



PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY A COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.—RUFUS T. HEFLIN, Editor.

VOL. IV—NO. 19.

RALEIGH, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1859.

\$1.50 a year, in advance.

ORIGINAL.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate. "Calvinism vs. Arminianism," Revised.—No. II.

REV. R. T. HEFLIN:—In my first No. I promised to furnish in this, the authority for the allegation against P. T. P.'s assertion, that "Arminians" have "virulently attacked Calvinism," not only from the time of the Synod of Dort, for a long time thereafter, but that this course has been pursued ever since. I remarked that so far as Methodism is concerned, this allegation against Arminianism, is not true.—My authority I now give, in regard to Mr. Wesley and those in council with him; but that the attack came from the Calvinists directly.

The occasion of this attack was the appearance of the following "Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesley and others." These conversations were brought up by Mr. Wesley, for re-investigation in August 7th, 1770, and are in the words following:

"We said in 1744, 'We have leaned too much toward Calvinism.' Wherein?"

"1. With regard to man's frailty. Our Lord himself taught us to use the expression. And we ought never to be ashamed of it. We ought steadily to assert, on his authority, that if a man is not faithful in the unrighteous mammon, God will not give him the true riches."

"2. With regard to working for life. This also our Lord has expressly commanded us. 'Labour, ergo estote,' literally, 'work for the meat that endureth to everlasting life.' And in fact, every believer, till he comes to glory, works for, as well as for life.

"3. We have received it as a maxim, that a man is to do nothing in order to justification. Nothing can be more false. Whoever desires to find favor with God, should cease from evil, and learn to do well. Whoever repents, should do works meet for repentance. And if this is not in order to find favor, what does he do them for?"—Fletcher's Checks, vol. 1, p. 8. I have this extract as embracing the views of "MR. WESLEY AND OTHERS," had in 1744, which they still adhered to in 1770. This view of 1744 gave occasion for the following attack upon Wesley and his views, by Walter Shirley and others, August 6th, 1770, as the following letter fully demonstrates:

"Sir:—Whereas Mr. Wesley's Conference is to be held at Bristol, on Tuesday, the 6th of August next, it is proposed by Lady Huntingdon, and many other christian friends, (real Protestants,) to have a meeting at Bristol, at the same time, of such principal persons, both clergy and lay, who disapprove of the under written Minutes: and as the same are thought injurious to the very fundamental principles of Christianity, it is further proposed that they go in a body to the said Conference, and insist upon a formal recantation of the said Minutes; and in case of a refusal, that they sign and publish their protest against them. Your presence, sir, on this occasion, is particularly requested. But if it should not suit your convenience to be there, it is desired that you will transmit your sentiments on the subject to such persons as you think proper to produce them. It is submitted to you whether it would not be right, in the opinion to be made to such a dreadful heresy, to recommend it to as many of your christian friends, as well of the dissenters as the established church, as you can prevail on, to be there, the cause being of so public a nature.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant.

"WALTER SHIRLEY." This is an extract from Mr. Fletcher's Checks, vol. 1, p. 7. Here, it is demonstrated, that while "Mr. Wesley and others," in a confidential conference, held "conversations" on doctrine without any kind of an attack upon others; they were assailed as teachers of a "dreadful heresy." This attack was not to be in the form of a friendly conversation with Mr. Wesley &c., but a formal demand of Mr. Wesley and others to "retract" their views. Where, in all history, is there such an instance of shameful offensiveness to be found; and where is the parallel of such an outrage on innocent men and pure doctrines?

