

twice slightly marred by "irrepressible" brethren, is too precious to miss for the mere apprehension of such a thing happening again. Barnabas must come as well as Peter, our "sons of consolation" as well as our "sons of thunder." All the more need of the former if the latter are to be there, that their words may distil like oil on the troubled waters of controversy, which free thought and free speech are ever liable to stir up. Only let us carry the spirit of Christ up with us, and seek new supplies of his grace with every fresh engagement, and then we shall realize the conception of the poet,—

"When, free from envy, scorn, and pride,
Our wishes all above,
Each can a brother's failings hide,
And show a brother's love!"

THE COMMUNION QUESTION.—CONCLUSION.

DEAR SIR,—In former communications I have shewn, that the practice of requiring believers' baptism to precede church fellowship, is established on Christ's command, and apostolic example. As you appear to wish to close the discussion on this subject, I am willing to do so, unless you have "any fresh light to throw upon it." We have both had opportunity to shew our opinions, and the result must be left with the Disposer of all events.

You decline to prove "that baptism, upon profession of faith, is to be confined to Jews and heathen," unless I can "adduce from the New Testament an instance of a child born of Christian parentage being baptised on his making such profession."

I always understood that Christians are to learn their duty from what the New Testament *does* teach, not from what it *don't* teach. The New Testament is silent on the question which you propose. If, therefore, you feel yourself at liberty to confine believers' baptism to Jewish and heathen converts, because the New Testament does *not* give an example of the baptism of a believer born of Christian parents, you may do so. I require something more substantial as a rule of conduct than the silence of the New Testament.

In noticing my "retort" about holy water and wax candles, you say, "baptism having superseded circumcision, in the administration of which children had always been associated with their parents, there was a moral certainty that it would be administered to them, as circumcision had been of old, unless it was expressly limited to adults."

Not quite so fast, Mr. Editor. You assume what you require to prove. Where did you learn that baptism has superseded circumcision? When, and by what authority was circumcision abolished?

You complain that I have not taken any notice of your thrice repeated reference to Rom. xiv. 3, 4. My reason for that was because I did not consider that these verses had any bearing on the subject under discussion. You also made reference to the mode of baptism, the Abrahamic covenant, baptism of households, &c. I have not taken any notice of