

table, but I have never been baptized with water, for I do not regard such baptism as obligatory on me. I believe I have received the baptism of the Spirit, all that in my view of Scripture, the Master requires of me. Will you admit me?" To such a request I would be compelled to reply, "My dear brother, I have the fullest confidence in you as a Christian. I know that you believe yourself baptized according to the requirements of the Word of God, and that you cannot see the necessity of water baptism. But however much I respect your conscientious convictions, and otherwise would gladly welcome you as a brother in Christ, one whom the Lord I believe, has received, my church requires in her standards, and that I believe agreeably to Scripture, baptism in water, as a pre-requisite to the table of the Lord. I am therefore under the painful necessity of declining your request." Now this is just the attitude which the Baptist assumes towards his Pedo-Baptist brethren. We must admit them, either as baptized or as unbaptized Christians. Suppose,

(1.) That we admit them to the table of the Lord as baptized Christians, what is the consequence? Why, we stultify ourselves. We profess to regard believers' immersion as the only baptism warranted by Scripture. If believers' immersion is the only baptism, then infant sprinkling cannot be baptism at all, and we are consistent in requiring the immersion of all received into church fellowship, whether they have or have not received what is regarded by Pedo-Baptists as baptism. But if we admit to the Lord's table as baptized persons, those sprinkled in infancy, or sprinkled upon a profession of their faith, we at once bear testimony against our own principles, and condemn our own practice, which we believe to be according to the Word of God, of requiring immersion on a profession of faith, even of those who have received the ordinance in infancy. You may find fault, then, with the Baptists' views of the ordinance. Prove to your own satisfaction, if you