

ticularly cited to you yesterday ; but when I went into the study of Professor Dörner, Schleiermacher's successor at Berlin, and conversed with him about the greatest skeptics of Europe, I came to the name of Renan and said : ' What are we to think of his Life of Jesus ? ' ' Das ist nichts,' he answered, and added on more. ' That is nothing.'

" No doubt in the fume and foam and froth of literary brilliancy, serving a lost, bad cause, there may be iridescence, as well as in the enduring opal and pearl. But while the colours seven flashed from the fragile spray are as beautiful as foam and froth, they are also just as substantial."

CLOSE COMMUNION.

BY A PRESBYTER.

SIR,—I have read all the letters that have appeared in your columns for and against Close Communion, and I desire, with your permission, to call attention to a few points that seem to be overlooked or ignored by the advocates of that exclusive and uncharitable theory. Their refusal to sit at the Lord's table with members of other Churches is based on the alleged ground, that the latter are not baptised, and that no unbaptised person can scripturally partake of the Lord's Supper. I shall now proceed to prove that this principle would have debarred from the sacred table the very persons with whom our Lord sat, when He instituted the ordinance, and to whom He said, " This do in remembrance of Me."

1. The ordinance of the Supper was instituted first, and Christian baptism afterwards. It was on the night in which He was betrayed, that He instituted and observed the Supper with His disciples ; but not until after His resurrection did He institute baptism, and give the commission contained in Matt. xxviii. 19.

2. If Christian baptism was not instituted when the Lord's Supper was observed in the upper room in Jerusalem, it follows that the disciples who there partook of it were not, and could not have been baptised. Close Communion Baptists seem to assume that baptism was instituted first, and the Supper afterwards, whereas the reverse is the case.

3. There is no record of Christian baptism having been administered until the day of Pentecost ; but we read of the hundred and twenty disciples before that time, besides the apostles. Now, will Close Communion Baptists tell us who baptised the apostles, and these hundred and twenty disciples ? There is not a vestige of evidence that they were ever the recipients of Christian baptism.

4. It will not meet this difficulty to allege that they may have been baptised by John the Baptist, for even if they were, his was not Christian baptism ; nor was Christian baptism instituted until long after the close of John's ministry. Of the 3,000 baptised on the day of Pentecost, the great majority had, in all probability, been baptised by John previously. Besides, we find in Acts xix. 5, the record of the administration of Christian baptism to certain disciples that had previously been baptised by John ; and this re-baptising took place under the direction of Paul himself.

The inevitable conclusion from all this is, that if the first disciples of Christ were now on the earth, the Close Communion Baptists would, in strict logical consistency, have to refuse to sit with them at the Lord's table. Yea, they would have to unchurch the very persons to whom our Lord gave the sacred cup ! And by implication that theory is a censure on the Great Head of the Church Himself ! It is true we who belong to other communions are suffering no hardship by being unchurched, as we are by them ; but it is painful to think of it when co-operating with them in all good works. The Mormons unchurch us all, Baptists included. Dr. Field, of the New York *Evangelist*, recently visited Salt Lake City, and in the course of an interview with the head of the Mormon Church, he made