

## SECOND-BLESSING MODELS OF SANCTIFICATION AND EARLY DALLAS DISPENSATIONALISM

Mark A. Snoeberger\*

*An assumption that dispensationalists are anti-Reformed in their soteriology may stem from an honest misunderstanding of publications of the early dispensationalists who separated the indwelling of the Spirit from sanctification. A historical survey of four early dispensationalists—J. N. Darby, James Hall Brookes, C. I. Scofield, and Lewis Sperry Chafer—reveals whether this model of sanctification is essential to dispensationalism. Darby rejected a second work of the Holy Spirit in a believer's life and was critical of D. L. Moody's Keswick beliefs. Brookes, after years of denying a second work of the Spirit, began affirming that doctrine in 1880. Beginning in 1893, Scofield apparently supported Keswick teaching of a second work of the Spirit in a believer's life, though the teaching was strongly opposed by other dispensationalists. Neither he nor Brookes associated it with the dispensational system. Chafer, founder and longtime president of Dallas Seminary and systematizer of dispensationalism, embraced the second work of the Holy Spirit from the beginning, but not as a part of his dispensational system. His "second work" view arose from his Oberlin training, his itinerant evangelism, and the influence of Moody and Scofield on him, not from his dispensational theology. From a study of these dispensationalists, it is clear that dispensationalism is not necessarily anti-Reformed in its soteriology.*

\* \* \* \* \*

### Introduction

Of all the charges leveled against dispensationalism, few are as unsettling as the classification of dispensationalists as anti-Reformed in their soteriology.

---

\*Mark A. Snoeberger is the director of library services and part-time instructor at Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary in Allen Park, Michigan. He is currently pursuing Ph.D. studies at Baptist Bible Seminary in Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania.

Sometimes this charge stems from mere ignorance—a misplaced assumption that a denial of Reformed eschatology must include with it the denial of Reformed soteriology. Often, however, the charge derives from an honest misunderstanding of publications by the early faculty of Dallas Theological Seminary, a significant fountainhead of dispensational thought and literature in the last century.

Central to the charge is a disjunction of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit from regeneration and sanctification that was common among early Dallas dispensationalists such as Lewis Sperry Chafer, John F. Walvoord, and Charles C. Ryrie. For these, indwelling was a new ministry of the Holy Spirit in the dispensation of grace (cf. John 14:17),<sup>1</sup> and thus not essential to regeneration or sanctification. Instead, these must be accomplished by other means.

Early Dallas dispensationalists developed an answer to the disjunction of indwelling and regeneration: the Holy Spirit uses an external operation to efficaciously awaken a depraved person, who then necessarily responds in faith for regeneration.<sup>2</sup> While this explanation has drawn fire for allegedly denying total inability, unconditional election, and irresistible grace,<sup>3</sup> an examination of early Dallas arguments proves these charges false. Early Dallas dispensationalists may have been guilty of peculiar disjunctions between the effectual call, regeneration, and indwelling, but they were not Arminians. Many dispensationalists *are* Arminian, but it is unfair to affirm that the early Dallas dispensationalists were Arminians,<sup>4</sup> or

<sup>1</sup>Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 8 vols. (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948) 5:151–52, 6:125–26; John F. Walvoord, *The Holy Spirit* (Wheaton, Ill.: VanKampen, 1954) 72–73; Charles C. Ryrie, *Basic Theology* (Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1986) 347–48.

<sup>2</sup>Chafer, *Systematic Theology* 3:210–11; Walvoord, *Holy Spirit* 119–27; Ryrie, *Basic Theology* 325–26.

<sup>3</sup>For instance, the chief objection and majority emphasis of John H. Gerstner's *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth: A Critique of Dispensationalism*, 2d ed. (Morgan, Pa.: Soli Deo Gloria, 2000) is that dispensationalism has an Arminian view of election and regeneration and a Keswick/holiness view of sanctification (113–304). Richard Mayhue ("Who Is Wrong? A Review of John Gerstner's *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth*," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 3 [1992]:73–94) describes Gerstner's argument as adhering to the following syllogism:

Premise 1: Calvinism is central to all theology.  
 Premise 2: Dispensationalism does not embrace Calvinism.  
 Conclusion: Dispensationalism is a "spurious" and "dubious" expression of true theology (2).

