

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XIX.—JUNE, 1890.—No. 6.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—CALVINISM AND FATALISM.

By REV. F. F. ELLINWOOD, D.D., NEW YORK.

MR. ROBERT J. INGERSOLL has unconsciously done the cause of Christian faith a service by pointing out its entire accord with the actual world in which we live, by showing that the book of Revelation and the book of Providence are in essential harmony. In the September (1889) number of the *North American Review*, while attempting to inform the public Why He is an Agnostic, he says :

“Most people, after arriving at the conclusion that Jehovah is not God, that the Bible is not an inspired book, and that the Christian religion, like other religions, is the creation of man, usually say: ‘There must be a Supreme Being, but Jehovah is not his name, and the Bible is not his word. There must be somewhere an overruling Providence or power.’ This position is just as untenable as the other. He who cannot harmonize the cruelties of the Bible with the goodness of Jehovah, cannot harmonize the cruelties of nature with the goodness and wisdom of a supposed deity. He will find it impossible to account for pestilence and famine, for earthquake and storm, for slavery, for the triumph of the strong over the weak, for the countless victories of injustice.”

The same mystery, then, hangs over the world as over the sacred page, and Mr. Ingersoll virtually admits that the Bible is true to the facts of life. Had it been a mere optimistic book, ignoring those things which baffle and perplex, he would probably have been one of the first to denounce its smooth prophecies as contrary to all observation and experience.

Mr. H. O. Pentecost has recently rendered a similar service to Calvinism. He denounces it as a horrible system, but declares that nevertheless, it is the only consistent philosophy of Christian belief and the only logical basis of theism. “If you admit the existence of a personal God,” he says, “you must be a Calvinist. There is no middle ground between Calvinism and Agnosticism, whoever is not a Calvinist must be an Agnostic and whoever is not an Agnostic must be a Calvinist.” The argument here is substantially that of Mr. Ingersoll.