

and will be so interpreted until better reasons are adduced for thinking and judging otherwise. To think, friend Davidson, that you have a whole armoury of arguments against the propositions, facts, and proofs contained in my letters, and that you withhold them when you have the fullest liberty to utter, illustrate, and enforce them through the same "organ" used by me, especially when you perceive the necessity of defending the Baptists from what is, according to your own words, "libelously false"; I say, my dear sir, to think you have the power and not the will to defend your brotherhood and to maintain truth against my error, is wholly inconceivable upon any principle, human or divine.

Want of time, and want of inclination, to engage in controversy, are standing apologies that the readers of the *Witness*, both Baptists and Disciples, know well how to explain. The pious Roman has no time, and not the least shade of a disposition, to converse with a protestant upon existing differences; the good Episcopalian has too many engagements, and a corresponding want of will, to speak with a Methodist or Congregationalist upon their respective views; the Congregationalist seldom has time, and never inclination, to enter into conversation with a Baptist concerning baptism or regeneration. But I have always found that the Papist had plenty of time, and abundance of will, to speak unfairly and uncandidly of the protestant; the Episcopalian finds opportunity, privately, or perhaps in the pulpit, to declaim against the Methodist and Dissenter; the Methodist does not often lose an occasion of disproving what he is assured he can disprove; and the Baptist, so far as I have observed, also acts upon this general and almost universal principle of arguing against what he finds himself able to refute. Whether any of these remarks apply to the case before me, I leave others to judge; but I incline to the conclusion that you decline a more elaborate answer to my letters because you mentally and religiously feel that the positions they embrace are not easily handled.

I appreciate what you say about my love of controversy and your love of peace. My love of controversy is well known. I love it the same as I love duty. When invited to a community where the truth is opposed, and when specially requested to contend for the truth against errorists of any or of every class, Universalist or Partialist, I am free to say that I shall make myself guilty of listening practically to the words of an inspired man, viz. to "earnestly contend for the faith formerly delivered to the saints." The Prince of Peace himself, in one sense, he tells us, "came not to bring peace, but a sword"; and if my friend Davidson is so much of a friend of peace as not to wield the Saviour's sword, or the "sword of the Spirit," I will neither envy nor disturb his love of peace.

In the letters that I have written, it is gratifying to say, have been extensively read, not to say highly approved, as I have evidence from all points of the compass to show; and the discovery that the readers of these letters will now make, that you are too fond of peace, and too much engaged, to respond to them; will, I doubt not, bring them still