

# PURGATORY FOR EVERYONE

JERRY L WALLS



Jerry L Walls was formerly Professor of Philosophy of Religion at Asbury Theological Seminary. This essay is adapted from chapter two of *Heaven: The Logic of Eternal Joy* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) and is reproduced here with the kind permission of the publisher. An extended version of this article was also published in *First Things* in April 2002.

## ROMAN CATHOLICS AND EVANGELICALS SHARE MANY BELIEFS CONCERNING THE NATURE OF SALVATION.

In 1997 an independent group of Catholic and Evangelical scholars and ministry leaders signed 'The Gift of Salvation', a document that reiterated the classical view that there is a close relationship between justification and sanctification. Salvation, in this view, is far more than forgiveness of our sins; it is also a matter of thorough moral and spiritual transformation.

It is here that an indiscreet theological question must be faced. If salvation essentially involves transformation – and, at that same time, we cannot be united with God unless we are holy – what becomes of those who plead the atonement of Christ for salvation but die before they have been thoroughly transformed? These people will have accepted the truth about God and themselves through repentance and faith, but their character will not have been made perfect. Their sanctification has begun but it remains incomplete. Such people do not seem to be ready for a heaven of perfect love and fellowship with God, but neither should they be consigned to hell.

This basic difficulty led to the formulation of the doctrine of purgatory.<sup>1</sup> While the doctrine was not fully developed until the Middle Ages, the seeds from which it grew go back at least to the Church Fathers, if not to Scripture itself.<sup>2</sup> Of course, many Protestants have summarily dispensed with purgatory on the grounds that it is not mentioned in Scripture, at least not obviously so, a point that is generally conceded even by the defenders of the doctrine. However, the fact that purgatory is not expressly present in Scripture is not enough to settle the issue. The deeper issue is whether it is a reasonable inference from important truths that are clearly found there. If theology involves a degree of disciplined speculation and logical inference, then the doctrine of purgatory cannot simply be dismissed on the grounds that Scripture does not explicitly articulate it.

Moreover, the prevailing doctrine of purgatory at the time of the Reformation was related to some of the worst abuses in the Church, particularly the sale of indulgences, a practice that many saw as a denial that we are saved through faith in Christ. It is no wonder, in light of this history, that the doctrine has provoked such strong reactions among Protestants.<sup>3</sup>

In the past few decades, by contrast, purgatory has lost much of its controversial edge. This is no doubt largely due to the decline of interest in the doctrine among Catholics, even among those who continue officially to

affirm it. And while Protestants still generally repudiate the notion, the matter incites much less fervour than it did in previous generations.

In my view, it is long past time to reassess purgatory and the theological problems it was originally intended to solve. I write as a member of the Wesleyan tradition. In agreement with the Great Tradition of Christian teaching, Wesleyans reject the notion that salvation is only, or even primarily, a forensic matter of having the righteousness of Christ imputed or attributed to believers. Wesleyans insist that God not only forgives us but also changes us and actually makes us righteous. Only when we are sanctified or perfected in this sense are we truly fit to enjoy the beatific vision in heaven.

But what of Protestants who emphasise the forensic aspect of salvation? How have they resolved the problem of sin and moral imperfection that remains in the lives of believers at the time of death? They agree, after all, that nothing impure or unholy can enter heaven and they also typically hold that most, if not all, believers are far from perfection when they die. The typical answer echoes the view eloquently expressed by Jonathan Edwards: 'At death the believer not only gains a perfect and eternal deliverance from sin and temptation, but is adorned with a perfect and glorious holiness. The work of sanctification is then completed, and the beautiful image of God has then its finishing strokes by the pencil of God, and begins to shine forth with a heavenly beauty like a seraphim.'<sup>4</sup> In other words, the work that believers in the broader Catholic tradition ascribe to purgatory is, for most Protestants, accomplished immediately, and apparently painlessly, by a unilateral act of God at death.

