

account, there was scarcely time for the appearance of that particular class, as candidates for baptism. But on the other hand, had it been the practice of the Apostles to baptize infants with their parents, there must have been thousands of such; and yet strange it is, if this theory be true, that there is no mention whatever of their ever having done so. Three thousand believers were baptized on the day of Pentecost, many of whom must have been parents; yet there is no mention of their infant children being baptized, and that too, under circumstances in which, according to Pædo-Baptist views of Peter's words, (Acts ii 39,) they would certainly have insisted on the rite for their little ones. "Men and women" were baptized by Philip at Samaria, but we are not told their children were included.

2.—But another objection is here urged, founded on the baptism of households by the Apostles. The argument in favour of infant baptism from this source is so generally known that I need not state it here. The most that is pleaded from it amounts to no more than a bare possibility that some infants were baptized. But an examination of the three instances given, and a comparison of these with other parts of Scripture, would, I am persuaded, forever dissipate the idea that even the remotest countenance is afforded to the practice of infant baptism, by the cases of household baptism mentioned. Of the Jailor it is said that "he rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." (Acts xvi. 34.) But infants, that is, those too young to make a profession of faith, could neither rejoice nor believe with him, and hence his household who were baptized with him could not have been infants but were such as believed and rejoiced with him. Of the household of Stephanus (1 Cor. i. 16,) it is said by the Apostle that they "had addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints," and were such as the Corinthian believers should submit themselves to, as those who helped and laboured in the gospel.