<sup>4</sup>For instance, in answering Gerstner, Turner lists several thorough-going Calvinists that have been prominent dispensationalists: James Hall Brookes, W. G. Morehouse, Wilbur Smith, Allan A. MacRae, Carl McIntire of early Westminster Theological Seminary/Faith Theological Seminary, and John MacArthur of The Master's Seminary (David L. Turner, "Dubious Evangelicalism? A Response to John Gerstner's Critique of Dispensationalism," *Grace Theological Journal* 12 [1991]:266; updated for presentation at the 44th national meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society [San Francisco, Calif., 19 November 1992] 4). We could add to these S. Lewis Johnson and Edwin Blum of Dallas Seminary and whole blocks of faculty at dispensational schools such as Grace Theological Seminary, Talbot School of Theology, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, Baptist Bible Seminary, and Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary.

worse, that Arminianism is essential to dispensationalism.<sup>5</sup>

Dispensational apologists have been less active in answering the more legitimate criticism raised by the disjunction between indwelling and sanctification in the theology of key early Dallas Seminary faculty. Their position that indwelling is new to the present dispensation demanded that indwelling could not be essential to sanctification—or else OT saints were never sanctified. Unmoored from the Reformed connection of sanctification to indwelling,<sup>6</sup> experimental sanctification had to have a different starting point—a crisis event that can occur weeks or even years after regeneration, in which the “carnal” Christian transforms into a “spiritual” Christian in an event where the believer makes Christ “Lord of his life.”<sup>7</sup> This understanding of sanctification (and of perseverance) is significantly different from the Reformed view, and instead reflects a Wesleyan holiness or Keswick pedigree,<sup>8</sup> thus seeming to confirm historians’ linking of dispensationalism to “second-blessing” theology.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>The definitive demonstration of this fact is John Feinberg’s “Salvation in the Old Testament,” in *Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg* (Chicago: Moody, 1981) 39–77. See also Allen P. Ross, “The Biblical Method of Salvation: A Case for Discontinuity,” in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Essays in Honor of S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.*, ed. John S. Feinberg (Westchester, Ill.: Crossway, 1988) 161–78.

<sup>6</sup>For an excellent synopsis of the Reformed view, see Anthony A. Hoekema, “The Reformed View,” in *Five Views on Sanctification*, ed. Melvin E. Dieter (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987) 61–90.

<sup>7</sup>For his twenty-eight years as president of Dallas Seminary, Chafer opened each year with a series of lectures on consecration as “the basic requirement for effective seminary study” (John Walvoord, Foreword to Chafer’s *He That Is Spiritual*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967] n.p.). Charles Ryrie’s *Balancing the Christian Life* (Chicago: Moody, 1969) confirmed in chart form the need for a second work of the Holy Spirit in order for progressive sanctification to begin (187). In 1987, Walvoord went so far as to describe this view of sanctification as the “Augustinian-Dispensational” view of sanctification, thus communicating his understanding that this is a virtually unanimous view among dispensationalists (“Augustinian-Dispensational View,” in *Five Views on Sanctification*, ed. Melvin E. Dieter [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987] 199–226).

<sup>8</sup>For instance, Walvoord lauds the Wesleyan understanding that “there is normally a later act of the will in which individuals surrender their life to the will of God,” and affirms that Wesley, unlike later Wesleyans, did not believe in entire sanctification in this life (John F. Walvoord, “Response to Dieter,” in *Five Views on Sanctification* 57). Responding to the Keswick view, Walvoord also claims broad sympathy, cautioning only that Keswick might lead to belief in perfectionism (John F. Walvoord, “Response to McQuilkin,” in *Five Views on Sanctification* 194). Robertson McQuilkin, who represented the Keswick view in the same volume, was happy to announce that Walvoord’s understanding “is in harmony with the Keswick approach” (Robertson McQuilkin, “Response to Walvoord,” in *Five Views on Sanctification* 237). Dieter, representing the Wesleyan view, comments, “Walvoord’s general description of the entrance into the Spirit-filled life is one that most Wesleyans would accept” (Melvin E. Dieter, “Response to Walvoord,” in *Five Views on Sanctification* 228). See also David L. Turner, review of *Five Views on Sanctification*, in *Grace Theological Journal* 12 (1991):94–99.

