















































know that there was variety of practice. What could have caused the variety? There are a number of options. We have already proposed the difference between babies born before and after their parents' baptism. Another option would be different policies for Jews, who circumcised their children, and Gentiles who did not. It is also possible that variety was introduced as the church spread into different places. The evidence from the New Testament that babies were baptised is impressive, though not conclusive. The evidence that *all* Christian babies were baptised is of course much weaker. While the New Testament offers no positive evidence for such a variety of practice, the later existence of a variety which is widespread, enduring and unchallenged leads us as seismologists to enquire about its origins and to ask whether it might not go back to the apostolic church. Such a hypothesis would explain the fact that we have no evidence for any objection in principle against either the baptism or the non-baptism of babies. This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that as far back as we have unequivocal evidence of how Christian children were initiated (early third century) we find variety. There is no evidence against the existence of such variety in the first and second centuries.

So what conclusion do we reach as twenty-first-century seismologists, drawing on the reports of witnesses from closer to the epicentre of the earthquake? Our evidence has not been confined to those witnesses residing at the epicentre itself but has also been drawn from nearby witnesses who witnessed the more immediate after-effects. This evidence leads to a number of conclusions. The meagre evidence from the first two centuries is consistent with the practice of infant baptism but does not demand it. The evidence from the third and fourth centuries unambiguously reveals a diversity in practice where the initiation of Christian children is concerned. There is a total lack of evidence in the first four centuries of any objection *in principle* to either the baptism or the non-baptism of babies. Given this evidence, what is most likely to have occurred in the apostolic church? That the practice of infant baptism was unknown seems to me to be the least likely hypothesis. That it was practised seems very likely. That it was *universally* practised is much less likely given the freedom that later Christians felt not to baptise their children.