

and in so doing some very startling facts have been brought to our notice in the modern teaching of holiness. One is that the *relative* value given to doctrines, in the Bible, is seldom observed in modern writings and pulpit utterance on the subject of holiness.

We have carefully gone over the books of the New Testament and found one hundred and fifty-six passages referring to the "Promise of the Father" as a distinct gift, apart from, or over and above all others. Now, accepting this as the standard value of importance to be attached to this doctrine, we think it not out of place to judge of the relative importance of other doctrines by the number of references thereto.

Let us now take an excursion amongst the various teachings of holiness writers and preachers, and we will be somewhat startled, if not edified, by our observations.

Take the subject of the *baptism of fire*, for instance, and we find it but twice mentioned. And in this case the same words of John are simply repeated by two evangelists, so that, virtually, there is but one allusion to fire as connected in any way with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. That is, whilst the apostles—judged by their writings—never used the expression, modern teachers use it so freely as often to make it the most prominent of their expressions in teaching holiness. Is this *Scriptural* teaching?

Again, take the dress question, which has but *two* passages directly bearing on it in the New Testament, and therefore its relative value, when compared to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, is as one to seventy-eight. That is, that any professor of holiness should make reference to the *Penecostal* fulness of the Spirit seventy-eight times to every one allusion to dress in its connection with the subject of holiness. We ask, Is this *Scriptural* proportion kept up at holiness camp-meetings, and in holiness literature?

And now we come to a subject which will awaken the watchful, jealous fears of some of the very best teachers of holiness. We refer to the doctrine of heart purity. Judging of its relative value, as a doctrine, as compared with the doctrine of the fulness of the Spirit, by modern teaching, as exemplified at holiness

gatherings, and in holiness periodicals, we would expect far more prominence given to it by the writers of the New Testament than to the other.

But what is our disappointment to find that whilst the figures 156 represent the relative value of the one, eight represents that of the other. That is that the first Christians, judged by their writings, only regarded the doctrine of heart purity, being cleansed from all sin, as a twentieth part of the value of the other, and that, therefore, modern preachers, to be scriptural, should preach twenty sermons on the *Penecostal* fulness of the Spirit, to one on the doctrine of being cleansed from inbred sin. Would not this, we ask, revolutionize the present teaching of the subject of holiness?

But, further, if these eight passages be examined minutely, they will not be found nearly so explicit in teaching the doctrine of cleansing from all sin as a second blessing, as that of the gift of the Holy Ghost is in the other passages.

In dwelling on this latter thought we remark further, that we are impressed with the fact that the apostles evidently regarded the gift of the Holy Ghost in *Pentecostal* fulness, as the distinct second blessing. So clear does this appear to us that we think no sincere lover of truth can arise from the close study of the numerous passages which refer to this subject without sharing this conviction with us.

But the case is very different when we study the eight passages which more or less remotely refer to heart purity as a second blessing, subsequent to justification; for in every instance there is a lack of definiteness which suggests doubt as to whether or no the teaching of the passage is, that being cleansed from inbred sin was, in the mind of the writer, the great second blessing of the New Covenant.

Indeed the thought will intrude itself, that heart purity is classed with love, joy and peace as simply one of the graces of the Spirit, and that exalting it to any higher place than one of the many results of the reception of the *Pentecostal* gift of the Spirit, is to be out of harmony with apostolic teaching.

We are aware that it is argued that