

GOLD REFIN'D;

O R,

Baptism in its Primitive Purity.

Proving Baptism in Water an Holy Institution of Jesus Christ, and to continue in the Church to the End of the World.

WHEREIN

It is clearly evinced, That *Baptizo*, or Baptism, is not Asperision or Sprinkling, or pouring a little Water upon the Face, or any other part of the Body: But that it is *Immersion*, or dipping the whole Body, &c.

Also that Believers are only the true Subjects (and not Infants) of that holy Sacrament.

Likewise Mr. *Smythies* Arguments for Infant-Baptism in his late Book, entitled, *The Non-Communicant*, (and all other Objections) fully answered.

By BENJ. KEACH,

Author of ΤΡΟΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ, A Key
to open Scripture-Metaphors.

Isa. 1. 22. *Thy Silver is become Dross.*

London, Printed for the Author, and are to be sold
by *Nathaniel Crouch*, at the sign of the Bell in
the *Poultry*. 1689.

GOLD REFIN'D;
OR,
Baptism in its Primitive Purity.

Proving Baptism in Water an Holy Institution of Jesus Christ, and to continue
in the Church to the End of the World.

WHEREIN

It is clearly evinced, That *Baptizo*, or Baptism, is not Aspersion or Sprinkling, or pouring a little
Water

upon the Face, or any other part of the Body: But that it is *Immersion*, or dipping the whole
Body, &c.

Also that Believers are only the true Subjects (and not Infants) of that holy Sacrament.

Likewise Mr. *Smythies* Arguments for Infant-Baptism in his late Book, entitled, *The Non-Communicant*, (and all other Objections) fully answered.

By *BENJAMIN KEACH*, Author of ΤΡΟΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ, A Key to open Scripture-Metaphors.
Isa. 1:22.

Thy Silver is become Dross.

London, Printed for the Author, and are to be sold by *Nathaniel Crouch*, at the sign of the Bell in
the *Poultry*. 1689.

Edited and formatted by Simon Wartanian.



Figure 1 - <http://gallery.wacom.com/gallery/41371055/Ilustracao-Benjamin-Keach>

Foreword by Simon Wartanian

This work has been compiled using the automatic transcription from Early English Books¹ and supplying it with a scanned version of the book on Google Books.²

- Scriptural references have been modernized and Latin numerals have been replaced by Arabic numbers.
- Spellings have been updated and modernized (this is the case also in the footnotes and quotations).
- Scriptural references in the footnotes have been moved to the text.
- Scriptural references have been added to citations which did not have the references.
- Some unnecessary footnotes have been left out.
- Headings have been added to make the book more readable and easily accessible (in addition to the headings provided in the original).
- Quotation marks have been added to identify (Scripture) quotes.

¹ <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A47535.0001.001/1:2?rgn=div1;view=toc>

² https://books.google.nl/books?id=YXRmAAAAcAAJ&hl=nl&source=gbs_navlinks_s

Table of Contents

Foreword by Simon Wartanian.....	4
THE EPISTLE To all that love our Lord Jesus Christ in Sincerity.....	10
Occasion for this work and the search for the meaning of <i>Baptizo</i>	10
The current controversy around <i>baptizo</i> and Rantism.....	10
Signification of baptism and the defense of an antichristian tradition.	11
Argument for Infant-Baptism from the Abrahamic Covenant.....	12
Advertisement.	13
1 – Wherein the Baptism of Water is proved to be that intended in the Commission, and so a standing Ordinance till the End of the World.....	14
Water Baptism an Institution of Christ.	14
Objection: The Commission does not mention water, but speaks about baptism of the Holy Spirit.	15
Objection: The Apostle shows that men had power to give the Holy Spirit.....	15
Water Baptism an Ordinance of Christ to the end of the World.....	16
Objection: They were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus not the Trinity, therefore, it is not the same Baptism.	18
Objection: John’s Baptism (with Water) is opposed to Christian Baptism.....	19
Objection: Paul was not sent to baptize and thanked God that he baptized a few households.....	23
Question: Didn’t John the Baptist have a commission to baptize?	24
Objection: Biblical baptism was lost in the Apostacy, how can it be restored again?	25
2 – Shewing what Baptism is from the literal and true genuine and proper Signification of the word Baptism.	26
Difference between dipping and sprinkling.....	26
Objection: <i>Baptizo</i> is not only to dip and overwhelm, but also to wash.	27
3 – Proving that Baptism is dipping, plunging, and covering the Body all over in Water from the Practice of the Primitive Times.	31
John’s baptism was plunging and dipping.	31
Jesus’ and the Ethiopian Eunuch’s baptism were by dipping.	32
Objection: Baptism signifies sprinkling as well as dipping.....	33
Objection: <i>Baptizo</i> will bear the meaning of washing.	34

Objection: The Pharisees are said to baptize their hands, vessels, cups, pots and beds in Mark 7:4.	34
Objection: They lived in a hot country and dipped, but we live in cool climate and that would lead to the death of some.	34
Objection: Why must the whole body be dipped, can't only one part be dipped?	35
4 – Proving that Baptism is Dipping, Plunging, or Burying the whole Body in Water, In the Name, &c. from the Spiritual or Metaphorical signification of this Gospel-Ordinance or Administration.	37
Baptism and the Lord's Supper.	37
Baptism signifies the death, burial and resurrection of Christ.	38
Objection: Do you acknowledge that baptism signifies our being washed in the blood of Christ?	41
5 – Proving Baptism to be Immerging or Dipping, from those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms spoken of in Scripture.	45
Way great Afflictions are called Baptism.	45
Baptism of the Holy Ghost.	45
What it is to be baptized with the Spirit.	46
Objection: Since baptism of the Spirit was by pouring, why may not water baptism be administered so too?	47
Baptism of Israel in the cloud and in the sea (1 Corinthians 10).	48
Conclusion.	48
6 – Proving Believers, or Adult Persons, only to be the Subjects of Baptism, from Christ's great Commission, Matt. 28.	50
Objection: Dipping may only be practiced when no danger is present for a person's life.	51
Objection: Where it is possible, baptism may be by dipping and immersion, but it can't be necessary because God loves mercy rather than sacrifice.	52
7 – Proving Believers to be the only true Subjects of Baptism, from the Apostles Doctrine, and the Practice of the Primitive Churches.	54
Acts 2	54
Acts 8	54
Acts 10, 16 and 18.	55
Objection: Believers baptism was only in the Apostles' time when the church was in its infancy.	56
Objection: Infant-Baptism is nowhere forbidden.	57
Objection: Adults were baptized at the first preaching of the Gospel, but afterwards their children had a right to baptism.	57

8 – Proving Believers the only true Subjects of Baptism from the special ends of this holy Sacrament.....	59
Baptism is a sign inward grace, that is, union in Christ’s death, burial and resurrection.....	59
The sign and the thing signified as a motive and reason.....	59
Christ’s burial and resurrection is a motive and argument for our spiritual death and resurrection.	59
Baptism teaches us to die to sin.	60
Baptism shows the believers union with Christ.....	60
Baptism is a sign of the Covenant on God’s part.....	61
Baptism testifies to the genuineness of repentance for the remission of sins.	61
Baptism signifies regeneration.	62
Baptism is the covenant of a good conscience before God.....	62
Baptism is the entrance to the Visible Church and all other Ordinances and Privileges thereof.....	63
9 – Containing several other Arguments, proving, why not Infants, but Believers only, are the true Subjects of Baptism.	64
Argument I: If there is only command to baptize believers, then infants should not be baptized.	64
Objection: The Disciples were commanded to “baptize all nations” and children are part of the nations.	64
Objection: Infants are disciples, and therefore may be baptized.....	64
Objection: Since circumcision belonged to infants, and it is called a yoke laid upon the necks of the disciples, therefore, infants are disciples.....	65
Argument II: If Faith and Repentance is required, then none are to be baptized but believers.....	66
Argument III: There is no precedent that any besides those who professed faith and repentance were baptized.	66
Argument IV: Paul declared the whole counsel of God, but did not declare Infant Baptism.....	67
Argument V: Whatever is necessary to faith and practice is in the Scriptures, but Infant Baptism is not.....	68
Argument VI: No one was commended by God for baptizing any child nor reproved for the neglect thereof, therefore, Infant-Baptism is not of God.	70
Argument VII: Infant Baptism makes Jesus Christ less faithful and clear than Moses.	70
The different grounds proposed for Infant-Baptism.	71
Argument VIII: That ordinance to which no promise for obedience or punishment for neglect is made, is no ordinance of God; such is Infant-Baptism.....	71

10 – Wherein the great Arguments, and pretended Scripture-Proofs for Infant-Baptism, concerning the Covenant Circumcision, and Infants Church-membership, are Examined, and Answered.	73
I. Argument from the Covenant made with Abraham.	73
Was not circumcision a seal of the Covenant of Grace then as baptism is now?	75
Objection: The Promise and Covenant of God was to Abraham and his natural offspring.	76
Objection: Doesn't baptism replace circumcision?	77
Question: Why may not children be baptized as they were circumcised heretofore?	79
Objection: Children were members of the Jewish Church with their parents and they are still so.	80
Objection: Jews and their children were broken off, but the Gentiles and their children were ingrafted in their place.	81
Objection: If the children of believer don't receive baptism then this makes them less privileged than children under the Law.	83
Objection: What hope do we have of our infants if they are not to be baptized nor that they are church members?	85
11 – Wherein many other pretended Scripture-Poofs and Arguments for the baptizing of Infants are answered, as that, Suffer little Children to come unto me, &c. and, Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the Kingdom of God, &c.	87
Objection: The Kingdom of Heaven belongs to infants, therefore, baptism must also belong to them.	87
Objection: There is no other way to regenerate infants than by baptism, therefore, they should be baptized.	88
The Proof from whole Households examined.	90
Objection: Whole Households were baptized, therefore some children were also baptized.	90
The Philippian Jailor and his household (Acts 16:33).	91
Crispus and his household (Acts 18:8).	91
Stephanus and his household (1 Corinthians 1:16).	91
Lydia and her household (Acts 16:14-15).	91
The Promise is to you and to your Children (Acts 2:39).	92
The Proof for Infant-Baptism—(<i>“Else were your Children unclean”</i> , 1 Corinthians 7:14) answered.	93
Objection: The children of believers are federally holy and thus are to be baptized.	93
A proof from Mark 16:16.	96
Mr. <i>Smythies</i> Argument, that Infants are Believers.	96

