

know this to be a mistake. If a convention of all the Presbyterians in Scotland were to revise the Confession of Faith, those portions of it which teach, or seem to teach, the divine authorship of sin, human inability, limited atonement, absolute election, reprobation, and the like, would, no doubt, be suppressed, but these are only the excrescences of Calvinism, which, when removed by skilful surgery, would leave the vitality of the system not only unimpaired, but vastly invigorated. The United Presbyterian body has added some supplementary statements to the Confession, but a recent, and apparently well-informed reviewer testifies that even these exhibit "most loving adherence to the Calvinism therein taught," and adds, "acceptance of this system of doctrine is, at the present time, as general and as emphatic as at any time in our national history." The same is no doubt substantially true of the American, Canadian, and other Presbyterian bodies.

We have to complain of our contemporary the *Christian Guardian*, and we do so without an atom of unkind or unfraternal feeling, that most of its exhibitions of Calvinism are of the extreme order, such as the great mass of those who consider themselves good, sound Calvinists unhesitatingly repudiate. This remark applies, perhaps, more especially to certain selected articles, but even the editorials are not wholly free from this fault. We do not for a moment imagine that our usually fair-minded neighbour would wilfully misrepresent or caricature a doctrinal system, but we do think the fact is overlooked—for a fact it is—that the cardinal and essential principle of Calvinism can be and is held most tenaciously by multitudes who no more believe in universal fore-ordination, limited atonement, or arbitrary sovereignty, than the most decided Arminian. It would be difficult to find a Calvinist prepared to accept such statements as: "salvation is unconditional," "it in no sense depends on anything that man can do, but upon the decree of God," "predestinated to perdition by a divine decree," "a salvation which God has decreed they shall never share,"—and many more like them which might be quoted from recent editorials of the *Christian Guardian* as descriptive of Calvinism. In further illustration of this point we may cite a reference twice made to Albert Barnes, the eminent commentator.

The most noticeable of these references was in an editorial on Mr. Moody's visit to Toronto, as follows: "Mr. Moody's theology, so far as he may be said to have a theology, is drawn from Puritan and Calvinistic sources. But there is to Methodists this comfort that when a man gets thoroughly aroused, and is pleading with sinners to come to Christ, Calvinism, as Barnes said, cannot be preached." Now, we are under the impression that Barnes never made any such statement. He did say, and he urged it as a forcible objection to that excrescence of Calvinism, the doctrine of limited atonement, that it could not be preached in times of revival when men were aroused to declare the Gospel with special earnestness. How could he make the broad, sweeping declaration attributed to him when he was himself a pronounced Calvinist? His commentary gives no uncertain sound on this subject, and the same may be said of his published sermons. Injustice is also done to the memory and work of Whitefield to back up the assertion that "Arminianism is the only possible conception of the doctrines of grace in a great revival." We are told that "Whitefield's Calvinism retreated at once from the centre of operations and became a spent force." This is historically incorrect, for "Whitefield's Calvinism" entrenched itself in the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion which was gradually merged in the Congregational and other bodies. As to the assertion that "Arminianism is the only possible conception of the doctrines of grace in a great revival," it is contradicted by the great revival in Jonathan Edwards' day, by the great revival under Finney's labours, by the Irish revival, and even by the *Guardian's* own statement concerning Mr. Moody, that "so far as he has a theology at all—and he must have one underlying his presentations of truth, however dexterously it may be hidden—it is drawn from Puritan and Calvinistic sources."

To come now more particularly to the doctrinal position of Congregational churches, it may suffice for the present to say that the Declaration of Faith adopted in 1833 is a distinctly Calvinistic document, as witness Nos. 14 and 15 of the "Principles of Religion" contained in it. Yet these paragraphs are entirely innocent of the ultra views usually held up as an exhibit of the Calvinistic system by Methodist journals, the *Christian*