

certainly do receive them just as Christ received us. We object to receiving them to *church* fellowship, on the strength of a ceremony invented by Rome: we do not receive them as the Pope receives numbers; but verily we receive them just as Christ does. If Christians doubt this, let them test us; let them ask us to baptize them into the fellowship of the church. If we refuse, then it will be time enough to charge us with not receiving them as Christ does.

Again, it is assumed, that the command to receive one another, means that baptized Christians must receive to the table of the Lord unbaptized Christians: but to whom was the command given? To whom did the Apostle say, "Wherefore receive ye one another as Christ also received us." We reply, to a body of believers who had all been buried with Christ in baptism; and never was any man received into an apostolic church, who had not submitted to this ordinance. They believed, were baptized, and added to the church. The Spirit of God has set his seal to this order; therefore it is the order in which Christ receives men into the visible church.

We regret to see it stated by the author of the preface, that the Regular Baptists in Canada, and in the United States generally, reject from their communion those who "hold the sentiment of free communion." This is a mistake; and our good brother ought to have better informed himself, before he gave it to the world as authentic.

There are few men for whom we entertain a feeling of higher respect, than we do towards the editor of this tract; but when Christ's laws are in question, we know no man after the flesh.

But to the tract itself, which comes to us so well endorsed. We may say of it in general that it is a re-echoing of some of Robert Hall's sentiments, although a little more suicidal. The writer admits and denies in one breath that we have Scripture precedent for confining membership to immersed believers. It has often been said of Pedit-baptists that when contending with Romanists, they employ Baptist weapons; and when contending with Baptists they employ Popish weapons. That this is equally true of open-unionists, the following comparison will serve to show.

The open-unionist says. "There is no law in all the New Testament which enjoins baptism in all circumstances, as an indispensable pre-requisite to admission to the Lord's Supper." Page 11. The Pedit-baptist says: Judea was a warm climate, and immersion might be practised there, but there is no law in all the New Testament which enjoins immersion in all circumstances; in all climates. (Doddrige, Calvin, Baxter, &c., urge this very plea.)

The open-unionist says: "We have no example in Scripture, of any sincere follower of Christ being on any pretence whatever, denied the privilege of sitting down with his brethren at the table of the Lord." The Pedit-baptist says: We have no example in Scripture of any sincere follower of Christ being on any pretence whatever denied the privilege of having his infant baptized.

The open-unionist says: "If we have no precedent for admitting unbaptized persons, neither have you for rejecting them." The Pedit-baptist says the same with reference to his babies.

Such principles of reasoning, if carried out to their legitimate results, would subvert every principle of Protestantism, and furnish a warrant for attending to the inventions of Popery; for it might be urged, no devout Christian in the days of the Apostles was ever denied the privilege on any pretence whatever of celebrating high mass, or praying to the virgin; and if the open-unionist should reply: the Apostles knew nothing about such practices, neither did the

Apostolic churches! "True," the Catholic might rejoin, "but the cases are not parallel. You look to the Bible, alone and are misled; but we are enlightened by tradition, and thus preserved from error." The Bible and Tradition is the religion of Rome. The Bible and the Prayer Book is the religion of Episcopacy. The Bible, and the varying circumstances in which Christians, by following error may be placed, is the religion of open-unionism—while it is boastfully said that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants.

The author of the tract, asks, what would we have done with uncircumcised persons had the canon of Scripture closed with the 9th Chapter of Acts. Our reply is that we cannot tell what would have been the result of an imperfect revelation of the mind of God to man, but we can tell, that to depart from the perfect canon is rebellion.

Again, our author, after admitting that in primitive times baptized believers only came to the table of the Lord, and after having denied that this is a precedent for us in our circumstances; proceeds to fight against the authority of precedent, with an earnestness which evidences with unmistakable certainty that he is not at all satisfied, that men with the Bible in their hands will admit his premises. He exalts the importance of "general principles," and then interprets the word of God by his view of those general principles. He adduces the case of Peter in the house of Cornelius to prove, that the Apostle was converted from the sentiment, that it was unlawful for a Jew to associate with one of another nation, by a general principle. On this we remark, 1. Peter had been in the habit of calling the Gentiles "common," or unclean. The voice said unto him, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." This was something more than a "general principle;" it was a POSITIVE COMMAND to Peter, to change his sentiments and his practice. 2. But the voice of God led Peter to receive those Gentiles, and the all-important question arises, did the subdued Apostle receive them into church fellowship without baptism? What saith the inspired record? When Peter saw the Spirit descend upon them, he said: "Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." When Peter rehearsed these facts to the Church at Jerusalem, the brethren there were satisfied with the reception which those Gentiles had met at the hands of God and man, and so would any baptized Church on the face of the earth; but this, like every other passage in the New Testament, bearing upon the question, gives open-unionism a fatal stab under the fifth rib.

We have next a military figure, in which the author's suppositions overlook the point at issue. And while on this subject, we would say to parties on both sides of this controversy, that to compare the positive commands of God, to the orders of a King; and the ordinances of the Gospel, "to the colour of a coat, or the length of a feather, or the size of a cockade," is superlatively preposterous. We could very easily turn such a figure to our own account, but not without insulting God. We say this in full view of the fact, that strict-unionists will be rebuked by our remarks, as well as our brethren who oppose them.

Catholicism everywhere aims to produce the impression, that strict-unionists do not admit the force of general principles. He also assumes that the general principles of the Gospel go to establish the dogma of open-unionism. In both of these positions the good man is utterly at fault. With us the positive commands, and plain examples, and general principles of the word of God, are alike authoritative; and the man who urges any one of these to set aside another, is just as certainly in error as it is that God's word is in harmony with itself. To co-operate with a Bible or Missionary Society, guided by