Faith nor Baptism is not required of Infants, yet they may be saved.....	97
What Confusion is here among the Pedo-Baptists?	97
12 – Containing an Answer to several other Arguments brought for Infant-Baptism.....	99
Objection: Infant-Baptism is proved by consequences.	99
Objection: The New Testament says nothing against Infant-Baptism.....	99
Objection: Our Savior took little children in His arms, but does not admit them into His Church?	101
Objection: Infants were commonly baptized before the Great Commission and thus is something common.	102
Objection: The Jews were accustomed to baptize proselyte parents and children.	102
Objection: But there are divers very learned Men who hold Infant-Baptism.	103
Objection: The Anabaptists lie under great reproaches.....	105
Objection: Anabaptists were stigmatized and refuse to obey kings and oaths. What about the Munster- Story?	106
Objection: But you lay too much stress upon Baptism?.....	107
Objection: Nowhere is it said that women received the Lord’s Supper, in the same way we should baptize infants.	107
Objection: Baptists have no ground to baptize children grown in Christendom as those in the New Testament were converts from Judaism or Paganism.....	108
Objection: How can baptism be by dipping if some were baptized in houses?	109
Objection: There were a multitude of children baptized to Moses in the cloud and in the sea (1 Corinthians 10:2).	109
13 – Shewing the evil Consequences, Absurdities, and Contradictions, that attend Infant-Baptism, as ‘tis Asserted and Practiced.	110
Objection: What harm is there in Infant-Baptism?.....	110
14 – Proving Baptism a great and glorious Ordinance, and that ‘tis initiating or an In-let into the Church. ...	114
Principle of Christ’s Doctrine and a Great Ordinance.....	114
Baptism is an initiating ordinance.....	115
Objection: Only some of the church of Romans were baptized (Romans 6:3).....	116
Objection: How can you deny a godly person who has lively faith into the church?	119
Objection: Doesn’t the Apostle say that the Romans received those weak in the faith (Romans 14:1)?	119

THE EPISTLE To all that love our Lord Jesus Christ in Sincerity.

Occasion for this work and the search for the meaning of *Baptizo*.

It may possibly be a little wondered at, that I should write at this time anything upon this Subject, which may seem to revive the Controversy, of which little has been written of late Years; it may therefore seem necessary I should speak something by way of Apology³ for myself. First of all, I must tell you, that this Treatise was written the last Summer, although it had no Birth till now, and many know what Provocations I had about that time to write in behalf of our Practice in respect of Baptism: having heard how a worthy Minister (whom I respect and honor) who liveth not far off from me, had publicly preached up the baptizing of little Babes, bearing very hard upon those of our Persuasion; and could I have had a friendly Conference with him, 'tis like this had not seen the Sun. Besides, we were challenged to dispute the Point with some Ministers of the Church of *England* much about the same time, not far from *London*: But though they had rendered us as odious as they well could (and as if we had nothing to say for our Practice, *viz.* for baptizing Men and Women) yet when all came to all, none of them would appear to defend what they had spoken, which caused some to conclude it did behoove me, or some other to write something about it. Moreover, a godly Friend (of some Eminency in *London*) sent for me to his House (who, though a Baptist, yet walks with our Brethren called Independents) and desired me that I would be pleased to write a Sheet or two upon Baptism, chiefly to shew what it was, since⁴ he perceived many good People were mistaken therein, and did, as he conceived, take that to be Baptism, or Baptizing, which was not the thing, he having examined what the Greek word βαπτίζω *Baptizo* did signify, and found by *Lexicons*, and by conferring with Scholars, it did not signify Aspersion, Sprinkling, nor pouring, nor any other Washing than *Immersion*, or *total dipping* of the Body in Water; and therefore did conclude it necessary this thing should be further opened, and would have me to consider with one able Person who well understood the Greek Tongue about it, which I was willing to do: Nay, and besides all this, when we wrote our *Key to open Scripture-Metaphors*, we promised the Reader we would write something concerning this very matter, as you may see if you read *Pag. 38, Part 2*, which, though it be above six Years ago, we never performed till now. All these things considered together, with that great Impulse of Spirit I found to do it, I thought I had a sufficient Call to undertake the Work, although I know it has been more effectually managed by far abler Pens some Years since, yet I conclude (with others) a short Tract of a small Price might come into more Hands than bigger Volumes would do.

The current controversy around *baptizo* and Rantism.

Moreover I must confess, I have not a little wondered to see so many *Eminent Fathers*, and *famous Divines*, both *Ancient* and *Modern*, speaking so *clearly* as to the literal, proper and genuine Signification of the word *Baptizo*, and yet finding so many wise and learned Men of late so strangely contradicting themselves by their own Practice. I am sure if Prejudice and Partiality were laid aside, and Men would deal faithfully with their

³ That is—in way of defense. – Simon

⁴ In the original “since”, which is an archaic form of since. It is everywhere replaced in this rework. – Simon

own Consciences, they must confess our Practice of *Immersion (or dipping Believers in Water in the Name of the Father, &c.)* must of necessity be congruous both with the literal and spiritual Signification of the word *Baptism*, and Practice of the Apostles and Primitive Church; and so it will be found one day, and that they have no just cause given them to reproach or charge us as they do: who laying the Foundation of their own House false, or not according to the Pattern; and not contented so to do neither, but vilify and reproach them who build exactly according to the Direction of the Master-Builder: We marvel how they can satisfy themselves to keep up that Practice of theirs of *Rantism*⁵, since there is nothing to be said in the Defense of it from God's Word; and if once it was laid aside (with the wrong Subject) as an unwarrantable Rite, and they would cleave to the Primitive Institution and Practice, what a glorious Reformation in point of Church-Constitution and Discipline would there be! and what a sweet Harmony and Union would follow amongst us! for there has been no one thing that hath caused like Contention in the Church for many Years, as this of Infants-sprinkling hath. If our Brethren would but lay this seriously to Heart, I can't but think it would put them to a stand or pause about it. It had need lie clear in the Word of God, since so great a stress as the Foundation of their Church in such an eminent manner (in respect of its Constitution) is laid upon it, and it being that main thing that obstructs and hinders that blessed Union and Fellowship amongst so many good Christians as it doth, who hardly in any other things differ at all in any Article of Faith or Practice. And whereas our Brethren seem to fly for Refuge to that indirect and remote Signification of the word *Baptizo* of *washing*, yet how apparent is it, that it means no other Washing but such as is by dipping, swilling, or total wetting that thing, Part, Member, or Person all over it. Water, that is said to be baptized; for though all dipping or baptizing may be called a washing, yet all washing is not dipping, &c. In a proper sense the word *Baptize*, Wilson in his Dictionary saith, *is derived from βαπτίζω, Tingo, to dip, or plunge into the Water, and signifieth primarily such a kind of washing as is used in Bucks where Linnen is plunged and dipt, &c. But how evident it is, that sprinkling, or pouring is no such washing, viz. baptizing.*

Signification of baptism and the defense of an antichristian tradition. *Ainsworth* upon Lev. 15:5 says, to *baptize*, or wash his Flesh, as is expressed ver. 13, 16 meaneth his whole Body; likewise (saith a great Author) the *Hebrews* affirm in every place, *where it is said in the Law of bathing the Flesh, and washing the Clothes of the Unclean, it is not meant but of baptizing the whole Body, &c.* but if the *Greek* word would bear sprinkling or pouring, yet that will not justify Men thus to baptize, because not according to the Usage of the Primitive Church; nor doth it answer or reach the Signification of this Ordinance, which is *the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, together with our Death to Sin, and rising with him to walk in newness of Life*; to represent which great Mystery, it was ordained, as you will find if you read this Treatise. I have been the larger upon this, because if Baptism is nothing less, nor more, nor any other Act than Immersion, or total dipping the whole Body, &c. than abundance of godly Christians must seek after true Baptism; neither can Infants, it appears from hence, be the Subjects of it, since their tender Bodies can't bear it in these cold Climates, without palpable danger of their Lives, as our Opposites confess,

⁵ *Rhantizo* is Greek for "sprinkling". – Simon

and formerly, by woeful Experience, found to be so. Jesus Christ never appointed an ordinance to destroy the Lives of any of his Creatures. But why will not our Brethren keep to the great Institution, and exact Rule of the Primitive Church? Must we content ourselves with that Light which the Church had in respect of this and other Gospel-Truths at the beginning of the Reformation,—since God hath brought forth greater (to the praise of his own rich Grace) in our Days? And why should a Tradition of the Antichristian State, be so zealously defended? The Church will never certainly appear in its Primitive Glory, till this Rubbish be removed; which is nothing less than to take a Stone of *Babylon*, and lay it in *Sion* for a Foundation. Besides, it doth not a little reflect upon the Honor of the Lord Jesus, thus to derogate from his holy Law, who is appointed Heir of both Worlds; who hath settled in his Church that Religion, and every Ordinance thereof, which must remain unalterable to the end of Time, or Consummation of all things. He (as our Annotators well say) is the Builder of God's House, propagating a holy (not a fleshly) Seed for himself; and hath appointed, and fixed on the Matter and Form thereof, as seemed good in his own sight, who is the *brightness of the Father's Glory, and express Image of his Person* (Heb. 1:3), &c. And what an account our Brethren or others will be able to give to him, for presuming to do anything contrary to the Apostolical Constitution, when he comes to judge the Quick and the Dead, I know not.