Nor, is it true, with regard to contravention of a more recent date. The Methodist wing of Arminians, are as free from this imputation, as can well be imagined. The proofs are abundant. A few will be adduced, and must suffice for the present. The Rev. N. L. Rice, D. D., of the Presbyterian Church, published a series of articles in a paper of which he, I think, was Editor, in which he assailed, with an unsparring hand, Methodist doctrines and usages. To counteract the evil influence of that publication, the Rev. R. S. Foster, A. M., a member of the Ohio Annual Conference, replied in the columns of the Western Christian Advocate; and afterwards, published his review of Dr. Rice's publication, in a book. In the first chapter, he gives the following as some of the

reasons inducing him to write. He observes

"The church, of which he is and humble an obscure minister, had been long and grievously assailed by one of the principal organs of a sister denomination—her doctrines and usages held up to public odium, and perverted by the pen of misrepresentation—her influence for piety questioned, and whatever was peculiar to her organization ridiculed and calumniated. And this ungenerous course was commenced and pursued by an accredited champion, at a time when peace and christian union had long existed—against remonstrances on our part, and published deprecation of the consequences which would result therefrom. We endured for a time. But this only seemed to whet the envenomed appetite of an adversary who seemed intent to devour us. The greater our reluctance, the greater his ferocity. It now seemed, that to remain longer silent would not only be a reproach to ourselves—a matter, which alone considered, gave us little concern—but must, also, weaken the force, if not the interest, of our own defence.—Objections to Calvinism, by Rev. R. S. Foster, A. M., pp. 13, 14.

Attacks of a similar nature were made upon Methodism and its doctrines, in the Christian Spectator, to which the Rev. Wilbur Fisk, D. D., so ably replied, which reply may be seen in the reprint in book form of his letters, in Calvinistic Controversy, of 273 pages.

More recently, the "Princeton Review" has made severe attacks upon "Arminianism." This Review endorses a book written by Mr. Cooke, against Methodism, and of course, becomes responsible for the slanderous assertions of that author. Now, to show the "virulence" of the attacks of Calvinism upon Arminianism, *alias* Methodism; I will present a few out of the many slanders upon the Methodist Church, perpetrated by Mr. Cooke, and endorsed, by the "Princeton Review."

"According, then, to this veracious 'centurion,' (and I add Princeton Review,) about 'nine-tenths' of Methodist conversions 'are found to be spurious after a longer or shorter trial.' (Vol. I. p. 266.) The Methodist 'system brings the matter of conversion to God into contempt,' and offers 'to every one invited to conversion a chance of ten to one that he will be cheated into a disastrous delusion.' (Vol. I. p. 269) It is 'a contest to spread over the greatest number of people the pestilence of a spurious conversion, which conducts its victims to irreligion and infidelity.' (vol. II. p. 122.) It glories in proselytism as its main accomplishment.' (Vol. I. p. 283.) Though 'the largest religious denomination in the United States,' the Methodist Church is working more evil than good.' (vol. I. p. 330.) Its 'so-called revival operations' are 'comic acting.' (vol. I. p. 319.) and its camp-meetings exhibit 'ho-cus-pocus comedies.' (Vol. I. p. 330.) It is a 'common enemy of Christianity, a great corrupting cause.' (vol. II. p. 57.) It is a 'corrupt and corrupting corporation, and the best interests of religion require that it should cease.' (vol. II. p. 61.) Its 'bishops claim to rule by the grace of God as really as do the despotic monarchs of Europe.' (vol. II. p. 53.) 'Every mother's son of the conference is ecclesiastically their bond slave; each bishop is an 'absolute despot in the affairs of the church;' (vol. II. p. 75.) and if he have any special ends to carry in the conference, his will is irresistible.' (vol. II. p. 79.) Promotions are reached in the Methodist Church, 'by all the arts best known to those who are mere wrigglers in place; (vol. II. p. 84.) indeed, 'the desirable places are made the stake of a game, in which the most expert players are sure to win, and some of the players improve such opportunities as offer, to play for money.' (vol. II. p. 91.) 'Finesse and deceit are prominent characteristics of Methodist ministers;' (vol. II. p. 100;) the body is schooled in all the arts of deception, and made fertile in tricks and inventions; it is so induced to these as to lose all sense of wrong in them; (vol. II. p. 113;) nay, Methodism itself 'is only another name for duplicity and deceit.' (vol. II. p. 120.) It 'lives and thrives by a falsehood.' (vol. II. p. 144.) It turns out infidels by millions.' (vol. II. p. 146.) Or, to sum up all in one sentence, as this [this] 'accuser of the brethren' does upon his title page, 'Methodism is not a branch of the Church of Christ.'—'Quarterly Review' of the Methodist E. Church, vol. viii. fourth series, pp. 258, 259.

