

prolong the cry of Prerequisite?—Yet we would follow Mr. Booth, in considering his three remaining arguments against our hypothesis.

"Secondly," says he, "the order of words, in that commission which was given to the ambassadors of Christ," claims our notice. "He who is King in Zion," commanded them to go into all the world, "and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Because the words teach, and baptizing, are here found in juxtaposition, Mr. Booth concludes that the Lord's supper must not be received by the young convert until he has been baptized. But why limit the argument to communion? If the near position of these words is sufficient to debar the babe in Christ from his table, until he be buried with him in baptism; we challenge the world to show that they do not constitute an unanswerable argument to exclude him from every act of Divine worship, until he has been baptized. In the same solemn commission as recorded by Mark, we read, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Had Mr. Booth, from the relative position of these words, come to the conclusion, that between baptism and final salvation none were at liberty to commemorate the death of Christ—would his inference have been any more sophistical than in the other case? But we hasten with Mr. Booth, to examine

Thirdly, The order of administration in the primitive and apostolic practice. "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls, and they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." In this case, also, because "baptism" is mentioned before "breaking of bread," Mr. Booth concludes that it must in all cases be first observed.—Notice—the breaking of bread is mentioned before prayer, and therefore must in all cases be first attended to.

We will not follow Mr. Booth, in his effort to show that baptism claims prompt observance. We believe it has a place among the commands of God; and like all the others, as soon as understood, it forbids one hour's unnecessary delay; And this not for convenience sake.

"Fourthly, If we regard," says Mr. Booth, "the different significations of the two institutions, it will appear that baptism ought always to precede." To me it appears otherwise. It is well known that the death of Jesus Christ, which his supper commemorates, is the ground work of our salvation; and as such it forms the all absorbing subject of the young convert's meditations. He dwells on Calvary. His thoughts refuse to leave the insulted, quivering form of the Son of God. Its peaceful, solemn repose in the tomb, and triumphant resurrection, are with him subjects of second thought. If, therefore, all things were ready for the observance of both ordinances by the young convert, in my judgment communion should precede; which, as we have already seen, was the order observed by Christ. In all other cases, the order in which Providence presents them should be constantly observed; a rule which must always make baptism precede on missionary ground, where churches have not been formed, as fully exemplified in the "Acts of the Apostles." I have been surprised to hear one after another of my close brethren ask with an air of certain triumph, after the example of Mr. Booth, "Did Paul say to the jailor believe and go immediately to the communion table?" I wish those good brethren would reflect a moment on the long journey they would compel the jailor to undertake.

Having thus answered Mr. Booth's arguments in support of the affirmative, withholding all that remains

to be said in favor of the negative; the reader will permit me to ask for his decision. The question will be remembered—"must every Christian be baptized, before he can partake worthily of the Lord's Supper?" The affirmative compels every Baptist to believe, that all paedobaptists eat and drink judgment to themselves, every time they approach the Lord's table!—The negative sounds the death knell of close communion.

And now, my dear brother, since you, as Editor of the Magazine, called our attention to the subject, permit me to say, that you are expected to take a decided stand on the affirmative or negative of the above question, unless you choose to pluck down upon your own head the double application of the "bird, or a beast" anecdote—pardon me, my brother, for naming it—I regret that you did not repress it entirely, after the example of the "Baptist General Tract Society." It is certainly utterly unworthy of a place in your columns.

As a sufficient answer to all that remains of the quotation before us, I would say, that although sprinkled in infancy, I have since been buried in the water of baptism—Can I furnish the world with any better proof that I disown infant sprinkling? And because I thus "disown" and "entirely reject" the practice, is its advocate justified in pronouncing my convictions of duty "heresy?" Most certainly not.—Am I then at liberty thus to condemn his?—Impossible! It seems to me, that equal brethren should always be willing to remain on the same level; leaving the throne of judgment to the Lamb of God, who will in the end decide all our differences.

From your brother,
ROBERT DICK.

P.S. If you cannot possibly give the above a place in the Feb. number, I hope you will at least notice it, that the subject be not forgotten, and say when it will appear. Expecting to preach the gospel in Canada before many years, I feel anxious to have this subject discussed now, that a right understanding may exist between us as open and close Baptists. If you decline publishing it, please return the sheet to me, with your reasons appended. R. D.

To this I received the following:—

"Sir,—Your communication was received and is now returned. About ten days before receiving it, the B. M. Society, or rather, a majority of the Committee, signified a desire that the subject of communion should not be continued in the Magazine, and I consented for a time not to insert anything, either on open or spiritual communion. Otherwise I should have printed yours, and met you on every point. I must say, however, that of all the communications received from my open brethren, yours is the only one containing anything worth answering. The \$2.00 was received, and the Magazine shall be forwarded to you regularly.—Ed. C. B. M."

SEQUEL TO THE PRECEDING.

The following observations were penned, and would have been forwarded to the *Canadian Baptist Magazine*, had its pages not been closed as above.

"This do in remembrance of Me." "Drink ye ALL of it."

The first quotation proves that communion is obligatory on all, to whom the command applies. Which position is emphatically sustained by the second text, "Drink ye all of it." The only question, therefore, necessarily involved in our present discussion, is simply this: to whom were these words addressed, "Drink Ye all of it?"—When this question is propounded to a Close Baptist, the answer is generally given with great confidence that Christ referred to the Eleven Apostles alone. But when reminded, that Paul affirms our Saviour to