Argument for Infant-Baptism from the Abrahamic Covenant.

As touching that great Argument for Infant-Baptism, taken from the Covenant made with *Abraham*, though something is here said in Answer, and enough hath been said by others formerly, yet I must acquaint the Reader, there is a most excellent Treatise prepared, written by a very worthy and judicious Person (and ready for a timely Birth) wherein that grand Objection, and all others are answered (beyond what any I think have hitherto done). But if we should grant all they say of *Abraham's* Fleshly Seed, and *Federal Holiness*, yet that will not prove Children to have a Right to Baptism, because Baptism (as well as Circumcision was) is a mere positive Law, and wholly depends on the Will and Pleasure of the Law-giver: which is in this Treatise opened and asserted again and again, and not without good Reason. But lest I should keep the Reader too long at the Door, I shall conclude this Epistle with my hearty Prayers, that God would be pleased in Mercy to open our Brethren's Eyes, or ours, wherein either they or we lie short as touching any part of God's Will, and let us strive to live in Love and Concord together, wherein we do, or can agree. 'Tis Truth I contend for, and that Truth which was once delivered to the Saints, and shall, I hope, whilst I am in the Body, who now (as well as formerly) subscribe myself thy Servant for Jesus sake,

Aug. 6, 1688.

Benj. Keach.

Advertisement.

IF any desire to be furnished that excellent Book, written some times since by Mr. *William Kiffin*, proving no unbaptized Person ought to be admitted to the Lord's Table; may have them at Mr. *Nath. Crouch's*, at the sign of the Bell in the *Poultry*, or at the Authors House in *Southwark*:

1 – Wherein the Baptism of Water is proved to be that intended in the Commission, and so a standing Ordinance till the End of the World.

I Having for many Years last past observed with what strength of Argument some worthy Christians have labored to defend the Sacred Ordinance of Baptism; and how they have endeavored to refine it from all Human Mixtures, to the great Satisfaction and Establishment of many Persons in the Land; yet notwithstanding, finding how that still a Multitude of gracious People remaining very ignorant about it, and others very obstinately and reproachfully do slight and contemn it, casting very scandalous and scurrilous Reflections upon those who practice it according to the Primitive Institution, both from the Pulpit and the Press: I have been put upon writing something further in the Defense of ourselves and Practice herein.

And that I may the more regularly proceed in this Work, I shall endeavor to prove Baptism in Water to be that Baptism which is intended in the Commission; and therefore to abide as an undoubted and standing Ordinance of the Lord Jesus Christ until his second Coming, or the End of the World.

Water Baptism an Institution of Christ.

First of all, it may be necessary to shew you, that this Ordinance was instituted and ordained by our Lord Jesus, and given forth by him soon after he rose from the Dead, and a little before he ascended into Heaven; see Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:16. *“And Jesus came, and spoke unto them, saying, All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: Teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always even to the end of the World.”* The Lord Jesus first of all asserts his Power and Authority. Secondly, he delegates a Power to his Disciples. Thirdly, he subjoins a gracious Promise to them.

1. The Power and Authority which he asserts to himself is, all Power in Heaven and Earth; Power to institute and appoint Laws and Ordinances, how and after what manner God ought in Gospel-Times to be worshipped; Power to give Repentance and Remission of Sins; Power to congregate, to teach, and govern his Church as the supreme Lord, Head, and Ruler thereof; yea, and Power to give Eternal Life to whomsoever he pleaseth. This was inherent in him as God blessed forever, given to him as our Mediator, given to him when he came into the World, but more especially confirmed to him and manifested to be given him at his Resurrection, and Ascension into Heaven. And having declared himself Supreme Lord and Law-giver, He

2. Delegates a Power to his Disciples, *“Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them”*; the Greek word μαθητεύσατε make Disciples, that must be by preaching the Gospel to them, instructing them in the Principles of the Christian Faith, *“teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always to the end of the World”*, that’s the Promise. These are the words of the great Commission, which contains part of the last Will and Testament of the ever blessed Jesus, the glorious Testator of the New Covenant, wherein Baptism is found and expressly given forth, and with as great

Authority, and in as solemn a manner as ever was any Precept or Ordinance that we read of in all the Book of God.

Objection: The Commission does not mention water, but speaks about baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Objection. But 'tis not said, baptize them in Water, it may therefore intend the Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Answer. To which we answer; As 'tis not said baptize them with Water, so 'tis not said baptize them with the Holy Spirit: They were commanded to baptize, that's evident; and that it was Water our Savior did require them to baptize with, and not the Spirit, we prove,

First, Because the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was never by our Savior or his Apostles commanded, it was never enjoyed as a Precept or Duty to be done, but was always mentioned as a Promise, "*He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.*" And again, "*Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence*": It argues great Weakness, or else Willfulness, that Men should see no better how to distinguish between a Baptism that was commanded as a Duty to be done, and a Baptism promised, which was never enjoyed as a Duty.

Secondly, It cannot mean the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, because the Disciples of Christ (nor no Man under Heaven) had ever any such Power delegated or given to them, as to baptize with the Holy Ghost; 'tis strange Persons should be so blind and bold to think (much less to assert) that mere Men can give the Holy Spirit, or administer that Baptism, as if the Holy Ghost was at the disposal of the Will of Man, or that Men know whom to give it to, which indeed only lies hid in the Breast of God himself, who bestows it to whom and in what manner he pleaseth. And therefore,

Thirdly, We do affirm from the Authority of God's Word, that to baptize with the Holy Spirit is the peculiar Prerogative Royal of Jesus Christ, and that he did never empower any Disciple of his to give it, "*He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit.*" The Father by him, and he immediately by himself in his own Person distributes or gives forth of the Spirit according to the good Pleasure of his Will, without imparting with this Sovereign Prerogative, or peculiar Power to any other. Now since Christ's Disciples could not baptize with the Spirit, and yet are commanded to baptize, it follows clearly it must be Water.

Objection: The Apostle shows that men had power to give the Holy Spirit.

Objection. Doth not the Apostle shew that Men had Power to give the Spirit? what else is the meaning of *these words*, he therefore that ministers to you the Spirit (Gal. 3:5)? *it appears that Persons who preached ministered the Spirit.*

Answer. By the Spirit is meant the Gospel, or Word of Christ: as the Law is called "*the Letter*", so is the New Testament called "*the Ministration of the Spirit*" (2 Cor. 3:6). "*The words that I speak unto you, saith Christ, are Spirit*", &c. Doth God (as if the Apostle should say) concur with our Ministry, and give the Spirit to those who hear it, and help us to work Miracles to confirm it? And is this done by our preaching the Law, or by the

hearing of Faith, that is, the Word of Faith, viz. the Gospel (see 2 Cor. 3:2) or by preaching the Word of Christ?

Fourthly, The Baptism in the Commission cannot intend that of the Holy Ghost; because the Spirit's Baptism signifies the miraculous Effusion, or extraordinary Gifts thereof (and not the saving Influences, Graces, and Operations of it) which but a few, and those too in the Primitive Time, did partake of; but the Baptism in the Commission is enjoined on all that are made Disciples in all Nations, and in every Age, even to the end of the World.

Fifthly, It must be Water-Baptism, because our Savior joins it with Repentance and Believing. Now all along in order of Practice these two went together both before this time and also afterwards. You may be sure had it been any other Baptism, it would never have been thus joined together in order of words, with that Baptism that was so united in order of Practice with Repentance and Faith, without the least intimation of anything by our Savior to the contrary.

Sixthly, Because 'tis a Baptism that is to be administered in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and Holy Spirit, how can any with the least shadow of Reason, suppose it should be meant of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, since it is to be administered in the Name of the Holy Spirit? Were any ever baptized with the Holy Spirit in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? The Spirit was that with which they were baptized; and therefore not baptized in the Name of the Spirit.

Seventhly, The only way further to remove this Objection, is to observe what the practice of the Disciples was after the Ascension of Christ in the execution of this great Commission: What was it they baptized with? See Acts 8:36. "*And they came to a certain Water; and the Eunuch said, See, here is Water*" (Acts 8:28). "*They went both down into the Water, and Philip baptized him. Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized?—And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*" (Acts 10:47-48). That Baptism which in the Commission the Lord Jesus commanded his Disciples to baptize with, was the Baptism which they after his Ascension did baptize with; and that it was Water the Scriptures we have now cited do evidently shew; certainly the Apostles well understood what Baptism it was their blessed Master did command them to administer.

Eighthly, Besides, were it not the Baptism of Water which was given to them in the Commission (Matt. 28:19-20). They did that in his Name, *i. e.* by his Authority, which they had no Authority to do, for other Commissions they had not, this being the only place where Water-baptism is mentioned, as being instituted and given in Commission to them to administer, and to all other Disciples and Ministers of Christ to the end of the World.

Water Baptism an Ordinance of Christ to the end of the World.

Now, Secondly, that this Holy Ordinance of Baptism doth continue to the end of the World is evident,

First, Because whatsoever is given forth by Jesus Christ, is given forth by him as he is King, and Mediator of the New Covenant, and as part of his last Will and Testament; and his last Will and Testament, I hope, all will

grant stands in full force and virtue, and every Part and Branch of it unalterable to the end of the World: *“Though it be a Man’s Covenant,”* or Testament, *“yet if it be confirmed, no Man disannulleth, or addeth thereto”* (Gal. 3:15). How much more dangerous than is it for any to disannul, alter, add to, or diminish from the last Will and Testament of the Lord Jesus the Son of God, who received Commandment from the Father what he should say and speak (John 12:49); *“And was faithful to him that appointed him, as a Son over his own House”* (Heb. 3:5)?

