

although you were able to establish the baptism of unconscious infants from God's Word, it would not set aside the necessity of *believers'* baptism, as practised by the Apostles. The example of the Apostles in this matter is the rule of the churches until the end of the dispensation, unless you say with Chevalier Bunson, that the "*doctrine of Biblical baptism must be reformed.*"

I was rather amused at the following remark: "G. M. and we are entire strangers to each other, but we will venture to say that his demand for proof upon this point is evidence that he has had a much more intimate acquaintance with English Baptist Churches, whose practice is almost exclusively that of open communion, than with those in this country."

I would venture to suggest, Mr. Editor, that it would be better for you not to attempt to write biographical sketches of your correspondents unless you are personally acquainted with them. G. M. never was in England, and is much better acquainted with Canadian than with English Baptist Churches.

The Editor of the *Canadian Independent* seems to wish to leave the question of close communion, and discuss the mode of baptism. I thought that gentleman had enough of the cavalier in his composition to stand his ground. The commencement of our discussion was on the subject of close communion. Hence I will "fight it out on this line" before I leave it. I will either beat you, sir, or you shall beat me. before I will retreat from the field.

In reference to the meaning of "Baptizo," you will get full opportunity to ventilate your Greek. I will contest every inch of ground with you, from Homer down to Chrysostom. "Not a tense will be confounded, nor an article omitted, nor a case overlooked, nor a preposition misconstrued, nor a particle despised."

I am, dear sir,

Yours sincerely,

G. M.

Our correspondent traverses, to a large extent, the ground covered by his previous communication, but we have thought it better to give his letter entire.

It appears then, that the best he can do is to offer us something, which in his opinion, is "equal to" positive injunction for close communion, viz., "approved Apostolic example." But supposing that we can set up against his reasoning a positive Apostolic injunction not to "judge" or "set at nought" a brother whom "God hath received," (Rom. xiv, 3, 10,) on account of any conscientious differences, what then? Is our correspondent's inference to be accepted as "equal to" the Apostles' command? If G. M. is prepared to say that no Pedo-Baptist can be a Christian, or what amounts to about the same thing, can he conscientious in rejecting immersion, he may adhere to the principle he is defending consistently enough. But if not, we think he should acknowledge with a certain old lady of whom we once heard,—“There Paul and I differ.”

“Approved Apostolic example” ought undoubtedly to have with us the weight of positive injunction; but no such supposed example can be accepted as “approved” that stands in direct opposition to Apostolic