

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1845.

No. IV.

James S. Graham.
ART. I.—*The Apostles' doctrine and fellowship: Five Sermons preached in the principal churches of his diocese, during his spring visitation, 1844.* By the Right Rev. L. Silliman Ives, DD. LL.D., Bishop of North Carolina. Published by the unanimous request of his Convention. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 148 Chesnut street. 1844. pp. 189.

THIS title page is not, we think, remarkable for its modesty. Dr. Ives styles himself Bishop of North Carolina. Are we to understand by this, that he is Bishop to the exclusion of the Bishop of the Moravians at Salem and its vicinity, the validity of whose ordination his predecessor acknowledged; and to the exclusion of all Roman Catholic Bishops? Is it implied that all other denominations are rebels against his authority? Does he claim jurisdiction *in partibus infidelium*? He prefers to call the convention of Episcopal ministers and delegates of North Carolina "his" convention, rather than the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as has been usual.

The first subject discussed is baptismal justification. We will permit the Bishop to define his own terms. "The term justification," he says, "may be expressed accurately enough for our present purpose, by the terms remission of sins, and regeneration, or, being born from above." In

and their posterity. It was for the sake of acting more intelligently in this benevolent project that the present tour was undertaken, and it is the conclusion of the reverend traveller, that though the Sardinian government is not openly encouraging any ill-treatment of the Vaudois, there is enough in the situation of the two religious parties to call for some more positive regulations on the behalf of the weaker class. This duty is the more imperative, because in almost every country we discover strenuous efforts made by the Romish church, to establish and extend the reign of spiritual despotism. Indeed, there are strong symptoms of an inclination on the part of the court of Turin, to press upon the liberties of the poor Piedmontese. In the new Sardinian code of 1837, the Vandois are prohibited to hold property beyond their ancient limits; they are not allowed to practice in the professions of law or medicine; they may not print any book, and must abstain from work on the Roman festivals. Now that the Protestant sympathies of the British government are growing weaker, it will require all the zeal and faith of the influential Christians of that country, in their private exertions, to withstand the Jesuit at the court of an Italian monarch.

James H. Leaveller.

ART. IV.—*Calvin's Institutes.* Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia.

THE General Assembly's board of publication have performed an acceptable service to the church in presenting this translation of the *Institutes* of the great Reformer. Time was when this work had a prominent place among the standard books of clergymen in all the reformed churches, having the same precedence there that Blackstone's *Commentaries* possess in a law library. No writer among the Reformers occupied so high a position as a theologian, no man was more consulted by his contemporaries, and his name was given to the system of doctrine maintained by the reformed churches, because of his pre-eminence in the defence of the faith once declared to the saints. It was not that Calvin taught any thing substantially different from his brethren, but for the reason that he was the

ablest defender of the common faith, that the doctrines maintained by the Reformers are inseparably connected with his name. The Institutes is his great work, and contains a complete summary of Christian doctrine. Eulogy and criticism in regard to a work like this is out of place, and no part of the design of this article; it has stood the test of centuries and will continue to the end of time, confessedly the greatest theological work produced by the Reformers.

An inspection of the causes of the hostility with which the Calvinistic scheme is assailed, and an exhibition of the grounds of this opposition, may not be without its use, in a day like this, when so many, both in and out of the church, "turn away their ears from the truth and are turned unto fables." Of course there is a cause for this hostility, many causes indeed, yet the real grounds of opposition are concealed and denied, and various pretences are brought forward which are utterly without foundation. It is alleged that the Calvinistic divinity makes bigots and fanatics, is of a persecuting spirit, intolerant and tyrannical, begetting a sour temper, hostile to human happiness, unrelenting and uncharitable. It would be easy to collect a host of epithets from every department of literature in which this impression is conveyed, and this apology for hostility attempted. The old slanders of the high church and tory party in England are served up in new forms, and the lie is repeated and multiplied indefinitely in the popular works of the day. The men who were, under God, the authors of English and American freedom, the Puritans of England and the Presbyterians of Scotland, are held up to the gaze of mankind as a set of sour hypocrites, who made up for their external sanctity by private corruptions, who were saints in public, devils in private, while the rakehelly, debauched and blasphemous Cavaliers are lauded as models of loyalty, generosity and good breeding. In the absence of all proof, every kind of dissimulation is presumed of men who perilled fortune and life for civil and religious liberty; who stood "in the deadly imminent breach" resisting the tyranny of the God-forsaken Stuarts, the forlorn hope of the world. The most profound hypocrisy is predicated of men who carried their Bibles with them to the camp, who were much in prayer, who sought the blessing of God in all their enterprises, and upon whose memories no stains of dishonesty or immorality rests; reasoning which assumes