<sup>9</sup>George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York: Oxford University, 1980) 100–101, 257–58 n. 32; Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 2d ed. (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 1996) 254; Donald Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 1987) 143–47. Interestingly, all three of these authors speculate on the

Being a historical project, this essay will not develop the exegetical or theological necessity/non-necessity of this model of sanctification to the dispensational system.<sup>10</sup> Instead, it will map the development of early dispensational views of sanctification to discover whether there is historical continuity or discontinuity within dispensational ranks on sanctification. To this end, it will examine the views on sanctification of four early dispensationalists, J. N. Darby, C. I. Scofield, James Hall Brookes, and Lewis Sperry Chafer, who arguably<sup>11</sup> form a chain of influence that connects the origin of dispensationalism to Dallas Theological Seminary, the self-styled “academic center of dispensationalism.”<sup>12</sup>

### J. N. Darby

Although elements of dispensational theology existed before Darby, Darby was the first to begin systematizing dispensationalism, and is thus a logical starting point for discussion. Charles Price and Ian Randall suggest that Darby’s spiritual “discontentment” and “dissatisfaction with the status quo . . . contributed to a desire for spiritual renewal.” With such the case, Darby represented the “wine skin” that Robert Pearsall Smith’s Keswick “wine” would fill.<sup>13</sup>

It is unlikely that Darby would share this assessment. Darby has documented his negative view of Keswick theology, and the repudiation of second-blessing theology is a key factor in the history of the Plymouth Brethren. As early as 1846, the reference volume *Christian Sects in the Nineteenth Century* characterized Darby’s sect as failing to “pray . . . for the presence and influence of the

---

connection between dispensationalism and holiness models of sanctification, but each proposes a different point of connection. For Marsden it is the common pessimism about culture and optimism about the individual; for Dieter it is the surprise element that is common to both rapture-seekers and second-blessing seekers; for Dayton it is the heightened role of the Holy Spirit in the eschaton, a prominent theme of dispensationalism.

<sup>10</sup>For a theological treatment of this issue, see William W. Combs, “The Disjunction Between Justification and Sanctification in Contemporary Evangelical Theology,” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 6 (2001):17–44.

<sup>11</sup>A direct link between Darby and Brookes is not certain (see Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism* [Chicago: University of Chicago, 1970] 74–75). However, Darby made five trips to St. Louis while Brookes was a pastor there, and reported having made promising contacts among ministers there, though he never names them (*Letters of J. N. D.*, 3 vols. [Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill Bible and Tract Depot, n.d.] 2:180). There is at least an intellectual link, for Brookes published in James Inglis’s Plymouth Brethren periodical, *Waymarks in the Wilderness*, as early as 1871 (C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development* [Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1958] 39). See esp. Carl E. Sanders, II, *The Premillennial Faith of James Brookes* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2001) 11–12, 28–35.

<sup>12</sup>George G. Houghton, “Lewis Sperry Chafer, 1871–1952,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 109 (1952):300.

<sup>13</sup>Charles Price and Ian Randall, *Transforming Keswick* (Waynesboro, Ga.: OM, 2000) 189–90.

Spirit.”<sup>14</sup> J. B. Marsden corrects this characterization with the explanation that “the Brethren, regarding themselves as, in theological language, in a state of grace, do not ask for blessings they have already received, but rather for an increase of the gifts of which they have already partaken.”<sup>15</sup> Thus from their earliest days, Darbyites objected to the idea of a second work of the Holy Spirit.

In 1873, Robert Pearsall Smith published the book *Holiness Through Faith*, which became the chief impetus for the formation of the Keswick Convention two years later.<sup>16</sup> In it he advocated a distinct work of the Holy Spirit,<sup>17</sup> accessible through faith, whereby the carnal believer could achieve a life of “victory,” “consecration,” “dedication,” “holiness,” or “deeper life,” that immediately and perfectly transformed the believer’s life from the slough of Romans 7 (Paul’s frustrated dialogue with himself) to the serene victory of Romans 6:11 (reckoning oneself dead to sin and alive to Christ). Darby responded immediately with a negative review of Pearsall Smith’s volume.<sup>18</sup> Though Darby maintained with Pearsall Smith the two states of Romans 7 and Romans 6:11,<sup>19</sup> he denied that Romans 7 represents a “Christian state.”<sup>20</sup> Instead it is the “regenerate state under law,” that is, the experience of believers under the OT economy.<sup>21</sup> Since the death and resurrection of Christ, however, all believers exist immediately in the Romans 6 experience at regeneration—not in a state of perfection (this does not occur until heaven),<sup>22</sup> but with the “old man” dead “once for all,”<sup>23</sup> needing no second work of

<sup>14</sup>Caroline F. Cornwallis, *Christian Sects in the Nineteenth Century* (London: James Pickering, 1846) 86; cf. J. B. Marsden, *History of Christian Churches and Sects*, 2 vols. (London: Richard Bentley, 1856) 1:95.

<sup>15</sup>Marsden, *History of Christian Churches and Sects* 1:95–96.

<sup>16</sup>Price and Randall, *Transforming Keswick* 21–24; J. C. Pollock, *The Keswick Story* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964) 11–17.

