

ARTICLE V.

THE REFORMED SYSTEM AND THE LARGER HOPE.¹

BY THE REV. J. N. MCGIFFERT, ASHTABULA, OHIO.

ONE of the prominent theological questions of the age is the salvation of the heathen. Can one who has never heard of the name and work of the Lord Jesus Christ be saved? and, if salvation is possible for such a one, what can we learn from the Scriptures of the method of his salvation?

It is easy to understand how this question has arisen, and forced itself toward the front. It is a direct result of the missionary enterprise of the century. Previously to this missionary arousing, the thoughts of the church were engrossed with home questions. The distinction of the true doctrine from the false, which had grown about it for ages; the formation of definite creeds; the separation of schools of thought into denominations; the defensive and aggressive work of the divided parties; the settling forever the great questions of the rights of conscience and religious liberty; the conscientious preparation, through difference and sundering, for the realization of true Christian unity, not in compulsive bonds of outward form, but in the fundamental truth, the renewed heart, and the everlasting hope,—these were the burning issues in the days of our forefathers. His is conceited pride which condemns these seekers after truth, and combatants for doctrine, as narrow, bigoted, or unpractical. Theirs was a preparatory work, which needed thorough doing, to clear the way for the grand mission of the Reformed Church in giving the pure gospel to the world.

¹ Lecture delivered at the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Jan. 29, 1891.

But the missionary work has aroused the church to think on matters of which before it had merely dogmatized. The adaptation of Christianity to the whole world and its power to bring all races of men to Christ have impressed on the mind of the church the likeness of men everywhere, and have emphasized the truth, which was accepted before, but was not realized, that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men," and that in Christ Jesus "there is neither Greek nor Jew, barbarian nor Scythian." Now that Christendom and heathendom are brought face to face, and are throbbing heart with heart, God's people are not only aroused with zeal to save the heathen, but questions of the divine purpose for these multitudes have forced themselves on the Christian mind. Has the salvation provided for all men no reference to them save as it has been brought to them by the church? Has the Christ who died for all no trophies of his death from among the nations yet unreached by the gospel, or from among those countless millions who died, before the church awoke to her mission? The question, in its breadth of reference, is immense. The conviction has arisen and is spreading, and that not among sectaries or those suspected of heretical views, but in the evangelical orthodox church, that God, who "so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," has not left these multitudes without some possibility of salvation.

The theory of a further probation for those who in this life have not heard of Christ, is an attempt to furnish logical ground for a hopeful answer to such questions. The theory is not new, save in its fuller development. A view which resembles it is as old as Hermas, who says in his "Pastor":

in Hades." "Did not the same dispensation obtain in Hades, so that even there all the souls, on hearing the proclamation, might either exhibit repentance, or confess that their punishment was just, because they believed not?"¹ The Purgatory of the Roman Church was a natural outgrowth of this ancient view; and the restorationism held by a large body of Universalists is somewhat similar. What is substantially the old theory of Hermas and Clement has been revived in our day by Canon Farrar and others in England; and special prominence has been given to it in our own country, through its presentation and defence by the editors of the *Andover Review*.

In their work, "Progressive Orthodoxy," the endeavor is made to give it a logical place in a theological system. They base the theory on the universal relation of Christ to mankind, as necessitating the actual presentation of Christ to all men. And they bring to its support the extreme view of the doctrine of justification by faith, that faith in the historical Christ is essential to salvation, and that such faith is impossible without the knowledge of the gospel. They present us this trilemma on the subject of heathen salvation: 1st. "The heathen are hopelessly lost unless they hear the gospel in its historic form during their life on earth;"² 2d. "Salvation is possible without any knowledge of the gospel, and yet by reason of the gospel;"³ 3d. "Those who do not know of God's love in Christ while they are in the body will have knowledge of Christ after death."⁴ They discard the first as a "terrible impeachment of the divine goodness;"⁵ they argue strenuously

and in the Reformed system of theology; and they turn to the third as all that is left after the others are rejected. The theory of a future probation is frequently styled "the larger hope;" as opening a door of hope for millions, against whom, in the opinion of those who hold it, it else were closed forever.