that all piety is simulation, and faith, integrity and patriotism at bottom no better than a lie. The lives and achievements of these men are no reproach to the creed they professed, and the cause must be a bad one which seeks to maintain its ground by slandering those who saved the ark of English freedom, and gave free institutions to the new world. There is in the world's history no greater evidence of ingratitude and falsehood, reiterated until it assumes the aspect of truth, than the manner in which historians have treated the puritans, though indications are not wanting that justice, however tardy, may at length vindicate the memories of men of whom the world was not worthy—that Cromwell will not be utterly given up as a hypocrite, a villain or a demagogue, or Hampden as a traitor and a bigot. Every act capable of a doubtful construction is tortured to give evidence of the persecuting spirit of Calvinism; the banishment of assassins in England, the expulsion of Quakers in the new world, by those who were admitted by their enemies to be as merciful after victory as they were undaunted after defeat, is enlarged upon and magnified for the same purpose. Are the men who repeat these stale slanders ignorant of the facts of history? Can they make no allowance for men who, though far in advance of the age in which they lived, were yet tempted to occasional acts of severity by the conduct of those around them, and the prejudices of the age? If Calvinism is to be judged by the occasional indiscretions of its adherents, what should we say of Popery, red with the blood of martyred millions, whose souls cry out for retribution from under the altar of God—what shall we say of infidelity, whose reign of terror shamed the orgies of Nero and Caligula—what of the loyal and accommodating Arminianism of the high churchmen, who beggared and drove into exile thousands of the most virtuous and peaceful subjects of the British crown? Let Calvinism be judged by the facts of history—we are content. Let infidels and papists, Arminians and worldlings, while looking here and there for a blot on the banner of Calvinism, remember that until the eve of St. Bartholomew is forgotten, Laud's acts of uniformity erased from history, and the bloody tragedy of the French Revolution causes the flesh of men to creep with terror, the charge of bigotry and persecution must fall back upon their own systems, and thus assailing Calvinism "they kick against the pricks." That the language of piety was not uniformly

the evidence of its power in the heart among the Puritans, is admitted. That the Puritans, in their struggle with Charles I. whose title of martyr is at once a burlesque and a blasphemy, were in every respect faultless, has never been asserted either by themselves or their friends, but the attempt to draw a comparison between the Calvinists and their opponents, unfavourable to the former, is impudent beyond expression. How much has been written to extenuate the conduct of men whose life was a libel upon human nature; whose shameless wickedness made the court of Charles the second the abhorred of God and man; who sacrificed the honour of the nation for the smiles of harlots, and were alike traitors to their country and apostates to their faith, while dark suspicions of interested motives, vague and unsupported charges of hypocrisy, are urged against the Puritans to shadow the glory of noble actions. What an array of calumniators caricature the manners, deportment and habits of the Puritans, to taint the reputations of the men who were an honour to human nature and ornaments to the Christian faith; who made the name of England a terror to tyrants, a strong tower to the oppressed. Do they not show by this that they are without sympathy for true goodness or greatness, resolving the one into hypocrisy, the other into ambition, endeavouring to produce the impression that all faith in God is fanaticism, all piety imposture?

But it is gravely charged that the Calvinistic divinity tends to licentiousness, that the doctrine of grace, of which justification by faith without the deeds of the law is the sum, renders men careless of good works; that the scheme which makes the divine purpose and efficacy the only foundation of hope and salvation, is a direct encouragement to inactivity and indifference. That some who have superficially examined the subject, or who have received their impressions of Calvinism from its enemies, may have been led theoretically to this conclusion is probable; but that any man who has ever had a clear intellectual apprehension of the doctrines of grace, or who has tried them by their fruits, can be honest in such a conclusion, is impossible. What was the faith of those who had the testimony of Jesus in the darkest period of the Roman apostasy? Who rejected the idolatry of the harlot, seated upon the scarlet-coloured beast, who made herself drunk with the blood of martyrs, and refused the cup of her abominations?