Secondly, The Arguments that Men bring against the continuation of Baptism, tend to root out all other Ordinances of the Lord Jesus as well as this. Why may they not deny Preaching to continue, as well as Baptizing, since Teaching is commanded by no other Authority than this? Are they not both expressly given forth and joined together by our Savior in this his last and great Commission?

May I not argue thus; If Teaching continues to the end of the World, Baptism continues? But Teaching none denies to continue, *Ergo* Baptism continues. Do but observe the conjunction between Teaching and Baptizing in the Commission, *“Go, teach all Nations, baptizing them”*; and again, *“teaching them”*, &c. Baptism is fenced in on both sides, ‘tis secured, one would think, (as our Lord Jesus has placed it) from all Force and Violence whatsoever; and that such must be impudently bold as dare attempt to raze it out, or seek to disannul it, and make it of none effect.

Thirdly, The Promise that is subjoined in express words, in the Commission, clearly proves the continuation of this Ordinance; *“And lo, I am with you always to the end of the World”*; not to the end of that Age only as some affirm. See our late Annotators on these words,

I am, and I will be with you; and those who succeed you in the Work of the Ministry, being called of me thereunto, I will be with you, protecting you in that Ordinance, and blessing you, and all other my faithful Ministers, that labor for making me and my Gospel known, with success to the end of the World; not of this Age only, but till the end of the World—or till the World shall be determined, and the New Heavens and the New Earth shall appear.⁶

Fourthly, The practice of the Apostles and Disciples of Christ, after his Ascension into Heaven, clearly proves, that the Baptism of Water doth continue; for how frivolous is that Objection that some make against it, *viz.* it was to abide no longer than till the Baptism of the Spirit (which say they was Christ’s Baptism) took place, seeing it is so evident and plain in the *Acts* of the Apostles, and in divers other places, that it was both taught and practiced, after that great Effusion, or pouring forth of the Holy Spirit, which was the Baptism promised, and was first of all made good to the Apostles and Saints of God at *Jerusalem*; *“When the Day of Pentecost was fully come, and they were all with one accord in one place”* (Acts 2:1-3); by the help and power of which Spirit St. *Peter* preached to those Jews that had put Christ to death: At the hearing of which Sermon, many of them being pricked in their Hearts, cried out, *“What shall we do? Then said Peter, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy*

⁶ Continuation of [Pool’s Annot. on Matt. 28:19-20](#).

Spirit" (Acts 2:37-38). Now the Baptism here enjoined on these Penitents, could not be that of the Spirit; for how absurd would that render the reading of the words, "*Repent, and be baptized with the Spirit, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Spirit*" (Acts 2:38).

Fifthly, But to make it appear yet more fully, that Baptism in Water continued after the coming of the Spirit, or great Effusion of the Holy Ghost (see Acts 10). 'tis said, "*While Peter yet spoke these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word, (that was on Cornelius and those with him). And they of the Circumcision, which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because on the Gentiles also was poured out the Gift of the Holy Ghost*" (Acts 10:45). "*For they heard them speak with Tongues, and magnified God. Then answered Peter*" (Acts 10:46), "*Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we*" (Acts 10:47)? "*And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord*" (Acts 10:48).

Here the very Persons who were baptized with the Holy Spirit, were commanded in the Name (that is, by the Authority) of the Lord Jesus, to be baptized in Water; and it was a thing that no Man did or ought to deny to be their indispensable Duty; so that the highest Gifts or Endowments of the Holy Ghost, cannot excuse or exempt any Persons from this Blessed Ordinance of Baptism in Water; and how bold and daring must that Man needs seem to be, who shall adventure to say, 'tis a low and carnal thing, and I forbid it to such who have the Spirit's Baptism. I would to God this were laid to Heart, for such Men are certainly grown to a great degree of Pride and Arrogance, as well as it argues palpable Blindness, Infidelity and Disobedience, and that they have lost their Way, and go astray in untrodden Paths, who shall speak at such a rate.

Objection: They were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus not the Trinity, therefore, it is not the same Baptism.

Objection. But say some, *The Baptism mentioned by you in both these places, was done in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and not in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and so not according to the Commission, and therefore not the same Baptism.*

Answer. To be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ,⁷ is to be baptized as Christ Instituted, Commanded, and Ordained; and as a Learned Person saith, These words, "*In the Name of Christ*", signifies no more that Baptism was administered only in the Name of Christ, not of the Father and the Holy Ghost, than these words, "*Paul a Servant of Jesus Christ*", argues, that he was a Servant of Christ only, and not of the Father and Holy Ghost also: Or as if those words of *Paul* to the Keeper of the Prison, "*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*", should be thought to free him from a necessity of believing in the other two Persons: for as he that believes aright in Jesus Christ, believes also in the Father and Holy Spirit; so he that is baptized in a right manner, is baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. But because the Lord Jesus more immediately, and as our Sovereign Lord, Law-giver and Mediator, instituted and gave forth this Command, they are said to be baptized in his Name, meaning, they were baptized by his Authority.

⁷ Jewel B. of Sal. Sect. 9. in Confut. Harding.

“Peter,” saith *Cyprian*, “makes mention of Jesus Christ; not as if the Father were to be omitted, but that the Son might be joined to the Father”⁸, &c.

And St. *Austin* saith, “They were commanded to be baptized in the Name of Christ; and though the Father and Holy Ghost were not mentioned, yet we understand they were not otherwise baptized, than in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Why dost thou not apprehend, when it is said of the Son, ‘*All things were made by Him*’, that the Holy Ghost also, though not mentioned, is there likewise understood?”⁹

“To be baptized into Christ Jesus,” (saith *Eulogius*) “signifies, to be baptized according to the Precept of Christ, that is, into the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And that other [*into his Death*] is typically representing his Death in Baptism. The same *Patriarch*, in the same place, a little before saith thus, What is said in the *Acts*, of those that had received the Baptism of *John*, that they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus, denotes, that they were baptized according to the Institution and Doctrine of the Lord Jesus; that is to say, they were baptized into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For so the Lord Jesus Christ taught and commanded his Disciples to baptize (Matt. 28:19-20).”¹⁰

Objection: John’s Baptism (with Water) is opposed to Christian Baptism.

Objection. Notwithstanding what we have said yet, saith the Objector, *John* Baptist opposes his Baptism to the Baptism of Christ; which could not have been done, if the Baptism with Water was an inseparable Companion of Christ’s Doctrine; How could *John* say, “*Verily, I baptize you with Water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost*” (Mark 1:8)? &c. Moreover, if Christ had been commanded to baptize with Water as well as *John*, the words would have run thus, “*Verily, I baptize you with Water only, but he shall baptize you also with the Holy Ghost.*”

Answer. Thus to distinguish the Baptism of Water, and that of the Spirit, into *John’s* and Christ’s, and oppose these two one to the other, as if the one of these were destructive to the other, as if that of *John’s* were his own, and none of Christ’s,¹¹ is very ridiculous, and argues great darkness in the understanding of these opposers of Water-baptism, for ‘tis undeniably evident, that this of Water (as well as that of the Spirit) was given forth by Christ himself, and as part of his last Will and Testament, to abide together with teaching, believing and repenting to the end of the World.

These Men would fain have us believe, that the Baptism of Water was the Baptism of *John’s*, and none of Christ’s, but as if *John* had instituted it, and not Christ, and as if *John* were the Author of it, and Christ the Finisher; whereas nothing is more clear that Christ, (considered as God) was the Author, and the first that ordained, appointed and instituted it to be administered by *John*; and after *John’s* decease, yea, and after his own Death, and Resurrection too, gave order to its continuance. And for the observation of it amongst all

⁸ *Cyprian Epist. 73. ad Jubaian.*

⁹ *Augustin. lib. 3. against Maxim. Bp. of the Arrians, c. 17.*

¹⁰ *Eulogius of Alexandria l. 2. contra Novatian, apud Photium in Bibliotheca.*

¹¹ See Mr. *S. F’s* Baptism before or after Faith.

Nations, our late Annotators also on Matt. 3:5 agree with us exactly herein, "*He (that is, John) was sent to baptize in Water; so as from this time (say they) the Institution of the Sacrament of Baptism must be dated.*"

Nothing can be more evident, than that the Baptism with Water was Christ's Baptism; and howbeit it is called *John's*, as *John* was the first Minister and Messenger from Christ to begin it, "*For, behold, I send my Messenger, and he shall prepare my way before me*", saith Christ (Matt. 11:10; Mal. 3:1). It was Christ's Appointment in whose Name, and not in *John's*, it was begun and dispensed always even in that juncture wherein *John* himself was living; and one would think Men could not be so blind to suppose it ceased in *John*, since our Lord Jesus after his Death and Resurrection, gives special Command for the continuation of it, "*in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*", in all Nations to the end of the World: And in regard also that the Apostles after Christ's Ascension into Heaven preached the same Doctrine of Repentance, and commanded such who were discipled to be baptized in Water (Acts 2:39; 8:16; 10:47), in the Name of the Lord Jesus, which signifies, as we have already shewed, nothing less than according to the Institution of Christ, and that glorious Commission they had received from him.

Therefore *John* Baptized only as Christ's Servant, and it was from Heaven he received Commission to Baptize; and our Lord's Submission to it himself as administered by *John*, to fulfil all righteousness, (that is, as one observes, the Righteousness of his own Law, *i. e.* the Gospel, to be an Example to us, and the Father's glorious Approbation of his Son in his Obedience herein, by a Voice from Heaven at the time of his coming out of the Water) one would think might put an end to these foolish Objections.

