A PHILOSOPHY OF HOLINESS

The rational problems which accompany the doctrine of holiness all seem to converge on one point, namely, a lack of understanding of the moral nature of man and the fundamentally moral nature of every step in redemption. Whenever the essentially moral nature of the doctrine is obscured by any incidental part of it, logical questions begin. "Holiness" theology by the very commitment which the name gives to it is morally structured and must be kept so, consistently, in every facet of its doctrine and expression. This is absolutely foundational and we cannot go behind this truth to any other for support except to the person of God who guarantees the meaning of holiness.

Holiness theologians and preachers so universally relate these two concepts that it seems unnecessary to spend time defending the statement. But at this point it is evident that questions arise which need to be recognized and answered.

The Doctrine of Holiness is not primarily a logic in the way that a set of conclusions systematically drawn from syllogistically arranged premises would be. It is rather a rationally formulated system of theological convictions which at every point require the critical analysis of Scripture to defend and maintain. The system does not inform Biblical exegesis, but is informed by it.

This is not a repudiation of philosophy but a statement of the philosophy which lies behind the doctrine of holiness. (It must not be supposed that any such formal statement is clearly articulated in any authoritative work, but it is the deduction of the author made on the basis of a very wide examination of the extant holiness literature and
a life-long acquaintance with holiness preaching). More specifically, it may be said that the attitude toward Scripture which makes it so uniquely important to the preaching and systematization of holiness doctrine, arises out of a conviction that the Bible speaks primarily to the moral condition of men and not simply to any one part of man, e.g. to the mind or emotions apart from the whole man.

Although "moral" is not a Biblical word it is a term which well expresses the central concern of the whole of Scripture. It is the conviction of the author that "moral" when properly understood can bear almost the whole weight of the meaning of the Biblical message and hence becomes a proper word to use in a statement of the philosophy of holiness. It can, it is believed, explain the doctrine and become a principle of Biblical interpretation. In defence of this it is only necessary to point out that the central thrust of Biblical teaching is moral responsibility, not ever a relaxing of moral sensitivity.

The word moral has been chosen because it expresses, popularly, an existential dimension. It has been seen that the Bible is vitally related to human experience and human experience is only intelligible in a moral environment. Moral is a word that helps to emphasize the unitary principle of personality. Biblical psychology does not permit a metaphysical distinction of entities within human personality. Men do not think apart from will or make decisions without the approval of the whole man. One who is dominated by emotions, alone, is irrational and not a normal human being. No scientist can be so objective and detached from moral concerns that his judgment is unaffected by what he is in himself. He is first of all, as a person, morally committed, and his entire life is a reflection of the kind of commitment he has
Moral commitment is the whole man in practical devotion to an object – or objects – which in turn, gives quality to his judgments and actions. This whole-man commitment to a governing center is a sort of moral presupposition, (presuming for the moment that moral can be distinguished from, hence become an analogy for, an intellectual or philosophical presupposition), to which every thought, word, deed, imagination and desire is indebted.

The word "moral", however, must be, for our purpose, carefully stabilized in meaning. It is an arbitrarily chosen word because its connotations are useful. But it must be meticulously guarded from unwanted and undesirable meanings which neutralize and actually pervert the central idea. Etymologically, it shares the history of "ethics". Moral, is the Anglicized equivalent of forms which support either word. One is the synonym for the other. In common usage however, there is detected a distinction between them which will be forced for the purpose of this study. For the moment, the simple statement is enough that ethics with its practical expressions will be deleted from the fundamental principle of action. or behind that, the spiritual dimension of personality which makes it human. It is to unnecessarily prejudice the whole study of holiness doctrine to confuse or equate it with a moralism. Holiness cannot be divorced from ethics as above described but it is not itself ethical conduct and to fail to make this important distinction is to make an understanding of the doctrine quite impossible. In this, again, holiness is not to be confused with perfectionism.
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Clarity may be achieved, we believe, by carefully distinguishing elements within the expression of holiness doctrine. It has been stated that there is a moral and psychological aspect. One stresses the essential nature of holiness, the other stresses the human experience of it. In the formalized expression of the doctrine, "second crisis" is centrally emphasized along with "cleansing from all sin". Now, these two verbal elements must be properly evaluated to prevent a logical distortion. "Second" and "crisis" are psychological elements each with its own apologetic needs, and "cleansing" and "sin", moral elements with a like need for an apology but on a different level entirely.