<sup>17</sup>Pearsall Smith called this the “baptism of the Spirit,” but contemporary Keswick leaders adopted the term “filling of the Holy Spirit,” noting that baptism occurs at the moment of salvation (Price and Randall, *Transforming Keswick* 52).

<sup>18</sup>J. N. Darby, “Review of R. Pearsall Smith on ‘Holiness Through Faith,’” in *The Collected Writings of J. N. Darby*, ed. William Kelly, vol. 23, *Doctrinal 7* (Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill Bible and Trust Depot, n.d.; reprint, Sunbury, Pa.: Believers Bookshelf, 1972) 184–211. See also his “Letter on Mr. J. P. S.’s [*sic*] ‘Holiness Through Faith’” in the same volume, 212–23. Darby did not limit his criticisms to Pearsall Smith, but also attacked A. Moody Stuart that year on the same grounds (“Higher Holiness: A Review of Dr. A. Moody Stuart’s Closing Address as Moderator of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland” in the same volume, 295–308).

<sup>19</sup>Darby, “Review of Pearsall Smith” 184; see also his *Letters* 2:328, 335.

<sup>20</sup>Darby, “Review of Pearsall Smith” 184.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, 184, 204.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, 188, 191, 194.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, 195, also 189–90, 196–203, 208–10. To affirm otherwise, Darby maintained, is to “apply the blood continually as if it were never finished” (200).

consecration whereby the believer “leaps by an act of faith into a positive purity.”<sup>24</sup>

Darby was not, however, without inconsistency. In his comments on 1 Corinthians 3, Darby, curiously, recognizes two classes of believers—“carnal (not spiritual)” and “spiritual”<sup>25</sup>—without explanation. Later dispensationalists would seize this distinction as the difference between “un-consecrated” and “consecrated” believers,<sup>26</sup> a difference Darby would have denied, but unwittingly precipitated in his inconsistent exegesis of 1 Corinthians 3. Darby was also one of the first to describe his Reformed understanding of progressive sanctification in terms of repeated acts of the “Spirit-filling,”<sup>27</sup> a category that Dallas dispensationalists also redefined as the progressive work of the Holy Spirit *after* the consecration event.<sup>28</sup> Thus, while early Dallas dispensationalists may have borrowed some of Darby’s terms in formulating their second-blessing theology, they inherited little of his theology on this point.

This section cannot conclude without a word concerning Darby’s relationship to D. L. Moody, whose Keswick beliefs, as will be demonstrated below, heavily influenced J. H. Brookes, C. I. Scofield, and Lewis Sperry Chafer. In 1873, Darby broke all ties with Moody, initially due to his disapproval of Moody’s Arminian views of depravity and grace. Weremchuk describes the disagreement as sharp and decisive—Darby simply “closed his Bible and refused to go on,” effectively canceling Darby’s agreement to speak for Moody at an upcoming engagement in Chicago.<sup>29</sup> Over the next four years Darby made several disparaging comments concerning Moody and Pearsall Smith, usually together, in his personal correspondence, regularly accusing the former of preaching a gospel that gives assurance to unsanctified professors of faith, and the latter of making humans sole agents of sanctification, denying priority of place to God.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 189–90, 210.

<sup>25</sup>J. N. Darby, *Synopsis of the Books of the Bible*, 5 vols. (Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill Bible and Tract Depot, 1949) 4:160.

<sup>26</sup>Chafer, *He That Is Spiritual* 19–22, Ryrie, *Balancing the Christian Life* 187.

<sup>27</sup>Darby, *Letters* 3:466. This is not the same “filling” seen in Keswick writings. In Keswick, “filling” is simply another synonym for “consecration,” “full surrender,” etc.—a single event that vaults one into the “victorious life.”

<sup>28</sup>E.g., Walvoord, *Holy Spirit* 189. Reformed theologians have generally avoided “filling” as a category, and those who do are careful to explain that filling commences immediately after salvation, not after a separate work of consecration (e.g., Robert L. Reymond, *A New Systematic Theology of the Christian Faith* [Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998] 765).

<sup>29</sup>Max S. Weremchuk, *John Nelson Darby*, English ed. (Neptune, N.J.: Loizeaux Brothers, 1992) 143; also H. A. Ironside, *A Biographical Sketch of the Brethren Movement*, rev. ed. (Neptune, N.J.: Loizeaux Brothers, 1985) 81–82; Thomas S. Veitch, *The Story of the Brethren Movement* (London: Pickering and Inglis, n.d.) 65–66.

<sup>30</sup>Darby, *Letters* 2:257–59, 327–29, 334–37, 355–59, 369.

