

again with any enquiries or complaints; but your response of the 11th inst. is not entirely satisfactory. The grand object of my note, and the motives which prompted it, seem to have escaped your notice. Indeed, you remotely hint, that if I esteem you a brother, I have not treated you according to the law of Christ!

Now, in reference to these points, allow me to explain myself, if possible, a little more clearly.

1. I have not charged you with any offence. I have not intimated that I have suffered personal wrong by anything you have said or done. If such had been my convictions, I should have certainly called on you in person; for "Christ's plan," (Mat. xviii. 15,) relates to individual and not to public offences of brethren. If I, in public, misrepresent your views, and prejudice my hearers against you, I should rather be amenable to the Holy Spirit's reproof, by Timothy, 1 Epistle v. 20, than to any other portion of the divine record now occurring to me!

2. I did not intend, in my former note, to intimate that I was offended with you; or that I had ever heard that you ever spoke disrespectfully of me or of any of my brethren. On the contrary; I am extremely happy to acknowledge to you, as I have often to my brethren and others, that I have always heard that your remarks in reference to us were usually fraught with great kindness. And I am happy to add, your treatment of me personally has been more respectful and kind than under all circumstances I have had reason to expect.

3. I did not complain because I had heard that you questioned or opposed anything that I or any one with whom I more particularly fraternize, have said or written. By no means. I more highly honor the man who brings every subject broached in the community, to the divine test—the word of God.

4. You are right in saying, that when a thought is written and sent abroad, or uttered before the world, it is then public property; and any one has a right to quote it and comment upon it at pleasure. But,

5. I had often heard that you *attributed to us sentiments which we never held nor advocated*, and the design of my note was to get from under your own hand a *confirmation, explanation or denial* of these reports. And at this very point you have strangely lost sight of my queries!

6. In reference to one of them you explicitly inform me, "I never said to any person that you baptized persons without their making a *profession* of faith and repentance." [I have marked as emphatic "profession." Did you intend that I should thus understand the sentence?] The substance of the question I asked was: Did you or did you not say that we *taught sinners to be baptized on a mere assent to the truth and to repent afterwards*? To this question your answer is very indirect.

7. The next question was: Did you not leave the impression on the company that you understood us to teach, and to encourage sinners to receive immersion before they experienced a "change of