If "second crisis" is not distinguished from and put into proper relationship to the more fundamental moral element, it can easily assume autonomous pretensions and raise questions totally foreign to the divine intension resident in the Biblical concept, "holiness". "Second" is not prior in importance, nor can it be defended apart from its total dependence on the central issue, namely, the "moral". In other words, it is possible to distort the true meaning of holiness doctrine, by stressing the psychological pattern, namely, "second", in such a way as to obscure the fundamental and crucial moral issue. The moral gives meaning to the psychological, not otherwise. It may, therefore, be affirmed that where "second crisis" is preached, the obligation of the preacher is always to show the moral meaning lying behind it. Finally, the "absolute" is moral, not psychological. That is, moral issues determine the experiential pattern, never does a pattern of experience condition moral issues. Therefore, the central truth of holiness doctrine should be moral not psychological. The psychological is a
deduction which must not be allowed to obscure the moral, but rather support its practical application.

It would be more true to the central insight of holiness doctrine to emphasize the moral dimension that informs the experiential involvement, for the moral is that which engages the whole man in its implications. Salvation is not a legal matter in God's mind only; neither is human intellect, will or emotion capable of satisfying God's requirements; only the whole man in responsible relationship to God will do. To stress this moral responsibility gives not only the right but the obligation to consciously relate it to practical life, hence both the moral and the psychological are needed, but must be kept in proper perspective.

If this analysis of holiness doctrine is correct, we may state simply the basic presupposition which must structure holiness preaching and which is capable of providing a rational answer to the questions raised. It is this: The most fundamental quality of intelligence is moral responsibility. The essence of the rational is moral. In view of this moral view of human nature, every aspect of soteriology, from God's provision of grace to every step which is required by God of men in redemption is in the interest of moral integrity. This defines holiness. When the implications of this are consistently related to theology, it becomes its unique distinction from other Christian theology. It is the hallmark of holiness preaching.

In Defense of the Premise

The basic assumption just stated is not a philosophical presupposition in that it does not partake of the speculative nature of discussions relative to human free will and determinism. It is wholly
practical and derives both from experience and the Scriptures. In human experience, we are conscious of entering situations which require of us the judging between conflicting elements - genuine alternatives that are open to us. We do not speculate as to whether we were pre-determined to a certain decision, we only know that within ourselves the full measure of authentic moral decision was fought out. We know why we did what we did. We feel we were capable of a contrary choice. It seems just as sensible to trust the sense of freedom as to trust the sense of coercion which accompanies other choices. The Bible speaks to men who are inwardly aware of this power of contrary moral choice. It reveals sin as rebellion against God, for which men are personally responsible. It gives no comfort to anyone who sins and who does not repent of his sin. All men, though sinners, are responsible. The gospel appeal is urgent, pleading, backed by terrible warnings, as if men could reject. The exhortation to believers suggests the possibility of forfeiture of grace at this point. The Bible drives straight through every external situation into the moral dimension of life and speaks to the inner man. It treats men, sinners or saints, as moral creatures, capable of moral decision, obligated to moral integrity. This fact defends holiness doctrine. An inductive study of the Bible could equally well produce holiness doctrine (which has probably not been done).

But what is "moral", and why is it important to an understanding of holiness?
The Meaning of Moral

1. Moral is personal.

"Moral" presupposes the personal in contrast to "thing-ness". Whatever it is that distinguishes the spiritual from the natural is personal. In this contrast, spiritual is identified as that in self-awareness that is not bound into the cause/effect matrix of the natural. It is precisely in freedom from cause/effect continuity that it escapes naturalism and becomes spiritual or personal. It is that which transcends the natural and can say. "I", meaning, "there is a difference between I and you and between I and things."

Martin Buber's discussion of "I" and "Thou" in a book by that name is suggestive and semantically useful here. A very free interpretation is given. Each "I" is a center of the universe, seeing everything from its own perspective, personal to the core in the sense that there is a sharp distinction from all other entities in personal self-awareness. "I" am not a "thing". I may be dependent on other-than-myself for existence and maintenance but I am not free to disclaim personal responsibility because of that dependence.