### James Hall Brookes

As founder and long-time leader of the Niagara prophecy conferences, personal mentor of C. I. Scofield, and editor of the fundamentalist periodical *The Truth* from 1875 until his death in 1897, Brookes was highly influential in systematizing American dispensationalism.<sup>31</sup> Although Brookes embraced premillennialism in the early 1860s,<sup>32</sup> there are several strands of evidence that Darby's direct influence was minimal at best: (1) Darby never mentions Brookes in his forty volumes of collected writings; (2) Brookes omits reference to Darby in his explanation of how he became a premillennialist;<sup>33</sup> and rarely cites him in his writings;<sup>34</sup> (3) Brookes opted against Darby's dispensational scheme, citing instead W. C. Bayne, another Brethren writer;<sup>35</sup> and (4), most significantly for this study, Brookes welcomed Moody to St. Louis in 1879 and adopted Moody's second-blessing sanctification model.

Moody experienced the filling of the Holy Spirit in 1871 in connection with the prayers of three women and the great fire of Chicago.<sup>36</sup> After the fire and destruction of his Chicago work, Moody became an itinerant evangelist, spending much of the following five years in England and Scotland, giving life to the fledgling Keswick impulse there.<sup>37</sup> In 1875, Moody even preached the sermon in which F. B. Meyer, a key Keswick leader, attained "full surrender."<sup>38</sup> However, Moody disagreed with Pearsall Smith's particular methods of finding the second blessing,<sup>39</sup> and was

---

<sup>31</sup>See Larry Pettegrew, "The Historical and Theological Contributions of the Niagara Bible Conference to American Fundamentalism," Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1976; also Sanders, *Premillennial Faith of James Brookes* 1–2 and passim.

<sup>32</sup>James Hall Brookes, "How I Became a Pre-Millennialist," *The Truth* 23 (1897):331–33.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Sanders, *Premillennial Faith of James Brookes* 28–35.

<sup>35</sup>Compare Darby's fivefold dispensational scheme in "The Apostasy of the Successive Dispensations," in *The Collected Writings of J. N. Darby*, ed. William Kelly, vol. 2, *Ecclesiastical I* (Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill Bible and Trust Depot, 1962) 124–30, with Brookes's sevenfold scheme in *I Am Coming*, 5th ed. (Glasgow: Pickering & Inglis, 1895) 112–27, and Bayne's outline in "The Dispensations Prophetically and Doctrinally Considered," in *Waymarks in the Wilderness* 1 (1864):440–53. See David J. MacLeod, "Walter Scott, a Link in Dispensationalism Between Darby and Scofield," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (1996):156–79, for the theory that Scofield borrowed from Isaac Watts or Walter Scott—in any case, he did not borrow from Darby.

<sup>36</sup>Paul D. Moody and Arthur Percy Fitt, *The Shorter Life of D. L. Moody*, 2 vols. (Chicago: Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1900) 62–65; see also Richard Ellsworth Day, *Bush Aglow: The Life Story of Dwight Lyman Moody* (Philadelphia: Judson, 1936) 143–44.

<sup>37</sup>Pollock, *Keswick Story* 18.

<sup>38</sup>Day, *Bush Aglow* 188.

<sup>39</sup>Pollock, *Keswick Story* 19.

not involved in the operation of Keswick until 1891.<sup>40</sup> Moody never defined his own method for achieving the second blessing—he just rejected Pearsall Smith's method.<sup>41</sup> These factors, coupled with his immense popularity and American fundamentalist roots, rendered Moody a “safe” speaker for early fundamentalist dispensationalists.

That the origins of Brookes's second-blessing theology are a result of Moody's influence is not certain. Being an Old-School Presbyterian, however, it is unlikely that Brookes picked up the American version of second-blessing theology from Finney and Mahan, making the transatlantic version (Keswick) a more plausible source. We also know from his *Way Made Plain* that Brookes was adamantly opposed to the idea as late as 1871. In it he wrote,

The second error [concerning the work of the Holy Spirit] arises from the still more common mistake of thinking, or, at least, of practically acting, about the Spirit as if He came on occasional and uncertain visits to the believer, in place of knowing that He abides with us forever. Many Christians are continually singing and praying, “Come, Holy Spirit, heavenly dove,” but He is already come.<sup>42</sup>

Without any precedent during his first five years of publishing *The Truth*, however, Brookes suddenly began affirming a second work of the Spirit in the periodical in 1880.<sup>43</sup> After this year the second blessing became a regular theme of the periodical.<sup>44</sup> Not too much should be made of this abrupt appearance of second-blessing theology, but it points tantalizingly to the year of Moody's St. Louis campaign of 1879–80.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Pollock, *Keswick Story* 116; J. B. Figgis, *Keswick from Within* (New York: Marshall Brothers, 1914; reprint, New York: Garland, 1985) 106; Price and Randall, *Transforming Keswick* 57.

