

churches, he is free of blame, but he is represented as teaching that "the *Apostles* and all the church until four or five hundred years ago understood by baptism *immersion*, and never sprinkled any body except the sick." We don't go to uninspired history to learn what was the practice of the Apostles. We go to their own writings which are as open to the members of the Church as to Prof. Paine. We are willing to hear what he has to say as a teacher of history, but it would be very unwise to accept his historical report without examination, especially if it has a bearing on Christian faith or practice. Even Dr. Carson who never, I am persuaded, made an incorrect statement intentionally, has so represented the views of Cyprian as to call forth the following from Prof. Wilson:—"A statement more completely at variance with ancient record we have seldom detected in the works of any author of character, and we are not, therefore, surprised at the strong language of Dr. Halley, when he says, 'Either the writer of these assertions is not a reader of Cyprian, or he is not an honest man.'" Paul commended the Berians because they would not take *his* word without examination.

To return to Aristotle's baptism of the African coast. I *affirmed* in a jocular mood never supposing that any one would be ridiculous enough to contradict it, that the sea coast is covered by the tide, not by being *dipped*, or *plunged*, or *immersed* into it. How does the Ed. M. meet this? He opposes to me the testimony of Paine that *immersion* was the practice of the ancient Church! and of Canon Lightfoot who expounds Paul's word to the Colossians (buried with him in baptism, &c.) as *implying immersion*! Had I stated that Saint John is not the Capital of N. Brunswick, there would be as much sense in opposing to me the testimony of Lord Dufferin and Gov. Archibald that Halifax is the Capital of Nova Scotia.

In my letter to the *Witness*, I *expressly* stated that *as far as argument goes* the Baptists are welcome to the history, yet as if history was the sheet anchor, a great part of the reply consists of a historical statement of Paine. It is this likely that has deceived poor J. Brown of Cow Bay, who has fallen into the mistake that I was leaving the Bible to found on history, when I am pleading against an appeal to history in favor of the Bible and in opposition to Baptists. Suppose all Paine states to be true, except that the term *primitive* used by himself and Coleman, and the terms *original* and *normal* used by Schaff, might be understood to make the Apostles responsible for the aberrations of the ancient Church, we are no nearer to the solution of the questions—What is baptism?—How is baptism to be administered? Suppose that it is fully ascertained and admitted that *Baptism by sprinkling* was ridiculed by the Devil's ministers, who transformed themselves into the Apostles of Christ, and opposed Paul at Corinth, or by Diotrephes, loving pre-eminence, who rejected John, and that through their activity, compassing sea and land to make proselytes, it was universally abandoned and *immersion*, with all its superstitious and shameless appendages, substituted in its room, we must still come to the Scripture to learn whether the practice of the Church has the sanction of her divine Head. The Israelites had not dwell in Booths at the feast of tabernacles from the time of Joshua till the end of the Babylonish captivity, but the practice was revived under Nehemiah and Ezra, because "they found *written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses*, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in

the f  
man

We c  
crowe

But

forme

that t

which

ment

God a

suppo

ish ci

of his

never

had b

The A

than t

is to b

of his

true, a

reader

to the

appeal

perpetu

ordinar

sation.

circum

long ex

public

baptism

blame

The

from th

stration

He mo

design

furnish

knowle

After

into th

quarter

of figs.

My t

But yo

of Aug

who fav

of the l

God's t