

while in the latter case it was perfectly valid, although the subject was a thousand times more unfit?

Our opponents often make a great mistake, in supposing that the adult baptisms mentioned in the New Testament entirely favour their own views. They not unfrequently point to these, and then ask, in triumph, where we can find a single clear case of infant baptism in apostolic times? Now it would be quite easy to rebut this challenge, by defying the objectors to produce a single case of adult baptism, favouring their own peculiar view, from the entire record of apostolic practice. We say, "favouring their own peculiar view." For what is that view, as stated by their own writers, and confirmed by the uniform practice of their churches? Is it not that the children of church-members should remain unbaptized until they grow up, and make a profession of faith in Christ? Then it is quite irrelevant to point to the adult baptisms mentioned in the New Testament; for they afford not the slightest sanction to this view. Without a solitary exception, they are the baptisms of persons who were trained up either in Judaism or heathenism, and who became converts to Christianity under the preaching of the Gospel. But this simply supports the view which, as we have already stated, is held by ourselves in common with our opponents, and is, therefore, quite irrelevant to the matter in dispute. They contend that it is wrong for Christian parents to present their infant children for baptism; and that in all cases they should remain unbaptized until they have grown up, and make an intelligent profession of faith in Christ. Now where have we, in any of the apostolic writings, any intimation of the baptism of an adult whose parents were Christians at the time of his birth? Not one such case can be found in the entire New