Now, Mr. Editor, this is evidence very plain, of the wanton attacks of "Calvinism upon Arminianism," *alias* Methodism.—These are but a few of the authorities I have to substantiate my allegation against P. T. P.'s assertion, that Calvinism has always been "virulently attacked" by Arminianism. Sometimes, it may be true, that writers of the Arminian faith, may have even attacked Calvinism, when there was no particular occasion offered by Presbyterians: but then, it should be remem-

bered that others, who are not Presbyterians, are nevertheless Calvinistic; and to meet their assaults, Arminians have been compelled to attack Calvinism, entirely irrespective of Presbyterianism.

In my next, I will notice something more, in P. T. P.'s first No. After that, I shall progress more rapidly, perhaps.—It is true, I mean to make thorough work of it; and when I have reviewed all his articles, I may carry the war into Africa.

Yours affectionately,  
PETER DOUB.  
Greensboro, N. C. April 21, 1859.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate. "The Duty of Giving away a Stated Proportion of our Income," No. 1.

For the above caption, together with many of the thoughts and illustrations in the articles which I propose writing under it, I here acknowledge myself indebted to that eloquent and forcible address, delivered by Rev. Wm. Arthur, in Belfast, and published by our Agents, at Nashville, in 1856. At first, I thought of condensing the address itself, and publishing it in a few short articles, but I soon discovered that it would be difficult to condense it in much less space than it was delivered. I have concluded, therefore, to write a few short articles on the subject, following his general plan, but embracing only some of the leading and more important thoughts. In the present article, I wish to call the attention of the reader to the

NATURE OF THIS DUTY.

1. By the duty of giving away a stated proportion of our income, I do not mean that every person is to give away the same proportion. Ability to give may be modified by the circumstances of locality and family. Of two brothers with equal income, one may reside in the city where rents, and the necessities of life are high, and the other may live in the country where all these things are comparatively low. Now, in this case, we find the circumstance of the location controlling ability; the one being able to give away a larger proportion than the other.

Of two brothers, one may be a bachelor, and the other may have a wife and seven children. Here the circumstance of family controls ability; for though their locality and income may be the same, no one will say that the man with the family should give away as large a proportion as the other. For him to give a tenth would be an effort—one that his wife and children would feel; while the other might give away one half with ease.

2. Nor do I mean that all persons are to give the same proportion, however the gross amount of their income may vary.—Take the case of the man who enters life on a small capital. At fifty he is rich and increased in goods, and spends twice as much on his house and family as he did before. Now to say that he should give no larger proportion when his income is ten thousand a year than he did when it was only one, is certainly wrong. Not only the amount, but the proportion should increase in direct ratio to our increase of ability. Would it not be as easy to give a third when the income is ten thousand as it is to give a tenth when the income is one?

But it may be asked; am I opposed to all increase of capital? I answer, no.—There are many passages in the Bible which promise large increase as a reward of providence for humble and godly industry. So far from the accumulation of capital, as a reward of honest labor, contravening the ends of benevolence, it directly and most efficiently serves them. Two brothers enter life with a capital of \$50,000, each. One of them distributes his money among five thousand persons, giving to each ten dollars. The other invests his in a cotton factory. At the expiration of five years we find that no permanent good has been done by the money distributed, while the invested capital has been all the time feeding a number of families and may continue doing so for years to come. Beside, the man making the investment has been enabled to give hundreds and probably thousands, out of his own profits. But as it probably will not be necessary to make much effort to prove the propriety of allowing our goods to increase, I will call attention to several matters directly connected with it.

