

have their explanations ready—but we must say that they appear to us explaining away rather than giving their true meaning. Our critic thinks we were very unfortunate in referring to these fathers. Well, we would like to know what reference made, or what argument advanced, by one on our side, has ever been anything else but unfortunate in the eyes of our opponents. Is there any argument in strong words and contemptuous language? We are referred to the “*Bibliotheca Sacra*” for 1849 for overwhelming proof, from this organ of our own denomination, that regeneration in Irenæus does not refer to baptism. Unfortunately we do not possess the number of that quarterly referred to. We would, however, respectfully inform our critic that it has never been the organ of Congregationalists: it receives contributions from all sections of the Christian church, and the Baptists have been frequent contributors; and now one of the editors is a Baptist. But we have not done with this reference to the *Bib. Sacra*. Was it not plainly intended to make us appear to take a view contrary to that advocated by that quarterly of Irenæus’ language, and that by a writer of our own denomination? On referring to the index of that publication for Vols. I. to XIII, we find that article noticed among the rest. Written by whom? by a Congregationalist? No, but by a “*thorough-paced*” Baptist! Was it honest, or candid, or frank in our critic to write on this matter as he did? We would feel ashamed could we stoop to such a jesuitical trick. Why did he not refer us to Neander on the subject?

Our reference to Polycarp is treated as something so surprising as to be deemed incredible; it is charitably hoped that it was written in mistake, or that it was the error of some bungling compositor—the name of the venerable martyr has never been seen by our critic in connection with this controversy. Be it so. We have seen it mentioned, and even if we had not, it is no objection to our using it. We again call attention to what we professed to find in these fathers—only such *indications and references* as we might expect, believing as we do, “*ex animo*,” that infant baptism was the general practice then. We are told that Polycarp, at his martyrdom, when urged to curse Christ, replied “Six and eighty years have I been his servant, and he never wronged me.” Neander says he was at this time 90 years of age. Now here is a reference to a period within four years of his birth, at the longest computation; it might be only 2 or 3 years, 90 being a round number. This period points out to us his baptism, that being the designation of catechumens, and might have been administered to him at that early age of his life; nor will anything that our critic or his confreres say to the contrary change our mind on the subject.

Our quotation from Principal Halley is dismissed very summarily—characterized as pompous and wordy—with the assurance that numbers of cases are producible of baptized parents whose children were not baptized. On this we have only a word to offer. Halley’s statement was before the British public for a number of years. In preparing a second edition of his work, after having, as he says, attentively read what was written against him, he saw no reason to change or modify anything in his lectures. We may here again accommodate the words of our critic and say, thus what all the learning and talent of pædobaptists in Britain could not accomplish, is easily performed by this unknown Canadian Baptist. Shade of Carson? *et il possible?*

We are told that it will be proved to us that even Tertullian does not refer to infant baptism. It is quite possible the gentleman will prove it to his own satisfaction, but to prove it to us is a very different matter. We claim to