An important variation on this theme appears in the theology of John Wesley. Unlike most Protestant theologians, Wesley believed that complete sanctification is possible in this life. In his model of the order of salvation, such sanctification can be received in a moment of faith analogous to the way justification is accepted by faith. Wesley also stressed the progressive dimension of sanctification and thought that entire sanctification could not normally be received without years of gradual growth and progress in grace and holiness. But what is significant for our purposes is that Wesley believed that, in most cases, complete sanctification takes place at 'the instant of death, the moment before the soul leaves the body'.<sup>5</sup>

Interestingly enough, current Catholic thought seems to be converging with Protestantism on this matter. Many

*'The doctrine of purgatory makes clear there is no shortcut to sanctity'*

► contemporary Catholic theologians argue that purification occurs in the act and experience of dying. This view can also be detected in the attitudes of the many lay Catholics who affirm the existence of purgatory but think it need be endured for but a momentary period. A consensus thus seems to be forming that our sanctification is completed either during the experience of death or immediately thereafter.

I want to argue, however, that the traditional doctrine of purgatory is far more coherent for Protestants and Catholics alike. The most basic problem for those who hold that sanctification is instantly completed at the moment of death, as David Brown points out, is that 'there is no way of rendering such an abrupt transition in essentially temporal beings conceivable'.<sup>6</sup> One way to avoid this problem is to appeal to the highly controversial doctrine of God's timelessness and to maintain that after death we share in this condition, thereby rendering temporal considerations irrelevant.<sup>7</sup>

More plausible is the attempt to conceive of sanctification along the lines of abrupt and dramatic conversions in this life. But as Brown also points out, there is good reason to think that such dramatic turnarounds have important antecedent causes that lead up to and prepare their way. Moreover, while outward change of behaviour may occur rather dramatically, internal change of character is another matter. Real virtue is achieved over a period of time by numerous choices and decisions, often in the face of adversity. Brown concludes that if man is essentially temporal, 'his capacity for moral perfection is likewise. No clear sense attaches to the claim that a human being could become instantaneously virtuous, morally perfect, and so, if God is to respect our nature as essentially temporal beings, he must have allowed for an intermediate state of purgatory to exist'.<sup>8</sup>

It is just this sort of consideration that led Wesley to insist that sanctification must normally be preceded by a significant period of growth and maturation. Without this process, one is not prepared to receive the fullness of grace sanctification represents. If this basic line of thought is correct, there is good reason to think that something like the traditional notion of purgatory is indeed necessary for those who have not experienced significant growth and moral progress.

The classical notion of purgatory also seems necessary to a related issue in the process of sanctification: our free participation in it. Many Christian theologians have

held that our necessary co-operation in our transformation constitutes the only satisfactory explanation for the bewildering array of good and evil in the world. God takes our freedom seriously and is patient with it; he recognises that even those who have made an initial decision to follow his will often make only sporadic or inconsistent progress in carrying out their resolution. In this view, while it is God who enables and elicits our transformation each step of the way, our co-operation with his will is necessary to our sanctification.

If God deals with us this way in this life, it is reasonable to think he will continue to do so in the next life until our perfection is achieved. Indeed, the point should be put more strongly than this. If God is willing to dispense with our free co-operation in the next life, it is hard to see why he would not do so now, particularly in view of the high price of freedom in terms of evil and suffering.

The process of sanctification involves coming to see the truth about not only our overt sinful actions, but also about the more subtle sinful attitudes we may cherish. A broad desire to be sanctified simply may not recognise all that is involved; that's why it takes time and growth for grace to penetrate the deeper recesses of our sinful characters.

Of course, the process must culminate at some point, and there is no reason why it may not reach its end in an act of faith in this life, just as Wesley believed it could. But the significant point is that considerable growth is required before such a stage can be reached. And if this growth has not occurred in this life, purgatory seems necessary if God is to complete the job with our freedom intact.

These accounts of purgatory underscore the notion that no one can be exempted from the requirement of achieving perfect sanctity in co-operation with God's grace and initiative. It is also important to reiterate here that, as beings who exist in time, our transformation must be a co-operative venture. It takes time to gain understanding of the various layers of our sinfulness and self-deception, as well as to own the truth about ourselves. Discerning truth and allowing it to transform our character is an essentially mental experience that requires time. The doctrine of purgatory makes clear that there is no shortcut to sanctity.