We should not resolve to be rich. We should not make up our minds to die with a certain amount. "For they that will be rich fall into a temptation and a snare." Nor should we make haste to be rich, for "He that maketh haste to be rich shall not be innocent." We should not adopt selfishness as a means to wealth, for we would directly contravene the ends of benevolence by shutting the heart to every gush of generosity, and the hand to every deed of goodness. We must not trust in riches. It is frequently said that men idolize various objects of affection, but it is truly said that men make a God of their money; they worship it; they trust in it; it is their providence; their faith centers in

it; it is their hope for the future; for their children; and for position and honor.

I do not say it is necessary to draw a line, and say we will not be worth over a certain sum; but oh, what a blessing it had been to thousands if they had adopted such a resolution. Many for years employed their growing wealth to do good, but at length they outgrew their religious strength, and like a youth falling under his own stature, their virtues died of decline. Job I admit was one of the richest men of the east, but before we exult in the belief that we may innocently accumulate to an indefinite extent, we should carefully mark how he employed his wealth. Says he: 'When the ear heard me then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me it gave witness to me; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I was eyes to the blind and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the poor; and the cause which I knew not I searched out.'—Job 29, 11 &c.

Go thou and do likewise. Thus bountifully distribute to man, liberally offer to God, and the writer of this will cheerfully leave it to God to fix your increase. 'But one word as you proceed upward, one earnest word: walk warily on those heights! Heads often turn, up there; and fearful gulfs yawn under you if you fall.'

While however I do not contend that to let riches increase is forbidden; or that it is unlawful to let them increase to an indefinite amount, I do contend in the language of Mr. Arthur:

'That not to give away any proportion of our income is unlawful.

'That to leave what we shall give to be governed by impulse or chance without any principle to guide us, is unlawful:

'That to fix a principle for our guidance, by our own disposition, or prevalent usage, without seeking light in the word of God, is unlawful:

'That when we search the Scriptures for a principle, the very lowest proportion of our income for which we can find any show of justification, is a principle of the whole.

That therefore it is our duty to give away steadily, for the service and honor of our God, at the very least, one tenth of all he commits to our stewardship.

RIDGEWAY.  
For the N. C. Christian Advocate. "The O'Kellyites."

BRO. HEFLIN:—In some editorial remarks, in a late number of your paper, you rather charged upon the O'Kellyites the teaching of Unitarianism, which called forth some remarks from the editor of the "Christian Sun" vindicating his Church from such an imputation, and with his apology you seem to be pretty well satisfied, from your remarks in connection with it. But all this does not satisfy me and if you will give me a little space in your "Advocate" I think I can offer satisfactory proof that that denomination is to be held responsible for Unitarianism. It is a well known fact that they have often been charged with it, and very properly too, when a number of their leading ministers have preached and published such doctrine from time to time. You stated yourself, Bro. Hefflin, that one of their ministers preached the doctrine at Pope's Chapel in Granville county, and another declared to you such sentiments. As to Eli Fay the editor of the "Sun" says he had a formal connection with them. Now he was either a member of that Church or he was not, but the plain facts in the case are these; all these men were in communion with the Church, and were retained in fellowship as Unitarians in doctrine, and therefore the Church is held responsible for their teaching. The editor of the "Sun" does not deny that this heresy exists among them at the North. Well, it is a notorious fact that although the Southern branch of the Church separated from the North it was not on account of Unitarianism, but abolitionism. This will be seen by reference to the minutes of their convention held in Alamance county in 1856, when and where the separation took place. I have very lately seen two publications which are circulated by their preachers in this section of country, and neither of them are orthodox. One of them is Maple's Sermons, and in it the vicarious statement of Christ is denied; the other is the life and writings of J. N. Walter, and he declares in that work Unitarian sentiments. He objects to the phrase *Trine* God, and denies that Christ is an *uncreated* being. If they are free from Unitarianism in North Carolina why do they circulate such books as these? But in addition to these facts I have yet stronger proof. They are characterized as Unitarians by the several authors of works containing religious statistics, &c. They are put down as such in School Atlases, Religious charts &c. and also in the Standard works of the day. In Paris' History of the M. E. Church dated 1849, he says of them "they have established a paper called the Christian Sun

