

course unfit to save the 'Universalists' "all," or the Calvinists' "few."

As the links not here, are necessary to adapt the chain to their use of it, they wonder at the omissions ; and regarding them as unintentional, they think they may venture to sunder the chain in different places, and insert the so-called missing links. It was so dealt with by the Confession of Faith, in Chap. iii., Section 6, which thus presents the result : "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they, who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ—are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season—are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, but the elect only." This is, obviously, a paraphrase of the verses under consideration, and as obviously adds to the number of its terms. But in doing so, they practically condemn this series of Scripture terms, as essentially defective, and practically admit, that without this human addition, it can neither be felt, nor shown, to answer their design.

2. The other class of interpreters, differ from the ones just noticed, in that they cannot overlook the evident connexion of verses 29, and 30, with the 28th verse. Dr. John Brown, for instance, (in his Analytical exposition of the Romans, p. 250,) remarks : "Whom he did foreknow" is plainly an imperfect expression. It looks back to the words immediately preceding :—"Whom he did foreknow" are plainly "the called according to his purpose."—Why not go back a step farther to ascertain that the called according to his purpose, are plainly "them that love God," and that were loving God, at the time this call came. He dare not let foreknowledge extend to them : it would rend asunder his creed. To save it, he rends asunder the closely related clauses of one sentence; and then makes the separated clause denote characters the very reverse of those plainly expressed in the preceding clause.

Thus every Calvinistic comment on the verses before us, rests from first to last, on a false basis. Indeed, no interpretation of them can