The Waldenses and Albigenses maintained the doctrines of grace, preserving the pure faith amidst cruel persecutions, provoked by the reproach which their virtue and piety reflected upon the dissolute morals and manners of both priesthood and laity in the Romish communion. And whenever, in the long lapse of centuries, an occasional light shone amid the darkness of the predicted apostasy, whenever a warning voice was raised in the bosom of Rome herself, against the terrible corruptions which indicated that the prophetic antichrist had reached the zenith of his ghostly despotism, that light was reflected from the pages of the Bishop of Hippo, that warning was heard from the followers of Augustine. What was the faith of the reformed churches as they came out of the spiritual Babylon and diligently sought the mind of the spirit in the holy scriptures? They found the Calvinistic system in the Bible and faithfully presented it in their confessions as the bulwark of the reformation against the corruptions of the papal hierarchy, and wherever, in the lapse of three centuries, Arminianism, Socinianism or Infidelity has weakened the faith of the people in their ancient symbols, true piety has, *pari passu*, disappeared and scarcely the form, much less the power, of godliness remains, when the doctrines of grace have been abandoned. The evangelical remnant in the church of England has always been Calvinistic; the English dissenters are in general decided adherents of the Westminster confession, while the numerous body of Wesleyan Methodists are Semi-Calvinistic, and their system, like the legs of the image seen in vision by Daniel, partly iron and partly clay. The witness-bearing church of Scotland who, above all the reformed churches, has maintained the integrity of her doctrinal standards, who has stood oftener in the breach for Christ's cross and crown than any other national church, has been chosen of God, in the nineteenth century, to startle a sceptical world with the evidence that the spirit of primitive Christianity exists. Never was a theory so contradicted by universal experience as the one that asserts that Calvinism tends to laxity; even candid men among opposers have felt constrained to admit that the power of Christian faith and the purity of Christian morals have never been so illustrated by any portion of the church visible, as by those who profess the hated creed of John Calvin. Strange paradox in the opinion of the world, that the advocates of divine sovereignty, ori-

ginal sin and election, who assert that men are justified by faith alone without the deeds of the law, should be careful to maintain good works, while those whose gospel is morality and whose hope is in the law, should so commonly prove unfruitful and careless of the moral virtues upon which they make salvation to depend.

In all the objections urged against the Calvinistic scheme, it is evidently assumed that it is inconsistent and unphilosophical, and therefore unscriptural, because the Bible cannot be supposed to contain any thing contrary to reason and sound philosophy. The exegesis of the sacred oracles by Arminians is evidently based upon the principle which is extended by the Socinians to a denial of the person and sacrifice of Christ, and all that is substantial in the gospel. Now if the assumption is false, if Calvinism is neither unreasonable nor inconsistent, if it is the true philosophy, the only consistent scheme of ontology, and if the supposed absurdities belong, in fact, to the opposing systems, then is the main objection gone, the grand difficulty removed, even in the case of those who are not to be satisfied with scriptural proofs, however conclusive. It must be obvious that such a subject cannot be disposed of in a single article, yet a few suggestions may be useful, by promoting a thorough examination of the question on the part of those who yet halt between two opinions. There are many sincere inquirers after the way of life who reject the Calvinistic scheme because they do not understand the system, or have become prejudiced by the stereotype slanders to which allusion has already been made, or disgusted with the pseudo-calvinism which affirms and denies in the same breath, and is as inconsistent with itself and the word of God as it is with the confessions of Westminster and Dort. A fundamental principle of the Calvinistic scheme is thus expressed in the Confession of Faith, chap. 3, sec. 1, "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass, yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of his creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." With this agree the synod of Dort and the articles of the church of England. The real objection of the philosophical opponents of Calvinism is not so much to the doctrine of the absolute predestination of God. The most respectable schools of

philosophy among the ancients maintained this truth upon the principles of natural religion and the conclusions of reason. The most absolute fatalism, based upon the divine decrees, is taught by many of the authors who deride Calvinism. That God foreordains whatsoever comes to pass, is the necessary conclusion of an intelligent deism, for if the principle of contingency be admitted in regard to the fortunes of created intelligences, why not in respect to their origin? If events are contingent, why not make all existences the result of chance? Atheism is philosophically the result of such reasoning, which the most gifted metaphysicians have always seen and acknowledged. It is not meant by this that the mass of men who reject the divine decrees are unbelievers or infidels; many truly pious persons do not apprehend this doctrine, and perhaps never will until the light of eternity is poured upon the subject, and their vision purified by the atmosphere of heaven. The being and attributes of God cannot be philosophically defended if the divine predestination be denied, and the weak evasions of the most able adversaries of the truth, such as that God did not choose to foreknow certain things, is no inconsiderable proof that they have felt that they were opposing a system philosophically impregnable. That many worthy persons believe that there is a middle ground on this subject, is not denied; but that they can successfully defend their position upon scriptural and philosophical grounds, is disputed. If God exists, all events are certain in his mind; "known unto God are all his works from the beginning," is the assertion of an apostle; but the foreknowledge of events as certain must be predicated of some assured ground of certainty; and where is this to be found but in the will of God, by whom all existences were called and are sustained in being? God's foreordination is plainly inferrible from his attributes. Would the all-seeing, the all-wise, and the all-merciful, call into being a universe the end of which he neither designed nor knew? Would the only wise God hang such interests upon a contingency, and leave it, after all, uncertain whether his counsel should stand, whether his purposes should be accomplished? Does a dark uncertainty, which may prove the chaos of a wicked world, rest upon the future? Unaided reason is abhorrent of such a conclusion. The philosophy of the stoics, of most systems in the pagan world, of Mahomedanism, and of ancient and modern Deists, sufficiently de-

