

care of Mr. Cronyn, the Warden of the Lunatic Asylum. But this teaching would not be more absurd than the idea of the faith and repentance of sponsors, as they are called, being reckoned to the account of the child.—It is in fact one of the most contemptible fictions of priestcraft that could have been devised; and none but those who are grossly ignorant about the simplest truths, or morally insane, can at all be deceived by it. Scripture truth scorns it—common sense revolts at it—for it is, in reality, a foolish *palpable* LIE imposed upon men by priestly deceivers to uphold their craft.

But the learned Professor of Divinity in King's College, who is paid for teaching such dogmas from the public chest, thus proceeds with his catechumen,—

“*Ques.* How many (sponsors) ought a boy to have? *Ans.* Two God-fathers, and one Godmother!

“*Ques.* How many ought a girl to have? *Ans.* Two Godmothers, and one Godfather!!”

The Apostles of Jesus Christ taught that only believers of the Gospel should be baptized—and they never taught the absurd notion of any human being repenting and believing by proxy.—But Doctor Beaven and his learned confreres not only teach this foolish nonsense, but prescribe that there must be three persons to play the farce—*three* children of riper years “to believe and repent” for each suckling: !—nay more,—he prescribes minutely the proportion of each sex to the sex of the child!! Now, let any person ask the learned Doctor where he has learned all this? Whether the Word of God warrants such clerical prescriptions? And if he were an honest man he would answer—“*the Bible teaches nothing about it*, but the clergy have invented the fiction to uphold the theory of infantile initiation into the Christian Church, which is the main stay of Priestcraft.”

But we give another extract from the Doctor's Catechism to show the difference between his teaching and that of the Apostles. After referring to “the outward and visible sign” in baptism, he asks,—

“*Ques.* What is the inward and spiritual grace? *Ans.* A death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness: for, being by nature children of wrath, we are *hereby* made heirs of Grace!

“*Ques.* What is the meaning of children of grace? *Ans.* Admitted into the grace or favour of our Heavenly Father. Titus iii. 4, 5, 6, 7.”

This is King's College Divinity: !!!—that, so soon as the Christening Water comes in contact with the skin of the infant, it becomes a child of Grace, *i. e.*; it is spiritually regenerated, or changed into the moral likeness of God! and Paul's language to Titus is given by the Professor as a proof of this;—that is, the Doctor assumes that the Apostle and he are of one mind upon this subject!! Now, let us candidly compare the two cases. Doctor Beaven is reasoning about the moral renovation of unconscious infants, Paul about the renovation of men and women who had believed the Gospel. Doctor Beaven is reasoning that the grace or favor of God comes to *infants* through the faith of proxies and the process of christening! Paul is reasoning that the grace or favor of God had appeared to *all* the human family through the death of the Redeemer