Jesus Christ we say, owned Water-baptism to be his Ordinance, by subjecting himself to it, though administered by his servant *John*; and the Father ratified it also, as well as the Holy Ghost, the one by that "*Voice from Heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; and the other in coming down, or descending (in a visible manner) like a Dove, and lighting upon him*" (Matt. 3:16-17). And certainly had not this Ordinance been to abide, our Savior would not have given such a Commission a little before he ascended into Heaven for the continuance of it to the World's end. Nay, if it had been to cease, he would doubtless have given some hint of it, and have told his Disciples plainly when at *Jerusalem*, they should be anointed with Power from on High, they should go and Preach the Gospel to all the World, or make Disciples of the Nations, but not baptize them anymore, for that the way of Repentance and Faith, and the Spirit's Baptism, was all the Baptism they should teach and instruct the People in. Moreover, had *Peter* known this to have been the Mind of his Blessed Master, he would doubtless have said to them (Acts 2), (when they asked what they should do?) "*Repent, and believe in Christ for the remission of your Sins*", but in the Name of Jesus Christ be not baptized in Water never a one of you, as some while since every Penitent was required to be, for that was a Dispensation and Baptism of *John*, and had its time for a while, merely to prepare the Way of Christ, but now is abolished and out of date; ye must forsake *John's* old Administration of Water-baptism, that being a carnal and low thing, and look wholly to a higher and more sublime Baptism, *i. e.* that of the Holy Ghost: And had he known this to be the Mind of his Master, would not he rather have said concerning *Cornelius*, and those with him (Acts 10), (instead of saying, Who can forbid Water?) Who can require Water, that these Persons should be Baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?

No doubt had Water-Baptism ceased, or been abolished, we should have had some discovery of it as well as we have of the Ceasing of Circumcision and other Rites of the *Mosaical* Law; for the Apostles, we find, were as ready, and as careful to make known the Cessation of such Rites, as Carnal Ordinances that were not to abide in the Church, as they were in establishing and confirming all those Precepts they knew were to continue to the end of the World.

If therefore, I say, Water-Baptism must not have remained, or if it were not, according to Christ's Will and Testament an inseparable Companion of his Doctrine, we should have had some hint or intimation of it, either by Christ's own Mouth, or by the Mouths of his Apostles, who were to deliver and command nothing to People, but what they had received of the Lord Jesus, or what was commanded them of the Lord as concerning the Cessation of that Service, or any Toleration of any one Person to omit it, but as we find it given forth by Christ, and practiced by his Apostles and Primitive Saints, even from the beginning of it, which was in *John's* baptizing in Water. So we find it, *ad jure*, to continue as part of his Mind and Testament, amongst other things, not a tittle of which Testament is yet annihilated, nor shall, till he come to take an account of all Men in respect of their Obedience or Disobedience, as to the preceptory part of his Will contained therein.

But furthermore, whereas these Objectors seem to intimate, that Jesus Christ was not commanded, or commissioned from the Father to baptize with Water as *John* was, because 'tis said by *John*, "*I verily baptize you with Water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit*" (Matt. 3:11); as if Christ had nothing to do to meddle with the Baptism of Water as any Ordinance of his, or to give any order about it, or had any more power to dispense or enjoin it, than *John* had power to meddle in, or take upon him to baptize with the Spirit, which peculiarly belonged to Christ, as that of Water peculiarly belonged to *John*.

To what they speak upon this account, we must say, and tell them, that Jesus Christ had Command and Commission from the Father, as Mediator, to give forth and enjoin Water-baptism, though he committed the actual Administration of it to his Disciples; for since he commanded them to do it, and so Baptized, saith an eminent Writer, *per alias* at least, if not *per se*; read John 3:22, "*And after these things came Jesus and his Disciples into the Land of Judea, and there he tarried with them, and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Enon near Salim*", &c. (John 3:22-23). Which is more fully explained, "*When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples*" (John 4:2). Now if he had not received Command from the Father thus to do, his Testimony is not true; which to say, as the same Author observes, were Blasphemy; for note, what he affirms, "*For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak—Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto, me, so I speak*" (John 12:49-50). Wherefore since he did, by the Hands of his Disciples, baptize in Water in *Judea*, and made and baptized more Disciples than *John*, he did it by Command from his Father: And indeed 'tis evident that the People generally flocked to him for the Administration of Water-baptism at last, and left *John*, insomuch as he in his Ministry, even of Water-baptism, increased, and *John* decreased (John 3:26-27). Those words of *John*, in Answer to the Jews, do plainly intimate no less, but that this very thing was intended by those

Expressions of his, though there might be more than this meant, *“And they came to John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest Witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all Men come to him. John answered, A Man can receive nothing, except it be given him from Above”* (John 3:26-27). *“Ye your selves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but I am sent before him.—He must increase, but I must decrease”* (John 3:28, 30). Doth he baptize? as if *John* should say, that is a sign he is sent of God: and do all Men come to him? do they rather go to him to be baptized than come to me? Why ‘tis no more than what I have told you, *“He shall increase, but I must decrease”*; He and his Ministry must and shall flourish, or increase in Honor, and Dignity, and Reputation in the World; He is the Rising Sun, to give you notice of which, I was but as the Morning Star; He must shine every day more and more. I have had my time, and near finished my Course, but do not think that the Baptism of Water shall cease with me; for as he baptizes, and rises more and more in Esteem and Honor; so he will do, and his ministration of this very Ordinance will increase and be magnified in his Hands, more than it has been in mine. I hope none will think it absurd to understand *John’s* words after this manner, for it must necessarily be taken in this sense, in any solid understanding, *“I verily baptize you with Water only; as if he should say, but he shall baptize you also with the Holy Spirit.”* He is empowered to dispense higher Matters to you than Water only, with which he baptizes (as you tell me) as well as I, though not himself, but his Disciples; I can go no further than to that outward Administration of Water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost. In which words *John* doth not oppose his Baptism to the Baptism of Christ, as if that which is called his, were none of Christ’s, but rather that *John* might magnify the Person of Christ above himself; as who should say, I can but dispense with the bare outward Sign, but Christ, who though *“he came after me, yet is preferred before me,”* in whose Name, and not in my own, I baptize, and whose the Baptism is that I dispense, and not my own; he is able, besides the Sign, to vouchsafe you the very Thing signified.

The Baptism then of Water, in the Name of Christ, together with Repentance from dead Works, and Faith in his Name, *John Baptist* was the first Minister to begin, in which respect it was called sometimes his; but he left it, after a while, to Christ himself and his Disciples to carry on, who all, till Christ was actually crucified, preached and practiced the self-same things that *John* did, as did the Disciples after his Resurrection.

All the difference between the administration of Baptism, as dispensed by *John* and the Disciples of Christ, before Christ’s Death and Resurrection, and the Administration of it afterwards were only in some Circumstantials; which briefly take as follows.

1. The Baptism in Water which was Christ’s, and of which *John* was but a Minister, together with Christ’s other Disciples before Christ’s Death, &c. was then the Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins by Christ, who was to come, *i. e.* e’re long, to suffer Death, be buried, and rise again.
2. But after Christ had suffered, it is the Baptism of Repentance, and Faith, for the Remission of Sins by Christ that is already come, hath died, was buried, and is risen again for our Justification; they baptized into Christ to suffer; now we are baptized into Christ who hath suffered.

3. Neither can this seem strange to any Man, since the Doctrine which *John*, Christ himself, and his Disciples, preached before our Savior suffered, differed in the same respect also, for they all then preached Repentance, Faith and Salvation by Christ, to suffer.

But had *John* lived till Christ had suffered, he would have preached Repentance, and Faith, and administered Baptism as we now do, *viz.* in and by Christ, who hath suffered; and this is all the difference, I say, that I know of, (which is only circumstantial) between the preaching the Gospel, and baptizing, before the Death of Christ, and that after his Death; wherefore the word of the Gospel under *John*, and after Christ's Death and Resurrection, is called the very same Word; and the Word that *Peter* preached to *Cornelius* and his House, is said to begin from *John's* Baptism, as the same Word which *John* came preaching; so that the Baptism with which *John* came baptizing, continues still, and was preached and practiced by Command from Christ, by the Mouth of *Peter*, on Disciples believing, in that very place *Acts* 10 (*Acts* 10:36-41). And this not in honor of *John*, as some frivolously affirm, but as a thing which ought to be done, as in force anew from the Lord Jesus, in whose Name *Peter* administered it, and not without Warrant from Christ so to do; "*He commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord*" (*Acts* 10:38).

Objection: Paul was not sent to baptize and thanked God that he baptized a few households.

Objection. But doth not *Paul* positively affirm, he was not sent to baptize, but to preach the Gospel (1 Cor. 1:17), and that he thanked God he baptized no more of them than *Crispus* and *Gaius*, and the Household of *Stephanus*?

Answer. *Paul* cannot mean, Christ sent him not at all to baptize; or, that the Gospel he was commanded to preach, had not Baptism enjoined to be preached and practiced, as an inseparable Companion of it, (because his Lord and Master, as we have shewed, hath joined Preaching and Baptizing together in his great Commission, *Matt.* 28:19-20) and so to continue to the End of the World.

Moreover, Teaching and Baptism, Faith and Baptism, Repentance and Baptism were always preached and practiced together: But he means this of Baptizing was not his chief business; nor did Christ require him absolutely to the actual dispensing of the Ordinance of Baptism with his own Hands, but to preach the Gospel, in which Baptism as well as Repentance and Faith were contained, and as a sacred Ordinance thereof, which he was sent to preach as well as any other Gospel-Institution, and that he did preach it, otherwise he could not have said as he did, that he had not shunned to declare the whole Counsel of God (*Acts* 20), and so, that it was done too by himself or some other, but it was not in his Commission, that he must administer it in but his own Person; for it is evident, the Administration or Act of Baptizing was not tied up to the Apostles, or to the more ordinary Ministers, but that any faithful gifted-Disciples might administer it as well as they; nor doth the Efficacy of Baptism depend in the least upon the Quality of the Person administering of it, whether it be *Paul*, *Apollos*, or *Cephas*, or any other Disciple much inferior to them in Capacity or Office, it is no matter; for *Ananias*, a private Disciple, baptized; and *Philip*, who was no other than a Deacon, or Over-seer of the poor, baptized many in the City of *Samaria* (*Acts* 8), so that we find in the

Primitive Times the simple Act of baptizing was a Work inferior, servile and subservient to that of preaching the Gospel, or Doctrine of Repentance, Faith and Baptism in Christ's Name for Remission of Sins, which was the great Work the Apostles were more especially sent to do, yet baptize they sometimes did, (when probably it was desired of them, or when the Multitudes to be baptized were so great that it required their help with others to do it;) nor is it rational to believe that *Peter* himself and the eleven did baptize all the three thousand (Acts 2), without the hands of the 120; though at that occasion the Apostles might baptize some likewise, there is no reason to doubt.

