

We had hoped that our correspondent would have stuck to his own motto—"reasoning and not railing"—but are sorry to observe a growing tendency, in every fresh communication, to use hard *words*, in default of hard *arguments*. He once wrote of us, "It is evident, at a glance, that the editor of that periodical (the "*C. I.*") thinks for himself. His first remark in the above letter would seem either to imply a withdrawal of his good opinion of us in that respect, or to cast a doubt upon our honesty, in arguing as we have done. Are, then, our strict Baptist brethren the only people who "think for themselves?"

Were we disposed to employ his own phrase, we should say that in the opinion of not a few "intelligent readers of the New Testament," the "shuffling" has been all on *his* side in this discussion. Thus far, at least, in spite of our thrice-repeated reference to it, we have been unable to extract from him a single remark about the 14th of the Romans. Will he kindly look our argument squarely in the face, and tell us the meaning of the 3rd and 4th verses of that chapter? G. M. must know very well that *we* never raised the question, "whether a Pedo-Baptist may, or may not be a Christian." He has himself tacitly admitted that he may, and we shall certainly not dispute it. But our brother must surely be the subject of some sad mental obliquity, if he cannot see that that admission has a most important bearing upon the issue between us. If it have not, why is he so shy of the chapter referred to?

The retort about "holy water and wax candles," has so much of the appearance of an attempt to "throw dust in people's eyes," that we should really so have regarded it, had not our correspondent so indignantly denounced such ways. It is very easily met, however. The use of these articles is one out of many Romish inventions, dating long after the completion of the Sacred Canon, which, while amply condemned by its general principles, needed no specific prohibition in the Apostolic age. But baptism having superseded circumcision, in the administration of which, children had always been associated with their parents, there was a moral certainty that it would be administered to them, as circumcision had been of old, unless it were expressly limited to adults. That such was the actual result, the prevalence of household baptism, in our judgment, abundantly proves; and that such was the Divine intention, we take to be equally evident from the conspicuous absence of any such limitation. Where now is the analogy between the two cases?

Of course, with these views, we do not admit that "the Scriptures are silent" on the subject of infant baptism; but we none the less value our brother's excellent admonition in regard to "abiding by our Master's orders," and hope he will keep them in view when next about to turn some conscientious Pedo-Baptist brother from the Lord's table!

As to our proving that baptism upon profession of faith was to be confined to Jews and heathen, it will be quite time enough for us to do that, when G. M., or any one else, can adduce from the New Testament, an instance of the opposite character, viz., that of a child born of christian parentage, being baptized on his making such a profession; or of a Judaizing teacher complaining that Christianity cut off the children from the covenant relationship which the Patriarchal and Mosaic economies assigned them.

The question as to how far the quotation from Dr. Davidson repre-