

Watson adds, "Whether we understand this (Of such, &c.) of future felicity, or, of the Church, the case is settled; in neither case can they be under wrath and liable to condemnation." He afterwards remarks, "all the children brought to Christ were not liable to die in infancy." The question arises, what is the moral state of those who would not die in infancy? He has just said, they are not "under wrath and liable to condemnation," but according to his theory, they could not be justified except in case of death in infancy. Is not an impossible moral state here implied? If not "under wrath and liable to condemnation", must they not be in a justified state?

We confess our inability to solve the problem of this evident inconsistency. If the only difficulty were in the "Institutes" versus the "Notes" we might suppose that the latter, being last written, expressed the matured judgment of the author, but, it is not so, and, the difficulty remains. All we can say is, that Watson does not argue on this point with his usual clearness and cogency, though, in his expositions, he generally admits, as we will see, all that Fletcher would demand.

But, beyond these considerations, where is the Scriptural proof that the Holy Spirit distinguishes between a dying and a living child, and, performs for the first a special work of grace, which He does not perform for the other? The only special references to the influence of the Holy Spirit