

such cases as Luther's and D'Aubigne's. Another is that, practically always perhaps, and theologically often, we separate between the two in our views and efforts, to secure them to ourselves, until we are experimentally taught better. We have one process for acceptance with God, that is faith; and another for progress in holiness, that is works. After having found acceptance in Jesus by faith, we think to go on to perfection by strugglings and resolves, by fastings and prayers, not knowing the better way of taking Christ for our sanctification, just as we have already taken Him for our justification. We see and believe in Jesus as our atonement on earth, and our Advocate and Mediator in heaven, but we fail to see and receive Him as our ever-present *Saviour from sin* now here with us in the hourly scenes of the daily journey heavenward. The consequence is, that as in the first instance we tried all sorts of expedients except the right one, and failed in every one, until at last the Lord opened our eyes to see both our own folly in all these vain attempts, and at the same breath to see the wisdom of God in giving us His Son our Saviour as *the Way*; even so now again in the second, we try all, and all in vain, until again in this new and equal necessity we find anew that all our ways are vain, and that Jesus is *the Way*.

These two facts will account for these cases of "second conversion." Let it not be supposed, however, that in every instance there must be two distinct experiences, separated by a gulf of vain strugglings. It is not necessary that there should be one even. Let Jesus be received as the all in all, and that is enough! Whoever can say, "Jesus is mine, and I am His—that He is complete, and I am complete in Him," and say the truth, has the experience, whether he has an experience to relate or not. He has the Rock of Ages for his foundation, and all the driving storms, and beating tempests, and swelling floods of time and eternity will not sweep it from under him. Christ, without any marked experience whatever, is all-sufficient; but the most brilliant experience without Christ would be only quicksand in the day of trial. Loyola's experience was as brilliant as Paul's, and Mohammed's was even more wonderful than either, just as some counterfeits are really finer in appearance than the genuine; but that did not make the great Jesuit a saint, except in his own eyes, and in the Romish calendar, nor the false prophet an angel anywhere outside of his own sensual paradise.

Some voyagers heavenward trouble themselves all the live-long voyage, clear to the very entrance of the haven of rest, with doubts whether after all they have really set sail at all or not, because they had not the same struggles and difficulties in hoisting anchor, and getting the canvas spread to the breezes of heaven, that others describe! Surely it should be enough that they are on shipboard, with anchor up, sails set, steam working, outward bound, ploughing the deep at the rate of fifteen knots an hour! What if they did set out in the night time, or in a fog? Is it not enough that the captain and pilot knew how to find the way, and that they are now out in the sunlight, on the open sea, and bounding over the billows to the desired haven?

This by the way. It is certainly pleasant to have distinct recollections of one's conversion, and also of the moment and the circumstances when full trust for full salvation was first reposed in Jesus; but this is by no means indispensable. To be in the way, to have Jesus for the all in all, is the great thing.

There remains yet one thing more to be done before closing these explanations. In the preceding examples and comparisons, certain differences were shewn between the three classes, which, for convenience, we named Lutherans, Wesleyans, and Oberlinians. It will be important to note again, first the points both of agreement and of difference between them, and then to give the reasons of both their differences and their agreements.