

little children are the subjects of His spiritual kingdom on earth, (which he does not question), then, until the moment that by actual sin, they bring personal condemnation upon themselves, they *remain heirs of the Kingdom of eternal glory.*" He is here speaking of all children, and we are led to ask, if all children "*remain heirs*," &c., must they not be in a state of acceptance with God? Is not our heirship conditional upon our adoption, ("if children, *then heirs*,") and, if adopted must they not be justified? What, then, becomes of the idea that they are justified only on condition of dying in infancy? In the same note, Watson says, children sustain "a spiritual relation to Christ;" "this relation is *not merely a nominal, but, a vital and beneficial one*;" "should they die before *forfeiture of this grace* by personal actual offence," they are admitted to the "felicities of immortal life in His perfected kingdom above." But, we ask, how can these things be, if the free gift does not come immediately on all children? Is not a "vital" relation to Christ a justifying one? Is not a "grace," only forfeited by actual sin, and fitting its possession for the happiness of heaven, a justifying grace? A similar difficulty elsewhere meets us.

See *Institutes*, Vol. 2, P. 60. "As to their *future state* He seems also to present a sufficiently encouraging view, when He says, 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven.'" We stop to ask, is it their *future state* to which Jesus here refers