

guarding, boldly defending, and resisting all attempts, &c., they should have to perform the rather ungracious, and as some might think, unseemly task of repelling an Edwards, a Dwight, a Payson, a Watts, an Owen, or a Doddridge. It is on the positive command that they have to keep a firm and steady eye. It is assumed that they have to do all this, too, in the spirit of their Master? That will be the crowning difficulty. What searching of the Saviour's history there will have to be to find manifestations of a spirit fitted to bear them up in the discharge of such a task! To think of the meek and lowly Jesus issuing his commands to Regular Baptists to guard, and boldly to defend the approaches to his table against such characters as those named above!

O that our brethren would more carefully guard against the danger of stultifying themselves! O that they would not suffer their prejudices to gain so completely the mastery over their judgments, as is manifested by the assumptions referred to! O that, in short, they would cultivate humility, and be willing to admit that after all they may themselves be guilty of disobedience of a nature similar to that of which they accuse their Pede-baptist brethren, or even of a nature more heinous in the sight of God! O that they would indeed study, and try to cultivate the spirit of Christ! His spirit was such that he bore long with erring children. He assiduously instilled into their minds the great truths of his gospel kingdom; but they manifested themselves "fools, and slow of heart to believe." One obstinately declared he would not believe till he saw in his hands the print of the nails.

Thomas, wast thou not present when thy Master solemnly declared that he would be betrayed into the hands of sinners, and crucified; and that he should rise again the third day? Surely thou heardest him declare the solemn truths on more occasions than one. Then, dost thou call thy master a liar? Thou wilt not believe till thou seest in his hands the print of the nails! Shameful and provoking incredulity! How can it but wear out the patience, and exhaust the forbearance even of Him whose patience and forbearance is inexhaustible! But, lo! still forbearance prevails! Thomas, reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing. And you, to whom the faithful tidings seemed as *idle tales*; what claim have you on the forbearance of your Lord? Did it not surprise you to be admitted into that communion which caused your heart to burn within you? Surely it surprised angels.

Yet, notwithstanding their slowness of heart to believe, their misconceptions, and their truly provoking incredulity, they loved Jesus Christ in sincerity. This was enough. This of itself secured the continuance of his favour; because of this, forbearance triumphed over every provocation. Provoking as was their misapprehension, their unbelief, yet

were they borne with and communed with. And how many Regular Baptists may there be who have not reason to confess that they have in one respect or another evinced worse than even Pedobaptist contumacy, and yet have been borne with, yea have been communed with? No guard has been placed to defend the approaches to his table, but they have been freely invited and welcomed. Here then, brethren, is a command, yea, and a precedent too. "If I then, your Lord and Master, have" done so and so to you, ye also ought to do so to one another. For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you.

Z. F.

For the Gospel Tribune.

#### BE YE ALL OF ONE MIND.—PETER.

Here, says the Close Communionist it is expressly enjoined by this Apostle, and also repeatedly by the Apostle Paul, that the Christians be of one mind. It is surely then our duty to separate from those whose views are different from our own; especially on a subject of such importance as baptism.

Hold, Brother, you arrive at your conclusion too hastily. Even though the injunction "Be ye all of one mind" should be allowed to mean—have the same views and opinions on every subject connected with religion,—even then your conclusion would not necessarily follow. It might be very far from being your duty to separate, and refuse the fellowship of your brethren who happen to have different views from yourself on some points; if these views were such as not to affect their state before God. Nay, it might be your bounden duty to cleave to your brethren whom you suppose to be in error, and affectionately endeavour by all prudent means to persuade them to embrace the truth. If we may assume that the injunction in question authorizes us to refuse to fellowship a brother because he has a different view of baptism from ours, why might we not assume that it authorises such refusal in case our brother should happen to hold a view of any other subject different from ours? This, we say, brethren is a sufficient condemnation of your principle:—it has no limits to guide us. You say certain errors are not to be borne with in the Church: we grant it. You say that an error on baptism is one of these; to this we demur,—you shew us no proof. We find certain errors did actually exist in the primitive Church, and we find forbearance nevertheless enjoined. The line of demarcation between errors to be tolerated, and those not to be tolerated was clearly the line of acceptance with God. the error of Pede-Baptism we say is clearly within that line, as few of you will dare deny. Then, on the principles clearly laid down by the Apostles themselves, and acted on in the church in their day, we are bound to forbear with our brethren. Yes, brethren, we do feel bound to act as we do in this matter because that we are conscious that in doing so, we are acting on a principle *clearly* laid