

come within the range of our argument. It is often said, "*Why baptize an infant?*" What good can it possibly do him?" Now, even if we were unable to conceive of any benefit which the infant could derive from the rite, we should, nevertheless, feel it our duty to administer it, because we are satisfied that we have the Divine warrant for doing so. But what right has any one to *assume* that an infant can get no good from baptism? The doctrine of "baptismal regeneration" we reject, of course, as a dangerous error. But almost every error is the perversion of some truth; baptismal regeneration is, we believe, the perversion of an important truth. It is natural for us to think that the farther we can get away from any error the better; that its extreme opposite must be the truth. But this is a mistake. The extreme opposite to "baptismal regeneration" is the lax notion that baptism is a mere matter of form, "giving a name to the child," as is not unfrequently said. But this is not truth, any more than its opposite, "baptismal regeneration." We say nothing now respecting the benefit which *parents* might derive, and which, indeed, they *ought* to derive, from the dedication of their children to the Triune God in a solemn religious ordinance. We have now to do with the question, "What good can the *infant* himself get from baptism?" When our Lord was upon earth, "they brought young children to Him;" "*infants*" St. Luke calls them: and though the disciples "*rebuked* those that brought them," doubtless thinking that the children were too young to get any good; yet "He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and *blessed* them." Now what was the "blessing" which the Saviour gave to these "*infants*?" Was it a mere matter of form? just empty words? Who can believe that? But if not, it must have been a real, sub