

ment; yet all these differing and conflicting parties are wont to meet together around the social hearth, or at a preaching, or prayer meeting, and offer up their prayers and praises as an act of social worship: and also join together in all or any of the "benevolent schemes" of the day; and this too, *because they view each other as CHRISTIANS*, who differ merely in non-essentials—as all travelling to the same place by different roads, and expect ultimately to sit down around the same table in the King's own country. To-day around the social hearth, *as Christians*, they will join in social prayer and praise, and to-morrow they will refuse to break the loaf together! What's the reason? Not because they think they are not Christians, for this they have before acknowledged; but because of some speculative difference. Now I know it is commanded. 2 Cor. vi. 17. to come out from the unrighteous, unbelievers, and infidels, and to be separate, and not to touch the unclean, and the Lord will receive us; but that any command exists to come out from *Christians*, and be separate when performing *any act of social worship*, I have yet to learn. So that consistency would say, if we unite in one act of social worship, we ought in all.

In the *Christian Baptist*, vol. 6, page 183, you give five reasons why you "object to making it a rule, *in any case*, to receive unimmersed persons to church ordinances:—

"1st Because it is no where commanded.

"2d. Because it is no where preceded in the New Testament.

"3d. Because it necessarily corrupts the simplicity and uniformity of the whole genius of the New Institution.

"4th. Because it not only deranges the order of the kingdom, but makes *void* one of the most important institutions ever given to man. It necessarily makes *immersion* of non-effect. For, with what consistency or propriety can a congregation hold up to the world either the *authority* or *utility* of an institution they are in the habit of making as little of, as any human opinion?

"5th. Because, in making a canon to dispense with a divine institution of momentous import, they who do so assume the very same *dispensing power* which issued in that tremendous apostacy which we and all Christians are praying and laboring to destroy. If a Christian community puts into its magna charta, covenant, or constitution, an assumption to dispense with an institution of the Great King, who can tell where this power of granting license to itself may terminate."

Again, (C. B. vol. 5, page 122,) you say, "Christian immersion stands in the same place in the Christian temple, or worship, that the laver, or bath of purification, stood in the Jewish—viz. BETWEEN THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST AND ACCEPTABLE WORSHIP;" and you make "prayer, praise, and vocal worship, the antitype of the Priest approaching the holiest of all;" and this (as in the case of the Priests) subsequent to immersion.

The question is, if it be scriptural, for those who have believed the gospel and put on Christ by being immersed into his death, to join in prayer, praise, or any other act of social worship with those who have