<sup>41</sup>Price and Randall, *Transforming Keswick* 67; Day, *Bush Aglow* 219.

<sup>42</sup>James Hall Brookes, *The Way Made Plain* (Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, 1871) 358.

<sup>43</sup>James Hall Brookes, “Consecration (2 Cor 5:9–15),” *The Truth* 6 (1880):65–68.

<sup>44</sup>James Hall Brookes, “Willing Consecration,” *The Truth* 9 (1883):149–52. Contributions from other second-blessing writers include articles by A. T. Pierson, R. A. Torrey, J. Campbell Morgan, and a comprehensive set of articles on the topic by George C. Needham (“The Spiritual Man,” *The Truth* 14 [1888]:474–80, 509–13, 561–67; 15 [1889]: 37–47).

<sup>45</sup>Several authors have noted Brookes's waning interest in his denomination starting in 1880. Joseph Hall attributes the decline to his premillennialism (“James Hall Brookes—New School, Old School, or No School?” *Prebyterion* 14 [1988]:35–54), Sanders to his increasing responsibilities at the Niagara prophecy conferences (*Premillennial Faith of James Hall Brookes* 70–74). Though Sanders's argumentation is more convincing than Hall's, it is possible to posit a third option: that in adopting Moody's revivalist and second-blessing ideas, Brookes had severed some of his theological links to Old School Presbyterianism.



Brookes was also one of the first to deny the indwelling of the Holy Spirit prior to the dispensation of grace, noting, “It is never said of the Old Testament saints that the Holy Spirit abode with them, or that He dwelt in them, or that by one Spirit they were all baptized into one body of which the risen Jesus was the glorified head. He had not then ascended, and consequently there was no man at God’s right hand, to whom believers could be united by the Holy Ghost.”<sup>46</sup> The Dallas construct of sanctification was beginning to take shape.

### C. I. Scofield

C. I. Scofield, who exercised immense influence on dispensational theology through the 1909 publication of his *Reference Bible*,<sup>47</sup> became a believer in 1879 through the witness of Thomas McPheeters, a resident of St. Louis and volunteer for the Y.M.C.A. By joining Brookes’s church in St. Louis and volunteering for the Y.M.C.A. (of which Moody was then president), Scofield thus had immediate contact with both men. Scofield regarded Brookes a mentor<sup>48</sup> and Moody a close friend.<sup>49</sup>

Clearly by 1899, Scofield had drunk deeply from the Keswick well. In that year he wrote a treatise on the Holy Spirit wherein he espoused essentially what would become the Dallas Seminary position. Indwelling, baptism of the Spirit, sealing, and union with Christ did not accompany regeneration in the OT, but in the NT they did—instantaneously.<sup>50</sup> However, not all NT believers are “filled” with the Spirit, a prerequisite of “securing the fullness of blessing, victory, and power.”<sup>51</sup> Scofield then goes on to give a detailed formula for realizing the initial “filling.”<sup>52</sup> Once the Holy Spirit fills the believer by an initial “act” or “event,”<sup>53</sup> he can repeat the filling many times.<sup>54</sup> The believer, however, will never be completely empty

---

<sup>46</sup>James Hall Brookes, “The Promise and Presence of the Holy Spirit,” *The Truth* 13 (1887):486. See also his *The Holy Spirit* (St. Louis: Gospel Book and Tract Depository, n.d.) 49–52; Larry D. Pettigrew, “Dispensationalists and Spirit Baptism,” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 8 (1997):31–34.

<sup>47</sup>C. I. Scofield, ed., *The Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford, 1909).

<sup>48</sup>Charles G. Trumbull, *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield* (New York: Oxford University, 1920) 35–37.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, 33–34.

<sup>50</sup>C. I. Scofield, *Plain Papers on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (New York: Revell, 1899) 31, cf. 41–50.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, 54–69.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, 49.

again: "The life that begins with the filling will go on in the fullness."<sup>55</sup>

When Scofield imbibed Keswick theology is disputable. Reports are inconsistent, and most important, Trumbull's authorized biography of Scofield is inconsistent with itself. Early in the volume, Trumbull reports that Scofield met the conditions for filling immediately at salvation, noting that "Christ came in, and drink went out. The miracle of the Victorious Life was instantly wrought for him and in him."<sup>56</sup> However, Trumbull later notes that, fourteen years later, "although God had greatly blessed the Dallas pastor in his own life, and was blessing his studies in the Word to himself and to others, he had not entered into the New Testament teaching of the life of power and victory."<sup>57</sup> Trumbull then goes on to describe this event as occurring in 1893.

