

its special patronage, and put it forth to the world as equally canonical, or as a rival to St. Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, how would the Baptist refute the claim of the newly discovered manuscript? His only method would be the following:—he would, no doubt, say, "it is very strange that, if this Epistle be as it pretends, a genuine production, it never was heard of for sixteen centuries? How did it happen that it never found its way into the catalogue of Scripture handed down to us? Surely the earliest ages of Christianity, which had the best opportunity for deciding the question, would have recognized it, if genuine; and if it ever formed part of Holy Scripture, it could not have dropped out of the book unnoticed. When the canon of Scripture was compiled, it could not have been acknowledged; because, had it been acknowledged, it never could have been allowed to escape from the sacred volume without remonstrance." Now, let the Baptists apply this same valid reasoning to their peculiar system, and they must come to the same conclusion, viz:—that had adult baptism been the exclusive practice of the earliest and purest ages, the Christian world could never have been so completely revolutionized that infant baptism could have been introduced, either surreptitiously without detection, or openly without rebuke. The practice of infant baptism is proved Apostoli-