

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

prince of divines, the Elder Edwards, and, in conjunction with him, made those invaluable "improvements in theology," which became new and impregnable bulwarks around the beleaguered citadel of our faith. Distant be the day when the New England churches shall abandon these strong defences to the enemy, and retreat again within the old, and not a little shattered, fortifications.

ARTICLE III.

EPISTOLA AD RUSTICUM APOLOGETICA.

BY REV. LEONARD WITHINGTON, D. D., NEWBURYPORT, MASS.

"They feared as they entered into the cloud." — Luke ix. 34.

You ask, my dear Rusticus, how the preacher's life appears in retrospection. You are curious to know, how the creed we have chosen in youth is sanctioned by the aged memory that reviews it; you have mentioned it rather as an unhappiness that the ministers of the gospel are obliged to adopt their principles before they have been tried by experience; and that, in youth, they must take the vast responsibility of forming the systems which they may be compelled to disapprove when enlightened by age. You put the question to me, and ask me, how the two views harmonize: the view, with which I began the work of a minister; and the view with which I close it? You put to me a difficult question; but you shall be gratified. I will attempt to answer. I shall suppose myself to be asked three questions:

- I. Why are you a Christian?
- II. Why are you a Calvinist?
- III. Why are you a moderate Calvinist?

As to the first question, I confess I cannot answer, with the

Rev. John Clarke, of Boston, "Not because I was born in a Christian country and educated in Christian principles; not because I find the illustrious Bacon, Boyle, Locke, Clarke, and Newton among the professors and defenders of Christianity; nor merely because the system itself is so calculated to mend and exalt human nature; but because the evidence accompanying the gospel has convinced me of its truth."¹ It is not the accompanying evidence that convinces me, so much as the intrinsic light of the gospel itself. Nor can I say that my being born in a Christian country has had no weight, or being educated in Christian principles. I look back with the deepest affection on the influence of Christianity which lay around the sunlight of my infancy. It made an impression on my heart which I do not wish to efface. Nor am I sure that it is not a legitimate argument. We judge of the divinity of the flower by its fragrance and beauty.

The gospel, to me, has been its own witness. The sun, when he arises, discharges two offices: first, to show his own glorious existence; and then, to enlighten and fertilize the world. So I see the proof of the gospel in its nature and use. The nature of the medicine is seen in its healing power. Certain passages of scripture have made a great impression on me, particularly Rom. 8: 22, 23, *For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, together, until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.* By "the whole creation," I suppose is meant the intellectual creation, *i. e.*, mankind; and by "the redemption of our body," I suppose is meant the complete recovery of our own race from sin and sorrow at the final resurrection — the raising of the body being the last triumph of the gospel. Supposing this meaning, what an argument for the truths of the gospel! The world is groaning, and has been so, since the dawn of creation. What is the matter? What is the cause? Just the evil that the gospel came to cure. Sin, in some of its forms;

¹ Answer to the question, Why are you a Christian? by Rev. John Clarke, D. D., Boston.

war, slavery, oppression, selfishness, cruelty, injustice, want of pity, want of love, want of devotion, want of religion. Thus we may ask two questions: Is it sin that afflicts the world? and: Will the provisions of the gospel cure its evils? Both these questions I must answer in the affirmative; and there flashes on my soul a perception that the gospel is true. The impression is irresistible.

The same impression is made when, in view of life and death, I consider the wants of my own heart. The deepest conviction rests on a moral induction, though I neither despise nor neglect the historical proofs. They are auxiliaries.

II. But, secondly: Why are you a Calvinist?

I here suppose that I am a Calvinist, a real one. My reason for this conclusion is an impression that, substantially speaking, amid all the vagaries of religious speculation, but four or five consistent systems have ever been offered to the world; that, as in the ground, according to the seed-germ you drop into it, the tree will grow up a chestnut, an oak, or an elm; so, according to the germinating principle you receive into your mind, you must, if an earnest and consistent man, become a Calvinist, or an Arminian, or a Universalist, or a Unitarian. There are not many new heresies in the world, and certainly no new gospel. Now, I received, very early in life, a centre-thought, which, while I hope it did not hamper free investigation, determined all my future opinions. The result of all my speculations was in the first postulate.