An incident in 1891 suggests the latter account to be the true one. As I have noted, Moody's disassociation with Keswick until 1891 had rendered him a "safe" speaker for American fundamentalists. In 1891, however, Moody attended the Keswick Convention, and, impressed by what he observed, invited F. B. Meyer to speak at his Northfield Conference the same year. The decision provoked consternation among the "Old Guard" at Northfield, among them Scofield, A. T. Pierson, and George C. Needham, the latter . . . who protested the invitation,<sup>58</sup> describing Keswick as "the ancient heresy of a sentimental higher life, . . . a fancied perfection taught through fancied interpretations."<sup>59</sup> Moody prevailed, and Meyer spoke at the conference in 1891 and in each of the next four conferences. During those four years, many significant American Keswick leaders emerged: J. Wilbur Chapman (1892), A. T. Pierson (1895), and, ostensibly, Scofield (1893).<sup>60</sup> Scofield's concerns about a Keswick incursion had been realized in dramatic fashion. Why Trumbull's account conflicts is a matter of speculation. It is this author's guess that Scofield or Trumbull hoped to give legitimacy to Keswick teaching by extrapolating a later, Keswick interpretation on the 1879 event, and simply overlooked the inconsistency.

Scofield refined second-blessing theology, and even avoided the label in

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., 68.

<sup>56</sup>Trumbull, *Life Story of C. I. Scofield* 32–33. This is not inconsistent with Scofield's own theology of Holy Spirit filling. He maintains that, though most do not, some believers can experience regeneration and indwelling simultaneously (*Plain Papers on the Holy Spirit* 48–49).

<sup>57</sup>Trumbull, *Life Story of C. I. Scofield* 66.

<sup>58</sup>William M. Runyan, *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute*, 5 vols. (New York: Oxford University, 1935) 2:5–7; Pollock, *Keswick Story* 117; Bruce Shelley, "Sources of Pietistic Fundamentalism," *Fides et Historia* 5 (1972–73):73; Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism* 176; G. M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* 249 n. 36. Marsden suggests that the conflict was overstated through the process of retelling the story, but admits "there was a definite gain in acceptance of explicit Keswick teachers in these years when Keswick speakers came to Northfield."

<sup>59</sup>*Watchword* 13 (1891):60.

<sup>60</sup>G. M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* 149 n. 36.

lieu of terms like “renewal”<sup>61</sup> or the place of “power and blessing.”<sup>62</sup> However, while he eschewed the label, his *Reference Bible* nonetheless purveyed the disjunction of indwelling and sanctification<sup>63</sup> into dispensational-fundamentalist and specifically Dallas dispensational thought. However, we must note that he, like Brookes before him, appealed only minimally to dispensational thought as the basis for Keswick ideology, and both were dispensationalists for many years before they adopted Keswick notions. The link between dispensationalism and second-blessing sanctification is *actual*, but not *necessary*.

### Lewis Sperry Chafer

Lewis Sperry Chafer, founder and longtime president of Dallas Theological Seminary, provided intellectual legitimacy to the practical disjunction of the Holy Spirit’s indwelling from regeneration and sanctification. One biographer of Chafer wrote, “If Scofield—due to the influence of his reference edition of the Bible—can be called the popularizer of dispensational thought, Chafer—on the basis of his *Systematic Theology*—can be called the systematizer of dispensational teaching.”<sup>64</sup> We might borrow these terms and add that as Moody was the popularizer of American second-blessing thought, so also was Chafer the refiner and systematizer of second-blessing teaching.<sup>65</sup> That is, he legitimated popular anthropocentric invitations for the unregenerate to “come to Christ” and for the regenerate to “surrender all” within a “moderate Calvinist” theological context.<sup>66</sup> And, since he did this at the “academic center of dispensationalism,”<sup>67</sup> Dallas Theological Seminary, it is not surprising that critics would link dispensational and second-blessing theology.

Chafer received his scant ministerial education at Oberlin College conservatory, and upon leaving the school traveled for five years as a musician with

---

<sup>61</sup>*Scofield Reference Bible* 1200.

<sup>62</sup>C. I. Scofield, *The Scofield Bible Correspondence Course*, 3 vols. (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1907) 3:571–72.

