

come universal; Dr. Howell infers that this is equivalent to an admission that the prevalence of open communion will annihilate the Baptist Church, and his doing so is a virtual confession that he contends for the name *Baptist* even should the universal prevalence of Baptist views and practice render its use ridiculous. Dispense with the name *BAPTIST*? No, not though every Christian Church in the world were constituted of immersed Christians! They must be designated *Baptist* churches even then! Else, in the Dr.'s opinion, the glory would be departed!!! *Baptists* all must be, to suit the Dr., not only throughout all time, but as it would seem even in heaven; for he does declare (p. 114) "We shall assuredly never commune with Pedobaptists in any manner in heaven in which we do not now commune with them on earth."

We do not say that all this is precisely Dr. Howell's language; but we assert it is not far from its precise import; and we cannot help thinking that such language as he uses in reference to this may very properly be designated *childish*. Mr. Hall, and all the most discerning friends of open communion confess that its universal prevalence would certainly and resistlessly annihilate the Baptist Church! But how would it accomplish the sad catastrophe? By hastening the universal prevalence of their views and practice on Baptism, which would render the designation "*Baptist*" a misnomer!

"Admitted, Mr. Hall may be wrong; he may have been too sanguine as to the tendency and effect of the prevalence of open communion; but at present that is not the question. It is, did Mr. Hall confess that the universal prevalence of open communion would annihilate the Baptist Church in a sense that is really to be deprecated? Rather, if it be at all proper to call that which he anticipated annihilation; is it not evidently in a sense for the speedy accomplishment of which all sincere Baptists will most earnestly pray? We repeat, therefore, our conviction, that Dr. H.'s assertion is grievous misrepresentation, whether by mistake or design; and so plain is Mr. Hall's language it is difficult to believe it could have been the former. It is to be feared prepossession sometimes affects the minds of *Baptists* who are so loud in charging the evil upon others.

Dr. H. contends (p. 41,) that there is a perfect parallel between the necessity of *faith* to baptism, and that of baptism to the supper, i. e. that baptism is as indispensable a prerequisite to the Supper, as faith is to baptism. He says "if baptism is not necessary to communion, faith, for the same reason is not necessary to baptism." He himself, however, makes a wide difference between the necessity of faith and the necessity of baptism, which we will demonstrate to his own entire satisfaction; and, 1. We appeal to him if he does not hold faith to be indispensable to the acceptable discharge of every religious duty; and, 2, Does he not admit that every religious duty may be acceptably discharged without baptism? 3. He ad-

mits (p. 22) one may be so eminently religious without baptism that he could delightfully associate with him in the service of the Redeemer, and in every good word and work; could he say this of one destitute of faith? 4. It is the language of unerring truth, "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Would the commission, or any other part of the divine record, warrant us to insert *baptism* instead of *faith* in this declaration? It is a fact on which we have all reason to insist that according to the commission baptism is as necessary to the acceptable discharge of every religious duty as it is to the Supper. It is truly amazing to find Dr. H. attempting to draw a parallel between the necessity of baptism to communion, and of faith to baptism, while by his own practice he manifests that he holds the difference to be immense. Here it is that the parallel is completely broken; it is faith, not baptism, that qualifies for every religious duty and privilege as well as the Lord's Supper; if that be wanting nothing else can be a substitute. Pious Pedobaptists have this grand prerequisite to the acceptable observance of every gospel ordinance. Many of them are "rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom."

#### THE REASON FOR COMMUNION WITH PEDOBAPTISTS IN RELIGIOUS EXERCISES NOT SACRAMENTAL.

This is manifestly the department of the controversy which our close brethren feel to be the most difficult to deal with; and instead of an effort to assign a valid reason, they generally satisfy themselves by stating the fact as it stands, viz., that they do commune with pious Pedobaptists in all religious exercises except those peculiar to church fellowship or those which Dr. H. terms "*Sacramental*." The Dr.'s mode of disposing of it requires special notice. He remarks as follows:—

"We have already conceded their general Christian character; as such we fraternize with them in every form not sacramental. (1.) We deem this a sufficient testimony of our good will, and desire for their prosperity, as far as they are engaged with us in the same common cause. (2.) We give them credit for sincerity and conscientiousness. What more can be required? (3.) The exercises in which we unite with them were duties before baptism was instituted; and would have remained duties to the end of time, had no Christian church existed. (4.) Since those facts are undoubted, how can our course be inconsistent with the opinions we entertain? Such a thing is impossible. (5.) It is our pleasure to pursue it when we think proper; and still, in our judgment, (6.) infant sprinkling is not Christian baptism. 7.) Christian baptism is the only authorised mode of entrance into the visible church."

#### NOTES TO THE ABOVE EXTRACT.

(1.) That it is a sufficient testimony of your good will we shall not dispute, but the question is, is it a sufficient reason for the distinction you make be-