

ordinance of the supper is exclusively a church ordinance, and the scriptural constitution of the church requires that all its members have been immersed on a profession of their faith.

But here again the objection is urged, "By your narrow and exclusive view you unchurch all Christian denominations but yourselves." No, my dear friend, we do no such a thing. We regard them as part of the church of Christ, but irregular and unscriptural at least on this one point. But the objection equally applies to every Christian denomination that claims Divine warrant for its peculiar ecclesiastical organization. Presbyterians and Episcopalians plead a Divine right for their respective forms of church government. Now, in this plea they as much unchurch the Baptists as in the other case it is said the Baptists unchurch them; for if either Presbyterianism or Episcopacy be *the* authorized constitution of the visible church, Congregationalism cannot be so. Or, when Congregationalists say that the church is composed of believers and their infant offspring, the Baptist churches cannot be, correctly speaking, New Testament churches, for they do not embrace, according to that view, all the elements which the New Testament enjoins the church to embrace. And the "Brethren," who cannot commune with any branch of the church, and some of whom would not even hear the Gospel in any denominational place of worship, do surely as much unchurch all these Christian denominations, and far more than the Baptists do! I trust that the unreasonableness of the objection will appear, or at least that it is equally applicable to the objector, be he Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, or Episcopalian.

But it is further urged—"By your close communion policy you exclude many good people from your church, far better men and women than some of those who are baptized." Yes, my friend, I know it, I feel it, I deeply deplore it. But the objection, like others, is equally applicable to