

Testament; and yet, as the Acts of the Apostles contain a record of church-history, extending over a period of more than thirty years, dating from the time of our Lord's ascension, there must have been a vast number of children, born of Christian parents, who had arrived at maturity long before the record was finished. How does it happen, then, if the views of our opponents be right, that we have no record of the baptism of any of these children? We are often challenged to produce a single clear case of infant baptism from the New Testament; and if we fail to meet the challenge in a way that is satisfactory to our opponent, he regards the failure as furnishing a clear proof that infant baptism is unwarranted by Scripture. Now let us apply the same principle of reasoning to the view which maintains that the children of professing Christians should not be baptized until they have arrived at adult years. The objector cannot produce from the New Testament a single case of *such* adult baptism. Then, according to his own principle, he must give up his favourite notion of adult baptism; at least, so far as the children of professing Christians are concerned.

We must now refer to the "*household*" baptisms mentioned in the New Testament. The "*household*" of Lydia was baptized, when she became a convert. When the jailor believed, he "was baptized, he and all his, straightway." And St. Paul states that he "baptized the household of Stephanas." (Acts xvi. 15, 33; and 1 Cor. i. 16.) Now it is quite easy to *assume* that there were no infants in any of these families; but this is really wide of the point. We care not if it were even *proved*, which it never can be, that in all these cases the families were composed of adults only. Every one must admit, on reflection, that

the
New
tolic
cons
apos
gard
Ther
thou
shou
Wel
the
with
they
sump
what
was
ing t
of th
hold'
any.
clude
he co
Old
sense
all th
rent
bring
raise
The
given
"hou
then,