illustrates this. They do indeed hold this truth in unrighteousness, and seek in their false inferences from it an excuse for their guilt, an apology for their depravity; were Calvinists to do the same, the opposition of science, falsely so called, would cease at once and forever. Does any man believe that the Calvinistic scheme really gives ease to the conscience; that it teaches the fatalism of the Mahomedans, or the philosophy of Hobbes, Collins and Hume, when the most bitter opposition is experienced from fatalists and infidels? Infidelity, indifference, and worldliness could have no controversy with a system of doctrine which furnishes a ready excuse for all irreligion. The avowed reason is not the real one; it is plausible and convenient, but false; which is manifest from the lives and recorded opinions of multitudes whose opposition to Calvinism would cease the moment they believed it to be what they hypocritically pretend that it is. The true ground of the hostility of such men to the Calvinistic scheme is this, that while it maintains predestination it prevents its abuse; securing the divine purpose and glory without excusing the guilt of the transgressor; teaching God's sovereignty without impeaching man's accountability; showing from the scriptures that the wrath of man shall praise Him, and yet the sinner be punished, who in his opposition shall glorify his creator while securing his own condemnation, of which the death of Christ is the most illustrious example. "Him being delivered," says the apostle, "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands crucified and slain." If the Supreme Governor is able to secure his glory and the great interests of his government by overruling and restraining the conduct of wicked men, without interfering with their freedom or responsibility, then is the reason of the permission of sin manifest, and the philosophy of being disclosed. The question, "why doth he yet find fault, for who hath resisted his will?" is sufficiently answered by the fact, that men are to be judged by the motives and not the results of their conduct, and that God has other purposes to answer in bearing long with men, besides that of salvation. "What" says the apostle in reply to this question, "if God, willing to shew his wrath and make his power known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction." If the glory of God and the greatest good are secured in the moral universe without any infringement of

freedom, and without furnishing any apology for sin, which is the conclusion of Calvinism, what is there in it unreasonable or unphilosophical?

It is not the understanding but the heart which rejects this truth; the wicked and impenitent will always be offended in the doctrines which make the wrath of man to praise God, though graven upon the rocks by the pen of truth, or uttered by the voices of the seven thunders at noon-day.

But the objections against the Calvinistic scheme, are not confined to infidels and the openly irreligious. Professing Christians, whose sincerity is unquestioned, inquirers after truth whose motives are not impeached, stumble at this stumbling stone. They can see no beauty in Calvinism that they should desire it, no consistency that they should believe it, and while they would by no means doubt the piety of those who embrace the system as that revealed by the Spirit of God in the sacred scriptures, they cannot consent to it and seem to wonder that those who do, should ever exhibit the power of true religion, and that a tree so evil should ever produce good fruit.

It is assumed by this class of objectors that predestination and freedom, divine purposes and human accountability are inconceivably and fatally at variance, and that the belief of the one necessarily involves the denial of the other. Now without entering upon the nature of the freedom of the will, it is sufficient to say that no man can prove that God's sovereignty and man's freedom are inconsistent, or that contingency is necessary to liberty; it is an assumption without evidence or argument, a conclusion without a premise. The inductive philosophy does not allow theory to contradict fact, which is exactly what is done by the opponents of Calvinism. It is not too much to say, that the phenomena of the universe demand the admission of both foreordination and freedom, that the actual government of God cannot be explained without it, and that to set them in opposition is to make one first truth contradict another. Predestination is inseparable from the existence and attributes of God, freedom and accountability are demonstrated by the testimony of consciousness. We are as certain of the latter as we are of our own existence, of the former as we are of the existence of an intelligent first cause. The agreement of propositions is to be inferred from their truth. What is more common in mathematical investigations than

the conclusion of the agreement of quantities or lines with each other, by their common agreement with a third; or in natural philosophy the observation of phenomena and the acknowledgment of truths, the mode of whose agreement no man pretends to understand. It is not the object of science to reconcile, but to ascertain facts; their agreement is presumed. To attempt to controvert facts by speculations about the mode of agreement, to argue against established truths, because the points of union are not seen, is bad reasoning and false philosophy, yet this is the cause of the opponents of Calvinism. The scriptures assert the foreordination of God and the accountability of man in a variety of forms and connexions, but they never reason upon their agreement, or argue their consistency, for to do this would be descending from the major to the minor proof. Do not the inspired writers treat this subject as the Baconian Philosophy deals with all ascertained truth, while the opponents of the Calvinistic divinity fall into the ways of the exploded philosophy of the schoolmen? Calvinists are often tempted to follow their opponents, and theorize about the consistency of doctrines whose agreement no man should be permitted to doubt after their truth is established. The cause has suffered by the speculations of orthodox writers, who have darkened counsel by their speculations. As independent truths, predestination and freedom are easily established by reason and scripture; the one is a necessary inference from the wisdom, power and goodness of God, the other is matter of personal consciousness; the one is the only sure ground of confidence in the divine government and in the final triumph of holiness, the other has its witness in the voice of conscience and in the universal recognition of obligation by all men in every age and under every form of government. Establishing the truth of the two propositions, we reconcile them by the highest possible evidence. Denying the one we rush toward atheism, abandoning the other we fall into fatalism. The attempt to divest the subject of mystery, is as vain as the effect to explain existence itself. Life is a mystery, profound, unfathomable, yet it is a truth, a reality which no one is permitted to question. Can man by searching, find out the mode of the underived and infinite being of God, or of the existence of finite beings? We may descend the scale to the lowest forms of vegetable life and the same inexplicable mystery attaches to the vegetation of a blade of grass. We reach

the boundaries of human knowledge, when we have ascertained facts, and to theorise about their agreement or disagreement, is sounding beyond the reach of our line. The doctrine of predestination is honourable to God and safe for man. Where can power be so safely lodged as in His hands? Who that exercises confidence in the supreme Governor can regret that He doth what he will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth? Who that loves his race will complain that their destiny is in the hands of the ever blessed God? Would any one prefer to have the moral universe upon the ocean of contingency, exposed to irretrievable ruin, subject to a hopeless wreck? Dare any man commit his own interests and those of mankind to such a hazard, and maintain a system which renders it possible that the ploughshare of final ruin may be driven on the hopes of a world? Who would seriously prefer a blind chance to the purpose of a wise, omnipotent and benevolent Sovereign able to bring good out of evil and light out of darkness? Creation itself was a blunder or an absurdity, if He who made all things knew not the issue of his own work, for there cannot be a more unworthy or irreverent idea of God, than that which presumes Him to have left the issue of creation uncertain. Rejecting the mystery of predestination, the opponents of this doctrine rush into a palpable absurdity; departing from the foundation of the divine decrees, they involve themselves in the chaos and old night. Is it not enough that we are conscious of freedom and accountability? Must God be robbed of his attributes to make assurance doubly sure? The very difficulties of the Calvinistic scheme are analogous to those which lie all around us, in the actual government of God. The varied fortunes of men, irrespective of their choice, the wonderful differences in human condition, which result from birth and parentage, which are the sovereign allotments of God, the working out of events in the divine providence against all human calculations and foresight, the impression that has ever haunted the minds of men who have played a great part in the drama of life, that they were raised up for the very purpose of executing the divine judgments, or fulfilling the divine purposes, of which Attila and Napoleon are examples, the one styling himself the scourge of God, the other the child of destiny, and the constant occasion every man has to see the working out of the ends of providence in despite of human sagacity, enter-

prise or opposition, are all so many corroborative proofs that the doctrines of Calvinism are but the exponents of the actual mystery of life. Nor does our experience fail to contradict the theory that predestination is irreconcilable with liberty for while we are compelled to notice the course of providence working out events and accomplishing ends by actors whose motives, designs and desires tend to anything rather than the glory of God or the good of mankind; while every one is made at times to apprehend in his own case, that a man's heart directeth his way but the Lord directeth his steps; yet who ever felt his moral agency infringed, his sense of accountability weakened, or found here an apology in his conscience for his guilt? The opposition to Calvinism is a war of theory against facts; the objections made are never practical, the excuses offered are never felt, the argument is unphilosophical and unreasonable, because it assumes what cannot be proved, that predestination and freedom are inconsistent. Were the principles advocated by the enemies of the Calvinistic scheme carried out, there would be an end of accountability, and law and government would be made to appear the most inexcusable tyranny. What culprit might not point out unfavourable circumstances with which the providence of God has surrounded him, and show to the entire satisfaction of the court and jury, that he might have been a very different man had his birth and parentage been other than they were, had not the pure and blessed influences which have surrounded them in childhood, been withheld from him, and plausibly excuse himself from condemnation. Yet the uniform experience and common sense of mankind, while admitting the premises of such a defence, deny the conclusion, and even the conscience of the criminal finds no relief, for he knows that he has done the things that are worthy of death, that he has treasured up wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. It is an ultimate fact that man is so constituted that no exciting causes, no exposures, no providences can purge his conscience from a sense of guilt, and though it may be evident that others have been made to differ only by the providence and grace of God, he neither excuses himself nor is excused by others on this account.

The Calvinistic scheme is assailed by fatalists, because it maintains that God is not the 'author of sin,' that no 'violence is offered to the will of the creature,' nor their ac-

countability as 'moral agents taken away but rather established,' and by Arminians for the reason that it teaches that 'God foreordains whatsoever comes to pass,' the latter charging the Calvinists with denying accountability, the former alleging that they are not consistent predestinarians, who thus misrepresented and assailed on either hand, are compelled between opposing fires to do battle for the truth. Nobly have the old Calvinists maintained their position, unmoved by denunciation, unseduced by blandishments, separating themselves from false friends, amidst the reproaches of intolerance and antinomianism.

The doctrine of original sin, which lies at the foundation of the doctrines of grace and redemption, is naturally the next point of attack assailed not only by rationalists, but by many who are nominally orthodox. Positions most unreasonable and unphilosophical, are assumed in opposition to this fundamental truth by those who, wise in their own conceit, charge the old Calvinists with being 'behind the intelligence of the age;' the connexion of cause and effect is denied, sin made a contingency uncaused and underived, and if actual transgression is admitted to have any connexion with the sin of Adam, every possible form of that connexion is denied; the imputation of his guilt, the corruption of human nature in the apostasy, are scouted. What is this but to affirm and deny in the same breath? Those who reject the universal depravity of man are far more consistent in their opposition, and it has been well remarked by a leading organ of the Unitarians in this country, that the denial of original sin is removing the key stone out of the arch of Calvinism. The corruption of human nature is the only sufficient cause, the only satisfactory account of actual transgression, if men are universally sinners, and this is the conclusion of reason no less than of Revelation.

The wisest of the ancient pagan philosophers acknowledged the universal corruption of human nature, though they knew not the remedy and had but one imperfect tradition of the apostasy. Let modern Rationalists mark the testimony of men whose conclusions were the result of profound observation and experience, centuries before Augustine was called to defend a doctrine, until then undisputed in the church, against the assaults of Pelagius. Plato asserts that "if children were born virtuous by nature, we should seclude them from contagion and guard them more sacredly than jewels." Plutarch affirms that "depravity is transmit-

ted in generation, hence the disorders of the soul, the diseases of the body and the cares and fate of mortals." Horace in one of his Odes asserts that no man is born free from vice. Sopater declares that "there is innate inclination in man to sin." Seneca says, "we have all sinned, some in greater things, some in minor. Nor do we merely come short now, but we shall continue to do so to the end of life." Thucydides that "all men sin both in public and private." These opinions are not expressed as articles of faith or as a dogma of religion, but philosophically as the conclusions of experience. They are the natural result of sound reasoning from effect to cause, to which all profound observers of human nature must unavoidably come. The contest of Rationalists and Pelagians is not merely with Calvinism and the scriptures, in their opposition to the doctrine of original sin, but with the reason and common sense of which they profess to be devoted adherents.

The opposition to the doctrine of particular election is equally groundless, for it flows naturally out of the attributes of God, and is the expression of his determination to secure the salvation of the entire number that can wisely and consistently be saved on the principles of his moral government. The only ground of encouragement, the safe hope of a ruined world, is in the revelation of the purpose of God to give his Son 'a seed to serve him.' The promise of the spread of the gospel, and of the universal reign of Christ in the period of millennial glory is founded on the doctrine of the divine election, which interfering with the freedom of no man and opposing no one obstacle in the way of the salvation of any, encourages the greatest offender with the hope of divine aid to rescue himself out of the snare of the devil, and encourages the church to press forward in the work of preaching the gospel to every creature, among all nations, being assured that God will "take out of them a people for his name," and that in no place where the word is dispensed shall there be wanting "a remnant after the election of grace." Take another view of election. God in the beginning either determined to save all men or a part only, or to leave the matter of human salvation contingent. He either provided for the salvation of all in the atonement, or for a portion of mankind, or he made the gospel scheme an experiment, the issue of which is uncertain in his own mind. If God preferred the salvation of the whole race, then is that end secured in the plan of redemption through Jesus

Christ, who by 'one offering hath perfected forever them that are sanctified;' if of a part only then is that result in like manner attained; if he had no purpose in the case, then the salvation of any is doubtful, and there is no certainty that Christ shall have seed to serve him or that he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; then the foundations of our hope for the world's recovery are forever removed, and the ark of the church is floating over the trackless waters without the guidance of Jehovah Jireh, without pilot or compass—

"A boat at midnight sent alone
To drift upon a moonless sea."

Which of these conclusions is the most scriptural, which the most reasonable in view of the testimony of experience that few find the gate or walk in the way of life? Do not the goodness and power of God secure those results which he from all eternity saw to be most desirable for the general good? He will certainly accomplish the salvation of the greatest possible number which he sees it to be wise and best to save, and all others will be left to the choice of their depraved will, to "walk in the ways of their heart, and in the sight of their eyes, and finally to perish in their darling corruptions." Will the champion of liberty and free-will, complain that the non-elect are left to their freedom? Why one nation has the gospel and not another, why one individual is taken and another left, why the period of the universal and effectual calling and sanctification of all men, is deferred until the millennium, are questions unsolved in the sacred scriptures, and unimportant for us to know. To limit the divine power, to deny, as some do, the possibility of its exertion beyond its actual influence, is to impeach the omnipotence of God, to abandon all correct views of regeneration, and to make salvation a matter of debt instead of an act of sovereign grace. The voice that called Lazarus from the grave, would have caused earth and sea to render up their dead had it been addressed to them; it was a demonstration of omnipotence, and the pledge of a future resurrection; the spirit that quickeneth might, so far as power is concerned, as easily regenerate all as one, had it been addressed wisest and best in the counsels of the Trinity, and the effect to justify the ways of God to man by limiting the divine power, is worthy of the rebuke with which a similar folly is chastised in the sacred scriptures, "will ye speak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for Him, will ye ac-

cept his person, will ye contend for God? Shall not his excellency make you afraid and his dread fall upon you." The argument that if God were able he would save all men, is subversive of the gospel, because it is no more of grace and favour, but a mere exhibition of the limits of God's power, who would upon this principle be bound to confer salvation upon all men if he could. Nor is it a sound conclusion, to affirm that because the atonement was sufficient in its nature for the salvation of all men, it must have been made for all; the inference from the premises is not legitimate; besides it destroys the character of the atonement as vicarious, unless the doctrine of universal salvation be conceded. To say that Christ laid down his life for all men, while he secured the salvation of a part only, seems to us neither sound reasoning nor scriptural theology, exhibiting as it does, the only wise God as laying foundations which it was never intended should be built upon. It has been well said that there is not gospel enough in some of the new theories of the atonement, to satisfy a pious mind or furnish a reasonable hope of salvation, they are 'broken cisterns which will hold no water.' The old Calvinism is the only scheme consistent in all its parts, or agreeable to the word of God, and the attempt to win men by yielding to their unreasonable objections the cardinal points of the plan of salvation by grace, will prove futile; those who engage in it will find at last that they have not gained the enemy, but have rather gone over to them, and that in abandoning the outposts they have surrendered the citadel.

The opposition to Calvinism is not confined to the open attacks of fatalists on the one hand, and Arminians and latitudinarians on the other. The most formidable attacks are made upon the Calvinistic scheme by those who acknowledge its symbols, and are solemnly pledged by their ordination vows and public profession to maintain them; men who claim to defend, as a whole, a system of doctrine, all the details of which they deny, or so explain and modify as to leave the impression that they cannot be defended on the ground of reason and scripture; that is the old Calvinism; but they have a young Calvinism, a new philosophy in the field of controversy, mounted on the war horse of Pelagius, about to "witch the world with noble horsemanship." Sometimes they agree, sometimes they differ; when it suits their turn they represent the position of the old Calvinism as God-dishon-

ouring, soul-destroying, and altogether monstrous; at another time, and for another purpose, they will sweetly assure you that between the old and the new there is no material difference. Honest men hardly know what to say when they hear Calvinism praised by those who deny its main positions; who are with you and against you, as it may happen; who do not hesitate to call original sin original nonsense; who ridicule the idea of the imputation of Adam's sin or Christ's righteousness, and then gravely allege that they hold to the Confession of Faith, and do not differ from the older divines. Charity hopeth all things, but it is impossible to give a construction to such conduct which will reconcile it with truth and honesty. That the old Calvinism is the true scriptural divinity, may be inferred from the fact that it is charged by one class of objectors with producing, in the lives and examples of its professors, an excessive strictness and austerity, an exaggerated devotion to spiritual interests; while another kind of opposers denounce the system as unfruitful in revivals of religion, producing a dead orthodoxy, more anxious for doctrines and symbols than for the salvation of souls. The constant recognition of the hand of God in all events, which is characteristic of Calvinists; the fact that they hold to the substance and not to the shadow, to the life and not to the forms of religion; that they look upon the present state as a pilgrimage in which the believer is engaged in a severe conflict with his remaining depravity, and with the powers of darkness, is of course offensive to formalists, a perpetual reproach to the gay and thoughtless, an unpardonable offence to the profligate, while their habitual caution of novelties, their refusal to believe every spirit, their unwillingness to do evil that good may come, excites against them the opposition of those who have a zeal without knowledge, or who are ambitious to become the founder of a new system of divinity, adapted to the wants of the age, or who "privily bring in damnable heresies." Infidelity, formality, and fanaticism make a common target of the Calvinistic scheme; and this is no inconsiderable proof that it is the system of doctrine revealed by the Holy Spirit in the sacred scriptures. The formal, the false, the fanatical and the superstitious, are fully forgiven by the irreligious masses, while Calvinism meets with no favour, and finds no apologists among them; the reason is obvious, the one gives them a plea for ridiculing all religion, the other compels them to suspect that it may be a reality. The wonder

that has sometimes been expressed, that the high Calvinism of the Presbyterians and Puritans should have produced so energetic and decided a cast of character, is the result of an unphilosophical and shallow view of the subject. The fatalist denies the use of means to ends, and stupidly remains in the vicinage of the plague; the Arminian, looking only to the means and not to the power, has really no encouragement to vigorous effort, and soon falls into indifference, satisfied with the religion of forms and externals. Fanaticism moves the soul to its inmost depth, and develops energies grand in their strength, but fearful from their misdirection. Calvinism combines the power of all opposing systems without admixture of their errors, acknowledging predestination, yet maintaining that the purposes of God are ordinarily accomplished by means, that the certainty of action does not destroy its freedom or impair the obligation to do with our might what our hands find to do. With the Arminian, the Calvinistic divinity admits the importance of well selected means to a desired end, but denies that the end justifies the means, asserting that "duties are ours, events are God's." Fanaticism lives and has its power in a real faith, however absurd its object; Calvinism inspires a living faith in realities. The latter is like a magnificent river, moving toward the ocean of eternity, fertilizing an empire, and bearing upon its bosom multitudes to the desired haven; the former is the same river, rising above its banks, overwhelming in its terrific course all things in a general ruin, and burying the broken fragments and dead bodies in a common grave. Every argument to effort and action, to patience and self-denial, which is found in man's accountability, and in the proper use of means, belongs to Calvinism; while faith in the firm purpose and promise of God excites invincible energy in the execution of great attempts. No hardships can deter, no discouragements can hinder the man who in the path of duty knows that God can work by few as well as many, and is able to make him stand, "though earth and hell should unite against him." All the elements of power are in the system which combines a firm reliance upon an overruling providence with a high sense of duty, irrespective of consequences; which encourages effort by the promise of divine assistance; which commands the creature to work out his salvation with fear and trembling, because it is God that worketh in him. both to will and to do; which excites the church to proclaim the gospel in every nation and to every

creature, upon the promise that the Son shall have the heathen for his inheritance. Is it then any marvel that the old Calvinists were distinguished for their earnest piety, for their courage in attempting great enterprises, their fortitude under reverses, and their indomitable spirit in the defence of violated rights? Were not these characteristics the fruits of their faith, the exponents of their creed? The day that John Knox was laid in the grave, the Regent of Scotland said, "there lies one who in his life never feared the face of man." What were earthly monarchs to men who held communion with the King of Kings, who gazed by faith into the "thick darkness" where Jehovah dwells, who grappled in their spiritual conflicts with principalities and powers, with evil spirits in high places, and who were persuaded that there was "no power but of God?" Such men were victors in defeat, conquerors at the stake. Death only hallowed their influence; the grave of every martyred Presbyterian in Scotland is "a fortress of freedom;" the memories of the Puritans, whose bodies were exhumed and exposed to the insults of the populace on the restoration of the second Charles, will be honoured when the Stuarts are forgotten. Let Calvinism be known by its fruits; let the end be judged by the long line of martyrs and witnesses of Jesus, who have sealed their faith with their blood, after illustrating it by their lives; by the memories of our fathers, who kindled anew the sacred fire, when despotism was about to crush out the last spark which yet glimmered upon the altars of freedom; by the present position of the Calvinistic churches pressing forward in the van of Christendom to the conquest of the world, confident in the purpose and promise of God, the ark of their faith floating unhurt amid the tumultuous waters which rage and roar, but are not able to destroy. The floods have lifted up, O Lord, the floods have lifted up their voice, the floods lift up their waves, the Lord on high is mightier than the voice of many waters, yea than the mighty waves of the sea!

Jas. H. Alexander.

ART. V.--*Proceedings of the meeting in Charleston, S. C., May 13—15, 1845, on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes, together with the Report of the Commit-*