

the new power whenever it strikes us. We do not see, then, that our account of human nature differs from that of these theorists, when consistent with themselves, so much in regard to its real and intrinsic powers and propensities, as in regard to the Divine plan of acting upon them. This difference, we will not disguise, is sufficiently wide,—the difference of supposing the child to be born into a state of the dreariest orphanage, to do nothing but sin up to the era of his conversion, and to be educated for repentance, and of supposing him at first the child of a Father whose claiming voice he ever hears, and whose spirit, unless rejected, ever shines within him “as glows the sunbeam in a drop of dew.” It is the difference between a regeneration which may commence with the very dawn of being and prevent the leprosy from ever appearing in the voluntary life, and the regeneration that finds man full grown in evil, and lifts him out of the pool of sin, and attempts to bring him to life as you bring back life to the drowned, which must be done, if at all, with unutterable pangs.

Nor yet, again, is it to be disguised, that some of the old formulas and terminologies exclude from the original constitution of man any such forces and capacities as we have placed under our third division. They even take from him the power of choosing any thing but pollution, and the capacity itself of receiving the Holy Spirit is only the result of a new creation. Calvin says of infants, “Though they have not yet produced the fruit of their iniquity, yet they have the seed of sin within them; even *their whole nature is as it were a seed of sin*, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God.” * But the

* Institutes, Book II. Ch. 1, Sec. 8.