The "I" is self determining and self-conscious. The "it" is determined. No "I"is an "it". When two self-conscious "I"s confront each other, two contradictory universes vie with each other for existence. Two self-conscious, self-determining worlds try to occupy the center and trouble brews. There can be a clash of "rights". When one "I" treats the other "I" as an "it" and tries to dominate and control the other - an immoral situation exists. Particularly is this true when the "I" tries to control and use the "Thou" - God. Without passing judgment
upon the philosophical use Buber makes of this idea, it is useful in pointing out the need to see the personal element in the meaning of moral. Astronomy can never be the locus of a study in ethics (astronomical patterns are not criticizable) but the astronomer is. No sensible farmer worries about tomatoes appearing on wheat stalks. Nor does a rational carpenter beat a roof that leaks in the rain. But the farmer is entirely liable for the answer to the question, "Why are you a farmer? or, Why did you plant wheat instead of tomatoes?" and the carpenter can be penalized severely for beating his wife no matter what she does to displease him. It is in the personal in contrast to "thingness" that moral begins to have meaning.

2. The personal is moral.

Moreover, to be personal, is to be responsible by created necessity. Men have wills, and the will is an integral part of personality. And the will is rational not simply a mood, instinct, or passing desire.

The one thing which distinguishes man as a man is his capacity to make decisions which are good or bad, right or wrong, on the basis of principle, irrespective of desirable or undesirable consequences to himself. It is precisely at the point where the cause/effect determinism of the natural body makes its demands upon the human spirit that responsibility begins. Natural law is impersonal, that is, it operates apart from will. Spiritual life is simply distinguished from the natural by its personal nature—it requires a rational will to maintain its existence.

In fact, persons are not free not to be responsible. The more that is
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discovered about human personality the more certain we become that will operates even in the lowest, most primitive, levels of consciousness, and we are told that in the deepest hypnotic state that moral responsibility and will is not lost. The operator cannot force the patient to violate his will. Rather than to say, men have wills, it might be more true to say, to be human is to will responsibly.

3. Moral Capacity as an awareness of "Ought"

Not only are men personal and responsible but also they are aware of themselves as facing the tension of ethical situations. In fact, moral awareness is precisely in the consciousness of being in oneself, the locus of moral tension. Not only do we say, "I can choose", or "I must choose", but, "In this choice I am violating, or approving the right." We may not know which of several possibilities may be best, or, we may not want to do the right were we to know it but we know that there is a right and a wrong and that we ought to do the right and ought not to do the wrong. A moral being recognizes these ethical demands in interpersonal situations. It is a recognition of the need for a right relationship and at least displays a need for self-approval and the inner balance as a result of that approval.

It would be to impoverish ourselves were we to fail to recognize the critical contribution Emmanuel Kant has made to the subject. Though he could not "establish" the categorical imperative with the same assurance that undergirded his postulates of empirical knowledge, the "ought" to him could be assumed as the basis of all rationality. It was that maxim of judgment which governed ones actions which could be willed to be universal law. Morality, to him, was not obedience to law, which could simulate goodness without willing the good, but it was the will to
will the universal good whether it could be put into action or not. This totally disinterested principle of right human interaction was the regulatory principle of all intelligence.

4. Moral is a two-foci relationship.

Moral capacity and responsibility requires a relation to another person to complete its meaning— to come into true existence. Goodness is never the autonomous achievement of a person within himself. Men were made to fellowship with God and with other persons. This Kant did not see.

Men were made to fellowship, is the basic truth. True personality is dependent upon the ability to communicate with others, responsibly. This fact draws the concept of "moral" into a definition and realization of personality. "Self-realization" alone, though important in a number of ways, is not and cannot be the expression of the person as a moral being. Any weed or animal by surrendering to the laws of its being, "realizes" itself, but personality cannot be so defined because the very identifying element, the moral, is ignored. Even apart from sin, uninhibited self-development is not valid. Contemporary psychology recognizes the absolute need for interpersonal communication for wholesome development.

Moral quality can only inhere in persons, never things. Personality is not a thing and only in the relations which characterize freedom of persons can morality have meaning. The self which develops apart from responsibility to other persons is not moral and not truly a person.

The "relationship" which determines the quality of moral is the interpersonal dependence and interaction of "I s", which give significance to each unit in the organism. Contemporary psychology recognizes the
foundational need inherent in every human unit of consciousness to love someone and to be loved. The self is only completed and integrated and wholesome when there is rapport with others. Mental hospitals are full of people who cannot communicate with others. It is this fact that makes it necessary to give them treatment. The need for fellowship is much deeper than sentiment, it is basic to mental health and ultimately to truly human existence.

