

and had it not been for the pride of intellect, of which it boasts, all that peculiar to it as a system would have gone out of the world long since.

In seeking to fasten the dogma of infant damnation upon the Methodist Church, this writer refers to some passages in Wesley's Sermons, his treatise on Baptism and the Baptismal Service. To all of which it will be sufficient now to say: 1st. That admitting Mr. Wesley did believe baptismal regeneration in common with the ancient Church, and with the Church of England of his day, did he hold that regeneration in baptism was *actual* or only *presumptive*? Clearly *presumptive*; for he says, "It is certain our Church *supposes* that all who are baptised in their infancy are at the same time born again,—and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this *supposition*." It is unfair for this writer to say that Mr. Wesley taught that, "By water, then, as a means, we are regenerated or born again." "Herein a principle of grace is infused which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long continued wickedness." His words are, "By water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again, whence it is called by the Apostle 'the washing of regeneration.'" Our Church therefore ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament." One who complains of misrepresentation should fairly represent others.

2nd. If Mr. Wesley did say that the ordinary way to salvation was through this sacrament, yet there is a very wide margin between him and the Calvinists, for he declares children have a *right* to baptism, being included in the evangelical covenant; "that the second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offence of the first, and although he does say that God has tied us to one way—by which the benefits of the remedy may be obtained—he also says, as this writer admits, "He may not have tied himself. Indeed, where it cannot be had, the case is different, but extraordinary cases do not make void a standing rule." Most likely it would have been very gratifying to our friend if Mr. Wesley had said, "God has bound himself by a decree as irreversible as his own nature, that none but the elect shall be saved. Great indeed would be the joy if he had followed in the wake of John of Geneva, and declared for electing grace, instead of reiterating the doctrine of John of Patmos, "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." Wesley was not the man to compromise the doctrine of universal grace, by binding it down to an accident; for this great doctrine, the grace or love of God, whence cometh our salvation is free *in* and free *for* all, runs through the entire of his teaching, and