This theory might be allowed by the church as one of the possible explanations of the ways of God, if it could be confined, logically and practically, to the heathen. But it is certainly logical to argue from a future probation for the heathen to a similar probation for those in Christian lands who, through their unfortunate environment, have never heard the gospel in any sense that is worthy of the name. There are multitudes in the larger cities in this land and throughout Christendom, whose probation in the present life, if probation consists in the offer of the historic Christ to the mind and heart for direct acceptance or rejection, is the hardest mockery. And, if not logical, it would be natural for worldly men to argue, from a future probation for the ignorant and debased classes, to a similar probation for all who have not committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, by a thoughtful, deliberate, and decisive rejection of the offered Christ. Indeed, Canon Farrar does not hesitate to look on such general probation as probable. He says, in a note on Mark iii. 29: "Our Lord states, with immense plainness and with no reservation, the possible ultimate remission of every sin and blasphemy except one. What that one is

guarding the interests of souls, has a right to challenge such theory, and to demand that it present some stronger evidence than speculation or labored inference.

But I will not discuss this theory farther. My object is to set over against it what I regard as the scriptural hope; a hope which does not contravene the old-fashioned doctrines and the established faith of the church, but which is their legitimate outcome. For, notwithstanding the skilful construction of a systematic new theology, suggesting a future probation logically as an article of its creed, I fancy that there is little probability that the theory will extend largely in the church, if the growing conviction of God's broader mercy can be met by the old theology.

Let us examine the doctrines of the Reformed system of faith so far as they bear on the larger hope. I understand by these doctrines: (1) the evangelical doctrines of the Protestant church in general, and (2) the Calvinistic or Augustinian doctrines of divine grace.

The starting-point of the Reformed system is, What does God's word teach? And naturally, in any religious investigation, we inquire first at this fountain-head. Yet we should not expect to find in the Bible many statements bearing directly on this question. The object of God's word is to set forth the duty of those who have it, rather than to solve problems about those who have it not. Yet there are portions of Scripture which, to say the least, permit us to hope that God has purposes of mercy outside of the proclamation of the gospel. I will quote a few of these, with very brief remarks in connection, as we have not time for their full discussion.

In Acts x. 35 Peter says: "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." It seems forced to explain this statement as a prophecy that, after the gospel has come to them, God will accept men, whether Gentiles or Jews, who

shall work righteousness. It occurs at the beginning of Peter's remarks, before he has declared one word of the gospel, and expresses his conviction that God has already accepted Cornelius, hearing his prayers and remembering his alms.

In Acts xvii. 27 Paul speaks of the nations of the world in their ignorance before the gospel was proclaimed. Having mentioned God's providence which cared for their wants and meted their bounds, he states the object of this providence, "that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him." A seeking which could in no case be successful would scarcely seem worthy of the divine purpose. To apply "if haply" to something which could not possibly occur, appears like a perversion of language. The statement in the thirtieth verse, "The times of this ignorance God winked at," seems to indicate some divine mercy toward those who lived in this complete ignorance.

In Rom. ii. 14 it is assumed that the Gentiles sometimes "do by nature the things contained in the law;" that is, as in Acts x. 35, "work righteousness."

Rom. x. 14 might seem to assert the absolute hopelessness of all to whom the gospel has not come: "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" But the eighteenth verse is a hopeful commentary on this: "But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily [quoting from the nineteenth Psalm of the voice of God in nature], their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world."

I do not assert that these passages of Scripture are sufficiently clear to prove beyond a doubt the possibility of salvation among the heathen, or to justify the church in placing an article to this effect in her creed. But they allow us to cherish a reasonable hope in that direction, and make it proper for us to consider the relation to this question of the general doctrines of God's word.

Following the testimony of Scripture, it seems proper to set forth the teaching of the creeds of the Reformed churches. Most of these creeds contain no reference to the question. In three of them we find statements of the insufficiency for salvation of the light of nature. Thus, in the Canons of the Synod of Dort: "Through the light of nature man cannot come to the knowledge of God, and turn himself to him."¹ In the Westminster Confession: "The light of nature and the works of creation and providence are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation."² The Savoy Declaration says: "Neither do the works of creation or providence, with the light of nature, make discovery of Christ or of grace by him, so much as in a general or obscure way; much less that men, destitute of the revelation of him by the promise or gospel, should be enabled thereby to attain saving faith or repentance."³ Yet these statements fall far short of an assertion that God may not, in ways of his own, sometimes supplement this natural light by his Spirit unto salvation.

