

to us from Adam." We must here note again the Satanic art, by which the language of Orthodoxy is used to denote ideas the very opposite. Here is talk of "corruption of the flesh" and a depraved constitution which, however, only denotes a diseased body, and even moral depravity which, however, is explained as denoting actual transgression.

But taking the view as it stands, we thought that we had at length found something new in the way of heresy, but really it is so transcendantly absurd, that we scarcely know how to treat it otherwise than with ridicule.

But the subject is too serious for ridicule. As the friends of truth, we are called to take a determined stand against such a system of low and debasing materialism—a doctrine akin to the old Heathen doctrine of the malignity of matter—a doctrine which destroys the very foundation of all moral obligation, by referring man's conduct, not to a responsible will, but to his physical organization, at the same time that we cannot but feel pity for those who have allowed themselves to be misled by such blind guides, and with scarcely pity for those guides who afford so impressive an exhibition of the apostle's language, "Professing themselves to be wise they became fools."

But this view of depravity leads to a new theory in regard to regeneration. This is admitted by themselves. They acknowledge no *radical change of nature*. It is merely as Finney expresses it, a change of the governing purpose of the soul," or as others define it, "of the balance of the susceptibilities," and hence the idea of instantaneous regeneration is scouted by some of them, and it is maintained that it is gradually effected, and in the catechism already referred to, it is asserted that a man is born again by a life in accordance with God's Word. In other words he performs the actions of life before he is born, and becomes born by continuing to do so. Surely absurdity like this needs no refutation. But how imperfect the whole view of regeneration compared with the Scripture account of the matter—as communicating new life to them that were dead—a being born again—a taking the heart of stone out of our flesh and giving a new heart, having a divine seed implanted in the heart, and being created new, so that, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. Old things are passed away and all things become new."

But the point particularly requiring attention is the agency to which all this is attributed. It is boldly asserted by Finney that this a man can do himself. "As God requires men to make themselves a new heart, it is the strongest possible evidence that they are able to do it. If the sinner ever has a new heart he must obey the command of the text, and *make it himself*. Sinner, instead of waiting and praying for God to change your heart, you should at once summon up your powers, put forth the effort, and change the governing purposes of your mind. The sinner that minds the flesh can change his mind, and mind God." Thus "the Ethiopian can change his skin and the leopard his spots."

This is plain enough, but such an entire denial of the work of the Spirit goes too plainly in the face of the Bible, to go down with any portion of the christian public, and accordingly there must be some appearance of acknowledging the hand of God in the work, but they reduce it all to the influence of moral suasion—such as one man exercises over another. "The power which God exerts in the conversion of a soul is *moral* power; it is that kind of power by which a statesman sways the mind of a senate; or by which an advocate moves and bows the heart of a jury." And again he says, in speaking of this change, "It is perfectly proper to say that the Spi-