When therefore *Paul* says, Christ sent him not to baptize, he intends not, that that Ordinance was none of those things he had in Commission to meddle with (for had it been so, he went beyond his Commission in baptizing those few he did baptize with his own Hands, which were absurd to think, since he was so faithful a Servant of Jesus Christ, and positively affirms, that he "*would not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ had not wrought by him to make the Gentiles obedient by Word or Deed*" (Rom. 15:18): The words [not sent] do not import not at all, as appears by these Scriptures: John 6:27; 1. Tim. 2:14; Eph. 6:12, therefore he must mean not chiefly, or only sent to baptize, but to preach the Gospel; or not sent personally to do it, as I might further make appear in respect of Christ himself, who, as Mediator of the New Testament, (as hath been proved) received Command from the Father to baptize; but yet in the like sense it might be said, he was not commanded to baptize, *i. e.* personally to dispense the Ordinance himself, for had he received such a Commission, he had not fulfilled it; for howbeit, it is said he baptized more Disciples than John, yet he himself dispensed Baptism to none with his own Hands, but by the Hands of his Disciples (John 4:1-2).

If what we have said here in Answer to this Objection were well considered, it will appear to confute such who object against the practice of Baptism, for want of a due and lawful Minister or Administrator, endued with an extraordinary Call and Power to work Miracles.

Since the Act of baptizing is a more inferior thing than that of preaching the Gospel, and that any gifted Disciple may baptize; all that is recorded of *Ananias's* fitness or qualification (who baptized *Paul*) is, that he was a Disciple. "*And there was a certain Disciple at Damascus named Ananias*" (Acts 9:10); and there is no cause to doubt but many such Disciples were employed in baptizing those 3000 converted by *Peter's* Sermon (Acts 2), so that there is no reason to tie up this Administration to ordinary Ministers or Pastors of Churches, much less to the great Apostles, or such who have an extraordinary Mission, since *Paul* saith he was not sent to baptize, intimating, as you heard, that that work was not limited to the Apostolical Office, or that it must be done by Men extraordinarily qualified and called forth, and none else.

Moreover, whereas 'tis said by some, that he who takes upon him to baptize, ought to have Power to work Miracles as the Apostles did; this seems very strange, seeing the Text saith expressly (John 10:41), that *John* the Baptist, the first and most eminent Baptizer, did no Miracle, yet the People made no Objection against him, or his Power to baptize notwithstanding.

Question: Didn't John the Baptist have a commission to baptize?

Question. But had not *John* an express Commission to baptize?

Answer. That his Baptism was from Heaven, or that he did receive Command to baptize, 'tis evident; yet we read not when or how he received such Commission; but let his Commission be what it would, and never so full, it could not be fuller or more plain than the Commission we have left us Jesus Christ, "*Go, teach all Nations, baptizing them—and lo, I am with you always, to the end of the Word*" (Matt. 28:19-20).

Now as this Commission authorizes the Disciples of Jesus Christ to preach to the end of the World, so it equally impowers them to baptize; and the same Argument that is brought against baptizing, *viz.* not having an extraordinary Mission, holds as strong against Preaching, and the practice of all Ordinances whatsoever as well as that; therefore how dangerous a thing is it for any to plead for the non-continuance of Baptism in the Church, or to say it ceased when the extraordinary Gifts ceased, since there is no other Commission that enjoins Christ's Disciples to preach, &c. but that which as well enjoins them to baptize those who are disciplined by the Word.

Objection: Biblical baptism was lost in the Apostacy, how can it be restored again?

Objection. But since the practice of Baptism in Water was lost in the Apostacy, how could it be restored again without a new Mission?

Answer. That makes against the Restoration of other Gospel-Ordinances. which were lost as well as Baptism, in respect of the Purity of them, as practiced in the Primitive Times: But as the Children of *Israel* had lost for many Years the Ordinance of *the Feast of Tabernacles* (Neh. 8:14-15), yet by reading in the Book of the Law there was such a thing required, they immediately revived it and did as they found it written without any new Mission, or extraordinary Prophet to authorize them so to do; even so ought we to act, God's Word being a Warrant sufficient to justify us in so doing.

2 – Shewing what Baptism is from the literal and true genuine and proper Signification of the word Baptism.

In shewing the signification of the word *Baptism*, we will, with all Impartiality, give the Judgment of the Learned; 'tis a Greek word, therefore let us see what the Learned in that Tongue generally have, and do affirm to be the express signification thereof: And such hath been our care and pains, together with a Friend of mine, (some time since deceased¹², who was several months in my House) as to examine the Writings of divers eminent Men upon this Account, amongst which are *Scapula* and *Stephanus, Pasor, Minshew*, and *Leighs Critica Sacra; Grotius, Vossius, Casaubon, Selden*, Mr. *Daniel Rogers, Mede, Chamiers*, Dr. *Taylor*, Dr. *Hammond*, Dr. *Cave, Hefychius, Budaeus, Beza, Erasmus, Buchanan, Luther, Illyricus, Zanchy, Glassius*, &c. who with many other Learned Men, nay all indeed who are impartial, agree with one Voice, that the primary, proper, and literal signification of βαπτίζω, *Baptizo* is *mergo, immergo, submergo, obruo, item tingo quod fit immergendo*, that is, in English, to immerge, plunge under, overwhelm, as also to dip, which is done by plunging.

Difference between dipping and sprinkling.

True in a less proper or remote sense, because thing that are washed, are commonly dipped or covered all over in Water, it is put for washing (Luke 11:38; Heb. 9:10; Mark 7:4). And we dare modestly assert, that no Greek Author of any credit, whether Heathenish or Christian, has ever put Baptizing for Sprinkling, or used those words promiscuously; the Greeks have a peculiar word to express Sprinkling, viz. ῥαντίζω, *Rantizo*, which as a Learned¹³ Author observes, is ever used in Scripture by the Holy Spirit, when he speaks of such a thing as Sprinkling, yea, 'tis used three times in one Chapter, viz. Heb. 9:13, 19, 21, and is always translated *Sprinkling*: Neither is there, saith he, any one place of Scripture, wherein the word ῥαντίζω is rendered to baptize, or used to signify baptizing: Neither is there one Scripture wherein the word βαπτίζω, *Baptizo*, is rendered *Sprinkling*, or used to signify such a thing as Sprinkling. This being so, and certainly so it is; How strangely hath the World, and many Godly Christians, been deceived, thinking they have been Baptized, when in truth they never were to this day, but only *Rantized*.

We have had many long and tedious Disputes, and perplexed Controversies, about the true Form or Manner of Baptizing, whereas the thing in difference, is properly not the Manner or Form of Baptizing, but what Baptism is; for, as one observes, A Man may ride many ways, viz. East, West, &c. backward, forward, apace, or slowly, &c. yet all this is riding still, whilst the Man moves to and fro on Horse-back, because the very formality of that Action of riding, consists in being carried by a Beast; but while he moves upon his own Legs up and down, you cannot at that time denominate him riding. In like manner a Man may be *Baptized* [*Anglicè, Dipped*] or put under the Water many ways, viz. forward, backward, sideway, towards the right Hand or Left, with a quick or slow Motion, and yet all the while be Baptized; if he is put under the Water, for

¹² Mr. [Thomas] Delaune.

¹³ S. Fisher.

in such respect the Form or manner of Baptizing, *i.e.* Dipping, doth consist: the manner of Baptizing is one thing, and the manner of Rantizing is another: Sprinkling is Sprinkling, let it be done how you please, but it never was, nor never will be Baptizing.

And that Baptism is anything else than Dipping, or Washing, which is by plunging or dipping, we do utterly deny; for as the cutting off a little bit of the Foreskin of the Flesh, and not the twentieth part round, is not Circumcision;¹⁴ so sprinkling a little Water on the Face is not Baptism: As it would be ridiculous, and very absurd to call that Circumcision, so it is as false and ridiculous to call Sprinkling, Baptizing.

If Accidentals, or mere Accessories, be wanting unto Baptism (saith one) there may be right Baptism notwithstanding, but abstract the absolutely Necessaries, 'tis not only none of the Baptism of Christ, but truly not any Baptism at all.

Objection: *Baptizo* is not only to dip and overwhelm, but also to wash.
Objection. But the word βαπτίζω, though it signifies not to Sprinkle, yet not only to Dip and overwhelm in Water, but also to Wash, and so 'tis rendered in the Lexicons, as must be acknowledged by you.

Answer. If the word βαπτίζω does signify *to wash*, yet it is a real *total washing*, only such a washing as is by Dipping, Plunging, or swilling the Subject in Water, and that signification is far off from Sprinkling: Can anything be said to be truly washed, that hath only a little Water sprinkled upon it?

The best Lexicons, and most eminent Critics,¹⁵ as well as the holy Scripture, do most plainly decide the Controversy, as Mr. *Danvers* and others observe.

Scapula and *Stephens*, two as great Masters of the Greek Tongue as most we have, do tell us, in their Lexicons, that “βαπτίζω, from βάπτω, signifies *mergo, immergo, obruo; item tingo, quod sit immergendo, inficere imbuere*, viz. to dip, plunge, overwhelm, put under, cover over, to die in colour, which is done by plunging.”

