

We have dwelt so long on the points we have considered that our limits will only admit of the briefest allusion to those that remain. The *Guardian* tells us that Calvinists are perplexed by seeing many who once rejoiced in Christ, and had their hearts in heaven, entirely and finally fall away. Calvinists can never be perplexed by a thing that never took place; and if they have seen those who were at one time more or less impressed by the truth, afterwards become utterly careless, they are not in the least perplexed with this, as the word of God leads them to expect it, and gives the explanation in such passages as this: "they went out from us, because they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us." Mr. Wesley and his followers might well be perplexed at seeing ninety-nine out of the hundred of their professed converts becoming two-fold more the children of hell than they were before. The close of our fourth article will explain this allusion. Calvinists propose no other tests of conversion than those plainly given in the word of God, of which a strong confidence of being in a state of safety is not of itself one: otherwise the Scribes and Pharisees, Paul before his conversion, and the stony ground hearers in the parable of the sower would have been children of God. There is an assurance of faith, and an assurance proceeding from the total want of faith.

The *Guardian* says we accused it of trying to create the impression that there are great differences among Calvinists. Our statement was "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;" but truly, it never occurred to us that the *Guardian* could fancy we applied to it so high a title as that of an Arminian controversialist. It is under such a mania for making charges that it accuses us of making an insinuation against itself in what we said about Dr. Chalmers!! To talk of Calvinism as teaching that the damnation of the lost is necessitated, and of foreordination, as if, according to that system, it was the cause of the destruction of the lost, is slander. Calvinists do not hold that the destruction of the lost is necessitated, or that the decree or foreordination of God has anything to do with their destruction, except in the way of determining to permit and to punish their sin; and Calvinists do hold that the lost are the authors of their own destruction. Many of the slanders of Arminians arise from their keeping out of view either the distinction made in our Confession as to the purposes of God, which, while efficacious as to good, are permissive only as regards evil, or the modifying clauses in the article on the ordination of all things, viz: "that God has so ordained, as that thereby neither is He the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature," &c.

The Calvinistic writer is yet to be found who ever denied the omniscience or foreknowledge of God, or any other of His perfections; and all these are repeatedly set forth at length in our standards. If God foreordained (in the sense now and before briefly explained) all that comes to pass, and if He foreknows all that He foreordained, then it is plain to every man that can reason that He must foreknow all things that come to pass; for His fore-knowledge and His foreordination equally relate to all things. It is very easy to shew that no difficulty attaches to the foreordination, which does not equally