The only article in the Reformed creeds which appears absolutely to deny the possibility of the salvation of any heathen without the knowledge of the gospel is the fourth section of the tenth chapter of the Westminster Confession, with the corresponding answer to the sixty-third question of the Larger Catechism. I will refer again to this article. In the second Helvetic Confession we have the only other statement on this subject; and it is of directly opposite import: "We acknowledge that God is able, without outward minis-

Passing from this paucity of creed statement, let us examine such doctrines of the Reformed system as bear upon the question.

The fundamental doctrine of the gospel, as Paul states clearly in 1 Cor. iii. 11, is that salvation is possible only through the redemptive work of Christ. But surely this truth does not forbid hope for the heathen; but shows us the ground on which we must rest it. If we hold to a universal statement, the fact of Christ's death for men everywhere suggests the hope that God may apply this redemption to some of those countless millions for whom Christ died. A universal atonement would seem almost mockery, if the larger part of the race, through no fault of their own, are completely debarred from receiving its benefits. Or, if we hold to a limited atonement, effectual to the salvation of all its objects, no evidence can be produced that Christ may not have given his life in behalf of some in heathen darkness, as well as for multitudes in Christian lands.

Another essential doctrine of the Reformation is that no one can be saved except he be renewed by the power of the Holy Ghost. "Ye must be born again" is a universal declaration for men in all lands, and with all measures of knowledge. "Which were born, not of the will of man, but of God" is the starting-point of the new character which shall fit any soul anywhere for heaven. But this work of the Spirit is not, by the nature of the case, and surely not in the power of God, limited to any outward circumstance. The Holy Ghost, who alone works regeneration under the teaching of the gospel in Christian lands, is able to work regeneration under the teaching of conscience in heathen lands. In the salvation of infants he works regeneration without any teaching whatever.

The real difficulty in this matter is not in the limitations of the atonement, nor in the power of the Holy Spirit, but in the revealed conditions of salvation. Not, that is, in what

God can do for man, which none of us would limit; but in what God, in his word, requires of man. Is it possible for any who have not the gospel to meet these requirements? The revealed conditions of salvation are faith and repentance. Is it, in the nature of these conditions, possible for a heathen, without the word of God, to believe and repent?

As to repentance, probably no one would assume an impossibility. The change of purpose from sin to righteousness, which is the essence of repentance, is clearly conceivable, under the power of God's Spirit, without the direct knowledge of the gospel.

But when we come to the question of faith, we meet with the crucial difficulty. "He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned," is the positive declaration, confirmed over and over again in Scripture. Justification by faith was the originating doctrine of the Reformation. Erase from a creed salvation through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is no longer evangelical. Does not the conditioning of justification on faith shut out from the possibility of salvation all who have not heard of Christ?

The difficulty must be met, if it can be met at all, in one of two ways. The position might be taken that the doctrine of the necessity of faith has reference only to those who have heard the gospel. We might note the fact that faith as a condition is announced in connection with the proclamation of the gospel, and conclude that the existence of this condition is dependent upon such proclamation. We might say that the expression, "He that believeth not," or, more literally, "he that disbelieveth," cannot be used properly of one who has never heard the truth; that such persons can neither believe nor disbelieve. In a word, it might be held that justification by faith is the condition of salvation where the gospel is proclaimed; but that the condition for the heathen world is something else than faith.

While I admit that there is some force in the arguments in

favor of this position: yet it seems so inconsistent with the unity of God's plan, and especially with the prominence given in the Scripture to faith as the condition of salvation, that I cannot accept it as the solution of the difficulty. The true religion is one, in whatever hearts it is exercised; and the principles which constitute it are the same. They may vary greatly in degree: they are one in essence.

