

effect follows its cause, that infants, born or unborn, in existence or only contemplated as to exist in future ages, are just as legitimate objects of Divine reprobation as the most openly wicked and ungodly on earth. Nay more, if *unconditional reprobation* be true, the unborn, the innocent and sinless infant, is just as legitimate an object of Divine reprobation as the ungodly who are now weeping and wailing in the place of woe.

The question then before us, is simply this, is *unconditional reprobation* a part of the Calvinistic system, or is it not? That it is not a part of the *Christian system* we have abundant evidence in the inspired, the unerring, and infallible word of God, to which we shall by and by have occasion more particularly to refer. But is it a part of the Calvinistic system? We shall let those who have written on the subject answer this question in their own words, and leave the reader to judge for himself.

John Calvin says, "Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, whereby he hath it determined with himself what he willed to become of every man. For all are not created to like estate: but to some eternal life, and to some eternal damnation is fore-appointed. Therefore as every man is created to the one or other end, so we say that he is predestinated either to life or to death." Institutes, Book iii. chap. 21. s. 5. It is quite evident from this, that Calvin considered the *end which God had in view* in the creation of a portion of our race *was their reprobation*; and their sinning after their creation was but a means, and a means too chosen and fixed by Himself, for bringing about the awful end. Hence he tells us in another part of his Institutes that "The ground of reprobation (is) the will of God to reject, and not men's deserving to be rejected." And he concludes the same section by saying. "Therefore if we cannot declare a reason why we (i. e. God) vouchsafeth to grant mercy to them that are his, but because it so pleaseth him: neither also shall we have any other cause in rejecting of others, than his own will. For when it is said that God hardeneth, or sheweth mercy to whom he will, men are thereby warned to seek no cause elsewhere than in his will." Book iii. chap. 22. s. 11.

It is well known that *Gomarus*, the great antagonist of *Arminius*, defended the horrible decree. His sentiments were, "That God, alike to make known his tender mercy and inflexible justice, did of his own mere good pleasure, divide the one, and that by far the less, he predestinated to eternal salvation; and the other necessarily the greater, he reprobated to everlasting damnation. And for the accomplishment of his decree, founded thereon, he resolved to create man, and prescribe to him