

to which we refer, is, because of the important admission, or confession which it contains. Our critic in his first article boldly, fearlessly and most ignorantly asserted in his own name, and in the name of I don't know how many of his brethren, "We have made it clear that the doctrine of Infant reprobation is no part of Calvinism."* In the second of our critic's articles however, he eats up his own previous statement, and at last comes out with the important and honest admission that John Calvin did believe that many infants "would be lost." We never said or thought that Calvin believed *all* infants were lost, though our critic most unjustly represents us as having done so. We repeat it, we made no such statement, we made no such insinuation; and our Presbyterian brother only deceives himself, and his readers, by labouring long and hard to prove that Calvin believed infants were saved. What we stated and what every one acquainted with Calvin's works know to be true, was, that he did believe in the unconditional and eternal reprobation of *some* infants, for no other reason, as he himself expresses it, *than that it so pleased God.*

. We did not prove, or shew that Calvin believed *some* infants were saved. We did not think it necessary to prove what everybody knows; and yet because we did not, lo! and behold! our critic shews his teeth; and imputes motives to us which our charity forbids us to impute to him. Because we have given publicity to the fact that Calvin believed in the damnation of *some* infants, our critic thinks that there was a studied attempt "to blink and to conceal," the fact that he believed in the salvation of *any*!! He thinks such conduct "is not consistent with Christian rectitude." He thinks there is a lamentable want of frankness, and fairness and candour about us.† Our critic is also of opinion that few of those into whose hands the *Day-Star* comes, or of the general public, know what Calvin's sentiments were with respect to the futurities of infants. We wish however to inform our Presbyterian brother that the great majority of the readers of the *Day-Star* know much more about Calvinism than he is aware of, and that the general public are fast losing faith in the unconditionalism of the Geneva school. He has given us lamentable evidence that he at least is very deficient in his knowledge

* See "*The Presbyterian*" Jan. 1862, Page 18.

† We would take this opportunity of recommending to our Presbyterian brother the careful perusal of a few articles on the Calvinistic controversy which recently appeared in the *Christian Guardian*. Mr. Jeffers, the talented Editor, in a clear and masterly manner exposes the dishonesty and deceptive dealing of his Calvinistic opponent.