which is devoted to the interests of the association and in which the doctrine of Unitarianism is boldly advocated." I will next quote from "Belcher's Religious Denominations," quite a late work. He says of them "in doctrine it is probably they are not entirely uniform, generally speaking however they deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the atonement and may be described to be what Mr. Gorrie calls them, Unitarian Baptists." And finally I refer to "Buck's Theological Dictionary" which is regarded as a Standard work. He says "Christian." A name assumed by a religious sect formed in different parts of the United States, though not in great numbers, nor of a uniform faith, differing but little from the general body of Unitarians. They deny in the main the doctrine of the Trinity and that of a vicarious atonement." Now it is not strange that in the face of such facts they will persist in denying that their Church is Unitarian? No body says that all of them believe or teach the doctrine, but they have a system that admits it, and they must abide by the old adage "a man is to be judged by the company he keeps." Perhaps it may be proper here to state why I designate them "O'Kellyites" instead of "Christians," as they call themselves.—My apology is this; christian is the common name of the disciples of Christ everywhere, and I do not recognize any small religious sect as being entitled to that name in distinction from the rest. I know that in assuming the name, they profess to be unsectarian, but there is sectarianism in that very thing. Paul in his reproof to the Corinthians classed the one who said, 'I am of Christ' with those who said, 'I am of Paul and I of Apollos.' They say their "only confession of faith is the Bible," &c. Now this is the greatest humbug of all, and which misleads so many unformed persons. We all know that the Bible is the true "standard of faith and practice," and one of the articles in our creed is to make the Bible "our rule," &c. But the difference lies here; while we as a church agree upon some system of doctrine as taught in the Bible, they have no settled doctrine, and what they call the Bible turns out to be their own opinion of the Bible, and so Unitarianism or any other heresy may be very easily introduced under such a system and is only the legitimate fruit of this "no creed" creed. I will here say that I have met with a number of excellent christian brethren among that denomination. I speak not against them as christians, but what I have written is in reference to their system. Perhaps some may think this article is uncalled for, but I desire that the light may come if the "Sun" will not give it. In a number of places they have formed Societies in the same houses where are Methodist churches, and sometimes our people join their church, believing them to be nearly the same as Methodists, which is not the case. I submit what is here written to candid christian men, and my only apology for doing so, is a desire to maintain the truth and the purity of the christian doctrine.

R. R. MICHAUX.  
Haw River, N. C., April 26, 1859.  
Gg.—Methodist Protestant will please copy.

descends behind a cloud very dark and very terrible. Judas, fresh from the councils and tearful admonitions of Jesus, sells his Lord for a slave's price, dies in despair, and "the son of perdition" "is lost," though the Father had given him to the Son. Was not such an apostasy total, and does it not seem to have been final?

Passing to those scriptures which treat the subject of set purpose and in detail, we find the positions we have assumed fully demonstrated. We select a few from the many:

"When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, shall he even die thereby." Ezek. xxxiii. 18.

"But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done it shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.

"Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; is not my way equal? are not your ways unequal?"

"When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." Ezek. 24-26.

The case is fairly made out. The man is righteous—not self-righteous, as that righteousness which saves; he turns from it and dies! Dies "in his sin." It will not be claimed that the death of these passages is simply of the body, for that must come alike to all. Yet, if it be so claimed, the point is yielded, for if the body dies while the soul is "in his sin," all is lost! There is no repentance in the grave.

It is not to be claimed that this is an apparent, not a real righteousness, or that a hypothetical case is assumed. Neither supposition can be maintained in view of the connection of these passages. No; they are solemn assertions. The righteous man turns from his righteousness, plunges into his iniquity, and so he dies! There is the simple record.

St. Paul, in his counsels to Timothy, says:

"Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck. The cargo of precious value was lost. We meet Alexander again (2 Tim. iv. 14.) still alienated from God—still backslidden, doing "much evil"—withstanding the apostle, who could only refer his case to the stern award of the Judge of all. And yet he once had faith, and a "good conscience!" Had them, lost them, and there is no intimation that he ever again found them.

Now let the reader refer to Hebrews: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.

"And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.