But what is faith? All will agree that it is not the mere act of believing that any revealed doctrine or fact is true. In this sense, the devils believe. An intellectual belief, even of the historic Christ, is ineffectual, except it turn the heart toward him in trust, and draw the will to his service. The seat of faith is in the heart, the will, the character. As is the clear scriptural declaration: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness."¹ Nor is faith a simple, single act of the will, done once and finished. Faith is an abiding trust, a continued willing, a fixed disposition. Faith turns the soul about toward God in Christ, and holds it in confidence to his service. Faith is thus a direction of the heart, a trend of the soul, a new element of character. If there be in any soul a trusting, loving disposition toward God as its Saviour, Helper, and Ruler, this disposition is faith. The relation of the soul to God is the important matter; not the external knowledge or circumstances which produce or accompany it.

The question of the possibility of faith where the revealed word has not been carried, resolves itself into this: Is this trustful disposition toward God, which is essential faith, possible without the intellectual knowledge of the work of Christ? And this question is answered by another; Can the Holy Spirit produce in a human soul this essential faith without first revealing to that soul the historic Christ? The question answers itself. Who can limit the divine power?

In the words of Dr. A. A. Hodge: "Whenever a human

¹ Rom. x. 10.

being is found, as a matter of fact, to be reconciled to God, we with perfect confidence attribute the result to the application to the person in question of the expiating virtue of Christ's sacrifice and of the regenerating power of his Spirit. The establishment of this personal relation to our Lord, so as to constitute one a beneficiary of his redemption, is generally conditioned upon personal recognition and confession of him. This is even essential, whenever intellectually possible. But it is not absolutely essential, as is proved in the case of those dying in infancy, and of idiots. On like grounds of principle, it might hold true in the case of some exceptionally enlightened heathen." ¹

Dr. Charles Hodge, in his "Systematic Theology," says: "If infants are incapable of using the word, and if the Spirit never operates except in the word and by its use, how is it possible that infants can be regenerated? If therefore the Bible teaches that infants are regenerated and saved, it teaches that the Spirit operates not only with and by the word, but also without it, when and where and how he sees fit." ² Again; "Experience teaches, first, that no evidence of sanctification, no indications of saving influences of the Spirit, are found where the word of God is unknown. This is not saying that no such occur. We know from the Bible that God is no respecter of persons, etc. No one doubts that it is in the power of God to call whom he pleases from among the heathen, and to reveal to them enough truth to secure their salvation." ³

Dr. E. D. Morris, in his work "Is there Salvation after Death?" says: "The question whether any among the heathen are saved; saved through their cordial recognition of the claims of God and their humble commitment of themselves to his mercy, so far as his existence, relationship, mercy, have been manifested to them, is one in which Christ-

¹ New York Independent of Sept. 17, 1885.

² Vol. iii. p. 483.

³ Systematic Theology, Vol. iii. p. 468.

ian hope may find large and legitimate field for practical exercise." ¹

Or in the words of the first Christian apologist: "We have declared that he [Christ] is the word of whom every race of men were partakers; and those who lived reasonably are Christians, even though they have been thought atheists; as, among the Greeks, Socrates, and Heraclitus, and men like them." ²

Even in the Westminster Confession of Faith we find all that is needed in support of this view, in that famous section which, but for the objections raised to the expression "elect infants," would be regarded by the church in general as one of the grandest declarations of the power and freedom of God. "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word."³ It matters not to our argument that the heathen were not designed to be included in the specifications of this section. The principle is all that is needful. A multitude, which no man can number, are declared to be saved by Christ through the Spirit, although never outwardly called. And broader modern ideas have enlarged that multitude, through the conviction that all infants, dying in infancy are elect.

But *how* are such infants saved? Do we answer: They are saved without faith in Christ, because the Spirit has renewed their hearts? Then a heathen might be saved without faith in Christ, if the Spirit renew his heart. Or do we give the wiser answer: They are saved through faith in Christ

should renew the heart of a heathen, there would be established within him the principle of faith.