Grotius says it “signifies to dip over Head and Ears.”

Pasor, “An Immersion, Dipping, or Submersion.”

Vossius says, “It implieth a washing the whole Body.”

Mincoeus in his Dictionary, says, that “βαπτίζω, is in the Latin *Baptismus*, in the Dutch *Dooptset*, or *Doopen Baptismus* or *Baptisme*, to dive or duck in Water; and the same with the Hebrew *Tabal*, which the *Septuagint*, or Seventy Interpreters, render by βαπτίζω, *Baptiso* to dip, as these Texts in the old Testament shew (Gen. 37:31; Exod. 12:22; Lev. 4:6; 17:14; Deut. 33:24; Num. 16:18; 2 King. 5:14, &c.)”

¹⁴ Circumcision, a cutting the fore-Skin round about quite off.

¹⁵ *Danvers* Treatise of Baptism, 2d. Edit. p. 182.

“This,” saith *Casaubon*, “was the Rite of Baptizing, that Persons were plunged into the Water, which the very word *Baptizo* sufficiently demonstrates. Which as it does not extend so far as to sink down to the Bottom, to the hurt of the Person, so is it not to swim upon the Superficies—Baptism ought to be administered by plunging the whole Body in Water.”

Also I find our late Famous, Learned, and Reverend Dr. *Du-Veil*, in his Literal Explanation of the *Acts* 1:5 citing the same Author in these words, “The word βαπτίζειν,” says *Casaubon*, “is to dip or plunge, as if it were to dye Colour.”

Leigh in his *Critica Sacra*, saith, “its native and proper signification, is to dip into the Water, or to plunge under Water (*Matt.* 3:6; *Acts* 8:38), and that it is taken from a Dyer’s Fat, and imports a dying, or giving a fresh Colour;” for which also he quotes *Casaubon*, *Bucanan*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchy*, *Spanhemius*: He saith withal, that some would have it signify Washing; which sense *Erasmus*, he saith, opposed, “affirming that it was not otherwise so, than by Consequence; for the proper signification was such a dipping or plunging, as Dyers use for dying of Clothes.”

Salmasius saith, that “that is not *Baptism* which they give to Children, but *Rantism*.”¹⁶

Beza, on *Matt.* 3:11 saith, “the word *Baptizo* signifies to dye, by dipping or washing.”

Selden saith, “That the *Jews* took that *Baptism* wherein the whole Body was not baptized, to be void.”¹⁷

Mr. *Daniel Rogers* saith, “That the Minister is to dip in Water, as the meetest Act the word *Baptizo* notes it, for the Greeks wanted no other words to express any other Act besides Dipping, if the Institution could bear it. What resemblance of the Burial and Resurrection of Christ is in Sprinkling? All Antiquity and Scripture confirm, that it was Dipping.”¹⁸

“If you would,” saith Dr. *Taylor*,¹⁹ “attend to the proper signification of the word, *Baptism* signifies plunging in Water, or dipping with washing.”

In the Synod of *Celichyth*, where *Wolfred* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* presided, as ‘tis cited by Dr. *Du-Veil*, “it was ordered that the *Presbyters* should take heed, that when they administered the Sacrament of *Baptism*, they should not do it by pouring Water, but always by plunging, according to the Example of the Son of God, who was plunged in the Waters of *Jordan*.”²⁰

The same Learned Author affirms, this was the constant practice of the Universal Church, till the time of *Clement* the 5th, who was crowned Pope, saith he, *Anno* 1305, under whom first of all the Second Synod of *Ravenna* approved the Abuse introduced into some Churches, about an hundred Years before that *Baptism*,

¹⁶ De prim. papae, p. 193.

¹⁷ De Jure Nat. &c. l. 2. c. 2.

¹⁸ Treatise of Sacr. par. 1. c. 8. p. 177.

¹⁹ Rule of Conscience, l. 3. c. 4.

²⁰ An. D. 816.

without any Necessity, should be administered by Aspersion. “Hence,” saith he, “it came to pass, that contrary to the Analogy, or intended mystical signification of this Sacrament, all the West, for the most part in this Age, they use *Rantism*, that is, Sprinkling instead of *Baptism*, as *Zepper* speaks, to the great scandal of the *Greeks* and *Russians*, who to this day plunge into the Water those they Baptize,”²¹ and “deny any one rightly baptized, who is not plugged into the Water, according to the Precept of Christ, as we may find in *Sylvester*, *Sguropalus*, and *Cassander*; the Custom of the Ancient Church was not Sprinkling, but Immersion, in pursuance of the sense of the word *Baptizo* in the Commandment, and of the Example of our Blessed Savior.”²² saith Dr. *Taylor*.²³

The Greek word *Baptein*, (saith *Salmasius*) from which the word *Baptizein* derives, signifies Immersion; nor did the Ancients other ways Baptize.

Mr. *Joseph Mede* saith,²⁴ that there was no such thing as Sprinkling or Rantism used in Baptism in the Apostles Days, nor many Ages after: He had spoke more proper if he had said, there was no Rantism used in the Apostles Days but Baptism, than to say no Rantism used in Baptism, since he could not be ignorant but that they are two distinct Actions, and it cannot be Baptism at all if it be only Sprinkling or Rantism as is now used, Dipping or Immersion being the very Thing, not an Accident, but an Essential, so absolutely necessary, that it can't be the thing without it.

The ancient Use of Baptism,²⁵ saith *Chamier*, was to dip the whole Body into the Element, therefore did *John* baptize in a River.

Neither is it amiss to give you what Dr.²⁶ *Hammond* speaks upon this account in his Annotations upon John 13:10 where he saith, that βαπτισμός signifies an Immersion, or washing the whole Body, and which answereth to the Hebrew Word טבילה used for dipping in the Old Testament, and therefore tells us upon Matt. 3:1 that *John* baptized in a River, viz. in Jordan (Mark 1:5), in a Confluence of Water, as *Aenon* (John 3:23). because 'tis said there was much Water; which he further makes out by the Name by which the *Greeks* called the Lakes where they used to wash; also the Ancients, he says, called their Baptisterions, or the Vessels containing their Baptismal Water, *Columbethras*, viz. swimming or diving-places, being made very large with Partitions for Men and Women.

To all these famous Authors, it may do well to add our late Annotations, begun by the Learned Mr. *Pool*, newly printed,²⁷ see what they say on Matt. 3:6, “A great part of those who went out to hear *John* were

²¹ Conc. Flor. §. 9. c. 9. & lib. of Infant Baptism, p 693.

²² Ductor Dubit. l. 3. c. 4. Reg. 15. Num. 9. St. *Martins* Life, N. 16.

²³ Not sure where the quotation marks are precisely to be placed. – Simon

²⁴ Diatribe on *Titus* 3. 2.

²⁵ Pan. Cathol. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 2.

²⁶ Annotat. on *John* 13. Matt. 3.

²⁷ [Pool's Annotat. on Matt. 3:6.](#)

baptized, that is, dipped in Jordan”, and on Matt. 28:20, say they, “it is true, the first Baptism of which we read in holy Writ, were by Dipping the Persons baptized.”

The Dutch Translation, according to their Language, reads Dipping.

Matt. 3:20. Jesus ge doopt zijnde, is terstont opgeklommon uit het Water.

And when Jesus was dipped he came out of the Water; hence they, for *John* the Baptist, read *John* the Dipper; and for he baptized them, *he dipped them*. Why our Translators, who have been so faithful and exact generally in all things (as is acknowledged by all Learned Godly Men in the translating the holy Bible) should leave the word Baptism (it being a Greek Word) and not translate it into our Language, as the *Dutch* have done into theirs, I know not, unless it were to favour their own Practice of Rantising or Sprinkling, which the word *Baptize* will in no wise bear, as is confessed by a whole cloud of Witnesses.

Mr. *Ball* in his Catechism renders it washing by Dipping.

See also Dr. *Ames* in his Marrow of Divinity.²⁸

Mr. *Wilson* in his Dictionary saith, “to baptize, is to dip into the Water, or to plunge one into the Water.”

Also in the Common-Prayer-Book dipping into the Water is given as the proper and primary Signification of the word.

We will leave this to the Consideration of all thinking Men, it being so, *i. e.* that Baptism is Dipping or Plunging the Body all over in Water, whether Infants can be the Subjects of it, since their tender Bodies cannot bear being plunged thus into the Water in cold Climates, without palpable danger of their Lives.

²⁸ Book 1. Cap. 40.

3 – Proving that Baptism is dipping, plunging, and covering the Body all over in Water from the Practice of the Primitive Times.

Certainly no better course or way in the next place we can take to find out what Baptism is, than to examine the Scripture, and see what the thing was which the Saints practiced in the Primitive Time, where we read they did baptize, or were baptized: for as the Jews in Circumcision all along were to practice that Rite, as it was commanded, and practiced by *Abraham*; and keep the Passover as it was given to them from the Lord by *Moses*, together with all other Ordinances and Services whatsoever, it behooved them to observe the first or Primitive Institution and Practice of every particular Duty, and were not to derogate from thence in anything whatsoever; and for their adulterating any of the Ordinances of God, they brought themselves under the Wrath of God, and many heavy Judgments from him, as the Old Testament doth sufficiently witness; so it behooves us, I say, to see to the first or Primary Institution and Practice of Baptism in the Gospel-Time, that being a Pattern or Rule to us, and to all Christians to the end of the World, in respect of every Gospel-Ordinance; and if we derogate from that Rule, we must expect to meet with sharp Rebuke from the Almighty first or last. Now that that Ordinance which is called Baptism, is Immersion, Dipping, or Plunging into Water, will appear, if we observe the Practice of *John* the Baptist, who was the first that was sent by Christ to baptize; read Matt. 3:6; he 'tis positively said baptized in a River, viz. in the River *Jordan*.

