

attach to the foreknowledge of God; that any other idea is founded on wrong conceptions of what the doctrine of foreordination is; and that those Arminians who admit the one and deny the other, strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. The *Guardian* makes no allusion to those Arminian and Methodist writers, whom we mentioned as denying, or calling in question, the omniscience of God. In attempting to substantiate against Calvinism the slander about its involving infant damnation, the *Guardian*, as usual, falls into misrepresentations. The only thing to which it adverts that has really any bearing on the question, is the doctrine of Calvinism respecting the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity; and all we shall say is, that though infants are involved in the penal consequences of Adam's sin, or *liable* to these, this leaves utterly untouched the question as to their salvation from these through their being interested in the death of the Redeemer. According to Mr. Wesley and some of his followers, the corruption with which every one is born into this world deserves God's wrath and damnation; and he tells us in his treatise on baptism that "we are all born under the guilt of Adam's sin, and that all sin deserves eternal misery," and that "the whole race of mankind are obnoxious both to the guilt and punishment of Adam's transgression;" but all this does not of itself shew that they held that any infants perish. The Wesleyan organ merely quotes from the Westminster Confession the passage about infants which we formerly explained, without ever saying a word about our explanation of it, or about the reason we gave to prove that, in the judgment of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who certainly understood the bearings of their own system better than Methodists do, Calvinism does not involve the doctrine that any infants perish. As to the assertion that infant damnation was commonly believed among the divines of the Synod of Dort, we merely state that there is nothing to prove this in their articles.

As to what we advanced in regard to the doctrine of Methodism on this subject, the organ of Wesleyanism makes little attempt to meddle with our argument. It states that Mr. Wesley did, in his early years, incline to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but inclined the other way in his later years; and that all Methodist standards earnestly reject this doctrine of the baptismal new birth. We state in reply—1. Mr. Wesley, in his treatise on baptism, as we shewed, states that doctrine in the plainest terms. 2. He wrote that treatise when he was 53 years of age, having been born in 1703, while it was written in 1756, twelve years after the first conference was held. 3. He inserted it unaltered and without note in his latest edition of his works, which, unless our memory be at fault, was published not long before his death. 4. In that treatise he argues for the baptism of infants, as our readers will see by turning to the longest quotation we made from it, on the ground that in the ordinary way they cannot be saved without baptism, and that baptism is the means for that purpose to which God has tied us, though He may not have tied Himself. 5. We quoted passages from two of Wesley's sermons (of those to which legal authority is attached) in which the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is declared; and according to the trust deeds of Methodist chapels here and in England, no one is permitted to preach in these who shall teach any doctrine contrary to what is contained in these sermons; while candidates for the