

or whether he shall
e has that right to
h an objection the
short of rebellion

have not the know-
herefore, are not fit

hat children should
prehend the nature

of such an objection
among men, and to
et. Young infants
ally and are bound
ises of which they,
t, and with which
their concurrence.

mbers of the com-
knowledge, and yet
tism acknowledge
ct on it every day
ious matters will
under obligations
ing, is absurd and
ection will apply
y did the Hebrew
hat circumcision
t ordinance? It

implied faith in a coming Christ, says St. Paul. Did they attain this knowledge before they were circumcised, or was such knowledge essential, and where is such doctrine taught? Nowhere. But as in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, baptism was to come first and teaching afterwards: "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And in the case of the Jewish child, first came circumcision and then the teaching. See Deut. iv. 9: "But teach them to thy sons and to thy sons' sons." Thus you may see this objection, as all the other objections to infant baptism, insults God, as finding His administration faulty, and is both frivolous and without foundation in reason.

OBJECTION FIFTH.—"Infant baptism is a childish ceremony." Not any more childish than for an adult to walk up to his or her neck in water and then some person bend over and dip the rest of them, and then pretend that is immersing them. Not any more than circumcising a babe. Why do not our friends find fault with God, and term such conduct cruel? But are not infants equally important with men and more innocent, and their consecration to God as momentous an affair as that of prince or sage? What childish work it was for God, as He did, to baptize by sprinkling all the children of the Israelites in the cloud and in the sea. Opponents of infant baptism are always