

night preceding his death, on which night he went through his regular religious exercises—singing, reading of the Scriptures and prayer. During his last illness which did not last twenty-four hours, he never spoke. In the course of the fortnight previous he frequently got out of bed during the night, and wished, as he expressed it, to go home. The good man has now gone home: he has gone home to that God in whom he so long believed, and whom he had so long and so ardently loved. Freed from the clogs and infirmities of age, he is now, there is every reason to believe, blooming in immortal youth before the throne of God, serving him day and night in his temple.

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

M. W. L.

BROOKFIELD, 25th Nov., 1856.

Continued from page 193.

REVIEW OF "TERMS OF COMMUNION AT THE LORD'S TABLE."

BY R. B. C. HOWELL, D. D.

The Apostle Paul's Principles of Toleration.

Dr. Howell, p. 86, speaking of Paul's principles of toleration, as laid down in the 14th of Romans, says, "They are three-fold. This is adding to the word of God, for the Apostle lays down only one principle, viz.: 'God hath received him.' Dr. H.'s second principle, 'Conscientiousness,' is necessarily implied in the first. The third, viz.: 'That the peculiarities of the parties be not subversive of any divine law, is neither expressed nor implied in the Apostle's language. True, there must be reason to believe that the parties are persuaded in their own minds that their peculiarities are not only not subversive of, but in full accordance with divine law; the objecting party will, of course, view the questionable practices as tending to subvert some divine law; for it may be said every peculiarity, either in doctrine or practice, viewed as objectionable, is held to be so for the very reason that it is believed to have such tendency. No doubt the objecting party, whom the Apostle exhorted to forbearance, surely believed that the practices to which they objected tended to subvert a divine law, and objected to them solely for that reason. The Jewish converts were in the belief that the law of God given by Moses, respecting abstaining from certain meats was still in force, and the Apostle when he enjoined forbearance doubtless knew it, and yet did not persuade them to forbearance by informing them that the law of God respecting meats being abrogated, the Gentiles by eating them could not subvert it; which, if Dr. Howell be right, he would, without doubt, have done. The Dr. adds the third principle without any authority whatever. All the three principles, the Dr. says, were united in the case in question. And it may be said that in the case of many Pedobaptists they are united; for those who rather than 'not subversive of any divine law,' Dr.

evince their acceptance with God sincerely believe that their Pedobaptism is not subversive of, but required by the divine law. Because Mr. Hall, in qualifying the questionable practices, chooses the phrases, 'not incompatible with a state of salvation,' H. is pleased to designate it a logical finesse; but truly it is his own mode of reasoning that may, with the greatest propriety be so designated. Mr. Hall's qualifying clause is clearly synonymous with the Apostle's 'God hath received him.'

But there is not only logical finesse in the Dr.'s reasoning here—there is sad incoherency. On page 86, he asks, 'Has God received them?' (viz.: Pedobaptists.) 'We trust he has,' he replies. 'Are they conscientious?' He farther asks, and replies, 'We are willing to admit that they may be.' And just a few lines further on, he says, 'Their reception by us would, on our part, amount to a conspiracy with them in their design to overthrow the law of God, and render us not Christian communicants, but partners in their rebellion against the authority of the Supreme Legislator.'

Truly these are very extraordinary characteristics for persons recognized as pious Pedobaptists! What! pious? and yet 'designing to overthrow the law of God?' Pious? Though in rebellion against the authority of God! Nor is this all. Pious Pedobaptists are held to be 'in design to overthrow the law of God.' Yet, to the question, 'Has God received them?' Dr. H. replies, 'We trust he has!' Pedobaptists are declared to be in rebellion against Divine authority. Yet, to the question, 'Are they conscientious?' The Dr. answers, 'We are willing to admit that they may be!!' We need then be at no loss to account for Dr. H.'s determined opposition to communion with Pedobaptists, if his adverse view of them be his actual or true estimate of their character, and this is obviously the only light in which he views them when 'sacramental' communion is in question. Elsewhere we find him speaking of Pedobaptists 'persevering in disregard of spiritual obligations;' 'Habitually violating the revealed will of God.' This is bad enough; but a *designed conspiracy to overthrow the law of God—rebellion against divine authority*—can be viewed only as the summit of wickedness. But how shall we account for the Dr.'s trust that God has received them? for his willingness to believe that after all they may be conscientious? Believing the character of Pedobaptists to be such as here represented, no wonder though the Dr. scruple to commence with them; especially when he believes that receiving them would constitute him a partner in their guilt.

Thus he estimates the character of Pedobaptists when *sacramental* communion is in view. But speak only of *Christian* communion, and anon a happy transmutation takes place; he 'cherishes for them, as the people of God, the sincerest affection;' takes pleasure in being associated with them in every good word and work; no danger is apprehended of being