

clergymen present seemed to call these statements in question.—If the Baptists are *historically* right, and we wrong,—Let us administer by immersion as the rule, and use (other!) methods in cases of necessity. If not, will some one tell us why not?" Prof. Paine, teaching such doctrine in a *Congregational* Seminary, is not an honest man, and his historical report cannot be accepted without examination. History furnishes proof of strange doings in the Church.

The appeal to the testimony of Paine and Park, and to the silence of the other clergymen present at the examination, is prefaced by the following statement:—"The bold affirmations of some obscure Pedobaptists, as to what history says on the subject, fade away into thin air, when men who ought to know, and do know, speak." We have here a specimen of that contemptible trickery which is not uncommon with our immersionist friends. This closes the ears of Baptists to all that may be said on the opposite side, no matter by whom. He is an *obscure Pedobaptist*. And weak-kneed Pedobaptists will allow themselves to be frightened into silence, lest they should be counted *obscure*. I am perfectly contented to be numbered with *obscure Pedobaptists*, and, as Luther said when he was represented as possessed with the Devil, "come, hear the Devil's arguments against the mass," I say, "come, hear the obscure Pedobaptist's arguments against Baptismal immersion." The writer of the article in question cannot have read the replies of Prof. Wilson, late of the Royal College, Belfast, and of Dr. Halley, to Dr. A. Carson, or he would not have made such an assertion. These were not *obscure Pedobaptists*. If he read Wilson on the *historical* argument, he will begin to suspect that Paine may be more dogmatic than learned, that Park is too easily cowed by the bold dicta of professorial greatness, and that the other clergymen were too timid to express an opinion in the presence of their superiors.

But, so far as argument is concerned, (no farther), I am willing to give the Baptists the history. The mystery of iniquity was at work in the Churches before the Apostles died,—has been developing in various forms till now, and at the present hour a far greater number, comprehending men of superior intellect and erudition, maintain the infallibility of the Pope—not *obscure Papists* at all—than all the immersionists in the world: they are as positive they are right as Baptists are; are as much irritated as Baptists are, when their peculiar views are called in question, and are as zealous to bring disciples into their fold as Baptists are. It seems to be pretty well authenticated that there were persons in Galatia who were so zealous for the spiritual interests of Christians in that region, so anxious to attach them more closely to themselves, that they sought to *exclude Paul and his fellow-laborers*; that others, in the sphere of John's labors, *refused to receive him and his brethren*, and turned them out of the Church who were willing to own them. Must it then appear impossible that there should arise, even under the eyes of the Apostles, men who, dissatisfied with Jewish *sprinklings*, thought this advanced dispensation demanded something more grand and imposing, and insisted that the disciples should all be *dipped*!