"For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh out upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God:

"But that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." Heb. vi. 4-8.

We will not offer an opinion as to what constituted the specific offense mentioned in this terrible passage. We let blessings had been attained by the persons who were at ed? 1. They had been "enlightened." 2. They had "tasted of the heavenly gift." 3. They "were made partakers of the Holy Ghost." 4. "Tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come." We know not how the most precious blessings of conversion and spiritual life can be more strongly stated; the enumeration is exhaustive. What were the steps of their fall? "They fell away." Nothing is gained by assuming that the case is merely supposed—

"if they fall away"—for the apostle would not climax a solemn argument against apostasy by supposing an impossible case. As well say that it is impossible for "the earth which drinketh in the rain" to "bear thorns and briers." But the best Greek scholars, Calvinistic as well as Arminian, yield the point claimed by Mr. Wesley, that "the apostle makes no supposition at all. There is no *if* in the original." 2. "They crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh." 3. "They put him to an open shame." 4. Instead of good fruit, the soul abundantly watered "bears thorns and briers"—hated, wrath, all unholiness.

Is not such apostasy total? It may be said this passage does not refer to ordinary backsliding; granted, that it referred to some specific sin. We care not to dispute about that. We only claim that the passage shows a complete apostasy of soul truly converted to God. Not only complete (or total) but final.

See the moral state and destiny of these apostates: 1. It is impossible to renew them to repentance. 2. They are nigh unto cursing. 3. The end is to be burned.

We feel that we have feebly brought out the meaning of the above fearful passage, but that we have correctly stated it, we are convinced from the whole tenor of the epistle. Turn to Hebrews x. 26-29: "For if we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.

"But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.

"He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses:

"Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, and unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

Here is also the same definite descriptions of the children of God, the same teaching of a total alienation, the same assertion of an irrevocable disinheriting and condemnation.

Following this is fitting admonition: "Cast not away, therefore, your confidence,—you now have it—hold it; you may, you can 'cast it away.'" "For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God ye might receive the promise." "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe unto the saving of the soul."

Confirmatory of the views given above is the teaching of St. Peter. He warns us to "give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall." But suppose we do not give this diligence? He who does not "is blind, and can not see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sin.

Still more unmistakable his language in chap. ii. 20-22 of his second epistle: "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.

"For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.

"But it is happened unto them accordingly to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow washed, to her wallowing in the mire."

We forbear giving any analysis, as it will be suggested by the most cursory reading.

Here we rest our case so far as positive testimony is concerned, and will close this article with a brief enumeration of consequences resulting, as we think necessarily, from the opposite view. Remember, we do not charge them as the fault of those holding the doctrine of perseverance in the Calvinian sense—by no means. We simply present them as consequences which we must receive if we receive the dogma.

1. *Sin becomes an absolute preventive of death, an assurance of earthly immortality.* "God doth continue to forgive the sins of those who are justified; and although they can never fall from the state of justification, yet they may, by their sins, fall under God's fatherly displeasure, and not have the light of his countenance restored unto them until they humble themselves, confess their sins, beg pardon, and renew their faith and repentance." Conf. Faith, chap. xii. sec. 6. "They may \* \* fall into grievous sins, and for a time continue therein; whereby they incur God's displeasure, and grieve his Holy Spirit." Ib. chap. xvii.

Now mark, (1.) They may fall—may grieve the Holy Spirit—may forfeit the light of his countenance.

(2.) This state of things must endure until they humble themselves, confess their sins, beg pardon, and renew their faith, and repentance.

(3.) It is impossible for them to die in this lost state.

Suppose we simply assert man's free agency, and state that he, having fallen into sin, will not "humble himself," will not "beg pardon," will not "renew his faith and repentance"—what then? If he dies in that condition he dies under "God's displeasure." But this can not be—he must not so die; and yet that displeasure can only be removed when he chooses to act—chooses to humble himself—chooses to "beg for pardon." He must live until this takes place. His sin secures his existence so long as his freedom to sin continues; and sin, having brought in temporal death, now lays an injunction upon it, and the man can only dissolve that injunction, and meet his last enemy, by "humbling himself" and "asking pardon."

