

tion as *the conscious crisis of religious life*, conditioned on faith, preceded by repentance, and crowned by the witness of the Spirit; and a sad day will it be for Methodism when she forsakes this clear foundation of conscious experience, and begins to trust in any occult work, supposed to be wrought secretly, by unconditional grace, and in unconscious states of existence. It is fraught with all the dangers of baptismal regeneration, or of unconditional election. It was difficult even for John Wesley himself to break away from the old notion of regeneration as a mysterious work wrought in baptism. Rather than deny the old church doctrine he was inclined to look upon men generally as backsliders, and speaks of the time when he himself sinned away the grace of his baptism. But all this belonged not to the Methodist Arminian theology which he was founding, but to the churchism which he was leaving behind. And the whole evangelical Christianity of our day has taken up the central idea of his theology, that the new birth is the conscious crisis of religious experience preceded by repentance, conditioned upon faith, wrought by the Word and Spirit of God, and completed in the full assurance of Sonship. To depart from this view is to reduce the work of the church to a process of *education*, as distinguished from the work of *evangelization*.

III. We are now prepared to see how these two relations limit each other, and in fact we see that they do not limit each other, until *they both begin to work*