

either of these topics, for the same reason. I am willing to discuss those questions with you one by one, but I decidedly object to discuss them all at once. Such a confused method of handling subjects has a tendency to perplex rather than edify.

I will now endeavour to tell you the meaning of Rom. xiv. 3, 4, not because these verses bear on the communion question, but because you request an explanation of them.

From various parts of the epistle to the church in Rome, we may learn that it was composed partly of Jewish and partly of Gentile believers. In accordance with their usual peculiarities, some of the Jewish believers at Rome were inclined to observe the things which Moses had commanded. A considerable part of the Mosaic dispensation had reference to "meats and drinks." If, then, a Jewish believer had doubts about the lawfulness of eating certain things, he was to be treated with forbearance. The stronger brother who believed that he could "eat all things," was not to despise the weaker brother who only felt at liberty to "eat herbs." The weak brother was to be received notwithstanding his scruples about meats and drinks, and the strong brother was not at liberty to despise or judge him. If a convert from Judaism, or even heathenism, who had scruples about eating certain kinds of food, were to ask for admission into a Christian church at the present day, it would certainly be the duty of that church to receive such a one, and not presume to judge another man's servant.

I am, dear Sir,  
Yours faithfully,

G. M.

Warwick, May 11th, 1870.

It is impossible not to admire the complacency with which our correspondent insists that he has proven his point, and were his arguments only equal to his confidence, our little passage-at-arms would undoubtedly be the "end of controversy" on the subject. We submit, however, that he has produced neither Divine command nor Apostolic example for restricting baptism to believers, or for excluding believers from church-fellowship, because they don't happen to agree with you as to the mode of its administration.

Our brother is in error in supposing us to have asserted that baptism in adult age is to be confined to "Jews and heathen." We only said that the "men and women" of whose baptism we read in the New Testament were Jews and heathen, and therefore naturally and properly received it on embracing the Christian religion. Now, however, when so many Baptists and others, neglect their duty, and forsake the good old Apostolic way of household baptism, the rite has often to be administered to "Christian" believers, as the next best thing in adult age. "But from the beginning it was not so," and we may therefore learn much of "what the New Testament *does* teach, from what it *doesn't* teach," G. M. to the contrary notwithstanding.

We always suspect a Baptist opponent of feeling himself exceedingly "hard pressed" when he has to demand proof "that baptism has superseded circumcision." We have usually found that to be their *dernier resort*. Our correspondent is *in extremis*, and he bethinks himself of the