

further professes to have "no pleasure in pointing out what he regards as a most serious conclusion drawn legitimately from the principles" of his Arminian brethren. We are strongly inclined to believe this in a certain sense, since we cannot but think that "conclusions drawn legitimately from their principles" would have been widely different from those which are here deduced; and the satisfaction attained by the writer must have arisen from the gross misrepresentation which his own peculiar mode of reasoning has produced. We have seldom read a more glaring perversion of Arminian doctrines than this article contains, and the re-publication of which, it is thought, "is fitted to be of service to the interests of religion in Canada!" Let us see, then, what are the pernicious errors of Arminianism which so seriously affect the interests of religion, as to demand the antidote which the re-published article from the *Princeton Review* is designed to supply.

The writer states his objection in the following words:—"The sum of our charge is that Arminianism, in its essential and avowed principles is subversive of grace." The writer further says that he is fully aware of the gravity of the charge here made, and that he would shrink from preferring it, but for the conviction that it is true, and that the error involved is incalculably injurious. He next proceeds to define the term "grace. It means favour, that to which the receiver has no claim, and the performer is not bound." To this definition we take no particular exception. "And yet we affirm," says the reviewer, "that the avowed principles of Arminianism entirely subvert this idea of grace." And why, because, he says, "according to this system man in his fallen state had claim to the divine favour, and hence that could not be of grace which was based upon a claim." Here we have the sum of the reviewer's charge against Arminianism, and the point of his argument to prove that it is subversive of grace; and here too we have the evidence of that misapprehension of the first principles of Arminianism which has led him into the false reasoning and wrong conclusions which constitute the sum of his charge, and the ground of the necessity laid upon him to break silence which he felt would be criminal.

Let us first endeavour to understand the meaning of the terms employed. If by "man," as the word is used in the statement, "Arminianism teaches that man in his fallen state had a claim to the divine favour;" we are to understand, the first of our race, or Adam and Eve personally, then we most positively deny that Arminianism teaches any such doctrine. Neither Mr. Wesley, nor any of the authorized standards of Methodist doctrine can be adduced in support of such a theory, and had the writer, or the re-publishers of the article in question, taken half as much pains to see