

but I will not take this ground, for it might be accepted as an admission that the will is bound in the adamant chain of a philosophical necessity. I prefer to answer the question by asking another: How is it, that of two persons in the same political assembly, under the same influence, in apparently the self-same circumstances, one becomes a political convert, while the other does not? The true answer in both cases is, **THE WILL IS FREE.** And if this be sufficient to explain the latter case, without calling into requisition the theory of a direct and irresistible touch, why is there such stumbling astonishment felt in the case of the former? The truth is, the one believes because the Holy Spirit has persuaded him to believe; the other remains in unbelief because he chooses so to do; while to ascribe the difference in *absolute and unqualified* terms to God, is inconsiderately to ascribe to him not only the faith of the former but the unbelief of the latter.

Our Calvinistic brethren often ask, To which do you ascribe the difference between these two opposite results—to *God* or to *man*? and so far dictate to us the reply as to demand that it shall be either one or the other of these two words "God" or "man," without qualification, hesitation, or reserve. Now, we take leave to tell such reasoners, first, that we reserve to ourselves the right to answer questions in our own way; and secondly, that there are here *two* distinct questions proposed to us, which, therefore, we will answer the one before the other. The first is, What is the ultimate cause of the believer's faith? to which, of course, we reply, Free and sovereign grace through the agency of God the Spirit. The second is, What is the ultimate cause of the unbeliever's unbelief? to which we reply, his own rebel will. If our brethren still insist on amalgamating or welding these two distinct questions into a composite one, to which they insist on a unique and categorical answer, such answer we must simply refuse; and, along with such refusal, we will further demand, in the name of fairness and consistency, that they will give such a reply as they would exact from us, and peremptorily answer either in the word "God" or the word "man." In this case, of course, their answer will be "God," with the devout view of magnifying the sovereignty of his grace; but at what expense is this honour yielded to the Most High? At the tremendous expense of making him, at the same time, to the same extent, and in the same sense, *the Almighty cause of the sinner's unbelief!*

2nd. Again, it is objected that we *make man stronger than God,*