

course such questions must be answered in the affirmative; but unless we assume that the disobedience of Pedobaptists evinces want of love both to Christ and the brethren, his questions are perfectly irrelevant, and we know he will not dare deliberately to assume this; for he knows many of them evince as ardent love to Christ, and to the brethren, as is evinced by Baptists. In reference to Mr. Hall's calling external rites the terrestrial attire of religion, he says:—"It would not be seemly to receive into our family and entertain a man destitute of garments. The decencies of society demand that he shall be clothed. But it is equally unseemly to introduce to the sacred Table those who are not furnished with the vestments of the former ordinance." This, in our view, would apply equally forcibly to publicly associating with them under any circumstances.

The fact is but too notorious that the obligations of humility and love are brought into competition with the punctual observance of the external rite of baptism in consequence of the introduction and prevalence of Pedobaptism, and the Communion controversy arising from it. But in proportion as the mind is free from prejudices of education, &c., and is pervaded by genuine humility, and that clarity which vaunteth not itself, there will be a strong inclination to forbearance, and a deep repugnance so far to assume infallibility and claim the right peremptorily to dictate to recognized brethren what is their duty in reference to an obedience to Christ. Nor does it consist with the obligations of humility to say to our brother, who, we may be constrained to admit, is more eminent in piety than ourselves, "Brother, unless you adopt my views and practice respecting baptism you cannot have the privilege of communing with me at the Table of the Lord."

We now notice, briefly, a few of the Dr.'s extravagances.

And first, on p. 39, we find him objecting to Mr. Hall for saying that baptism is a mode of professing our faith, alleging that he ought to have said *the* mode, &c. Of course, in his opinion, it is the *only* mode by which faith can be professed. If the Dr.'s opinions were right it would certainly follow that the unimmersed ought not to be communed with; for if immersion be the *only* mode of professing faith, of course they have not professed faith, and to commune with those who have not even professed faith would look too like bare-faced latitudinarianism. It is rather surprising that the Dr. should have advanced this, aware as he must be of the Apostle's declaration, Romans x., "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and *with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.*" And the Dr. himself declared that Faith ought, in all cases, to be professed before baptism; but this contradictory assumption is necessary to the theory of close communion.

#### AN EXTRAORDINARY INSINUATION.

On p. 109 Dr. Howell observes, "If God has some secret code by which he saves those who habitually violate his revealed will, it is for his own government, not ours."

What meaning the Dr. intended to convey by this is rather uncertain; but after reading it, and its context, several times over, we have concluded that he must have meant something like the following, viz.—"Pedobaptists being habitual violators of God's revealed will, if they are saved, must be saved by a code different from that by which others are saved; a code too which God has not seen meet to reveal!" But can this be the deliberate opinion of Dr. Howell? If so, surely his orthodoxy needs to be inquired into.

Conflicting statements of the Dr. in regard to the purposes for which the Supper was instituted:—

His 7th chapter is for the discussion of this question, and in commencing he quotes the words of institution as proving it to be commemorative, and to show the Lord's death till he comes. "It is," he says, "to be invariably administered and received for these purposes, and for no other." But on his 22d p. he tells us "it is called a *sacrament*, because it is a public declaration of allegiance to our Lord Jesus Christ;" and "the *eucharist* because it is an act of personal adoration and thanksgiving to God." And on p. 111 he calls not only commemoration, but also "a testimony of our united love and obedience to our Lord, *purposes alone sanctioned by the word of God.*" On p. 105 he admits that the Supper was appointed to be a test of our love and confidence in each other, though not so much so as of our obedience to Christ; and further says, that "As it is a sacred feast, &c., *mutual Christian affection among communicants is very becoming and highly necessary.*" In the same chapter (p. 114) he calls the opinion that the Supper is designed as a test of Christian fellowship, and that one purpose of its administration is to express *mutual Christian fellowship, a mistaken notion, an exploded dogma.* Verily, these are not easily reconciled. And other similar instances could be pointed to, but let these suffice.

In his 8th chapter he discusses the three prominent considerations which influence Close Baptists to decline fellowship with Pedobaptists. A few remarks on the first of these seem called for, it is, that fellowship with these would involve an abandonment of all those principles on both ordinances held by Close Baptists. But is this a necessary consequence? What are their principles on both ordinances? They hold that baptism is an indispensable prerequisite to the Supper; and that the commission is equivalent to a law positively prohibiting the admission to the Supper of any one whom they, as Baptists, deem unbaptized. Granted, if these principles had their foundation in truth, communing with Pedobaptists would involve their abandonment. He assumes that they are proved. But where is the proof? It is the opinion of Close Baptists; and Pedobaptists, in general, are understood to hold the same opinion. Waiving, however, taking into account the vast difference as to character between the "unbaptized in relation to Pedobaptists, and that of those unbaptized in relation to Baptists, we remind the Dr. that Pedobaptists may be, and we believe are, all in error in respect to this, i. e., as far as their Close Communion amounts to rejecting recognized Christians. The truth is, as we firmly believe, the principle remains unproved by either Baptists or Pedobaptists. The assumption that my communing with a Christian who holds a view of a doctrine different from mine necessarily involve an abandonment of my own view of it, is a notion too childish to require refutation.

The Dr. is certainly very reckless in his assertions. For instance, he assures Pedobaptists that Open Communions differ from them more widely than Close. It is true that Open and Close Baptists hold the same views as to their being unbaptized; but while the Open hold that their error is to be ascribed to *involuntary mistake or misconception*, the Close brethren charge them with *conspiring in design to overthrow the law of God, and with rebellion against Divine authority!* Dr. Howell, moreover, charges them with foul conception; insinuating that, for all their pretensions, their only object in seeking fellowship with Baptists is to get them to acknowledge the validity of their infant baptism; and but for that, he assures us, they have no desire to commune in Baptist Churches. He