

out number, of the plain and abundant support their system receives from the Scriptures. Appeals to other sources, they have long and loudly condemned. And yet, in their controversial writings, with much apparent delight, they produce names in abundance, and encumber a scriptural subject, with human authorities. If they can prove their system from the scriptures alone, let them do so. If they cannot, let them candidly acknowledge it. But it looks a little strange, that they should marshal together the opinions and dogmas of men, when the Scriptures themselves so plainly and fully demonstrate their views. And to add to their inconsistency in this business, they first condemn all resource to human authority, and then "greedily accumulate" every scattered fragment of divines, poets, and historians, which seems in any measure to favour their notions.

The advertisement which preceded Mr. Richey's publication, is declared by the Editor of the Magazine, to have charged Mr. C. with "wilful misrepresentation." That 'wilful *misinterpretation*' is charged against many baptist writers in that notice, is an undeniable fact; and if proof is needed to corroborate this allegation, we need only mention that "Jeremy Taylor's *Baptists Justified*" was republished by a Baptist Preacher a few years since, as making concessions of vast importance to the Baptist argument, whereas the Bishop himself deemed the arguments he had written as sophistical and unworthy of notice: but Mr. C. is only said to have added "another specimen to the mountain pile of misrepresentation." We leave it to our readers to decide, whether Mr. C. is justly chargeable with misrepresentation, according to the view we have taken of that subject. He has given us the mere opinions of certain Pedobaptists—these opinions are, in nearly all cases "extracted from those works in which the writers do not treat on the controverted subject, and wherein they would express themselves with caution,"—these apparently careless or incidental expressions do not concede the whole point at issue—moreover they are introduced to sanction the system of the Baptists, which system their authors shew they utterly disregarded by a contrary practice. If these Pedobaptists considered the views of the Baptists exclusively scriptural, they must have been notoriously perverse and insincere in practising an unscriptural and invalid baptism; if they did not consider them exclusively scriptural, then of what use is their introduction into the controversy. As to the odium of the advertisement, we may perhaps think it worth our while to notice it, when the Editor has cleared himself of the odium which must rest upon him, for allowing an unintentional charge of falsehood against Mr. Richey, to be circulated over the whole province for two months, without attempting in any way to correct so great and grievous an error.

We notice one more particular in this modest editorial. "Mr. R.'s friends would do well to check the SCHOOL-BOY exultation,