

the most learned of the German divines are found on the same side. In support of the same idea that it did not exist prior to the Christian era, Dr. Stuart, of Andover, enquires, "What Philo and Josephus and the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan said or hinted as to the baptism of proselytes? The answer to this question is, *Nothing*. In all these writers, so far as their works have yet been examined, there appears a deep and universal silence on the subject of baptizing proselytes." Again: "In fine, we are destitute of any early testimony to the practice of proselyte baptism antecedently to the Christian era. No account of any other (initiatory rite than circumcision) is found in the Old Testament; none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, Joseph the blind—none in Philo, Josephus, or any of the earlier Christian writers."

But besides these, we should be satisfied from the New Testament that there was no such rite at the time referred to. 1. In reply to our Lord's inquiry, "The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men?" The chief priests and elders would be at no great loss to reply, had John only adopted the rites from others, either Jews or Gentiles. 2. The enquiry made of John himself, 'Why baptizest thou?' John i. 25, plainly implies that baptism was a new rite, and (since it was one not civil but religious) a rite for which a divine warrant might justly be demanded. 3. The language employed in Matt. iii. 1. and many other passages, also appear plainly to point out John's office as a new one. He is there called *The Baptist*. But there is no propriety in this, if proselyte baptism was then practised; for then were there *many* baptizers, and no one could be properly designated *the* Baptizer. 4. John expressly ascribes his commission to

baptize immediately to God, John i. 33. But if proselyte baptism existed, it was plainly of men, a mere Rabbinical tradition, for the Old Testament did not enjoin it.

Your view of discipleship, and the manner of making disciples, I shall consider in another number.

ALPHA.

---

MR. FRASER AND MR. M'KILLICAN.

We have received a letter from Mr. M'Killican, in reply to Mr. Fraser's last; and though justice may seem to require that he should be heard as often as his antagonist, yet from regard to both these brethren, and to the cause in which they both labour, we think it our duty to put a stop to this controversy, as far we are concerned. We regret that we have unwillingly been the means of commencing it; an acknowledgment which we certainly would not have incurred the necessity of making, could we have foreseen the extent to which it would have been carried, and the aspect which it has now assumed.

The following statement has been drawn up by two Ministers of this city, to whom the parties have agreed to refer the decision of the case:

"We think we are bound to declare, in justice to Mr. M'Killican, that, in our humble opinion, nothing has been established by his opponent in the slightest degree injurious to his character or integrity. The original charge brought against him by Mr. F. is evidently founded on a mis-statement or partial representation made to him, or misunderstood by him; and even though it had been true to the letter, we see nothing criminal in it. We regret that Mr. F. did not abide by the original charge, which had reference to Osgood, and that, instead of doing so, he changed the ground to Breadal-