

ism, and held it strenuously without having come into the experience at all. The two things, therefore, have no necessary connection whatever, or the examples must go for nothing.

Two illustrations may serve to make this entirely clear. In a little book, which at the time excited some attention, and induced an answer from the late Venerable Leonard Woods, D.D., "Mahan on Christian Perfection;" the author, in a narrative near the close of the book, very naively informs us that, first at Oberlin, at a time when there was deep and increasing religious interest, he himself and Mr. Finney became deeply impressed with the necessity of greater holiness of heart, and after a period of intense anxiety and earnest struggling, first one, then the other, came out into the light to see that the Lord Jesus Christ must be, and was their sanctification, as already they had before received Him as their justification.

They began, then, to preach the full Gospel as they then for the first apprehended it. Power attended the preaching. Many were impressed in like manner, and many in like manner came into the light of this second conversion. So the matter went on for *six months*, while as yet *there was no adoption of either the theory or the name of perfectionism*. Six whole months it was a nameless experience, or at most called second conversion. After a while, like the Israelites in the wilderness, when the bread of heaven was given them in the dew of the morning, they began to say one to another, "Manna! Manna! What is it? what is it?" Then, as the author informs us, there was quite a shock given them—a thrill of revolt, when one asked in one of their meetings, "Is this Christian perfection?" They hushed the question, but hugged it. A thousand pities that they had not dropped it! But no. By and by, when college vacation came, they two, Mr. Mahan and Mr. Finney, took the question to New York with them—as yet, three months after the experience received, an open question to be discussed and decided. While in New York, after long deliberation, they accepted and adopted the name Christian perfection, or entire sanctification, and elaborated their own peculiar theory according to their own peculiar philosophy and theology; and with this returned to Oberlin to make it the headquarters and stronghold of the system we have named the Oberlinian.

Now this fact proves one thing beyond the possibility of successful controversy, viz., that in their own case the experience they described and the theory they imbibed are and were separate and distinct, having no necessary connection whatever with each other.

Another, a very different case, will serve to make the separation wider and plainer still.

One, who in these pages shall be nameless, though known to the writer, became deeply interested in the subject from reading the memoirs of eminent Christians—James Brainerd Taylor, first of all. By and by he came to associate the terms of the Wesleyans and the ideas of the Oberlinians with the experience narrated by Taylor. At first it was a hard matter for him to gain his own consent to accept these terms and ideas, and still harder to be willing to acknowledge it. But he did it. The experience he believed to be true, and saw to be excellent. His heart yearned for it. He was not satisfied with what he felt in himself, and saw in others. He was sure there was something better within hopeful reach, in the gospel. And, alas for him! perfectionism was thrown square in his way. He must accept it and acknowledge it—so he verily thought—or fail of the blessedness he saw in prospect and longed to enjoy.

As God in mercy would have it, this obstacle did not stop him as it has stopped thousands—stopped them, to use a paradox, before they had started. He urged his way onward. The struggle was long and severe. His was the