In the year 1816 I was settled over a small congregation in Massachusetts. As it was expected that I should state my religious opinions, I threw into the council the following confession of my faith:

“I submit the following as a summary view of the principles of my creed: I believe in the existence of one God, the creator of all things, possessed of every possible excellence, upholding all things by his power, swaying the universe by the most righteous government; holy, wise, and just in all his dealings with created intelligences, and to the manifestation of whose glory all things will ultimately conduce. I believe that this holy and beneficent God has made a com-

munication of his mind and will to man, in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; and that when the apostle says that *all scripture is given by inspiration*, his language is prospective as well as retrospective, and establishes the plenary inspiration of the books contained in our common Bibles. These books contain the only infallible rules of faith and practice. I believe that Jesus Christ took upon himself the nature of man, and died a propitiation for our sins; that before his incarnation he was *God over all, blessed forever*; and that, since his resurrection, *all power is committed into his hands, whether in heaven or in earth*, and that he is now the King and Head of the church, and that he will one day come to judge the world. I believe that the Holy Spirit is the sanctifier of all the saints, the originating source of whatever may be called, evangelically, good in the heart of man. I believe that when our Saviour says, *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, and when the apostle declares that *the carnal mind is enmity against God*, they have reference to one and the same thing, and jointly assert the original and total corruption of human nature in consequence of the apostasy of our first father Adam; so that all men are born *children of wrath*, and none can be saved without repentance, faith, sanctification and pardon. I believe that when Jesus Christ says, *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*, and when the apostle says, *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature*, these words are to be understood in their most obvious sense, and teach us that an ESSENTIAL CHANGE, by the Spirit of God, in the heart of man, is absolutely necessary to make him a real follower of Jesus Christ. I believe that all who are admitted into the spiritual kingdom of Christ are justified by faith alone; but it is a faith that *works by love*, and love is the fulfilling of the law, and faith is the gift of God. I believe that when our Saviour says that *the Son of man goeth as it is written of him, but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed*, he alludes to the truth that God foreknows and foreordains all things; but shows us, at the same time, that there is nothing in this doctrine which should alter our most simple ideas of approbation and blame, as

applicable to human actions. I believe that when one apostle says that *believers are kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation*, and when another apostle declares that *it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, if they should fall away, to renew them again to repentance* — if they taught the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, they taught it in such a manner as not, in the least degree, to diminish caution, humility, diligence, and self-distrust in real Christians. I believe that the righteous will be eternally happy, and the wicked eternally miserable, in the world to come; and by the righteous, I understand those that have believed in Jesus with a saving faith; and by the wicked, those who have not. I believe, mainly, in those doctrines which are embodied in the SHORTER CATECHISM of the Westminster divines."

Such was my creed then. Perhaps you will ask how I regard it after forty years' review. I must say that, if innovation is the sole proof of progression in religious wisdom, I must blush and confess that it is my creed now. I am twice a child in religion.

But why are you a Calvinist? Not because I bow, with supreme veneration, to the doctrine of Calvin, though I have a great respect for that wonderful man; nor because I follow, or wish to follow, the dictates of a sect or party; but simply because, with my veneration for the Bible, I cannot distinguish between the system of Paul and Calvin, so far as the pillars and fundamentals are concerned. The distinguishing features of Calvinism are the famous five points growing out of one — the sovereignty of God. God has boundless powers, boundless knowledge, boundless goodness. He knows the future as well as the past, and I must conclude, from his perfections, that he *foreordains whatsoever comes to pass*. So nature, reasoning from the perfections of God, teaches. But the Bible, before its language is twisted by an explanation, teaches the same sublime and awful truth: *For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born*

among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we, then, say to these things? (Rom. 8: 29, 30, 31.) So, in the next chapter: He saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy; and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So, then, it is not of him that willeth, but of the Lord that showeth mercy (Rom. 9: 15, 16). Thus we have the testimony of revelation to a truth which reason feels, beforehand, obliged to deduce from the perfections of God. And from this primal truth come others, which constitute and support the peculiarities of the system which has received the name Calvinistic, though it existed long before Calvin was in his cradle. Particular redemption, irresistible grace, the servitude of the will, the perseverance of the saints, all are branches of the same trunk, emanations from the same first principle.¹

Then these truths seem to have done the most good in the world: embraced by the church in the fervor of her first foundation and the fervor of her reform. The deepest Christians (so it seems to me) have loved them most; and they seem to have made the deepest Christians. If you ask, then, why am I a Calvinist? I answer, not because Calvin taught these doctrines, nor solely because I received these principles in my early education, but because I cannot distinguish between this system, in its outline, and that of Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, the great expounder of doctrinal truth.