John's baptism was plunging and dipping.

Diodate on this place in his Annotations, saith "he plunged them in Water"²⁹; and our late Annotators say "he dipp'd them in *Jordan*."³⁰

Moreover 'tis said that *John* was baptizing in Aenon near Salim; the Reason is given, "because there was much Water" (John 3:23). Now if it had not been dipping or covering the Body in Water, this could be no reason, for a little Water would have served to sprinkle thousands, as *Cornelius à Lapide* notes.

Piscator on this Passage saith, that "Baptism was dipping the Body in Water."³¹

Also our late Annotators upon the place say thus, viz. "It is from hence apparent, that both Christ and John baptized by dipping the Body in the Water, else they need not have sought places where had been a great plenty of Water."³² They say well, and less they could not speak unless they would stifle their Consciences, or offer Violence to their Reason: but if they had from hence said, it is apparent that Christ and *John* Baptized, and not *Rantized* Persons, they had come off better, and had undeceived the People.

²⁹ *Diodate Annotat.*

³⁰ [Pool's Annotat. on John 3:23.](#)

³¹ See Mr. *Gosnold's* Doctrine of Baptism, pag. 20.

³² [Pool's Annot. on John 3:23.](#)

Jesus' and the Ethiopian Eunuch's baptism were by dipping.

Secondly, 'Tis said when our blessed Savior was baptized by *John* in *Jordan*, he went up straightway out of the Water (Matt. 3:16), &c. and *Philip* and the *Eunuch* 'tis said went both down into the Water, and that they came up out of the Water (Acts 8:38-39).

The Assembly in their Annotations on this Text, say, "they were wont to dip the whole Body"; and *Piscator* on the place (as I find him quoted by a worthy Divine) saith, "the ancient manner of Baptism was that the whole Body was dipped into the Water."

Certainly it had been a vain and weak thing for them to have gone down into the River to be sprinkled with a little Water.

There is no ground to think they would ever have done so, if Sprinkling or Rantism had been the Ordinance required of them, the manner was not to apply Water to the Subject, as some do, but the Subject to (nay into) the Water.

In *Mark* 1:9, 'Tis said, Jesus was baptized of *John* in *Jordan*: Now, saith one on this place, it had been nonsense for *Mark* to say that Jesus was baptized in *Jordan*, if it had been sprinkling, because the Greek reads it "into *Jordan*", εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, could Jesus be said to be sprinkled into *Jordan*? 'tis proper to say he was baptized, that is, dipped into *Jordan*, and that was the Act and nothing else, as all the Learned acknowledge.

Moreover, *Philip* needed not to have put that noble Person, who was a Man of great Authority under *Candace* Queen of the *Ethiopians*, to the trouble to come out of his Chariot (if Sprinkling had been Baptism) and to go into the Water and dip him; or if Sprinkling might have done as well as Dipping, sure *Philip* would on this occasion have dispensed with Immersion, and let Rantism have served, considering he was a great Man and on a Journey; he might have fetched a little Water in his hand and have sprinkled him in the Chariot. But as *Philip* had preached Baptism to him, so there is like ground to think that the *Eunuch* very well understood what it was, and readily submitted to it; but if Sprinkling would not excuse them, I know not how any Christian can think it may excuse us in these days; we have no Reason to think Christ Jesus, or his Apostles, did do or teach anything in vain, yet so we must conclude, if he went into a River to receive no more than Sprinkling; and so we must think of *Philip* and the *Eunuch* also.

But to proceed, here I cannot well omit that which Mr. *Daniel Rogers*, a most worthy English Writer, hath said in a Treatise of his, "*It ought (saith he) to be the Churches part to cleave to the Institution, which is Dipping, especially it being not left arbitrary by our Church to the Discretion of the Minister; but required to dip or dive: And further saith, that he betrays the Church, whose Officer he is, to a disordered Error, if he cleave not to the Institution, which is to Dip.*"³³ What abundance of Betrayers of the Truth and Church too have we in these days? How little is the Institution or Practice of the Primitive Christians minded amongst many good Men?

³³ *Rogers* in his Treatise of the two Sacraments, part 1. chap. 5.

and where is the Spirit of Reformation? And doubtless that famous Author, and Learned Critic *Casaubon* was in the right; will you have his words;

I doubt not, saith he, but, contrary to our Churches Intention, this Error having once crept in, is maintained still by the Carnal Ease of such as, looking more at themselves than at God, stretch the Liberty of the Church in this case deeper and further than either the Church herself would, or the Solemnness of this Sacrament may well and safely admit.—Afterwards further saith, I confess myself unconvinced by Demonstration of Scripture for Infants Sprinkling.³⁴

But Oh! how hard is it to retract an Error which has been so long and generally received, especially when there is Carnal Ease and Profit attending the keeping of it up, and when the contrary Practice, I mean dipping, is looked upon so contemptible a thing, and those who do it are daily, by the ignorance of foolish Men, reproached and vilified, as it is now as well as in former days.

Acts 8:38.—And they went both down into the Water, both *Philip* and the *Eunuch*, and he baptized him.

“We may see”, saith *Calvin*, “what fashion the Ancients had to administer Baptism, for they plunged the whole Body into the Water: The use with us is now,” saith he, “that the Minister casts a few drops of Water only upon the Body, or upon the Head.”³⁵

And upon *John’s* baptizing in *Aenon* near *Salim*, John 3:23, saith the same *Calvin*,

From this place we may gather that *John* and *Christ* administered Baptism by plunging the whole Body into the Water.³⁶

The Learned *Cajetan* upon Matt. 3:5 saith, “Christ ascended out of the Water; therefore Christ was baptized by *John*, not by sprinkling or by pouring Water upon him, but by Immersion, that is, by dipping or plunging into the Water.”³⁷

Moreover, *Musculus* on Matt. 3 calls Baptism Dipping, and saith, the Parties baptized were dipped, not sprinkled.³⁸

Objection: Baptism signifies sprinkling as well as dipping.

Objection. But it is still objected, Sprinkling is Baptizing, say you what you will; and Baptism signifies Sprinkling as well as Dipping.

³⁴ *Casaubon on Matt 3:11.*

³⁵ [Calvin on Acts 8:38.](#)

³⁶ [Calvin on John 3:23.](#)

³⁷ *Cajetan on Matt. 3:5.*

³⁸ *Muscul. on Matt. 3.*

Answer. To this we always answer, and again say and testify, that the Greek word *to sprinkle*, is, ῥαντίζω, *Rantizo*; and that the Translators themselves never so much as once, in all the New Testament, render Baptism, Sprinkling; and where is the Man that affirms the word signifies *Sprinkling*?

Objection: *Baptizo* will bear the meaning of washing.

Objection. But the word *Baptizo* will bear Washing.

Answer. We answer then, 'Tis such washing as is done by dipping; so much as is *baptized*, or washed, is dipped, and your *Rantism* is no washing; and we also say, and that too with good Authority, that though the word *Baptizo* doth sometimes allow of that Acceptation, yet it is not the direct, immediate, genuine, and primary signification of it, for that is to dip, or plunge, as you see in the *Lexicons*. But at the best 'tis but indirectly, collaterally, by the by (as one observes) so meant, or improperly and remotely, that it so signifies: And we ask, Whether when we try any Matter by the signification of the word as 'tis in the Original, we shall go to the direct, original, prime, and proper, or to the occasional, remote, indirect and improper signification to be tried by? Your practice it seems is built only upon the indirect, improper and remote acceptance of the word, and therefore is at best only an uncouth, indirect, improper and far-fetched practice; and indeed, as the word is found in Scripture, respecting Christ's Ordinance of Baptism, it is evident to all what it signifies.

Objection: The Pharisees are said to baptize their hands, vessels, cups, pots and beds in Mark 7:4.

Objection. But the Pharisees held "*the washing of Hands, Vessels, Cups, Pots, and Beds*", &c. and there Washings are called Baptism (Mark 7:4).

Answer. Yea, and what then, for, saith Mr. *Wilson*, "to baptize, is to dip or plunge primarily, and signifies such a washing as is used in Bucks wherein Linen is plunged and dipped; and thus they washed their Vessels, Hands, and Cups, viz. they swilled, rinsed, cleansed, and totally washed, dipped, or wetted them all over with Water, or else you may be sure it could never be said they baptized them." But, Sirs, who-ever washes Hands, Cups, Pots, or Beds, by sprinkling a few Drops of Water upon them? there is no washing by such a kind of Sprinkling. O that you would give over such Arguing, since the practice of Baptism in the Primitive Times doth, as you have heard, evidently shew that the Baptized were always dipped all over in Water; Certainly 'tis no Baptism at all, if not so administered.

Objection: They lived in a hot country and dipped, but we live in cool climate and that would lead to the death of some.

Objection. Doth it follow that we must Baptize so now? That was in a hot Country; but we live in a cool Climate, and when Children were Dipped, some of them died; and *God will have Mercy, not Sacrifice*.

Answer. Ought you not to make God's Word your Rule? Have you a Dispensation to make the Commandments of God void by your Traditions? We conclude, the Institution of Christ and the Practice of the Primitive Church, ought to be followed in all things as near as we can. But you say this is a cold Climate:

Pray, Sirs, did not Christ, when he gave forth his Commission to his Apostles, to teach and make Disciples, and Baptize, bid them go into all the World, and into all Nations (Matt. 28:19-20)? Were they not to go into cold Countries as well as Hot? And, were they not to teach the same Doctrine, and administer the same Ordinances alike where-ever they come? Or, did he tell them they should *Baptize* those in hot Countries that were Disciples, and *Rantize* such who received the Word in cold Countries? Unless you can prove this, I am sure all you say is nothing.

Certainly you were as good never pretend to Baptize, but wholly deny it, and cast it off as a low and carnal Thing, as some do, as to do another thing in the room of it, which Christ never commanded, and call it his Ordinance; