

JOHNSON'S
UNIVERSAL CYCLOPÆDIA

A NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A CORPS OF THIRTY-SIX EDITORS, ASSISTED BY
EMINENT EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN SPECIALISTS

UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D.
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

ILLUSTRATED WITH MAPS, PLANS, AND ENGRAVINGS

COMPLETE IN EIGHT VOLUMES
VOL. II

NEW YORK
A. J. JOHNSON COMPANY
1894

COPYRIGHT, 1874, 1877,
BY A. J. JOHNSON.

COPYRIGHT, 1885, 1889,
BY A. J. JOHNSON AND COMPANY.

COPYRIGHT, 1893,
BY A. J. JOHNSON COMPANY.

in the latter part of July, 1536, intending merely to stop over night, but Farel laid hold of him, and solemnly adjured him to remain as pastor of the feeble evangelical church there lately gathered, and he consented. Perceiving the imperative need of a strong moral government, he proceeded to give one, but the discipline he set up was too stern to be endured. He was banished Apr. 22, 1538; went first to Bern, then to Zurich, and then to Basel. In Sept., 1538, he settled as pastor in Strassburg, and there in 1540 he married the widow Idelette de Bure, with whom he lived happily nine years. In 1541 he returned in triumph to Geneva, being recalled by the united voice of the secular and religious authorities, with the general assent of the people. He arrived Sept. 13, went at once to work, and never ceased his beneficent activity. He ruled the city with an iron hand, and by his writings exerted a dominant influence upon the Reformed Church in all lands. His reform met with vigorous opposition from the so-called Patriots and Libertines, and for ten years he kept up the fight. He conquered at last. He opposed heresy as well, and his opponents, as Bolsec, Curio, Ochino, and above all Servetus, felt his resistless power. He was great as a preacher, unrivaled as a clear and profound thinker. He corresponded with the Protestant leaders in all lands. With Melancthon he enjoyed peculiarly friendly relations. The French language owes him a debt like that which the German language owes Luther. Civil liberty the world over is likewise his debtor. He is the father of Presbyterianism, and the greatest of all Protestant commentators and theologians. There is but one blot upon his memory. The burning of Servetus for heresy (Oct. 27, 1553), though sanctioned even by Melancthon, was a shocking tragedy. Calvin died in Geneva, May 27, 1564. The standard edition of Calvin's works is that of Amsterdam (1671, 9 vols. fol.). The exhaustive edition by G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss (Brunswick, 1863, *sqq.*, vol. xlviii., 1892) is not yet complete. There is an English translation nearly complete (Edinburgh, 1843-53, 52 vols.). Most accessible are his *Institutes* and *Correspondence*, 4 vols. (both pub. Presbyterian Bk., Phila.). The best biographies are by T. Beza, in Latin and French (Geneva, 1564); Paul Henry, in German (Hamburg, 1835-44, 3 vols.); partially translated, London and New York, 1881, 2 vols.); Henry abridged his book (Hamburg, 1846); T. H. Dyer, in English (London, 1850); E. Stähelin, in German (Elberfeld, 1863, 2 vols.); cf. especially Schaff, *Hist. Chr. Ch.*, vol. vii. (Reformation in Switzerland, pp. 223-844). The Roman Catholic scholar F. W. Kampschulte left unfinished at his death an excellent study of Calvin's Genevan activity (Leipzig, 1869).

R. D. HITCHCOCK.

Revised and enlarged by S. M. JACKSON.

Calvinism: Calvinism (like Pelagianism and Lutheranism) is a term used to designate, not the opinions of an individual, but a mode of religious thought or a system of religious doctrines, of which the person whose name it bears was an eminent expounder. It is synonymous therefore with what is technically called "the Reformed Theology." There have from the beginning coexisted in the Christian Church three specially well-marked and generically distinct systems of doctrine, or modes of conceiving and adjusting the facts and principles understood to be revealed in the Scriptures, under one or the other of which nearly every form of theological thought may be subsumed. One of these is the Pelagian, which denies the native guilt, pollution, and moral impotence of man, and makes him independent of the supernatural assistance of God. At the other pole is the Calvinistic system, which emphasizes the guilt and impotence of man, exalts God, and refers salvation absolutely to the infinite love and undeserved favor of God working in harmony with his justice, sovereignly selecting its objects, and saving them by the almighty power of grace. Between these comes the manifold and elastic system of compromise known in one of its earlier forms as Semi-Pelagianism, and in a more modern type as Arminianism, which admits man's original pollution but denies his native guilt, regards redemption as a compensation for innate and consequently irresponsible disabilities, and refers the moral restoration of the individual to the co-operation of the human with the Divine energy, the determining factor being the human will. The system to which this article is devoted was known historically, in its opposition to Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, and is now designated more generally and indefinitely, by the title *Augustinianism*, from its earliest champion, the illustrious Augustine, Bishop of Hippo Regius in Northern Af-

rica (395-430 A. D.); while the more modern and specific title is *Calvinism*, from the fact that it was developed into a perfect form, and infused into the creeds of the Reformed Churches, and into the life of modern nations, through the instrumentality of John Calvin, the Reformer, of Geneva (1509-1564). The authentic statement of its constituent doctrines is not to be drawn exclusively from the writings of either of the great men mentioned, but from the public confessions of those Churches which have professed this form of doctrine, and from the classical writings of their representative theologians.

The Reformed Confessions are very numerous—more than thirty in number—but they substantially agree in the system of doctrine which they teach. Those which have been most widely accepted as of symbolical authority are the Second Helvetic Confession, prepared by Bullinger, 1564, and adopted by all the Reformed Churches of Switzerland (with the exception of Basel) as well as by the Reformed Churches of Poland, Hungary, Scotland, and France; the Heidelberg or Palatinate Catechism, prepared by Ursinus and Olevianus, 1582, indorsed by the Synod of Dort, and accepted as a doctrinal standard by the Reformed Churches of Germany and Holland, as well as by their representatives in America; the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; the Canons of the Synod of Dort, 1618-19, an Œcumenical Synod of the Reformed Churches; and the Westminster Confession, with its accompanying Larger and Shorter Catechisms, prepared by the famous Westminster Assembly, 1644-47, and accepted as a doctrinal standard by the Presbyterian Churches and by British Calvinists in general. The Canons of Dort are not so much a complete confession as a supplement to the previous confessions of the Reformed Churches, which was necessitated by the rise of the Arminian controversy. The Westminster Confession is the only Reformed creed of wide acceptance which was framed after this controversy; it was prepared with the intention of exhibiting the harmony of the Reformed Churches, and with Œcumenical purpose and breadth; and it presents "the fullest and ripest symbolical statement of the Calvinistic system of doctrine" (Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, i., 788).

John Calvin remains the most representative theologian of Calvinism. Perhaps a list of representative theologians after him would include especially Bullinger, Aretius, Ursinus, Zanchius, Polanus, of the first age, with such others as Amesius, Voetius, Witsius, Heidegger, Turretin, and among English writers John Owen, John Howe, and Jonathan Edwards for the next age. Modern Presbyterian Calvinism "is best represented by the theological systems of Charles Hodge, W. G. T. Shedd, and Henry B. Smith" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. vii., p. 544). The *vade mecum* of the Reformed pastors was in early days Bucanus's *Institutiones*; this was supplanted later by Amesius's *Medulla*; and it in turn by Marck's *Compendium*; perhaps no handbook is more used to-day than A. A. Hodge's *Outlines*. Attempts more or less successful have been made to present the Calvinistic system from the writings of its representative theologians by, among others, Heinrich Heppé (*Die Dogmatic der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, Elberfeld, 1861); Alexander Schweizer (*Die Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, Zurich, 1844-47); and J. H. Scholten (*Leer der Hervormde Kerk, in hare grondbeginselen uit de bronnen voorgesteld en beoordeeld*, 1848-50).

It is proposed in this article to present, in necessarily meager outline, a statement (I) of the fundamental characteristics of the system; (II) of the history of its development and prevalence both before and after Calvin; and (III) of its practical moral influence upon individuals and upon communities.

I. Statement of Principles.—There is a very important distinction between the central, formative, or root principle of a system and its distinguishing features, which is not attended to when it is said, as it is sometimes said, that the "principle" of Calvinism is "the metaphysical principle of predestination." Predestination is rather a logical consequence of, and an essential element in, than the determining principle of, Calvinism. This is rather the glory of the Lord God Almighty. The formative idea of Calvinism is the conception of God; and it is its determination that God shall be and remain God in all its thought—to embrace God in the wholeness of His nature, and to do full justice to God in all His relations—which itself determines all those doctrines which have from time to time been mistaken for its "prin-

ciple." On the practical side this is equivalent to saying that it is the effort of Calvinism to do full justice to the essence of religion. "Since all religion springs from the relation in which God the Creator has placed us, His creatures, to himself, it follows that the greatest religious height will be reached by him who at every point of his horizon views God as God, by honoring Him in all things," as the Almighty Being who has created all things for His own sake, who is bound by nothing out of himself, and who determines for every creature both its being and the law thereof, both now and for eternity. And "as religion on earth finds its highest expression in the act of prayer," "Calvinism in the Christian Church is simply that tendency which makes a man assume the same attitude toward God in his profession and life which he always exhibits in his prayer. . . . Whoever truly prays ascribes nothing to his own will or power except the sin that condemns him before God, and knows of nothing that could endure the judgment of God except it be wrought within him by the Divine love. But while all other tendencies in the Church preserve this attitude so long as their prayer lasts, to lose themselves in radically different conceptions as soon as the amen has been pronounced, the Calvinist adheres to the truth of his prayer in his confession, in his theology, in his life, and the amen that has closed his petition re-echoes in the depths of his consciousness and throughout the whole of his existence." A. Kuyper, *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, ii., 378-382.

Those teachings which distinguish the Calvinistic from other systems of theology are simply the outgrowth of this fundamental attitude of mind. The Synod of Dort defined the distinguishing doctrines of Calvinism as over against Arminianism in five propositions, which have therefore since been called "the five points of Calvinism," though they are rather the Calvinistic response to "the five points of Arminianism" than an independent statement of the differentiating elements of Calvinism. These five points affirmed absolute predestination, particular redemption, total depravity, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints. If a single distinguishing principle is to be discriminated among these, it will not be found in "predestination," but rather in "irresistible grace." Predestination is acknowledged by both parties, and is indeed a necessary postulate of natural religion; the difference between the parties here lies in the conception of the *ground* of the predestinating decree. The distinguishing mark of Calvinism as over against all other systems lies in its doctrines of "efficacious grace," which, it teaches, is the undeserved, and therefore gratuitous, and therefore sovereign, mercy of God, by which He efficaciously brings whom He will into salvation. Calvinism is specifically the theology of grace; and all are properly Calvinists who confess the absolute sovereignty of God in the distribution of His saving mercy. Two modifications of typical Calvinism have been attempted within the limits of the system, and have had considerable temporary and local influence. One of these, called Salmurianism from its place of origin (the theological school of Saumur, in France), sought to reconcile the sovereignty of grace with the doctrine of a universal atonement, which had been taught previously only by Pelagians and Arminians; this involved a modification of the doctrine of "particular redemption," and with it of the nature, purpose, and effect of the atonement, but left the doctrine of "irresistible grace" unaffected. The other modification sought to reconcile the sovereignty of grace with the Pelagian theory of the will and of man's power to the contrary; in its highest form (as taught by Bellarmine and certain Jesuit theologians) it has received the name of "the doctrine of congruity," and teaches that God adapts the amount and time of the persuasive influences of His Spirit to the foreseen state of mind of those whom He elects to salvation, and thus secures their free acceptance of His offers of mercy. This modification affects directly the doctrine of "irresistible grace," but remains Calvinistic so long as it makes God's selection of the recipients of the saving mercy entirely sovereign, and His application of grace to them certainly efficacious. Typical Calvinism, which remains the faith of the great body of those who hold this type of doctrine, teaches that "efficacious grace" is the creative efficiency of the Holy Spirit operating beneath consciousness, not by moral suasion but "physically," the soul remaining passive therein until it has been quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit and thereby enabled to act in the powers of its new life.

The following is an exposition of the chief features of Calvinism as a system of doctrine.

A. *The Relation of the Creator to the Creation.*—There are three generically distinct views as to the relation of the Creator to the creation, each, of course, embracing many specific varieties under it. 1. The Deistical view, which admits a creation *ex nihilo*, and an original endowment of the elements with their active powers, and the subjection of the whole system of things to certain general laws, adapted to the evolution of certain fixed plans. The general plan and order of the creation is attributed to the Creator, and all events are referred to Him in a general sense as the indefinitely remote First Cause, who inaugurated the ever-flowing line of second causes. This view, however, denies the continued immanence of the Creator in the creation, and the immediate dependence of the creature on the Creator for the continuance of its substance, the possession of its properties, and the exercise of its powers. 2. The opposite extreme is the Pantheistic mode of thought, which identifies God and the universe as His existence-form, or at least so confines Him to it as to deny His transcendence beyond the universe as an extra-mundane Spirit and conscious Person whose actions are rationally determined volitions. 3. Between these extremes stands Christian Theism. It emphasizes at once the transcendence of God beyond, and the immanence of God within, the world. He remains ever a conscious personal Spirit, without and above the world, able, in the exercise of His free volitions, sovereignly to exercise a supernatural influence (*potestas libera*) upon any part of that system of nature which He has established, ordinarily working through second causes, "yet free to work without, above, and against them at His pleasure." At the same time He continues to interpenetrate the inmost being of every element of every creature with the infinite energies of His free intelligent will, and His creatures momentarily continue absolutely dependent upon the energy of that will for substance and for the possession of the powers communicated to them as second causes in all their exercises.

All Christians, of course, are Theists in the sense thus defined; but the different schools of Christian theology take their points of departure here, as, on the one hand, they press the essential dependence of the creature upon the Creator in substance, properties, and actions, or as, on the other hand, they press the self-active power of second causes, and by consequence their self-sufficiency and independence. Here we have the ultimate antithetical grounds of Pelagianism and Augustinianism. Pelagius, who was characterized by a rationalistic habit of thought and a superficial religious experience, believing that power to the contrary is an inalienable attribute of every act of free will, necessary to render it responsible and therefore moral, maintained, in the supposed interests of morals, that every free agent is so adequately endowed by God as to be inalienably self-sufficient for action, each in a manner appropriate to his kind. Augustine, on the contrary, held that every creature exists and acts only as its substance is momentarily sustained, and its action conditioned, by the omnipresent and omnipotent energy of God. While affirming the free self-determining power of the human soul, he referred the moral character of the volition to the disposition which prompted it, and the persistence of the moral nature of man to the immanent influences of the Spirit of God. Even anterior to apostasy, therefore, the spirit of man depended for spiritual life and moral integrity upon the *concursus* of the Spirit of God, and the withdrawal of this would be the immediate cause of spiritual death and moral impotence. This Divine influence, in one degree and in one mode or another, is common to all creatures and all their actions. This view of Augustine was subsequently elaborated by his disciples into the theory of the "previous," "simultaneous," and "determining" *concursus* of the Thomists and Reformed theologians. See the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, 2. 1. 10., and Turretin, 6. 6. 6. and 7.

B. *The End or Design of God in Creation.*—Every intelligent Theist must regard the universe as one system, and must therefore believe that the Creator had from the beginning one general end, for the accomplishment of which the whole and all its parts were intended. This general end must have determined the Creator in every step he has taken in the evolution of the universe, and hence our conception of it will give shape to any speculations we may form with respect to the relations of God and His works. It is evident that no solution of this transcendent question can be reached by reasoning from *a priori* principles, or by generalizations drawn from the comparatively few facts at present accessible to our observation, and that it can be rationally sought

for only in a direct revelation. For the most part, this general end has been referred to the essential benevolence of God, prompting Him to confer the greatest possible amount of blessedness, in the highest forms of excellence, upon innumerable objects of His love. Leibnitz, in his *Théodicée* (1710), which has exerted a wide influence on all modern speculation, lowered this view by emphasizing the "happiness" of the creatures as the great end of the creative goodness. The Scriptures, on the contrary, emphatically declare that the manifestation of His own glorious perfections is the actual and most worthy possible end of the great Designer, in all His works of creation, providence, and redemption; and hence likewise the final end of all His intelligent creatures in all moral action. The recognition of this great principle, and its application to the interpretation of all God's dealings with man, and of all man's duties to God, has always been an essential characteristic of Calvinism. Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, with more or less decision, place the general end of the system of things in the well-being of the creature: Calvinists place it absolutely in the glory of the Creator, which carries with it, not as a *co-ordinate* design, but as a *subordinate* yet certain effect, the blessedness of all loyal creatures.

C. *The Relation which the Eternal Plan of God sustains to the Actual Evolution of Events in Time.*—Every Theist believes that the eternal and absolutely perfect intelligence of the Creator must have formed from the beginning a plan comprehending the entire system of creation and providence in reference to the great end for which they were designed. Pelagius himself admitted that the absolute foreknowledge of God embraced the future volitions of free agents, as well as all other classes of events, while he denied their foreordination. The Socinians, who have developed Pelagianism into a complete system, more consistently deny foreknowledge, as well as foreordination, since, if it is essential that a volition should be purely contingent in order that it should be responsible, it must be indeterminate before the event, and while indeterminate it can not be certainly foreknown. The Arminians (though not without exceptions, such as Adam Clarke and the late Dr. McCabe) admit foreknowledge, but deny foreordination. The Calvinists argue that, in an intelligent being, prevision implies provision; and that the admission of God's infinite foreknowledge therefore necessarily involves the admission of His eternal foreordination.

In this matter they maintain the following positions: 1. In the case of an infinitely wise, powerful, and free Creator of all things *ex nihilo*, it is obvious that the certain foreknowledge of all events from the absolute beginning virtually involves the predetermination of each event, without exception; for all the causes and consequences, direct and contingent, which are foreseen before creation are, of course, determined by creation. As Sir William Hamilton asserts (*Discussions*, Appendix 1, A), "the two great articles of foreknowledge and predestination are both embarrassed by the self-same difficulties." 2. Since all events constitute a single system, the Creator must embrace the system as a whole, and every infinitesimal element of it, in one all-comprehensive intention. Ends more or less general must be determined as ends, and means and conditions in all their several relations to the ends which are made dependent upon them. Hence, while every event remains dependent upon its causes and contingent upon its conditions, none of God's purposes can possibly be contingent, because in turn every cause and condition is determined in that purpose, as well as the ends which are suspended upon them. All the decrees of God are hence called absolute, because they are ultimately determined always by "the counsel of His own will," and never by anything exterior to Him which has not in turn been previously determined by Him. 3. This determination, however, instead of interfering with, maintains the true causality of the creature, and the free self-determination of men and angels. The eternal and immutable plan of God has constituted man a free agent, and consequently can never interfere with the exercise of that freedom of which it is itself the foundation. However, according to the principles above stated, this created free will is not independent, but ever continues to have its ground in the conserving energies of the omnipresent Creator. Since the holiness of the created moral agent is conditioned upon the indwelling of Divine grace, and its turning from grace is the cause of sin, it follows that all the good in the volitions of free agents is to be referred to God as its positive source, but all the evil (which originates in defect, privation) is to be referred simply to His permission. In this

view, all events, without exception, are embraced in God's eternal purpose; even the primal apostasies of Satan and of Adam, as well as all those consequences which have flowed from them. It is in view of these principles that Calvinism has been so often confounded with fatalism. It is, however, the antipodes of fatalism, preserving the real efficiency of second causes while subjecting their action to intelligent control. It teaches that the all-penetrating and all-energizing will of the personal Jehovah, who is at once perfect Love and perfect Light, constitutes and conserves our free agency, and through its free spontaneity works continually the ever-blessed counsel of His own will, weaving even rebellious volitions into the instrumentalities of His purpose, and making every consenting soul a conscious coworker with himself.

As to the bearing of this principle upon the question of the design of God in the application of redemption (predestination), see below.

D. *The Manner in which the Divine Attributes of Benevolence, Justice, and Grace are illustrated in the Scheme of Redemption.*—Arminians have generally held, with Leibnitz, that "justice is benevolence acting according to wisdom"—i. e. inflicting a lesser pain in order to effect a greater or more general happiness. The necessity for punishment therefore lies not in the essential and inexorable demands of righteousness, but in its being the best means to secure the moral reformation of the sinner, and the best motive to restrain the community from disobedience. Grotius maintained that the moral law is a product of the Divine will, and therefore capable of being relaxed by that will. In the gospel scheme, therefore, God, in the exercise of His sovereign prerogative, relaxes His law by forgiving sinners upon repentance and reformation, while as an administrative precaution He makes an exhibition of severe suffering in the person of His Son, in order that all other subjects of His moral government may be deterred from making the impunity of repentant men an encouragement to disobedience. The atonement, therefore, was an exhibition solely of the Divine benevolence, but not of justice in the ordinary sense of that word.

Calvinists, on the contrary, hold that justice in the strict sense, as well as benevolence, is an essential and ultimate property of the Divine nature, and hence lies back of, and determines the character of, all the Divine volitions. By the perfection of God's nature He is always both benevolent and just in all His actions. The atonement accordingly was an act of infinite love, seeking and finding a way to be both just and yet the justifier of the sinner; it provides a Divine substitute for the sinner, who undertakes for him and bears his penalties, and works out a perfect righteousness in his stead, with regard to which God may accept the person of the sinner as (judicially) righteous in His sight. While Arminians in their view of the gospel emphasize benevolence, Calvinists in their view emphasize justice and grace.

E. *The Degree of Guilt and Moral Damage entailed through the Apostasy of Adam upon his Posterity.*—The answers respectively given to this question impose form and character upon all the various systems of theology.

1. Pelagius held that free will (*liberum arbitrium*), in the sense of an absolutely unconditioned power of choice between good and evil, is essential to responsible moral agency, and hence inalienable from human nature. Since, then, all men continue after the apostasy to be responsible moral agents, their nature in this essential respect must remain in the same condition in which it was created. The moral agency of a man at any one moment can not determine the character of his moral agency at any other moment, and he possesses throughout his entire existence ability to will and to do all that God has any right to require of him. Hence Pelagians deny—(1) All original sin or corruption of nature, because sinfulness can be predicated only of free acts, and man in order to be responsible must always possess plenary ability to will aright. (2) All original guilt or desert of punishment common to the race, and prior to the actual transgression of the individual, since it would be a violation of justice to hold one moral agent responsible for the wrong volitions of another. (3) Hence men need redemption through Christ only to deliver them from the guilt of actual and personal transgression, and only those need it who have thus sinned. Those dying in infancy are therefore worthy of neither reward nor punishment, and can be benefited by Christ only by being raised to a higher plane of blessedness than that belonging to nature—to the *regnum celorum* as distinguished from the *vita aeterna*.

2. Augustinians and Calvinists, on the contrary, maintain—(1) That the entire soul, with all its constitutional faculties and acquired habits, is the organ of volition, the agent willing. (2) That this soul possesses the inalienable property of self-determination, the moral character of which determination always depends upon the moral condition of the soul acting. (3) That the holy moral condition of the soul, and hence its spontaneous disposition to will that which is right, depends upon the indwelling of the Divine Spirit. The free agency of God is an absolute self-existent and self-sufficient perfection, self-determined to good and incapable of evil. The freedom of saints and angels confirmed in holiness is dependent upon Divine assistance, but, like that of God himself, it is the very opposite to the "liberty of indifference" or "power to the contrary," being a *non posse peccare*, a *felix necessitas boni*. Adam was created in fellowship with God, and hence with a holy tendency of heart, with full power not to sin (*posse non peccare*), but also, during a limited period of probation, with power to sin (*posse peccare*). He did sin. As a punishment the Holy Spirit was withdrawn from the race, and he and his descendants lost the *posse non peccare*, and retained only the *posse peccare*, which thus became the fatal *non posse non peccare*.

This theological doctrine of total moral inability has nothing whatever to do with the psychological theory of "philosophical necessity" as an attribute of voluntary action, which, since the time of President Edwards, has been too frequently regarded essential to the defense of Calvinism. It has been conclusively shown by Principal Cunningham (*Theology of the Reformers*, Essay IX.) that this metaphysical doctrine is not essential to Calvinism; while Sir William Hamilton (*Discussions*, Appendix 1, A) and Sir James Mackintosh (*Dissertations on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy*, Note O) propose to prove that it is absolutely inconsistent with Calvinism as historically taught. The phrases "bondage of the will," etc., so frequently used by all classes of Augustinian theologians, and above all by Luther in his treatise *De Servo Arbitrio*, are intended to apply only to the corrupt spontaneous tendency of fallen man to evil, which can be reversed only by a new creating energy from above. At the same time, every Calvinist holds devoutly to the free self-determination of the soul in every moral action, and is at liberty to give whatever psychological explanation of that fact may seem to him most reasonable. See *Confession of Faith*, ch. ix., and Calvin's *De Servitute et Liberatione Humani Arbitrii*.

Hence Calvinists hold—First: as to original guilt. (1) Human sin, having originated in the free apostatizing act of Adam, deserves God's wrath and curse, and immutable justice demands their infliction. (2) Such, moreover, was the relation subsisting between Adam and his descendants that God righteously regards and treats each one, as he comes into being, as worthy of the punishment of that sin, and consequently withdraws His life-giving fellowship from him. Some refer this responsibility of Adam's descendants for his apostatizing act to a purely sovereign "divine constitution" (New England view); others hold that we all were in our generic essence guilty coagents with him in that act (Realistic view); while the common opinion is that God, as the guardian of our interests, gave to us all the most favorable probation possible for beings so constituted, in Adam as our covenant representative (Federal view). The whole race, therefore, and each individual it embraces, is under the just condemnation of God, and hence the gift of Christ, and the entire scheme of redemption, in its conception, execution, and application, are throughout and in every sense a product of sovereign grace. God was free to provide it for few or many, for all or none, just as He pleased. And in every case of its application the motives determining God can not be found in the object, but only in the good pleasure of the will of the Divine Agent.

Calvinists also hold—Secondly: as to original sin. (1) Since every man thus comes into the world in a condition of antenatal forfeiture because of Adam's apostasy, he is judicially excluded from the morally quickening energy of the Holy Ghost, and hence begins to think, feel, and act without a spontaneous bias to moral good. (2) But since moral obligation is positive, and the soul is essentially active, it instantly develops in action a spiritual blindness and deadness to divine things, and a positive inclination to evil. This involves the corruption of the whole nature, and absolute impotency of the will to good; is, humanly speaking, without remedy; and necessarily tends to the indefinite increase both of depravity and of guilt. It is therefore said to be

total. Some Calvinists hold original guilt to be conditioned upon original depravity (e. g. the advocates of mediate imputation). Others, including the large majority, of all ages, hold original depravity to be the penal consequence of Adam's apostatizing act, and therefore to be conditioned upon original guilt (hence immediate imputation).

3. The advocates of the middle scheme have, of course, varied very much from the almost Pelagian extreme occupied by many of the Jesuits and of the Remonstrants, to the almost Augustinian position of the Lutherans and of the great Wesleyan Richard Watson. The Semi-Pelagians admitted that the nature of man was so far injured by the fall that he could do nothing in his own strength morally good in God's sight. But they held that man is able to incline himself unto good, though he is not able to effect it; so that in every case of spiritual reformation the first movement toward good may be from the soul itself, while the performance of it is the result of the co-operation of Divine grace with the human will. They consequently denied the *gratia præveniens*, but admitted the *gratia co-operans*. The modern Protestant Arminians (Limborch, Episcopius, etc.) admit original sin, while they deny original guilt, and regard innate corruption rather as a vice or fault of nature than as a sin in the full sense of that term. Dr. D. D. Whedon (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Apr., 1862) admits—1. That Adam and Eve by the apostasy morally corrupted their own nature and that of all their descendants; 2. That every child of Adam is born with an inherent tendency to sin which he can not remove by his own power; 3. That Adam and Eve were fully responsible for their apostasy, because they sinned in spite of possessing power to the contrary, and therefore might justly have been damned; 4. Nevertheless, their descendants, although corrupt and prone to sin from birth, are neither responsible nor punishable until there has first been bestowed upon them redemptively a gracious ability to the right; 5. After Adam sinned, therefore, only one alternative was open to Divine justice—either that Adam should be punished at once without issue, or that he should be allowed to generate seed in his own moral likeness, when equity required that an adequate redemption should be provided for all; 6. Hence Christ died for all men, and sufficient grace (including *gratia præveniens* and *gratia co-operans*) is given to all men, which is essential to render them responsible, and they become guilty only when they abuse (by failing to co-operate with) that gracious power to the contrary (*posse non peccare*) which has been conferred on them in the gospel. Quoting the dictum of President Edwards (*Will*, pt. 4, § 1), "The essence of the virtue or vice of dispositions of the heart and actions of the will lies not in their cause, but in their nature," Whedon says: "To this we oppose the counter-maxim, that in order to responsibility for a given act or state, power in the agent for a contrary act or state is requisite. In other words, power underlies responsibility." The only limit he allows to this principle is in the case of that moral inability which results from the previous abuse of freedom by the agent himself. This he declares is the fundamental ground upon which all the issues between Arminianism and Calvinism depend. Thus while Calvinism exalts the redemption of Christ, in its execution and in each moment of its application, as an adorable act of transcendent grace to the ill-deserving, Arminianism, in its last analysis, makes it a compensation brought in by the equitable Governor of the world to balance the disabilities brought upon men, without their fault, by the apostasy of Adam. This difference is the practical reason that Calvinism has such a strong hold upon the religious experience of Christians, and that it finds such frequent irrepressible expression in the hymns and prayers of evangelical Arminians.

F. *The Nature and Necessity of that Divine Grace which is exercised in the Moral Recovery of Human Nature.*—Grace is free sovereign favor to the ill-deserving. It is the motive to redemption in the mind of God. It is exercised in the sacrifice of His Son, in the free justification of the believing sinner on the ground of that Son's vicarious obedience and sufferings, and in the total change wrought in that sinner's moral character and actions by the energy of the Holy Ghost. While the word *grace* applies equally to the objective change of relations and the subjective change of character, it is used in this connection to designate that energy of the Holy Ghost whereby the moral nature of the human soul is renewed, and the soul, thus renewed, is enabled to act in compliance with the will of God.

Pelagius found in his system neither need nor room for

this Divine energy, and confined the conception of grace to objective revelations and educational and providential influences.

Semi-Pelagians admitted its necessity to help man to complete that which he had himself power to commence, and held that it is actually given to all those who had thus prepared themselves for it and made themselves worthy of it.

Arminians admit that it is necessary in order that the corrupt will shall be even predisposed to good; but they regard it as a universal compensation for the irresponsible defects of an inherited nature, which restores the native power for either good or evil; and they make all further effects depend wholly upon the use made of it by the soul in which it acts. This is styled the theory of Co-operation as held by the Arminians, and of "Synergism" as held by the followers of Melancthon in Germany. Regeneration is the result of the co-working of two energies, but the determining factor is the human will. Hence grace is *sufficiens* in every case, and *efficax ab eventu vel congruante*.

Augustinians and Calvinists, on the other hand, hold—1. That, for Christ's sake, and in spite of all human demerit, a gracious influence is exerted on the minds of all men of various intensities. This is "common grace," and is a moral and suasive influence on the soul, tending to good, restraining evil passions, and adorning the soul with the natural virtues; it may be resisted, and is always prevailing resisted by the unregenerate. 2. But at His pleasure, in certain cases, God exerts a new creative energy, which in a single act changes the moral character of the will of the subject, and implants a prevailing tendency to co-operate with future grace in all forms of holy obedience. This is *gratia efficax*, "effectual calling," which is always effectual because it consists in effecting a regenerative change in the moral nature of the will itself. The change which this grace effects is the "new heart" of Scripture, the *conversio habitualis seu passiva*, of which God is the agent and man the subject, which as a new habit of soul lays the foundation for all holy activities. Augustine has been generally followed in styling this grace "irresistible," because it can not be resisted. Yet this is as incongruous a designation as it would be to call the creation of the world or the generation of a child "irresistible." Effectual calling consists in a new creative energy within the soul, making it willing, upon which it spontaneously embraces Christ and turns to God (the *conversio actualis seu activa*). It merges itself into the very spontaneity of the will, and enfranchises it from the corruption which had hitherto held it in bondage, and restores it to its normal equilibrium, in harmony with reason and conscience and the indwelling Spirit of God. 3. Afterward the Divine Spirit continues to support the soul, and prepare it for, and to concur with it in, every good work. This grace is now prevailing co-operated with by the regenerated soul, and at times resisted, until the status of grace is succeeded by the status of glory.

Calvinists hold that this "grace" in all its stages is purely undeserved favor, and therefore sovereignly exercised by God upon whom and at what time He pleases; hence it is called *gratia gratuita et gratis data*, otherwise grace would be no more grace. It also works in its various stages progressively, except in the single regenerative act. It is at first the *gratia preveniens*, then the *gratia operans*, then the *gratia co-operans*, and finally the *gratia perficiens*, including the *donum perseverantiae*, infallibly securing perseverance in faith and obedience, unto the complete redemption of soul and body in glory.

G. *The Relation which the Eternal Plan of God bears to the Application of Redemption to Individuals.*—Since the eternal plan, decree, or purpose of God includes all things that come to pass, none of which comes to pass without His prevision and provision, it includes also the destinies of all creatures. Predestination, in its restricted sense, is the term employed to express the purpose of God in relation to the salvation of individual men. Arminians maintain that this purpose of God is with reference to each man conditioned upon God's foresight of his possession or lack of faith and repentance; but Calvinists insist that since faith and repentance are the gifts of God and the fruits of His Spirit, their presence or absence can not be the condition of predestination, but must be rather its predetermined and graciously effected result. The primary efficient cause of predestination is therefore God Himself; the discriminating cause lies in the hidden counsels of His own will. Predestination therefore is the eternal, inscrutable, and unchangeable decree of God concerning the salva-

tion of individual men; it consists of two parts—eternal election on the one side and eternal preterition on the other. It thus includes both the selection of one portion of the race to be saved and the leaving the rest to perish in sin. This act of discrimination is necessarily absolutely sovereign, and can find its cause on neither side in aught in the creature moving God to elect or pass him by; *ex hypothesi*, all stand in like condition before God prior to this act of discrimination, and what is common to the whole can not be the ground of discrimination between the parts. But the subsequent treatment to which each section is subjected is not sovereign, but is conditioned on the one side on God's purpose of love to His elect, and on the other on the guilt of the sin in which the non-elect are left. The decree of election to eternal life is followed therefore by the foreordination of all the means thereto. And the purpose to pass by the rest and leave them in their sin is followed by the ordination of them to dishonor and wrath for their sin. A discrimination is thus drawn between the sovereign act of preterition and the judicial act of reprobation; or, as they are otherwise called, between the sovereign act of "negative reprobation" and the judicial act of "positive reprobation." So far all historical schools of Calvinism agree. Adherents of what is known as the school of Saumur are equally explicit and decided in these points with typical Calvinists. (See e. g. Amyraldus, *Defense of Calvin*, ch. xiii., *Declaration against the Errors of the Arminians*, 1646, p. 6; and in this country James Richards, *Lectures on Mental Philosophy and Theology*, 1846, pp. 332, seq.; Henry B. Smith, *System of Christian Theology*, 1886, p. 508.) Accordingly the Œcumenical Reformed Synod of Dort (1619) and the broadly Calvinistic Assembly of Westminster (1644-47) so define the doctrine.

In the further development of the subject, however, diverging schools of thought emerge within the limits of Calvinism. The great majority of Calvinists have always been what has come to be known as Infra- or Sublapsarians—that is, they hold that God's predestinating decree contemplates man as already fallen and resting under the curse of the broken law. God is conceived of as, moved by ineffable love for man, selecting out of the mass of guilty sinners a people in whom to show forth the glory of His grace, and then as providing redemption for them in order to carry out His loving purpose in election. The "order of decrees," as it is technically called, stands in this view thus: Creation, fall, election, redemption by Christ, application of redemption by the Holy Spirit. A few Calvinists, whose inconsiderable number is balanced by their considerable learning and logical power, have always contended that on logical grounds it would be better to place the decree of election in the order of thought before that of the fall; they are therefore called Supralapsarians, and give the "order of decrees" thus: Creation, election (or even election, creation), fall, redemption, application. This question did not come into discussion until the close of the sixteenth century, so that the position upon it of Calvinistic writers before that date is usually in dispute. There seems no good reason to doubt, however, that Augustine and Calvin were essentially Infralapsarian in their fundamental conceptions. On the other hand, the Supralapsarian scheme was adopted by men of such mark and influence as Beza, successor to Calvin in Geneva; Gomarus and Voetius, the great opponents to the Remonstrants in Holland; Twisse, the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly. Œcumenical Calvinism ranged itself explicitly as Infralapsarian in the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1619), and with less explicitness but no less reality, in the Westminster Confession (1644-47). The difference between the two views is, however, almost entirely a logical one, and has little or no theological importance. (See Twisse, *The Riches of God's Love*, etc., p. 35; Cunningham, *The Reformers*, etc., pp. 359-362; Dabney, *Syllabus on Systematic Theology*, p. 233.) On the other hand, a departure from typical Calvinism was proposed by the school of Saumur in the first half of the seventeenth century, in the opposite direction. In the effort to conceive of the work of Christ as having equal reference to all men indiscriminately, they proposed to place the decree of election subsequent in the order of thought to that of redemption, making the "order of decrees" the following: Creation, fall, redemption by Christ, election, application of redemption by the Holy Spirit to the elect. This change is of greater theological importance, as it involves an entirely different view of the nature of the atonement from that taught by typical Calvinism. It has exercised far more influence than

Supralapsarianism; but has left the great majority of Calvinists unaffected, chiefly on account of its inability to coalesce with a truly substitutionary doctrine of the atonement.

In all its forms alike Calvinism makes God the sole arbiter of the destiny of His creatures. But in no form does it make Him the author of sin, or the condemner of man irrespective of his sin. In all forms alike man is made the author of his own sin, and sin is made the ground of his condemnation. God positively decrees grace, and thus produces all that is good. He only determines the permission of sin, and punishes it because He forbids and in every way morally discourages it. He elects of free grace all those He purposes to save, and actually saves them, while those whom He does not elect are simply left under the operation of the law of exact justice, whatever that may be in their case. Archbishop Whately, himself an Arminian, in his essays on *Some of the Difficulties in the Writings of the Apostle Paul*, honorably admits that the apparent harshness of Calvinism lies in the facts of the case as admitted by all Christians. It is obvious that all who are born sin and die, that all do not believe, and that all are not saved. Calvinistic "particularism" embraces the actual results of salvation in their widest scope, and refers all to the gracious purpose and power of God, but does not restrict it one iota within the limits determined by the facts themselves.

II. *The History of Calvinism.*—The Christian doctrines of sin and grace were, like other doctrines, brought to clear definition only through controversy. The intellectual energies of the Church were at first absorbed in the realization and definition of the doctrines of God and of the Person of Christ; and it was only after four centuries of controversy had brought these doctrines to clear expression that the Church could turn its attention to the more subjective side of truth. In the meantime all the elements of the composite doctrine of man were everywhere confessed: the evil consequences of the fall and the necessity of Divine grace for salvation were as universally recognized as the freedom of the will and the complete responsibility of man for sin. But the prevalent Gnostic and Manichean heresies, which represented sin as a necessity of nature, led necessarily to a very special emphasis being thrown upon human freedom and responsibility by the Church teachers of the time. In necessary antagonism to these fundamental heresies, the early Fathers, especially Origen and his colleagues and followers of the Alexandrian school, were led to insist in a very unqualified manner upon the independent, self-determining power of the human will, and to maintain that sin is the product of that freedom abused. They universally held that human nature was morally ruined by Adam's sin, and that it was redeemed by the blood and restored by the Spirit of Christ; but they conceived of these great principles in a crude and indefinite manner, without determining their relations to each other. But in the special attention to the defense of human self-determining power as the basis of responsibility, which all were in a manner forced to give, it was inevitable that sooner or later some one would arise who should so one-sidedly emphasize this element of the truth as consciously to deny its other hemisphere. As a general fact, the Greeks were especially distinguished for emphasizing the autocracy of the will, though without denying the need of grace. And the anthropology of the Greek Church has continued to preserve the same characteristics to the present day (Athanasius, *Expos. in Psalmos*, Ps. l. 7; *Orthodox Confession of Peter Mogilas*, 1642). On the other hand, there was, during the third century, a marked tendency in the Latin Church to more profound views as to the moral and spiritual nature and relations of man. This characteristic was developed most obviously in Tertullian of Carthage (220 A. D.), who taught the propagation (*ex traduce*) of a corrupt nature from Adam to each of his descendants; in Hilary of Poitiers (368); and in Ambrose of Milan (397), the most explicit defender in that age of the sovereignty of God and the moral impotence of man, and the immediate teacher of Augustine.

The inevitable heresiarch came at the opening of the fifth century in the person of Pelagius (Morgan), a British monk, a man of pure life, clear, practical intellect, and earnest zeal for the moral interests of human life. He was the moral author of the system which bears his name, while its intellectual constructor was Celestius, a youthful Roman advocate; and its most effective advocate was Julian, the deposed Bishop of Eclanum in Campania. The central and formative principle of Pelagianism was the inalienable plenary ability of man to do all that can righteously be

demand of him; from this principle it inferred that men are fully capable in their own powers to attain and maintain entire perfection of life, that they come into the world without entailment of moral weakness or sin from the past, and that they need and receive no divine aid in the sense of inward renewal and sustaining grace, to enable them to do their full duty. It was this denial of the necessity and reality of the inward operations of God's grace which most outraged Christian hearts, and Augustine lays the chief stress in the controversy on the reality of grace, and its necessity as arising out of original sin. In opposition to Pelagianism, the distinctive features of the theology of grace were developed out of the Scriptures and his own deep experience by this profound thinker, Augustine (354–430), a native of Tagaste, in Numidia, the son of a heathen father and of the sainted Monica, in turn a prodigal, unbeliever, Manichean, Platonist, disciple of Ambrose, Christian of profound experience, preacher and teacher of transcendent genius, Bishop of Hippo Regius from 395 to 430, and the greatest theologian of all time. The result of the controversy was not doubtful. The opinions of Pelagius were universally condemned by the whole Church, Eastern and Western, at the councils held at Carthage 412 and 418 A. D., at the Council at Mileve, 416 A. D., by the popes Innocent and Zosimus, and by the Œcumenical Council held at Ephesus, 431 A. D. This rapid and universal condemnation of Pelagianism, after making all due allowance for extraneous influences, proves that, however indefinite the views of the ancient Greek Fathers may have been, nevertheless the system taught by Augustine was in all essentials the common and original faith of the Church. In the history of the entire Church to the present moment, Pelagianism has never been adopted into the public creed of any ecclesiastical body except that of the Socinians (*Racovian Catechism*, 1605), and it has prevailed practically only among Rationalists, whose Christianity was disintegrating into Deism.

But Pelagianism did not so die as to leave no "remainders" behind it. Already in Augustine's lifetime (as early as 428) we hear of a body of monastic leaders in Southern Gaul seeking a middle ground between Augustinianism and Pelagianism by admitting inherited sin and the necessity of grace, but denying that this grace is either inevitable or necessarily preventive. John Cassian, a disciple of Chrysostom, abbot of the monastery at Marseilles, was the leader of this middle system of compromise, whose advocates were at first styled Massilians, but during the Middle Ages and at present in the Romish Church Semi-Pelagians. His most influential supporters and followers were Vincentius of Lerinum (434), Faustus, Bishop of Rhegium (475), Gennadius, and Arnobius; and his opinions prevailed in France for a long time, and were confirmed by the provincial synods of Arles (472) and of Lyons (475). Against this party Augustine wrote his great works *De Prædestinatione Sanctorum* and *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, and he was ably represented by Prosper and Hilarius, and the unknown author of the great work *De Vocazione Omnium Gentium*, ascribed to Pope Leo I. (461); by Avitus, Archbishop of Vienna (490–523); Casarius, Archbishop of Arles (502–542); and by Fulgentius of Ruspe (1533). Semi-Pelagianism was condemned by the decree of Pope Gelasius (496), and finally in the synods of Orange and Valence (529), which were confirmed by the edict of Pope Boniface (530); from which time a modified and softened form of Augustinianism became the recognized orthodoxy of the Western Church. It was taught by Gregory the Great, and held by the Emperor Charlemagne, the two persons who exerted the greatest influence in the reconstruction of Europe at the commencement of the Middle Ages. It was held throughout those ages by all the greatest Church teachers and ornaments, as the Venerable Bede (673–735), Alcuin (804), and Claudius of Turin (839). The history of the persecution and condemnation of Gottschalk, under the influence of Rabanus Maurus and Hincmar, with which Scotus Erigena was involved (about 850), show, however, how deeply the ever-increasing Semi-Pelagian leaven was affecting the whole Church. All the most illustrious teachers of the scholastic age, making allowance for the extravagance of many of their speculations, preserved, however, more or less of the tone of Augustinian thought, as, for example, Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury (910); St. Bernard, Bishop of Clairvaux (1140); Peter Lombard, *Magister Sententiarum*; Hugo de St. Victor; and, above all, Thomas Aquinas, *Doctor Anglicus* (1247); and Thomas Bradwardine, Archbishop of Canterbury (1348).

Thomas Aquinas fairly represents the result of the driftage of the Augustinian orthodoxy toward Semi-Pelagianism: his system is almost exactly intermediate between these two great types—with the one he affirmed that man since the fall had lost all ability to anything spiritually good, and without grace he could do nothing acceptable to God or which secured salvation; while with the other he represented original sin as rather a languor and a disease, and affirmed the power of fallen man to co-operate with grace. The distinctive point of Semi-Pelagianism is the denial of prevenient grace; the distinctive point of Thomism is the denial of "irresistible" grace—i. e. of prevenient grace conceived of as a *creative* energy of God. The Dominicans as a class followed Aquinas, while the Franciscans followed their champion, Duns Scotus (1265), *Doctor Subtilis*, and in that age the ablest advocate of pure Semi-Pelagianism.

The controversies then revived have continued to agitate the Romish Church up to the present time. The Council of Trent (1546) attempted to satisfy both parties by indefinite decrees, and accordingly both Augustinians and Semi-Pelagians, Thomists and Scotists, have claimed that their respective views were sanctioned. The Jesuit society, whose doctrines and casuistry were ventilated in the *Provincial Letters* of Pascal, has always advocated Semi-Pelagianism. The illustrious thinkers of Port Royal, Paris, called Jansenists from Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres (Tillemont, Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, Quesnel, etc.), were at the same time devout Catholics, and in the matters of grace and predestination earnest Augustinians. They were persecuted by the Jesuits, and finally outlawed by the bulls of Popes Innocent X. and Alexander VII. (1653 and 1656 A. D.), and of Clement XI. (1713). The present pope, Leo XIII., has thrown the weight of his influence for Thomism, which indeed is as nearly as may be the doctrine of the decrees of Trent. This may be held, therefore, to be the formal doctrine of the Church of Rome.

The great evangelical teachers and forerunners of the Reformers in the century immediately preceding the Reformation were prevailingly decided Augustinians (Neander's *Hist. Doc.*, vol. ii., p. 609). This is most conspicuously true of Wickliffe (1384), Jerome of Prague, John Huss (1415), John of Goch (1475), John of Wesalia, Jerome Savonarola, a Dominican (1498), John Wessel (1499), "the Light of the World," and his disciple, the great Grecian, John Reuchlin, in his turn the teacher of Melancthon, and Staupitz, vicar-general of the Augustines and the spiritual teacher of Luther.

The Reformation was in all its leaders and in all its centers as much a reaction from the growing Semi-Pelagianism as from the tyranny of the Papal Church. Zwingle of Switzerland, Luther of Germany, Calvin of France, Cranmer of England, and Knox of Scotland, although each movement was self-originated and different from the others in many permanent characteristics, were alike strictly Augustinian in doctrinal position. So that the Reformation was before everything else a great Augustinian revival—the forerunner in this of nearly all the great revivals which have refreshed the Church since. Melancthon, in the earliest editions of his *Loci Communes* (1521), took extreme ground as to the moral impotence of the human will and absolute predestination, which, however, he gradually and radically modified in subsequent editions, until he finally assumed synergistic ground. The personal followers of Melancthon excited the strong opposition of the stricter Lutherans, and the struggle came to an explosion in the Weimar Confutation (1558). The result was that grandest monument of Lutheran symbolism, the *Formula Concordiæ* (1579). This symbol sought to find a middle ground on the matter of predestination by teaching absolute predestination unto life (election), but denying predestination unto death (preterition); thus making the single predestination, as distinguished from the *predestinatio duplex* of Augustinianism, confessional orthodoxy in the Lutheran Church. (See C. Heidegger, *Syst. Theol.*, ii., 721, *seq.*; Francis Pieper, *Lehre und Weisheit*, 36, 3.) In this illogical position the theologians of the Lutheran Church could not remain, and therefore, since Gerhard († 1637), they have cast off all remainders of Augustinianism and teach that predestination is based on foresight. A reaction led by a great theologian, C. F. W. Walther († 1887), has in our own day led the large Lutheran "Synodical Conference of America" (commonly called the "Missourians") back to the position of the *Formula Concordiæ*. In most other respects, as to the guilt, pollution, and helplessness of the condition into which all chil-

dren are born, as to justification, and the necessity and the efficacy of regenerating and sanctifying grace, the *Formula Concordiæ* and Lutheran orthodoxy are at one with Calvinism.

By far the greatest of the Reformers, viewed either as a theologian, an interpreter of Scripture, as a social organizer and founder of churches and republics, was John Calvin. His *Institutes* (1530), written when he was twenty-seven years old, the greatest work of systematic divinity the world has seen, has recast Augustinianism in its final Protestant form, and handed it over to the modern world stamped with its great author's name. His *Commentaries* are acknowledged by the most advanced modern scholars of every school to be the ablest exegetical work achieved in his generation. His *Tractatus* consist of various controversial treatises in defense of the truth, and his *Epistolæ* consist of his voluminous correspondence with princes, nobles, and commoners, statesmen and churchmen in every part of the Protestant world, concerning the important movements then revolutionizing Europe, both in Church and state. By him Calvinism and its correlates, Presbyterianism in the Church and republicanism in the state, were not invented, but advocated and disseminated with transcendent ability and success. His doctrines have been most consistently developed and illustrated in the writings of such men as Bullinger, Martin Bucer, Theodore Beza, Diodati, Heidegger, Turretin, Witsius, Vitringa, Markius, De Moor, Pictet, John Owen, and Jonathan Edwards; in the deliverances of the international Synod of Dort (1618-19), of the national Assembly of Westminster (1648), of the French synods of Charenton and Alez, and in such creeds and confessions of the Church as the following: The Creed of the Waldensian pastors at Angrogne (1532), the two Helvetic, the Gallic, Belgic, and Scotch Confessions, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the Lambeth Articles (1595), the Articles of Religion of the Dublin Convocation (1615), the Heidelberg Catechism, the Savoy Confession of the English (1658), and the Boston Confession (1680) of the American Independents. Calvinism is professed by all those Protestants of Germany who embrace the Heidelberg Catechism, the national (Protestant) churches of France, Switzerland, Holland, England, and Scotland, together with most of the Free Churches which have grown up in these lands, and the Reformed Churches of Hungary and Bohemia, the Independents and Baptists of England and America, as well as the various branches of the Presbyterian Church in England, Ireland, and America.

From the time of Archbishop Laud (1644) a large proportion of the clergy and influential writers of the Episcopal Churches have been Arminian, and it has even been disputed whether the Church of England was originally Calvinistic or not. The fact that the founders and leading ministers of that Church were thorough Calvinists during the first hundred years of its history, and that its creed (the "Thirty-nine Articles") remains such to this day, is as certain and as conspicuous as any other fact in history. The seventeenth article, "On Predestination," corresponds in spirit, design, and expression with all the other Calvinistic creeds. Tyndal, Frith, Barnes, who suffered under Henry VIII.; Hooper, Latimer, Ridley, who suffered under Mary; Cranmer, the real author, and Jewel, who gave the finishing touch to the Thirty-nine Articles, were all Calvinists. "The same is proved by the whole history of the proceedings connected with the Lambeth Articles, the cases of Baro and Barret (1595), the Irish Articles (1615), and the Synod of Dort (1619)." (*Cunningham*.) The sources of information, and the arguments on both sides of this controversy, may be found in the *Works of the Parker Society*, Richmond's *Fathers of the English Church*, the *Zurich Letters*, the works of Heylin, Winchester, Daubeny, Tomline, and Lawrence on the Arminian side, and the works of Prynne, Hickman, Toplady, Overton, Goode, Principal Cunningham, and Alex. F. Mitchell on the Calvinistic side.

Over this vast area of time, and under all these various conditions of national and ecclesiastical life, Calvinism preserves its essential identity as a system of theological principles. It has, of course, undergone within these limits very various modifications as to details of structure and modes of statement. In Germany it has been rendered less thorough and definite through the influence of the compromising school of Melancthon, and more lately under the modern tendencies brought in by Schleiermacher. In Holland, England, and Scotland it has been modified in form by the "Federal Scheme" introduced by the West-

minster divines (1650) and the Dutch school of Cocceius. In France it was temporarily modified by the *Universalismus Hypotheticus*, or the universal impetration and limited application of redemption (1642), as held by Amyraldus, Daillé, and Placcus on the Continent, and by Baxter, Davenant, and in modern times by Wardlaw and others, in England. In America it has been coerced through more radical and more transient transformations in the speculations of Hopkins, the younger Edwards, Emmons, N. W. Taylor, and others of the New England school. But its vitality is ever exhibited by its power to take upon it various forms, and to live through periods of depression, and to enter the hearts of men as a power and new life after long epochs of religious death. It was the inherent power of Calvinism which revived religious life in Switzerland in the early part of this century, in the humble teaching of Haldane and the powerful preaching of Malan, Gaussen, Merle d'Aubigny, and other collaborators. And our own days have seen a new exhibition of its power to awake to new life in Holland, through the steady testimony of the Christian Reformed Church and the great leadership of Dr. Kuyper. The history of Calvinism exhibits it not merely as a system with great inherent vitality, but as the system of truth in which abides the springs of religious life.

III. *The Practical Effects of Calvinism on Personal Moral Character, and upon the Social and Political Interests of Men.*—From the time of Cælestius and Julian, in the fifth century, to that of Heylin (1659) and Tomline (1811), the *a priori* objection has been brought against Calvinism that its principles should lead either to licentious liberty or to abject subserviency, to discouragement in the use of means, and to undue disparagement and neglect of human reason. It is argued that the doctrine of the absolute moral impotence of man's will should destroy all sense of accountability, and that the doctrine of absolute decrees should cause the use of means to appear either unnecessary or ineffectual, and lead to despair upon the one hand or to licentiousness upon the other.

But the moral character of Calvinism is abundantly vindicated in two ways: 1. On the ground of reason. The recognition of the true (i. e. actual) condition of man's nature and relations to God, as this is revealed in Scripture and experience, must be more moral in its effect than the most skillful misrepresentation possible of that actual condition can be. The historian Froude, himself held by no trammels of sect or party, says in his well-known address at St. Andrews (1871): "If Arminianism most commends itself to our feelings, Calvinism is nearer to the facts, however harsh or forbidding those facts may seem." Archbishop Whately, himself an Arminian (in his essay on *Some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*), acknowledges that the ordinary objections against the moral attributes of Calvinism are in effect objections to the open facts of the case. That standard of morals which places the ground of obligation in the supreme will of the All-perfect, instead of in a tendency to promote happiness, and which utterly condemns fallen man, is obviously higher, and therefore more moral, than a more self-pleasing one which either justifies or excuses him. The system which teaches the total depravity and guiltiness of human nature from birth, its absolute dependence upon Divine grace, together with the universal sweep of God's absolute decrees, at once maintaining the free agency of man and the infallibility of the Divine purpose, must of course empty man of self, make all men equal before the law, and exalt the all-wise and all-powerful Father to the control of all events; such a system must make the highest attainments the condition and the fruit of God's favor, and must raise even the weakest believer to the position of an invincible champion for God and the right, "a coworker together with God." 2. In the second place, Calvinists claim that on the ground of an illustrious and unparalleled historical record they can show that their system has been eminently distinguished by the effects produced by it upon all the communities which have embraced it in its purer forms, as to the following particulars: (a) the general standard of moral character practically realized in personal and social life; (b) the amount of rationally regulated liberty realized both in Church and state; (c) the standard of popular intelligence and education actually attained; (d) the testimony yielded to the power of the truth by the number and illustrious character of its martyrs; and (e) the zeal and devotion expressed in sustained missionary efforts for the extension of the kingdom of Christ.

1. As to the influence of Calvinism on the moral char-

acter of individuals, it is only necessary here to quote Mr. Froude's citation of the names of "William the Silent, Luther, Calvin, Knox, Andrew Melville, the regent Murray, Coligny, Cromwell, Milton, John Bunyan—men possessed of all the qualities which give nobility and grandeur to human nature." As to its effect upon the general moral character of communities, it will be sufficient to cite the Waldenses; the little radiant state of Geneva, whose Protestant reconstruction began with the establishment of a Court of Morals; the Huguenots as compared with their Catholic fellow-citizens; the Jansenists as compared with the Jesuits; the Dutch Protestants of their heroic period; the Scotch Covenanters; the English Puritans, whose very name signalizes their eminent moral character, in contrast with the corruption brought in at the Restoration (see Macaulay's *Essays on Milton* and Hallam's *Constitutional History*); and finally, all those sections of America settled by English Puritan New Englanders, by the Scotch and Scotch-Irish, and by Presbyterians from France and Holland. Mr. Froude (*Address*, p. 7) says: "The first symptom of its operation, wherever it established itself, was to obliterate the distinction between sins and crimes, and to make the moral law the rule for states as well as persons." Pascal, the sublime avenger of the persecuted religionists of Port Royal, shows in the first nine of his *Provincial Letters* the connection between the infamous morality of the Jesuits and their Semi-Pelagian views as to sin and grace. Sir James Mackintosh, in vol. xxxvi. of the *Edinburgh Review*, vindicates at length the morality of the theological doctrine of predestination by a general review of the history of its most conspicuous professors.

2. It appears superfluous to prove the tendency of Calvinism to promote freedom and popular government, both in Church and state. Its principles strip the ministry of all sacerdotal powers; they make all men and all Christians equal before God; they make God absolute and supreme over all, and the immediate controller and disposer of human affairs. Hence all Churches accepting Calvinism, unless prevented by external conditions, have immediately adopted popular constitutions, either Presbyterian or Independent. This is true of all the Churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, the Palatinate, Scotland, America, and the Free Churches of England and Ireland. The apparent exception is the English Establishment. The history of its political relations explains its prelatical character. Cranmer and the other Calvinistic founders of that Church held, as did Archbishop Usher, a very moderate theory of the episcopate, and submitted to the constitution actually established only for state reasons. Afterward, as Calvinism became more thoroughly incorporated in the public faith, Presbyterianism was established by the Long Parliament, and Independence by the Puritan army and Protector. It is a conspicuous fact of English history that high views as to the prerogatives of the ministry have always antagonized Calvinistic doctrine.

The political influence of Calvinism was at an early period discerned by kings as well as by the people. The Waldenses were the freemen of the ante-Reformation period. The republic was established at the same time with Presbytery at Geneva. The Hollanders, grouped around the sublime figure of William the Silent (*Calvus et Calvinista*), performed deeds of heroism against odds of tyranny unparalleled in all foregoing and subsequent history. This battle was fought by Calvinistic Holland, and the victory won (1590) completely, before the Arminian controversies had commenced. Add to these the French Huguenots, the Scotch Covenanters, the English Puritans in the Old and in the New World, and we make good our claim that Calvinists have been successful champions of regulated freedom among men.

Bancroft, the historian of the U. S., attributes the modern impulse to republican liberty to the little republic of Geneva and to its Calvinistic theology (vol. i., 266; ii., 461-464). He credits the molding of the institutions of North America chiefly to New England Independents, and to Dutch, French, and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians. "The Mecklenburg Declaration, signed on May 20, 1775, more than a year before that of July 4, 1776, signed in Philadelphia, was the first voice publicly raised for American independence. And the convention by which it was adopted and signed consisted of twenty-seven delegates, nine of whom, including the president and secretary, were ruling elders, and one, Rev. H. J. Balch, was a Presbyterian minister." Tucker, in his *Life of Jefferson*, says: "Every one must be persuaded that one of these papers must have been borrowed from the other"; and

Bancroft has made it certain that the Declaration of Jefferson was written a year after that of Mecklenburg. The correspondence between the representative system and the gradations of sessions, presbyteries, provincial synods, and national general assemblies, developed in the Presbyterian system, to the federal system of State and national governments in the Constitution of the U. S., seems too remarkable to have been accidental.

3. The relation of Calvinism to education is no less conspicuous and illustrious. The little republic of Geneva became the sun of the European world. The Calvinists of France, in spite of all their embarrassments, immediately founded and sustained three illustrious theological schools at Montauban, Saumur, and Sedan. The Huguenots so far surpassed their fellow-countrymen in intelligence and skill that their banishment, on the occasion of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) quickened the manufactures and trades of Germany, England, and America, and for a time almost paralyzed the skilled industries of France. (See Weiss's *History of French Protestant Refugees*.) The fragment of marshy seacoast constituting Holland became the commercial focus of the world, one of the most powerful communities in the society of nations, and the mother of flourishing colonies in both hemispheres. The peasantry of Scotland has been raised far above that of any other European nation by the universal education afforded by her parish schools. The common-school system of Puritan New England is opening up a new era of human history. In this country, for the first two hundred years of its history, "almost every college and seminary of learning, and almost every academy and common school even, which existed, had been built up and sustained by Calvinists." See *New Englander*, Oct., 1845.

4. The martyrdom of Calvinism is pre-eminent in the history even of the Church. We call to witness John Huss and Jerome of Prague, who perished for their adherence to this faith one hundred years before Luther. The Waldenses, of whom were the "slaughtered saints whose bones lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold," the victims of the reign of "Bloody Mary," John Rogers, and Bishops Hooper, Ferrar, Ridley, Latimer, and Crammer, and their fellow-martyrs, were all Calvinists; as well as Hamilton and Wishart, the victims of Claverhouse and the "Killing Time" of 1684 in Scotland, and the victims of the High Commission and of the "Bloody Assizes" of England (1685). Under Charles V. and Philip of Spain, Holland had been made a spectacle to all nations by her sufferings, and had surpassed all other Christian communities with the number and steadfastness of her martyrs. When the Duke of Alva left the Netherlands, Dec., 1573, he boasted that within five years he had delivered 18,600 heretics to the executioner. (Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, vol. ii., p. 497.) Moreover, Calvinists claim the victims of the Inquisition in Spain and Italy; the history of the Huguenots of France, from the martyrdom of Leclerc (1523) to the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, 1598; the victims of the unparalleled atrocity of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, Aug. 22, 1572, when some 20,000 princes, noblemen, and commoners perished at one time by the hand of assassins; and all the hundreds of thousands of the very flower of France who fell victims either to the wars which raged with comparatively short exceptions from the Reformation to 1685, or to the dragonings, the galleys, and the expatriation which preceded and followed that dreadful time.

5. Calvinism has been proved an eminent incentive to all missionary enterprises, domestic and foreign. It is of course acknowledged that several Christian bodies not characterized by what are generally regarded as the peculiarities of Calvinism have been in the highest degree distinguished by missionary zeal and efficiency. The most remarkable instances of this kind have been the Nestorians in Western and Central Asia from the fifth to the ninth century, the Moravians from 1732, and the Wesleyan Methodists from about 1769 to the present time. In the early Church, St. Patrick, the missionary of Ireland, fifth century; Augustine, the missionary of Gregory the Great to England; and Columba and his missionary college at Iona in the Hebrides, and his disciples the Culdees, in the sixth century, as well as the Lollards, the followers of Wickliffe, in the fourteenth century, were all of the general school of Augustine. In 1555, through Admiral Coligny, Calvin sent two ministers to the heathen in Brazil. Cromwell in the next century proposed to appoint a council to promote the Protestant religion, in opposition to the congregation *De Propaganda*

Fide in Rome. One of the principal objects of the promoters of the Plymouth and Massachusetts colonies was the conversion of savages and the extension of the Church. The charter of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was granted by the Calvinistic prince, William III. It is to the Calvinistic Baptists that the impulse to modern Protestant missions is to be traced, and the Calvinistic Churches are to-day behind none in their zeal for a success in missionary work.

IV. LITERATURE.—1. H. A. Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum* (Lipsiae, 1840); Philip Schaff, *Credo of Christendom* (3 vols., New York, 1877); George Benedict Winer, *Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions of the Various Communities of Christendom*, translated and edited by W. B. Pope (Edinburgh, 1873); A. A. Hodge, *A Commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith* (Philadelphia, 1869); John Macpherson, *The Westminster Confession of Faith* (Edinburgh, 1881); A. A. Hodge and J. A. Hodge, *The Theology of the Shorter Catechism* (New York, 1888).

2. *Augustini Opera Omnia*, Benedictine edition (Paris, 1838-39); Aurelius Augustine, works of, a new translation, edited by Marcus Dods, 15 vols. (Edinburgh, 1871-76, American ed., New York, 1886-88, edited by Philip Schaff, 8 vols.); Bright, *Select Anti-Pelagian Treatises of St. Augustine* (London, 1880); Warfield, *Augustin's Anti-Pelagian Treatises* (vol. v. of American ed. of works of Augustine, above), with full introduction (New York, 1887); Wiggers, *Historical Presentation of Augustinianism and Pelagianism*, translated by Ralph Emerson (Andover, 1846); Mozley, *The Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination* (London, 1855).

3. *Joannis Calvinii Opera Omnia*, edn. Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss (Brunswick, 1863—); John Calvin, *The Works of*, translated and published by the Calvin Translation Society (51 vols., Edinburgh, 1844-56); *Joannis Calvinii Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, edited by Tholuck (Berlin, 1846); John Calvin, *The Institution of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia); Cunningham, *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1862).

4. Cornelius Jansen, *Augustinus, s., doctrina Augustini* (3 vols., Paris, 1641); Moses Amyraldus, *De Prædestinatione*, Saumur, 1658; Bernadini De Moor, *Commentarius Perpetuus in Joh. Marekii Compendium Th. Chr.* (7 vols., Leyden, 1761-64); Francisci Turretini *Institutio Theologiae Elenctica* (7 vols., Geneva, 1679); J. H. Heidegger, *Corpus Theologiae Christianæ* (Figuri, 1700); Herman Witsius, *The Economy of the Covenant between God and Man* (2 vols., London, 1840); John Owen, *Works*, ed. by W. H. Gould (16 vols., Edinburgh and New York, 1853); John Howe, *Works* (New York, 1835); Jonathan Edwards, *Works* (10 vols., New York, 1829); Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols., New York, 1872); W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology* (2 vols., New York, 1888); H. B. Smith, *System of Christian Theology*, (New York, 1886); R. L. Dabney, *Syllabus* (1885); A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology* (New York, 1889, 2d ed.); also Heppel, Schweizer, and Scholten, as given above.

5. Pascal, *Provincial Letters*, translated by Thos. McCrie, D. D.; William Ames, *Anti-Synodalia* (1629); J. Triglandius, *Refutatio apol. Remonstratum* (1664); S. Rutherford, *Examen Arminianismi* (Utrecht, 1668); Amyraldus, *Fidei contra errores Arminianism. Declaratio* (Saumur, 1646); Toplady, *Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England* (London, 1827); Goode, *Vindication and Defense of the XXXIX. Articles*; Dickinson, *The Scripture Doctrine concerning some Important Parts of Christian Faith* (Boston, 1741); Girardeau, *Calvinism and Evangelical Arminianism Compared* (New York, 1890).

6. E. P. Humphrey, *Our Theology and its Development* (Philadelphia); *New Englander*, Oct., 1845, art. *Comparative Influence of Calvinism and Arminianism on Civil Liberty*; W. M. Paxton, *The Mission of the Presbyterian Church* (New York, 1880); James Anthony Froude, *Calvinism* (London and New York, 1871); A. Kuyper, *Calvinism and Confessional Revision*, art. in *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, July, 1891; also much relative matter in such histories as Motley's *Dutch Republic*, and succeeding periods; Bancroft's *History of the United States*; Douglas Campbell's *The Puritans in Holland, England, and America*, etc. See ARMINIANISM.

A. A. HODGE. Revised by B. B. WARFIELD.

Calvinistic Methodists: a body of Methodists in Great Britain which originated in a difference between Whitefield and Wesley respecting Calvinistic doctrines, and is in three divisions: (1) "Lady Huntingdon's Connection," dat-