with us, as we do with you; and see whether the Lord will not deliver us whether He is not able, yea, and willing, 'to save them to the uttermost that come unto God through Him.'

--John Wesley