It is at this point of our co-operation that Protestant objections to purgatory become most pointed, even in

*'believers from all traditions who have experienced as joy the purging involved in drawing closer to Christ can affirm purgatory as a gracious gift of love'*

our ecumenical age. To take our role in sanctification so seriously that purgatory seems to be required inevitably provokes loud protests concerning works righteousness. Millard Erickson speaks for many of his fellow Evangelicals when he writes, 'In both this life and the life to come, the basis of the believer's relationship with God is grace, not works. There need be no fear, then, that our imperfections will require some type of post-death purging before we can enter the full presence of God.'<sup>9</sup>

Some Protestants go so far as to insist that purgatory amounts to a denial of justification by faith. I would insist, however, that it all depends on what one means by *justification* and by *faith*. The traditional view was that justification involves actually making us righteous, and that this is what finally restores us to a loving relationship with God.<sup>10</sup> It was a Protestant innovation to separate justification from sanctification and to construe the former primarily in legal and forensic terms. But since justification so understood does not make us actually righteous, it is simply irrelevant as an objection to purgatory.

Erickson's objection misses the mark for similar reasons. To insist that we must be fully transformed by freely co-operating with God before we can fully enter his presence is not a denial of the fact that grace is the basis of our relationship with him. For his grace is precisely what takes the initiative and enables our transformation. Erickson's objection to purgatory implies that grace is primarily, if not exclusively, a matter of forgiveness. It is this narrowly forensic conception of grace that must be challenged.

Appealing to God's forgiveness does nothing to address the fact that many Christians are imperfect lovers of God (and others) at the time of their death. This is not to say that the experience of being forgiven does not change us. Indeed, gratitude for God's free offer of forgiveness is a powerful incentive for the believer to love God in return. But forgiveness alone, especially on a legal model, does not change us in a subjective sense.

Forgiveness alone does not eliminate unpleasant odours, and lack of condemnation does not clean up soiled clothes. Other remedies are necessary, and as CS Lewis suggests, they may involve pain.<sup>11</sup>

The invocation of pain has also been a major source of resistance to the doctrine of purgatory. At its best, this is an understandable reaction to the rather lurid depictions of purgatory that have appeared in some

Roman Catholic writers in the past. At worst, however, it smacks of the sort of cheap grace, pervasive in much popular contemporary piety, which implies that mere mental assent to some basic Christian doctrines is all that is necessary for salvation. On this picture, salvation is a perfectly painless thing that requires nothing of the believer but simple faith.

Purgatory enables us fully to come to terms with reality. Richard Purtill has suggested that the period between our death and resurrection will be a time of 'reading' our lives like a book. The entire book would be present to us and we could re-read past sections, skip ahead, and so on. All of this reading would be done in what he calls 'Godlight.'<sup>12</sup> That is, it would be a matter of coming to see our lives as God sees them (e.g. seeing the full force of how our sins affected others).

Indeed, the accent here should fall on grace, for to see things in 'Godlight' is to see them illumined by God's perfect love for all persons and his will to redeem us from our sins and unite us to himself and to each other. Continuing the reading analogy, Purtill points out that, although the first time we read a book we may hardly appreciate it, a subsequent reading may fully disclose its beauty and richness.

As we may write a commentary on a book that has meant much to us, so part of our afterlife could be an appreciation and correction of our present lives. Even if our present lives have been almost a failure, we could still make these wasted lives the foundation of something glorious – a 'commentary' much better than the 'book'.

Purgatory so conceived is not only a matter of taking our choices and our freedom seriously, it is more importantly a matter of taking seriously God's overwhelmingly gracious love to us and his power to redeem our lives, even 'wasted' ones.

Construed along these lines, purgatory can rightly be characterised as a time and place of joy. While popular images of purgatory may evoke negative thoughts, we should recall that the New Testament frequently teaches Christians to rejoice in the adversity that purifies our faith. This is not to trivialise the pain of purgatory, but rather to point out that it should not be dreaded any more than the pain of moral transformation that we experience in this life.

Indeed, believers from all traditions who have experienced as joy the purging involved in drawing closer to Christ can affirm purgatory as a gracious gift of love. ■

**NOTES CONTINUED**

8. Brown, 'No Heaven without Purgatory', pp. 450–1.

9. MJ Erickson, *Christian Theology* Vol 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985), p. 1184.

10. A McGrath, *Institia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

11. Lewis insists, by contrast, that the moral transformation necessary for salvation is essentially painful. The pain of moral growth and progress is not an arbitrary punishment that God attaches to it; rather, the pain is intrinsic to it. Lewis makes this point vividly in several memorable images in *The Great Divorce*.

12. Richard Purtill, *Thinking about Religion* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978), pp. 141–3.