

ish tradition from that mode of argument, by means of which we establish infant baptism, that it is hardly fair to call our method of proof tradition at all. It is not tradition (which, in the Romish sense, means a mysterious legend transmitted from age to age, by mouth, to the rulers of the Church); neither is it a tradition that there is no tradition of the date of infant baptism, but it is *the fact*, that there is no historical allusion to that date; and so, though some, in loose language, may call this proof traditionary (by which Baptists understand legendary) it is, in point of fact, historical. We have dwelt on this the more fully, because we suspect that some persons have been seduced into the Baptist society chiefly through the importunity with which it is impressed on them that infant baptism is dependent for its authority on tradition; by which word, every ear is instinctively caught, and every thought directed to Rome as having handed over to us infant baptism, with other errors. We shall, then, conclude the subject with another illustration of the argument against the Baptist system, derived from what is vulgarly called tradition:—Two centuries ago (not long after the rise of the Baptists) a Third Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, in the Armenian language, was brought to light, having been discovered in Asia; a very specious forgery. Now, supposing a sect to take this Epistle under