

est misrepresentations, and casting recklessly the foulest aspersions. He does not scruple to contradict himself,—telling us for example in the same article that “Calvinists really think that their doctrines are the only ones which honor the grace of God,” and on the other hand that “they know that we (Methodists) hold the doctrines of grace as fully as they could desire;”—saying at one time that “Calvinism exalts grace at the sacrifice of everything else,” and at another, denouncing it as “destructive of grace” altogether. Referring to Calvinists, he says “they think Methodist doctrine very wicked, but he never could see the propriety of treating any doctrine as wickedness,” and then he afterwards vilifies Calvinism as being as opposite to perfections of God as hell is to heaven. He professes to write in a “perfectly kind spirit;” he is “unwilling to charge Calvinists with wilful misrepresentations;” advancing a step further, he says again “the misrepresentations of the pamphlet he reviews are so very great that he forbears characterising them as they deserve; there is just a possibility that obstinate prejudice blinded its author to the plainest distinctions;” and then after making these professions, he charges the author with “wilful misrepresentation” and “concealment,” with “dishonesty,” “trickery,” “deceit,” and “dishonest cunning pervading his whole tract.” Because the author whom he reviews says that transgression without freedom of will is no sin, this writer accuses him of “dishonesty,” of “pretending that Calvinists believe in the freedom of the will,” “as deceitfully using the word freedom in a sense opposite to that in which Arminians understand it,” and “as guilty of intentional ambiguity”—taking no cognizance of the fact that one of the articles in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which we presume the accused as a minister had solemnly declared to be the confession of his faith, declares that God has endowed the will of man with a certain natural liberty which is essential to it and to man as a rational and accountable creature; the article being to the effect that “God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty, that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined, to good or evil.”

Mr. Isaac Taylor, an author who has long been of the foremost rank and of world-wide reputation, whose voluminous writings are almost all on religious subjects, and who, though he is sometimes too free and untrammelled in his speculations, is yet ever on the whole a decided friend of evangelical truth, this writer, without any foundation, charges with the lowest trickery and deliberate falsehood. He says, “Taylor knew that Methodism had always been remarkable for its social character and social means of grace: he therefore resorts to the trick of pretending that the chief defect of Methodism is that it ‘makes no provision for the social element in our nature.’ He pretends that it wants that which is one of its chief characteristics.” For all this, Mr. Taylor affords not the vestige of a foundation. He not only does not say what is here ascribed to him, but he says the very reverse. He certainly does advance grave charges against Wesleyan Methodism as to its theology, its spirit, its form of church government, and in various other respects; but as to the degree in which it employs the social element, he declares that “social organization thoroughly pervades it and is its very soul, and is carried out from its centre to its extremities, taking hold of, assimilating and employing absolutely