¹ The five points of Calvinism are, as manifested in the "Quinquarticular Controversy," as it was called, the bondage of the will, particular redemption, irresistible grace, unconditional election, and the perseverance of the saints. I have said that this system never lies in the objector's mind as it does in that of him who accepts it; and this remark is particularly illustrated in the third article in the foregoing list, namely, irresistible grace. Let any one consider the meaning of two words of Augustine, and see what a new world of conception they open on the mind — *VICTRIX DELECTATIO*. These two words are a key to open the cabinet, which no one ever has opened who does not believe the doctrine —

" 'T was the same love that spread the feast
That sweetly forced us in."

We may say the same of the decrees of God. See how the doctrine is mitigated and modified by Dr. Griffin, in his Park-street Lectures.

It enables me to be an honest interpreter of the Bible. I take the whole; I cover up nothing; I shrink from nothing. When my Saviour utters a hard saying, I do not *go back and walk with him no more.*

Another reason for being a Calvinist is, that it seems to me to mark a more ample sweep of mind to be a Calvinist, than to embrace the other systems, more negative in their character and less comprehensive in their design. There are two elements in this theology, of which the basis is man and God. Both of them exist and coëxist, and must be recognized in our religious convictions. We must reason from God to man, and from man to God. God is not a sleeping energy, nor is man an irresponsible subject. But if the scripture has deduced certain conclusions from God's perfection, I must admit them, or question scripture and deny some of the fundamental laws of my being. I believe, therefore, that God, in being perfect, foreknows all things, and that it is impossible to separate his foreknowledge from his EVERLASTING DECREES.

But man, too, exists, and is a sinner; and it is impossible for him to be a sinner without having violated some human obligation. The violation of obligation is the very idea of sin: *I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet* (Rom. 7:7). I must, therefore, explain and deduce, from the scripture, the responsibilities of man and the adaptedness of the divine law to his condition. Now, I must enforce this obligation and the reason for it, unhampered by any other impediment which may meet me from any other source. I must show that the law of God, in its high demand, is reasonable and just.

There is still another reason why I am a Calvinist: I have attended seriously to the objections, and am confirmed in my faith by some of the strongest objections brought against the system. To me, the objections are new proofs and confirmations; for I think I see how they arise and where they fail. Let us take an example. The objector always mistakes the system. He imputes to it a rigor which it disclaims.

IT NEVER LIES IN HIS MIND AS IT DOES IN THE MIND OF HIM THAT RECEIVES IT. Thus the decrees of God are always supposed, by those that reject them, to be executed by a physical power, and imply an anti-moral necessity. The necessity asserted, or the future certainty, or whatever you please to call it, always degenerates, in his view, into a fatal, material law. Sin is so cogent that it ceases to be sin. The sinner's inability becomes a cruel misfortune. Now, the Calvinist holds no such doctrine. He says the sinner's inability is wholly owing to sin, and that "God executes his decrees in the works of creation and providence,"—creation in the natural world, providence in the moral. Second causes are not removed—not even disturbed; they are the very means through which God exerts his power. So the Presbyterian church say, in their constitution: "God, from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established" (Constit. of Presb. Ch. p. 15, Phila. Ed. 1827). And Augustine asks, *Si non sit liberum arbitrium, quomodo damnabitur mundus? Si non sit gratia, quomodo servabitur?*—If man is not free, how can the world be condemned?—If there is no place for sovereign grace, how can it be saved? And Calvin says (Inst. lib. I. c. 16, sect. 9), "*Quod statuit Deus, sic necesse est evinire ut tamen, neque præcisse neque suapte natura necessarium sit.*"—What God decrees, must happen, and yet not by a strict necessity; for it is not necessary in its own nature. Our catechism says that "God doth persuade and enable us to embrace Christ freely offered to us in the gospel;" and a still higher authority, with a still briefer comprehension, has exhorted us to *work out our own salvation, with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do.*

Perhaps I ought to confess, also, that I have always rather inclined to the human side of these opposites, for this reason: I better comprehend the duties of man than the operations

of God. I have always inclined to the finite side of the question.