Just as fellowship is necessary to human relations, so it is necessary in the spiritual dimension which, actually is the only truly personal dimension. Men seek an object of affection to complete themselves. They must love something. If the searching self settles for things, it idolizes - makes a god of - material things and the moral existence is thwarted and distorted. If the self fastens on other human beings moral life is improperly developed. If one loves himself the result is moral perversion - grotesque, destructive, ugly. Augustine was right when he saw that men are made for God and cannot find rest until they rest in Him. It is no idle thing to say that men were made to fellowship with God. To cut off that fellowship is to throw personality off balance, to say the least.

It is probably true to say also that human nature was never intended to appear apart from the presence of the Holy Spirit. That is, the personal fellowship, the mutual rapport, and harmonious response of God and man was the natural and intended atmosphere of fellowship and holiness. In fact, holiness could be defined by this state of affairs. In the atmosphere of fellowship with God, holiness consists. Moral life has two foci, not one. Only as men trust and love God is morality valid and holiness possible. A refusal to use the moral capacity to
maintain this relationship is sin. Holiness and sin are, thus, two kinds of relationship to God, one positive, the other negative, but both active because it is the person, forced to decision, choosing the right or wrong object of his love. Holiness theology rejects the Augustinian concept of concreated holiness—an impersonal goodness—in favor of a more Biblical idea of holiness which is a proper personal relationship to God. It does not seem proper to think of persons created in such a way that they, apart from this personal fellowship, are holy. Holiness, or morality, is never a quality of impersonal substance but the way one reacts to a person. To understand this is to help prevent the idea arising that sin has substance or is a thing which can be—or cannot be—removed as a deceased part of the body. Holiness is not metaphysically conditioned substance, but a proper relationship to God—by the Holy Spirit. In this relationship to God, holiness is moral integrity, and sin is the lack of moral integrity. This is responsible consciousness at its highest and shows the proper context in which moral has meaning.

If this is true a serious challenge to Christian morality loses its force. The vicious charge against the church is that it requires the surrender of moral integrity rather than the strengthening of it. If one must obediently obey an imposed moral code, it is said, the very structure of integrity is violated. That is, if one surrenders his own active judgment to that of another he is no longer a moral man but a puppet. Kant, Tillich and Fromm among others argue in this way and with telling force if their interpretation is true to fact. None of these persons, it is believed, would reject the moral law as such but do question the source of law and one's attitude of irresponsibility to moral existence.
The fallacy, as we see it, in this criticism of Christian morality is in supposing that law to which one is to surrender is impersonal and arbitrary. The word surrender is used advisedly, for it is precisely in the idea of passive, a - moral renunciation of personal responsibility that the error lies. And can it be said that the church has not been guilty of giving just this impression? Surrender is not a Biblical word and ought never to be used in relation to salvation, at least without limiting its popular meaning carefully. Obedience, in the evangelical sense, is not heteronomy, in the sense of surrendering moral integrity to an impersonal law. But, neither is it an expression relative to autonomy in which the person makes himself the object of his obedience. Christian morality is the person-to-Person rapport which is the relationship of harmony and love and mutual will which requires moral integrity to enter and to maintain. One wills to will God's will which puts the self creatively within the context of true morality. This does not by-pass moral law which has objective existence but it is a reestablishment of the personal fellowship which makes the law a normal and desirable expression of love. It is precisely this view of relationship to law that was a correction in the New Testament of the Old Testament moralism. No Christian is ever asked to surrender to the law, to the Church, to a creed. or to persons. It is precisely a rapport with God that is to be established at whatever cost to human autonomy which is the evangelical message. This is not anti-human. It does not violate the normal. It is not immoral. It does not tear down the structure of integrity. It is simply that which men actually desire by deepest created need. Law is not abrogated but fulfilled. Obedience is the back side of love. Love is structured by obedience. Moral
experience is completed by this relationship, not destroyed.

5. Moral is structured by love.

Everything said thus far about the meaning of moral leads directly into the fact that the commitment which makes any person a moral person is that he has made a whole-man commitment. This commitment, to constitute it a moral act, is simply the whole man in responsible decision. It does not matter whether the chosen "center" is right or wrong (according to any particular standard) but that one has desired a certain thing enough to have pledged himself wholly to it. He may be moral or immoral depending on the religious or cultural norms in which he lives but by this act he becomes moral in the sense which we are trying to develop. The cohesion of this commitment is integrity.