<sup>63</sup>Arguably the essential feature of any second “blessing” or second “experience” theology (see esp. Combs, “Disjunction Between Justification and Sanctification”).

<sup>64</sup>Houghton, “Lewis Sperry Chafer” 299.

<sup>65</sup>As Scofield before him, Chafer eschewed the term “second blessing,” opting instead for descriptive ideas like “an experience . . . accompany[ing] the first entrance into the Spirit-filled life” (*He That Is Spiritual* 43). He also sought to distance himself from Wesleyan perfectionism by denigrating the term “second blessing.” By my decision to associate Chaferian sanctification to earlier second-blessing models, however, I hope to highlight the fact that the Chaferian sanctification model is not an independent model, but one closely descendent from and similar to earlier second-blessing models (see *supra*, n. 8).

<sup>66</sup>See esp. Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology* 6:232–68; *idem*, *He That Is Spiritual* 29–39.

<sup>67</sup>Houghton, “Lewis Sperry Chafer” 300.

several evangelists, most notably Arthur T. Reed, whom he met at Oberlin in a Y.M.C.A. meeting.<sup>68</sup> In 1897 he became an evangelist himself, sometimes alone, sometimes as part of a team. Interestingly, he traveled briefly with the Keswick leader J. Wilbur Chapman during these years, but soon left him because of his Arminian methods and “gimmickry.”<sup>69</sup> In 1901 Chafer moved to Northfield, Massachusetts, where he ministered for many years beside Ira Sankey in Moody’s music ministry. Scofield, who pastored in Northfield from 1895–1902, influenced Chafer heavily during the next two years before he returned to Dallas. The two maintained a strong relationship for the rest of Scofield’s life, corresponding extensively and conducting “short-term ‘Bible institutes’ in churches” together.<sup>70</sup> Chafer also taught at Scofield’s educational efforts, the New York Scofield School of the Bible and Philadelphia School of the Bible.<sup>71</sup> In 1918 Chafer had a “remarkable spiritual experience in the study of Dr. Scofield in Dallas, Texas, [where he] . . . definitely dedicated his life to an exacting study of the Bible.”<sup>72</sup> Chafer assumed the pastorate of Scofield’s church in Dallas for four years after Scofield’s death—Chafer’s only pastorate.

Oberlin training, itinerant evangelism, Moody, and Scofield combined to create in Chafer fertile soil to appropriate the second-blessing sanctification model and to adapt it into the distinctive “Chaferian” model that came to distinguish Dallas Seminary.<sup>73</sup> Unlike the other three dispensationalists analyzed in this study, no evidence exists to suggest that Chafer ever believed differently.

### Conclusion

Dispensationalism has long been associated with the second-blessing model of sanctification and its variations. However, the coexistence of these two emphases is incidental rather than necessary, as illustrated by the theological odysseys of four leading dispensationalists who pre-dated Dallas Seminary. Those models of sanctification within dispensationalism do not arise essentially from dispensational

---

<sup>68</sup>John D. Hannah, “The Early Years of Lewis Sperry Chafer,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 144 (1987):12.

<sup>69</sup>Houghton, “Lewis Sperry Chafer” 294; also John Witmer, “‘What Hath God Wrought?’ Fifty Years of Dallas Theological Seminary,” part 1, “God’s Man and His Dream,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 130 (1973):294 n. 9.

<sup>70</sup>Hannah, “Early Years” 21.

<sup>71</sup>*Ibid.*, 22–23.

<sup>72</sup>C. F. Lincoln, “Biographical Sketch of the Author,” in Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 8 vols. (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948) 8:4. For the details of this incident, see Hannah, “Early Years” 19–20.

<sup>73</sup>Chafer’s biographers tend to emphasize Scofield’s role in influencing Chafer’s theology, and there is little doubt that his was a key influence. However, it is difficult to ignore Chafer’s ministerial experiences in the thirteen years before he met Scofield as stimuli in his theological development.

theology, for dispensationalism existed independently of second-blessing and second “experience” thinking for all of Darby’s ministry and for parts of Brookes’s and Scofield’s ministries. Instead, these sanctification models stemmed from the popular evangelism of the day, especially that of D. L. Moody, and were systematized by Lewis Sperry Chafer.

To conclude that Dallas Theological Seminary began with two separate emphases is better: (1) dispensationalism, which intrinsically demands no distinctive soteriology, whether Calvinist or Arminian, and (2) a variation of the second-blessing model of sanctification that intrinsically demands no distinctive theological system, whether Reformed or dispensational. Only speculative historiography has made a link between these two emphases essential.