

that Paul never could have said, as he did, "Henceforth, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing." 2 Tim. iv. 8. According to Arminians, Paul, notwithstanding of all his high attainments in grace, might still have fallen away and perished, and they that love the appearing of the Lord Jesus may fall away finally and for ever, and so may never receive the crown of righteousness, but on the contrary be consigned to everlasting misery and shame.

Were it worth while, we should have a good deal to say in reference to this writer's account of the origin and history of Calvinism, of the views of Calvinists on the subject of grace, and of their way of reasoning in support of it. We merely state that, though we have read many Calvinistic writers, we never read in any of them that Calvinists so thought and reasoned; and that it could be said with a great deal of truth of Arminianism that it is founded on assumption and on false metaphysics, in opposition to plain statements of the word of God. Mr. Wesley tells us in one of his sermons (and these have the unqualified sanction of Methodist Conferences), that "he verily believed that the real heresy of Pelagius was neither more nor less than this: the holding that Christians may by the grace of God go on to perfection;" and that "he (Mr. Wesley) would not affirm that the arch heretic of the fifth century (Pelagius) was not one of the holiest men of that age;" and thus we are the more glad to find the Wesleyan organ saying of Pelagius that he taught dangerous errors. According to it, the truth of God had never been fully exhibited from the days of the apostles till last century, when Wesley arose—a period of 1700 years!—a proof surely that what was peculiar in his doctrines has not been so very plainly revealed as his followers would have us believe.

It has been common with Arminian controversialists to magnify modifications of sentiment among Calvinists, so as to create the impression that there are great differences among them; and also to hold up prominently a view of the order of the divine decrees which has been held by very few, but against which it is easiest to awaken strong prejudice. Arminius, in treating of the subject of predestination in one of his works, is guilty of the gross unfairness of devoting about four-fifths of his space to those who carried furthest the view referred to, and only the remainder to an exposition of the views of other Calvinists and of his own. It would be easy to shew that there is a greater variety of sentiment among Arminians than among Calvinists; on the subject of election, for instance, some holding that the choice of God is based on a foreseen faith and obedience, others, that the choice is one of nations and communities to outward privileges, other saying that it is a choice of individuals to such privileges, and others again, if we remember right, that all are chosen to a salvable state. The description which the *Christian Guardian* gives of the three classes into which he divides Calvinists is so far from correct, that from it no one ignorant of the subject could possibly learn the truth. He states, for example, that the first class hold that God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass—leaving it to be inferred that this belief is peculiar to them, whereas all Calvinists hold this; and he proceeds further to state that