All of this defines that illusive word love. Love is a hard word to define. It is usually described by some illustration or figure of speech. Both it and moral can be defined in relation to each other profitably, we believe. Love is the integrity which gives commitment its stability. The essence of love is not emotion, not simply will, not sentiment, but man's full attention on some object. A divided attention is a divided heart and is the essence of an unstable moral life—the source of moral breakdown. To be moral is to love wholly. Certainly everything the New Testament says about agape answers to the personalizing of moral as we are using the term in this study. Moral, abstractly, is integrity. Love is the personalizing of moral integrity which relates it to a practical expression of man's relationship to God and men. "The end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned" (I Tim. 1:5).

That one cannot have integrity in any other commitment than that wholly to God is the contention of Søren Kierkegaard and his point is
well taken. "Purity of heart," he tells us by a title to one of his books, "is to will one thing," and the only object which can engage the whole of man's devotion is He for whom men were made. Any other love is duplicity and confusion and hence not pure and not moral.

In a word "moral" is single-heartedness by its very definition.


Deep in the heart of "moral" lies a vital characteristic that gives it the unique strength and character which it possesses, namely, decision. To be moral, life must proceed on the basis of crisis and choice—not simply cause and effect flowing indecisively from one moment to another. Moral integrity is maintained by decisive action and even the loss of integrity is by a series of wrong decisions, not simply an unobstructed path downward. The Scriptures recognize this extremely important truth and call all men to deep and farreaching moral decision. Wherever men seek to avoid this clean-cut personal choice by hiding behind custom, religion, family, morality, philosophy, etc. -- the Holy Spirit tears away the deceptive device and requires responsible personal declaration. To avoid it is to make a responsible decision.

Moral decision, then, cannot end in this life. There may be crucial and formative decisions which overshadow others seemingly less important and which consciously determine the course of life, but the cruciality of the unbroken series of less spectacular crisis/decision events must never be forgotten. If one could picture the movement of responsible life it would look something like stairs. To go up requires vision, purpose, determination, effort, consciousness. To go down requires the same things in reverse. One cannot slide down without meeting the painful protest of the edge of every step. Moral decision
is not terminated by grace, but constitutes the life-long probation necessary to character formation.

7. Moral integrity is the goal of redemption.

God deals with men as responsible persons and every step God requires of man from the first stirrings of conviction to the last responsible act in life is in the interest of moral integrity. This means that every individual must square up to God personally. The Holy Spirit seems to force man into a fully conscious, deliberate, personal, voluntary decision. At least, so far as the Bible teaches us, it is the rational man standing responsibly before God with which we have to do. The proper prayer never seems to be, "Give me an experience like someone else, "but, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"

Every step in grace is taken in sharp conscious awareness, and clear rational insight and the most deliberate moral decisiveness. Consciousness is not by-passed, submerged or violated. All the powers of the personality converge with full rational responsibility upon those moments, to which the Holy Spirit carefully and imperiously draws us. Nor is there any relaxation of this moral responsibility within the Christian life—rather an ever deepening capacity for it. In the Bible the lowest allowable level of obedience is the highest possible capacity for it at any one moment. The capacity may vary, deepen, become senile, but the responsibility is always equal to possibility. When one says, "perfect obedience", and "perfect love", it does not mean that fully mature capacity is expected. A child can qualify in spite of his imperfect development. What is required is all one is at any time.

But more important even is this, that all we can contribute by way of moral responsibility is required. It is not the faith we do not
have which is demanded but that which is ours to exercise by way of a full commitment.

It is this understanding of moral that gives holiness its Biblical meaning and preserves justification from abstraction and antinomianism. Holiness relates the provisions of Christ's death to practical life. Grace must be met by faith. God does not treat us as automatons or chessmen on a board, but as persons. Redemption is never impersonal, always related in the most practical way to life. "Moral" guards holiness from two opposite errors. On the one hand holiness defined philosophically, or abstractly, theoretically, ideally, simply robs it of any real meaning. Philosophical or abstract holiness is "perfectionism." The experiential dimension, or the moral, is as necessary to its definition as child is necessary to the definition of parent. On the other hand, it guards holiness from the charge of self-righteousness and an easy view of sin. Holiness is never the product of the good will alone, it is not so much something that happens to us as it is Someone who unites Himself with us.