A priori, there is evidently no greater difficulty in the way of God's saving heathen than of his saving infants under the conditions of the gospel. Whatever principle we hold as to the salvation in one case is applicable in the other; excepting only the Pelagian view that infants are morally pure, and inherit salvation of right, not of grace; as the natural outgrowth of an innocent nature, not through the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

Indeed, it can scarcely be doubted that in many cases a covert Pelagianism is at the foundation of the view of the salvation of all infants. The feeling, quite extensively, is that infants are not sinners, and that it would be unjust in God to condemn them. If we base the salvation, either of infants or heathen, on the claims of justice, we rest it on unscriptural grounds. The hope for infant salvation is in God's broad love giving Christ to die for them, and in the power of his Spirit to renew them. And this scriptural foundation is broad enough as a basis of hope for men who have heard of Christ no more than the helpless infant.

Those who hold the theory of a future probation recognize the fact that such probation must be for infants as well as for heathen. The editors of "Progressive Orthodoxy" say: "We think it more reverent, as it is certainly more reasonable, to believe of infants and heathen alike, that according to the development of moral agency, they are brought into conscious relations to Christ, and that according to their needs they are enabled personally to appropriate his redemption."¹ But what a gloomy conclusion for a theory which boasts its larger hope! For surely no evidence can be fur-

as we sing, to "the arms of Jesus," but to a conflict with temptation of whose issue we can predict nothing. The larger hope, offered by the new theology, has become, instead, a robbery of hope and an anxiety beyond measure, right where the loving heart will feel the robbery most keenly, and right in the face of the loving act of Jesus in taking the infants in his arms, and his precious assurance that of such is, not the semi-purgatory of a future probation, but the kingdom of heaven.

It is asserted, however, that if the possibility of essential faith where the gospel is unknown be granted, it affords but little relief in the matter of heathen salvation, as the instances for which this essential faith may be claimed are so rare. Thus we read in "Progressive Orthodoxy": "A possibility which does not rise into any appreciable realization fails to remove the difficulty."¹ Supposing it be admitted of men like Socrates in ancient times, or, with Dr. A. A. Hodge, of Moses Montefiore in modern days, or of an occasional individual whom missionaries have met in heathen lands who seemed Christians in all things except in the knowledge of Christ, that such persons were accepted of God, yet what are these among the countless multitudes? But the objection ignores an important fact. The name of Socrates has come down to us, not because of his character mainly, but because of his intellect and influence. Who can say that there were not others in his age as pure and spiritual as he was, but more ignorant and lowly, whose names have never been placed on human record? Men admire Epictetus. But may there not have been in the Roman Empire other men whose characters were as estima-

among the wise and honored of the world, and suggests the hope that, if these shining lights of heathendom found acceptance with God, divine grace had more numerous trophies among the lowly. The hopeful words of Dr. E. D. Morris are in place here: "So long as we do not deviate from the cardinal doctrine of sinfulness, and the need of heavenly grace in order to a true regeneration and salvation, we are in little danger of hoping more widely, more ardently, than the living word permits. The multitudes whom the great Swiss Reformer anticipated seeing in the celestial life, may by the large grace of God bringing them to repentance and obedience during their earthly pilgrimage, possibly attain with us to that beatific home." ¹

We need to keep in mind the principle of divine judgment, that it is according to the light possessed. The test in gospel lands is very different from that in heathen ignorance. God judges men by the light which *they* have. We too generally judge them by the light which *we* have.

It may be thought that the tendency of such a view would be to impair the interest in the work of foreign missions, by taking away its motive. But a hope of this nature for the heathen is slight and dim, compared with the advantages given by the gospel. At best, it is but "a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise." And it is the solemn, blessed duty of the church to hasten everywhere that dawning day. The work of missions would rest on a tottering foundation if it needed to be braced and buttressed by the teaching that God has consigned to hopeless destruction all who do not directly hear the gospel. The highest motives to missionary zeal are

the Protestant church in general to the special doctrines which distinguish the Reformed system; which are usually designated by the term Calvinism. It is not essential to our argument what shade or grade of Calvinism be hold, provided it be not so attenuated as to make the Calvinistic entitlement a misnomer. Let it be Supralapsarianism or Sublapsarianism, the five points as summarized by the Synod of Dort, or the moderate type which, at present, is so prevalent; any statement which holds that God has elected to salvation certain individuals of the human race, and that he effectually brings into his kingdom those whom he has thus chosen, by the redemption of Christ, and through the regeneration of the Holy Ghost, is sufficient. Anything less than this can scarcely be called Calvinism. Anything more than this may buttress the doctrine with strong, stern words, but affects little its essence.

