

choices, their state has been already divinely determined : they are saved before responsible action commences, and their new life is from the first, not one of testing with a possible fall or failure, but one of holiness instant and above all change.

The writer has deemed it important thus to state the evangelical doctrine for substance before considering the alternative view presented in the question under discussion. It may be that such a statement will help to free the doctrine on one side from some of the misconceptions which have attached themselves to it, and on the other to bring out more fully the contrasts, wide and deep, between the doctrine and this alternative *dogma*—as the question describes it. There are, in fact, three of these alternative views—the Romish, the Unitarian or Liberal, and that which has been so ably advocated in the pages of this REVIEW. With the Romish and the Liberal dogma, we have here no present concern. The papal notion that the characters and conditions of some are modified or improved through certain disciplinary or retributive processes divinely instituted for this purpose, and the liberalistic notion that such modification or improvement may and does occur through restorative forces still resident in the sinful soul itself, are alike without foundation—to use the language of the question before us—in either reason or revelation. This question involves rather the antithetic hypothesis, that something higher than the remaining capabilities of the sinning soul, and higher than purgatorial discipline in whatever form, comes in to effect the favorable changes contemplated,—in other words, that what we term the Gospel is to be brought into play in the future as in the present life, and that through the forces embodied in that Gospel sinners are to be convicted, persuaded, made penitent and believing, transformed into saints and sanctified for heaven, in the next life substantially as in this. It is this hypothesis, standing in clear contrast with the current orthodox belief, yet claiming for itself, if not explicit divine teaching, a general warrant from the Bible and from the nature of Christianity, that we are to consider :

(1.) It should be noted just here, that the advocates of this dogma are very far from being agreed among themselves as to the classes of persons whom they regard as having, in the divine economy of grace, such a probation after death. As to all who die in infancy, the issue between them and the current evangelical belief is a verbal one mainly: it is a technical question as to the term, probation : it is a matter of method or process rather than of result. Certainly, it is not necessary to regard each dying infant as waking at once into full moral consciousness in the heavenly state, and there deliberately choosing Christ as its Redeemer, in order to hold that such an infant is saved through Him.—As to the pagan world, solemn and pathetic as the question is, it is no injustice to say that the dogma under discussion