

introduces the Quakers as reasoning in the following manner: "Water baptism was divinely appointed, and continued in force till the death of Christ; but as that rite had for its object the descent of the Holy Spirit and his divine influences, no sooner was the promised Spirit vouchsafed to our Lord's disciples, than the obligation to regard water baptism entirely ceased. For baptism in water being only an emblem of the promised baptism in the Holy Spirit, why should the former be continued after the latter has taken place?" This, he says, or something like it, if he mistake not, is the Quakers' principal argument; and, for aught he perceives, it is equally forcible with that of his opponent.

I confess I am not sufficiently versed in the Quakers' mode of reasoning to know whether Mr. B. has done them justice. He first makes them say that baptism continued till the death of Christ, and then that the obligation to regard it ceased when the promised Spirit was vouchsafed: So there are two periods for the expiration of baptism. But I have no dispute with the Quakers; I know they are only brought in here as a blind, that Mr. B., by getting behind them, might withdraw more easily. I am persuaded he does not approve of their argument—he only wanted to get rid of the allusion, and he has got rid of it; but it is in the same way as the Quakers get rid of the two ordinances: Nay, far worse; for whereas they do this by arguments which they deem good, but Mr. B. has done it by such reasoning as he himself would be ashamed to adopt. This is Mr. B.'s miserable way of getting rid of the allusion, viz. by giving the reader a Quaker's argument. I will now advert to his other shift, by which,