I am aware, also, that it may be said by the objector that these two elements cannot be embraced by the same mind; they are destructive of each other. I can only reply that I cannot do otherwise than embrace them both.

The doctrine of the Trinity is not a part of Calvinism, distinctively so called; yet all Calvinists are Trinitarians. I have never felt any of the objection to this mystery; I have always received it without much mental conflict. Indeed, I receive the doctrine of the Trinity partly *because* it presents a clearer conception of God. Let me explain: As, in conceiving a material object, an apple or a stone, I am compelled to regard it as a substance holding certain qualities; although this central substratum is the darkest conception that ever meets the mind, yet we cannot conceive of the quality without presupposing this centre in which they meet; so, in forming a conception of God, *how* the persons are united in one Godhead is a very dark conception; yet, when we assume this, and pass to the *manifestation*, our idea of God, in his relation to mankind, becomes more positive and more clear, by viewing him in his trifold personality. I adore my Creator, I love my Redeemer, I feel the influence of the Holy Spirit. Yes, I do not hesitate to say (it is no paradox) that God, in his manifestation, can only become clear to man through the belief in a Trinity; and hence, historically, we find that those who deny the Trinity, lose the personality of God, and are fast becoming pantheists.

III. But, thirdly, you may ask the question: Why are you a moderate Calvinist?

Some say that this is an impossibility. They ask: What is moderate Calvinism? It stands on the side of a declivity, and must slip down to something softer and better. Dr. Channing says: "If the stern reformer of Geneva could lift up his head and hear the mitigated tone in which some of his professed followers dispense his fearful doctrines, we fear he could not lie down in peace until he had poured out his displeasure on their cowardice and degeneracy. He would tell

them, with a frown, that *moderate Calvinism* was a solecism, a contradiction in terms; and would bid them, in scorn, join their real friend Arminius. Such is the power of public opinion that naked, undisguised Calvinism is not very fond of showing itself; and many, of consequence, know imperfectly what it means." Yet notwithstanding this blast of condemnation, moderate Calvinism always has existed in the church, and I trust always will.

But you may ask: What is moderate Calvinism? Now, moderate Calvinism consists, not in denying any one of the great doctrines, but in mixing them with other truths equally obvious and equally important. A moderate Calvinist is not a man of one idea. He is willing to take all the elements of our moral being into his comprehensive creed. He knows the magnitude of these speculations and the weakness of our moral powers; and therefore he does not make *all* the deductions from such high declarations which a rigid logic would seem to demand. He knows the greatness of God and the weakness of man. He knows how inadequate the human mind is to grasp the vast conception of the plans and purposes of God. He often says, this great doctrine may be true, but, then, I see it through a glass, darkly. I must reason from it just as God does, and apply it with all the limitation sanctioned in his word. When he reasons from God down to man, the divine perfections seem to necessitate the reception of the doctrine of an absolute and absorbing predestination. It is an ocean; it swallows up everything. But that truth does *not* stand alone. When he reasons from man up to God, the freedom and responsibility of the creature seems to be necessary to our simplest conception of duty and religion. Here, then, is another truth standing on its own basis, and one of the eternal pillars of religion. And this truth is taught and assumed, in the Bible, as clearly and as often as the other. God is sovereign; man is free. God sees no contingency; man meets scarcely anything else. God foreordains; man is capable of good and evil. God works in us; and yet the gospel gate is wide open. Now, I must mingle these truths just as they are mingled in the

