

of the other churches concerned as true ministers of Christ? Will they give its proper place to free prayer, or even agree to the revision of their book—striking out the title “priest” as in no sense belonging to the New Testament elder or bishop—discarding the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, the sign of the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, kneeling at the Lord’s Supper—in a word everything which leads to sacerdotalism and sacramentarianism? Our writers have not tried their dialectic skill upon these points, as well as sundry others—doctrinal and practical—which have divided many of the most profound and learned thinkers of past ages. This modesty and silence on their part will be regarded by many as ominous of difficulties which are not likely to disappear suddenly.

4. The denominational spirit as might be expected is manifest, more or less, in all the discussions; and in one instance, that of Mr. Upham, our Baptist brother (if he will allow us to call him brother) there is an undisguised determination to show that his sect is right and all the rest wrong. According to his notion if union is ever to be accomplished it must be either by leaving the Baptists out, or by all others becoming Close Communion Baptists. True, he says, “it is not so intended,” but he immediately adds, “It is meant rather as an invitation to others to return to the acknowledged teachings of the New Testament on one point, and if there are points wherein we need to return we wish to know them.”

Meanwhile in spite of all the numerous volumes that have been written for the very purpose of showing such points, Mr. Upham does not “know them.” His case seems hopeless. How is such difficulty in acquiring knowledge to be overcome? If Dale, and Bushnell, and Wilson, and Edwards, and Mackay, and a thousand others, have failed to indicate and prove points on which he needs to return, *or at least become tolerant*, we cannot hope to aid him in a few editorial sentences. We can assure him, however, that his practice on the point to which he gives such prominence is undeniably in opposition to the whole of Protestant Christendom. It is necessary to say this with emphasis, because he seems to try to convey the opposite impression, and to have it understood by a sort of universal consent that Baptists are right in their distinctive peculiarities. The ecclesiastical history of centuries is the refutation of this idea.

Divested of circumlocutions the positions urged by Mr. Upham are:—

(1) That no infants should be baptized; and that close communion