2. The above consequences can only be eradicated by the destruction of man's free agency. He can continue in this state of sin described in the Confession as possible to children of God, or he can not. If he can, then the consequence is legitimate—if he can not, then he is not free but bound.

3. And if he can but so humble himself as to again find the favor of God, then all the warnings of the New Testament seem to be needless. He may "draw back," but can not "draw back unto perdition"—may "cast away his confidence," but can not lose it:—may sin, but must be saved, and death must be held in abeyance until he is ready. His lamp can not go out, and against him the door can not be shut.

We repeat that we state these simply as logical consequences. Calvinistic ministers preach a faithful gospel to their people, so far as practical duties are concerned. They urge holy living—urge it earnestly. They would not think of teaching any man that he might safely neglect duty and live in sin. Yet we believe that the tendency of the doctrine of certain salvation, to all who have been converted, is to produce carnal security, and to lull the soul to slumber. We honestly think the creed involves an error which rests upon the soul.

"Like the bat of Indian brakes, Whose pinions in the wound he makes; And soothing thus the dreamer's pain, He drinks the life-blood from the vein."

N. W. Ch. Advocate.

SELECTIONS.

Falling Away.

Can a child of God so fall away as to perish eternally?

We have been requested to offer a few thoughts on the above question, and scarcely feel at liberty to refuse, although disinclined to controversy. In the outset let us see how far all agree. Ist. That there should be a careful watch over our whole conduct to preserve our Christian character. 2d. There may be sad falling into sin—grievous departures from right.—These two points are enforced from every evangelical pulpit; how logically, is another matter. When, however, we come to the question, Can any regenerate person die in these backslidings, and dying be lost? there is a difference. We assume just the possibility, and simply assuming it might leave the question to take care for itself; for if the backslider be still a free agent, he can die, unless he bear a charmed life; if so, he dies in sin, and the end we need not tell.

Let us examine the subject without going into other questions connected with it in past controversies. It has been stated that backsliding is admitted. We assume that it may become complete, entire, and result in a total departure from God; and that it may be final, and involve eternal damnation. These propositions we shall argue jointly.

The history of manhood has been, alas, a history of apostasy. Adam walked in the garden with his God; with the echoes of the divine voice yet lingering amid its groves, he fell—so fell, as to bring in "death and all our woe." From then until now apostasy meets us at every turn. David descends from his high position to the depths of adultery and murder. Solomon gives up "wisdom dwelling with prudence," falls from God, and his sun

sets behind a cloud very dark and very terrible. Judas, fresh from the councils and tearful admonitions of Jesus, sells his Lord for a slave's price, dies in despair, and "the son of perdition" "is lost," though the Father had given him to the Son. Was not such an apostasy total, and does it not seem to have been final?

Passing to those scriptures which treat the subject of set purpose and in detail, we find the positions we have assumed fully demonstrated. We select a few from the many:

"When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, shall he even die thereby." Ezek. xxxiii. 18.

"But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done it shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.

"Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; is not my way equal? are not your ways unequal?"

"When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." Ezek. 24-26.

The case is fairly made out. The man is righteous—not self-righteous, as that righteousness which saves; he turns from it and dies! Dies "in his sin." It will not be claimed that the death of these passages is simply of the body, for that must come alike to all. Yet, if it be so claimed, the point is yielded, for if the body dies while the soul is "in his sin," all is lost! There is no repentance in the grave.

It is not to be claimed that this is an apparent, not a real righteousness, or that a hypothetical case is assumed. Neither supposition can be maintained in view of the connection of these passages. No; they are solemn assertions. The righteous man turns from his righteousness, plunges into his iniquity, and so he dies! There is the simple record.

St. Paul, in his counsels to Timothy, says:

"Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck. The cargo of precious value was lost. We meet Alexander again (2 Tim. iv. 14.) still alienated from God—still backslidden, doing "much evil"—withstanding the apostle, who could only refer his case to the stern award of the Judge of all. And yet he once had