Bible, and I have no right to make the one weaken the other. The one class of truths are as necessary to the fulness of the gospel as the other. I have no right to strike a single quantity from this celestial equation. I must let it stand just as it is. I must leave the compound with all its perplexities and DIVINE CONTRADICTIONS. The different notes are the harmony of the whole tune; and, although this mixture is a delicate one, and even good men may differ in the degree of prominence they give to each of the parts, yet I must do as well as I can. I must see that these opposing powers form the harmony of the whole system; and this is, as I conceive, moderate Calvinism. It tells the whole truth; it reads the whole Bible. It is not afraid of earth-born antagonisms; it aims to be *filled with all the fulness of God.*

All this may be illustrated by what takes place in the natural world. We find that through the whole system of our sun and planets there prevails the law of attraction, by which all things are drawn to one common centre; and you might ask: Why do they not rush to one consolidated union? There is another law, by which they are repelled. And these two laws act in opposition to each other; and that opposition is the harmony of the whole. So in the spiritual world: two pillars support the fabric, of which, if either be removed, the roof falls — God and necessity; moral subjects and freedom. Nay, the law of antagonism reigns throughout all nature: “All nature’s difference keeps all nature’s peace.”

The moderate Calvinist is the more confirmed in his views, inasmuch as he finds his system injured, as either of the parts assume an inordinate proportion. I have no hesitation in saying that the worst error that ever infested the church is a distorted orthodoxy, a caricature of truth, a tree with its branches without its roots; predestination without free agency; a divine will without a divine reason; a physical necessity controlling a moral being; faith without works; action without motive; sin without law, or a gospel that annihilates the law; an Antinomian gospel;¹ a God whose only

¹ I ought to say, however, that the danger of leaning to this side of the question is greatly mitigated by the utter impossibility of benumbing, or destroy-

attribute is irresistible power ; a God whose will makes all things right, whose only righteousness is his will. All this is horrible, and the more horrible for its partial resemblance to divine truth. Such a rock I have always aimed to shun.

Calvin has one fault : he makes sovereignty too absorbing. He was pressed to it by the reaction of the age. I have endeavored to preach a simpler gospel. I deny nothing in the old forms ; I believe *all*.¹ I have only made a different mixture. I have tried to give my hearers an ampler whole : God is sovereign ; man is free. He works in us to will and to do ; and when we will well, we do his work.

On the question of original or inherited sin, I have always been a moderate Calvinist, seeking to utter no more than the Bible allowed me to know. On this sensitive point, which always must come up in ordaining-councils, and when candidates are examined for the ministry, and on which some good men concentrate all their wisdom, you might see me sitting a patient listener, silent as Ignorance herself should be, with my longest finger over one eye and my thumb folded over the other, waiting the result, which was always similar, and having one consolation, that the process must finally end. It has always seemed to me that Paul, in the 5th of Romans (which is the seat of this doctrine) is very clear as to the *effect* of Adam's transgression, and says very little as to the *mode* of the transmission. It seems to me he is arguing, in this chapter, against a favorite tenet of the Jews, that the gospel was for them, not so free for the Gentiles ; they were the children of Abraham, and heirs of the promise ; and yet they were obliged to confess, from their own authoritative record,

ing those instinctive feelings of liberty and responsibility which are engrained in the nature of man, and ever operate, whatever be his speculative notions. Dr. Twiss, Dr. Gill, and others of that class, did not injure practical piety so much as their creed would seem to threaten ; for the same reason that Don Quixote's senses were always correcting his imagination, he was always at last compelled to find an inn where he imagined a castle.

¹ That is, I do not remember a principle, or technic term in the old Calvinist writers, in which one might not detect the reality which they were aiming to express. Whether the expression was the best possible, is another question. They have been accused of suffering their thoughts to evaporate in mere technics. It is not so, or only so to the reader who chooses to continue uninitiated.

