

have added, "for as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," the answer is quickly withdrawn; for every Close Baptist believes, that the expression *till he come*, has reference to a time yet future; and knowing that the eleven Apostles are all dead, the incongruity of his answer is too obvious to admit of one moment's defence. On requesting a second answer, I have generally obtained this; "Christ must have addressed all regular church members," and yet every Close Baptist knows, that there are thousands in the Denomination, of his own faith and order, who, if this second answer be correct, have been invited, by Jesus Christ, to eat and drink damnation, or judgment to themselves. When Paul exhorted the Corinthians to examine themselves, in order to ascertain if they were prepared to approach the Lord's table, why did they not inform him that they were all regular church members? For Paul must have overlooked that fact, if it be true, that Christ told all regular church members to sit at his table. Thus it is plain, that we have not yet obtained the true answer. The close baptist will not now hazard the statement, that the words under consideration were addressed to all who had been regularly immersed in Christian baptism. Nor will he apply them to *all* of his own faith and order: for he knows it contains hundreds, who, like Simon Magus, have neither part nor lot in the matter; the same is true, in degree, of all existing denominations. How then can that minister be justified, who invites all his party? And how can those be guiltless in the sight of God, who invite all the parties? I must here be permitted to give in my solemn protest against the system of inviting by "faith and order," and by "evangelical denominations" as altogether too loose, and latitudinarian; until it be made appear, that "our faith and order" is composed of Christians exclusively: and that the evangelical denominations fellowship none but the true followers of the Lamb. How then should the invitation be given according to the words of Christ, "drink ye all of it?" We would say let facts answer. The speaker is now on the point of going away into a far country, to be absent nearly two thousand years; "the multitude wish to have it so, and that he would not return: they have no desire to see or hear anything more of him. A company gather around him, who weep and mourn at the thought of his departure, and long absence; preferring rather to go with him, than remain alone. He tells them that it was necessary for them to remain until he returned. And then, that he might always be had in remembrance, he so arranges certain actions, as to make them represent the manner of his departure, and the manifold sufferings he had endured on their account, while yet with them. The closing act consists, in presenting a cup, with these words "drink ye all of it." Should we ask, in this case, who the speaker meant by *all*, none would hesitate a moment in saying, all his true friends, who could understand the symbols, and by them call the departed to mind. And, these being the facts which led to the institution of the Lord's supper, it is obvious the Saviour addressed all his true friends, when he said, "this do in remembrance of me—Drink ye all of it; for as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." And thus the invitation should always be given, to every true child of God wherever found: to all the living branches of the true vine: to all who have washed their robes, and keep them white through the blood of the Lamb—to all who are not conformed to this world, but transformed by the renewing of the spirit; whether in the denominations, or standing clear of all denominations.—If Christians would only bear in mind, that the avowed object of the Lord's supper, is to ensure their remembrance of him, in recalling the sufferings he endured, there would be no difficulty whatever.—Where is the son, who could say to an affectionate brother who was willing to weep with him over a

father's grave, you shall not?—Where is the daughter who could shake from her sister's hand the gray ringlet she was moistening with her tears?—Such cannot be found! nor will they, until something more than a grateful remembrance of the departed, be required in these acts. We find an awful curse denounced against the man, who shall add anything to the written word. Should we not therefore tremble at the thought of adding to the import of God's ordinances? But close communion appears to be based on the assumption that in partaking of the Lord's supper we endorse the sentiments of all those with whom we sit, or invite to sit with us. Yet, on being closely pressed, the advocates of this assumption are compelled to limit its application to one of two sentiments; first, that baptism is rightly administered by sprinkling the infants of believers. The second, that baptism is not prerequisite to communion: for he cannot evade the fact, that his own denomination contains men of every other variety of sentiment within the limits of orthodoxy; from the firm advocate of free-will, to the hyper Calvinist; and each member of these different varieties, stoutly denies that in communing with the others he fellowships their sentiments! Yet all of them seem to be agreed, that it is impossible to sit at the Lord's table with a pseudo-baptist, and not endorse his infant sprinkling! To exhibit the strength of this feeling, I here insert the following facts.

On the first Sabbath of October, 1839, the Rev. Mr. H——, of Warren County N. Y., had an appointment to preach, and administer the Lord's supper, in the Baptist meeting house of Schroon, Essex County.—On reaching the place he ascertained that Rev. Mr. Barker of the Baptist church designed to preach and administer the supper on the same day. Wishing to save as much time as possible, Mr. H—— proposed to Mr. Barker, that as the house was sufficiently large, the Presbyterians and Baptists should sit on opposite sides, and both attend to the Lord's supper at the same time. This being agreed to, it appeared to be superfluous to spread two tables, providing two loaves, &c. The Presbyterians were perfectly willing that Mr. Barker should ask the blessing of God upon the elements. The Baptists could not see that they violated "gospel order," in permitting the Presbyterians to take part of the bread, and divide it among themselves; or in permitting their minister to address both churches on the same occasion: And, therefore, in accordance with the preliminaries, the Presbyterian and Baptist churches of Schroon, partook of the Lord's supper together, in the sweetest harmony. At least in the same house, and at the same time, they partook of the same bread and wine, from the same table; and all in the kindest feeling. But the body pews lay between the two churches lest the Baptists should endorse infant sprinkling! And for the same reason Mr. Barker, and not Mr. H——, asked the blessing of God upon the elements.

REJECTED CORRESPONDENCE OF THE N. Y. BAPTIST REGISTER.

But if Baptist papers have choked the discussion of this question in Canada, they have also done the same in the neighboring Union, which may account for the fact, that close communion is still prevalent in the Republic.

About twelve years ago, the "N. Y. Baptist Register" refused to publish the following paper, although it published the whole of the circular to which it refers. The paper now appears in the *Tribune*, not simply because it was then rejected by the "Register," but because the publisher considers the arguments suitable, and now in place at the present stage of this inquiry.