It is the moral atmosphere, the spiritual climate, which is created in us when the Holy Spirit's ministry is allowed to bear fruit. In this atmosphere, so long as the Holy Spirit abides, cleansing takes place and is maintained, growth in grace proceeds, the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, fellowship is deepened, character is strengthened, moral capacity is enlarged and responsibility becomes ever more intelligent. Holiness is not static. It is the life of God in the soul. It is love to the core of its existence. It is not sentimentally but the whole personality centered in God, drawing his spirit, actions and purposes from a dynamic contact with God.

If holiness is basically a moral concept, therefore, it is an intensely practical matter. The term holiness, and others relating to
it, will not be abstract but relevant to life.

If this analysis of moral is correct and if it answers to the Biblical concept of holiness several observations relative to it are pertinent to this study.

Holiness, expressed in terms of philosophical absolutes is not the Biblical concept. The Biblical idea of the holiness which is required of men is wholly within the possibilities of human experience. Both Calvinist and Wesleyan tend to extreme positions. Actually both describe soteriological matters much the same. But one says, this cannot become human experience in this life, the other says that it can become so. In spite of the claim to be Biblical both were apt to fall into the intellectual trap of philosophizing Biblical statements. God is defined philosophically for fear that anything other than a semantic ultimate or some human concept, than which no more perfect can be conceived, will result in a finite God—which is not God at all. He is philosophized into immobility for fear an internal movement will destroy him. The Bible does not know anything about that kind of God— or fear. Sin is philosophically defined so that it must include every thing that is not as perfect as God; every imperfection, immaturity, fallibility, limitation, weakness, every ethical ambiguity, ignorance or failure is sin. That is not a Biblical doctrine. The requirements are so unrealistic (not high) that no human experience can contain them, absolute obedience, absolute love, absolute everything. When the absolute is philosophical, the tension between it and human experience is morally and intellectually destructive. The Scriptures know nothing about this. Those who say the commands of Scripture are impossible because of these concepts are under the logical necessity of interpreting Scripture accordingly. Either it is said to hold up a standard which is impossible, to keep us humble, or by an extreme dispensationalism conveniently separ-
ates us from the age in which these moral demands can be relevant. Either way results in a lack of seriousness regarding the Bible that is morally undesirable. Those who say these commands must be kept and can be, either attempt to reject or "reform" human nature in order to square up to the absolute (asceticism) or reinterpret sin and so tend toward antinomianism. One sins cheerfully in order to permit the glory of God's forgiveness to be revealed, the other has little place for post-conversion confession of sin confident that God would not be glorified by doing so.

It is our opinion that the illogicalities and lack of practicality and realism and moral seriousness arises, not because men are not serious or devout or Christian, but because the Bible has been interpreted philosophically and not existentially. Moral, when understood, relates all these soteriological truths to practical life. Holiness, when seen as a moral matter, is not something so unrelated to life that one must either be baffled and discouraged by it or reject it in the interest of honesty. Sin is not something that even God can do nothing about except pass judgment on or cancel out on the books or reinterpret in Christ. All of these things are related to human experience. They are to be worked out in the ordinary life of ordinary people. To make this impossible is to make a farce of Christian faith. If God says, in His word, that those in fellowship with Him are cleansed from all sin, this fact must be accepted if one claims to be Biblical but only a Biblical interpretation of sin can keep this sublime statement from absurdity, and the full moral fallibility of human nature and temporal probation must also be kept within the concept.

This understanding of moral obligates believers to an ever deepening moral experience which is as necessary to soteriology as the grace
which is given us by God through Christ. This is the genius of Wesley's contribution to theology. Moral is relevant in holiness. The benefits of grace are put into life. Holiness is a matter of experience. Grace has implications for human relationships.

The relevance of crisis and growth are established by the concept of moral.

Perhaps the foregoing analysis will be accepted in the main by the majority of readers as true for the ordinary daily life of humanity. But to apply it to the Christian experience may not be as easy to do. But it is precisely this point for which we are contending. Christian faith is not an activity or function that can be relegated from the total personality. This understanding of moral proceeds into a discussion of Soteriology and becomes an integral part of all aspects of redemption. This concept of moral, then, links God's grace and human life. The law of the moral runs into every factor of redemption from the creation of man, through the matters pertaining to sin, into the truth structuring the Atonement and extending the whole length and breadth of Justification, Sanctification and eternal salvation.

The moral is a concern of God for men in this life. Whatever moral is, it is the ground for probationary existence and probation is not ended by justification or by sanctification, but only by earthly life.

Therefore, no theology that dulls the conscience or relaxes the moral imperative or in any sense abrogates the moral law is quite true to the New Testament Soteriology.