Let us, as Calvinists, look at this question of heathen salvation. Surely we cannot say that God has not elected some of the heathen to eternal life. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?"¹ Surely we dare not say that the Divine Spirit hath not power to carry into effect the divine election, by renewing the hearts of those whom God hath chosen. In the face of our belief in the salvation of infants, we cannot thus limit the work of the Infinite. Surely we would not say, if God hath elected, and the Holy Spirit hath renewed, the blood of Jesus Christ is insufficient to cleanse from all sin. As Calvinists, we must hold that the efficiency of the divine atonement, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost, extend as far as the election of grace. What, then, has Calvinism to say on the question but this, that it depends upon the divine purpose?

should come to repentance," who will forbid the right to cherish the hope that God's purpose of mercy is far broader than our narrow arguments and inferences?

Undoubtedly the framers of the Westminster Confession intended to deny the possibility of heathen salvation in the words "Much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess."¹ Though it is noticeable that, grammatically, the words admit of a milder construction, as will appear by inserting from the third section, after "whatsoever," the clause logically referred to in the word "other," "except by Christ through the Spirit." But this isolated declaration cannot be considered as an essential part of the system of doctrine. Those grand words in the third section set forth that system in its bearing on the carrying into effect of the divine purpose; "through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth." This declares the unlimited power of the Divine Spirit, unlimited by conditions or circumstances, unlimited save by his own limitless pleasure. The fourth section is simply an assertion which fixes a limit to his unlimited working, deciding of a great portion of mankind that the preceding section has no relation to them; a decision which lies beyond all human knowledge, and was an unintentional usurpation of divine rights. It is no discredit to the fathers that they did not grasp the broad results of the truth which they held so staunchly. Nor is it strange that, when they went outside the proper province of a confession of faith, to fix the limits of that truth which they had declared, they fell into the common mistakes of their age. We hold the same truth which they held, the truth assailed but unshaken through the ages; the truth of Paul, and Augustine, and Calvin; that Calvinism, which many

¹ Chap. x. sect. 4.

pronounce dead, but which never was so living, so strong, so far reaching, as to-day; the truth of the absolute divine sovereignty and freedom. But the increased knowledge of God's word, and the light afforded by the progress of his work, have broken down some of the old limitations, and opened to our hope broader fields for its application. The truth is not disarmed or dishonored by this; but acknowledged more fully, and appreciated more largely.

Calvinism, rightly understood, gives the firmest ground for the very largest scriptural hope. It places the salvation of men where the Scriptures place it; in the wise and loving purpose of the Infinite Father; dependent on the redemption of the Lord Jesus Christ, and wrought out by the Holy Ghost. It puts salvation in the hands of God; and resting on the assurance that God hath chosen a multitude which no man can number, believes that he will accomplish his beneficent will.

Such Calvinism does not hinder work, but nerves for it. It discloses God back of all Christian work, active in all Christian work, giving results to all Christian work. It encourages young men to go forth preaching the gospel, assured that "it hath pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe." It encourages the missionary to advance against the strongholds of heathenism, assured that "the weapons of our warfare are mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." And where we cannot go, it encourages the earnest prayers to Him whose presence and power know no bounds, to "gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." True Calvinism is not narrow, as is the common charge against it. It is broad as the power and wisdom and holiness and love of God. These infinite attributes are its only limit. And we apprehend that our wonder and joy in the life hereafter will be the discovery of the exceeding breadth, beyond human thought and Chris-

tian hope, of the work wrought by Christ through the Spirit, as the elect of God, the redeemed of Christ, the sanctified of the Holy Ghost, come from all lands and ages into the kingdom of the Father.

Let us not be afraid of the grand old faith which has come down to us, not from Westminster only, nor Calvin, nor Augustine, but in the word of divine inspiration; that strong, dauntless faith, which gives us in our efforts for those who have the gospel, the Infinite Might working with us, and in our hope for those who have not the gospel, the Infinite Might working beyond us. Let the standard of our work and the lodestar of our hope be the grace of God, not the good will of men.