

did not consider it my duty to be silent in private; but those who heard me, baptists and others, know well that in public I said nothing about either the mode or subject of baptism; and it is well known to all the baptists on whom I call, that I never introduce any thing about baptism, when speaking to them; and in justice to them I may say that they do not trouble me on that head. But though I had sinned in this way, both public and private, it is well known to many that Mr. F. is not the man who ought to *cast the first stone at me*. I do not mean to charge him with knowingly writing falsehood. I believe he would not; but this, while it acquits him, necessarily criminales some other person or persons. The people in Osgood who heard me, are well aware of circumstances which will make them remember that on my first journey I said nothing in preaching on sprinkling or dipping. What, then, will they think of Mr. F.? "Woe unto the world because of offences" (stumbling blocks). What pity that the professed children of the God of truth should lose sight of the importance of every man speaking the truth to his neighbour, and that in consequence of being in such a feverish heat about an ordinance, which, however important in its place, is so distinct from real religion, that a *Sorcerer* may submit to it, as well as a *Paul*. I say not this to depreciate baptism; for it is applicable to the ordinance of the Supper: it applies to every thing connected with religion, which wicked men may do or submit to, and ought to teach us not to *glory in the flesh*. Gal. iii. 3. vi. 12, 13., Phil. iii. 3—6.

But while I admit that Mr. F. did not knowingly write of me what was false, I am far from thinking that he did right in giving such information, even though it had been true. What good could it do to him, to his readers, or to me? What he told was something which he considered foolish and simple; that a missionary went among a mixed people, Scotch, English, and Irish, and, in place of preaching Christ and him crucified, he "laboured to teach infant sprinkling." And did he not wish his readers to view this conduct in the same light in which he viewed it himself? I lately met a missionary who told me that he read Mr. F.'s account of the missionary in Osgood, and that he formed a bad opinion of him; he wondered when he learned who the person referred to was, and that the account was false. This shews the tendency of what Mr. F. wrote. Is the tendency at *variance with his design*? Why could he not tell all the good about himself which he saw proper to tell, without telling evil of his neighbour? Really, Mr. Editor, some of your readers, in going over this part of his

letter, cannot help remembering the two men who went to the Temple to pray, and the one thanked God that he was not like the other, though he had then nothing to do with him, unless to pity and pray for him.

According to Mr. F.'s account of said *offending* missionary, baptism, or rather the mode, appears to be the burden of his teaching—and he was laborious in this matter. "He laboured to teach, &c." No, Sir, though I am by no means ashamed of, or disposed to deny or conceal, my views on baptism; yet I would really be ashamed to be guilty of what my neighbour imputes to me. I can very willingly leave such conduct to him and all others, whether baptists or pedobaptists, who lay such stress on baptism, or rather on their *opinion* about it (for they do not pretend to be infallible, and I hope they will not say that Scripture and their opinion concerning Scripture, are one and the same thing), that they will not admit to church fellowship any who differ from them on this point.

To prevent mistakes, by applying to my last journey what I said of my first, I may say that once, after preaching, when most of the baptists were present, I told the people that I was to state my views of baptism to any who wished to remain and hear me, and did so at that time. This was on the 28th of February, on my last journey: Mr. F.'s letter is dated February 27, and must refer to what was past.

I may add that I do not like to see the passage from Mr. Barnes sent you by Mr. F. Though I see no argument on either side in it, yet its appearing in such a connection, the praise bestowed on the author, with the remarks which follow, will lead many to think that Mr. B. was of the same opinion with Mr. F. on dipping; as it is Mr. F.'s manner to bestow liberal praise on those whose names he brings forward to confirm his own view. It cannot be right that many of your readers should be led into the mistake that Mr. B. believed in immersion while he did not practise it, and that he was, therefore, to be blamed, like Dr. Campbell, who seemed to glory in his inconsistency, in teaching one thing, and doing quite a different thing. I think it is not right that an author's name, and a few words or sentences of his, be brought forward, so as to make people believe that he had opinions which he had not. It is in such a case as this that the whole truth, or none at all, must be told. It is fair to Mr. B. and your readers that the whole of his note on Mal. iii. 6, be given in your Magazine, or as much as belongs to the subject referred to.

Mr. F., I fear, is rather fond of human authority. If he think that the Bible is on his side, is not that enough? He who has