that all men were the children of Adam. Now the apostle adroitly seizes this concession, and proves to them that the gospel was for all, because all needed it; and that men were just as certainly sinners as they were the descendants of Adam. His object is to teach the universality of sin, as the foundation of an universal offer of the benefits of redemption. The mode of connection or transmission he does not stay to discuss. The broad fact is enough for his purpose. I have been very cautious of adding to his words. I have not chosen to make a paradox where he has only left a mystery. I suppose that the connection between my sinful bias and Adam's first transgression is wholly owing to the sovereign appointment of God; if so, it is highly improper to adduce the original endowments of Adam as a solution of the obligations of man, ACCORDING TO OUR NATURAL APPREHENSIONS OF JUSTICE. From the very nature of the case, you cannot make a mystery an explanation of itself. All the formulas about Adam being our federal head, our representative, our sinning in him, and falling with him in his first transgression, of his sin being imputed to us, etc., may be reduced to one, viz., that for certain unrevealed reasons, God willed that man should be born with just such propensities as he is born with. All these forms of expression resolve themselves into sovereignty. We must bow to his sovereign will. It is right, because the Lord hath done it. The fault of the high Calvinist was, he sought an explanation where God intended none. His speculations always play between a mystery and an exponent. Sin, from its very nature, is the violation of an obligation; and in order to know the nature of sin, we wish to know the nature of those obligations it violates. Now, I cannot see that Paul intends our union with Adam as such an explanation. You cannot make a mystery an explanation. What was given to try our faith, was never intended to satisfy our reason.

If, then, you ask me, my dear Rusticus, how these sentiments appear on review, after the lapse of half a century, to a man who has one foot in the grave, and the eternal world just before him, I sigh and say, Alas! I see much to lament

in my defective spirit, my want of zeal and a want of vitality to the orthodoxy I embraced; when the truth was constantly seen, the impression was too feeble, and my preaching was the stammering of a child. But the creed I threw into the council at twenty-seven years of age, is my creed now that I am beyond threescore and ten. I have been, always, a **MODERATE CALVINIST**. This is not boasting, for some will say, it is a miserable confession; a man ought to be more progressive. Why should he ride at anchor all his life, when he ought to be sailing? I can only reply, that I am ready to pull up my anchor when I know whither I am going, and am assured of profitable discoveries.

One reason of my cleaving to Calvinism is, that when you have slain the body of it, you cannot exorcise the ghost. It will remain, and will haunt you, and you cannot think its residuum into non-existence. As it is with regard to the substratum of matter, denied or reduced to a minimum by certain metaphysicians, you cannot think of qualities without thinking of a primitive in which they inhere; so it is with the hypostasis of this system: it will not down at your bidding; it will haunt your speculations when you deny it. The strongest opponents of the system have felt its power even when denying it. The invisible chain of necessity was around Erasmus, Episcopus, Whitby, and all the vigorous minds who have striven to break its material form. Priestley himself ran away from Calvinism, and fell into the chains of a stronger necessity.

I must add, however, that in my religious investigations I have never been under the play of polemic antagonisms. I have never been fond of pursuing truth in that way. My battles have been with my own objections. My issues have been, almost all of them, mental. I have been my own opponent and my own convert, and have never, for a moment, dreamed that I was born to stand sentinel over the orthodoxy of the church. I have cheerfully devolved this duty on those of my brethren who selected this mission because they felt themselves born for it. I have always had enough to do to get rid of my own heresies. I have found the path of truth.

so dark and difficult, that I have not wondered if some have missed it.

As I draw near to the eternal world, I must confess I feel an increasing, perhaps I should say an alarming, indifference to the niceties of mere speculation. The spirit of the gospel is all: a spontaneous, an all-absorbing love, is the best light when we tread the dark passage. O, blessed Redeemer, beam on my dying hour with thy light, and I can adjourn all my speculative difficulties to the world where I shall *know even as I am known.*

ARTICLE IV.

SPECULATION AND THE BIBLE.

BY REV. JAMES W. M'LANE, D. D., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THERE is much bold adventure, at present, in some departments of intellectual effort. A draft is frequently made upon the belief of the Christian, which he cannot honor. A possibility is pushed into the place of certainty. A mere *perhaps* has given to it all the importance of an undoubted fact. In many of our popular lectures, and in much of the current literature of our day, there is a departure from that which should be regarded as the legitimate domain of the scholar; a divergence from the course of a safe and salutary exercise of human reason; a non-observance of that "temperance over appetite," which, as Milton intimates, should be regarded by us in the pursuit of knowledge. There are boundaries in the domain of truth which must be recognized; lines, where certainty to us must, in the nature of the case, cease, and where mystery must begin; limits, we may add, within which man has his safety, his intellectual freedom, and his moral elevation. When he goes beyond these, and draws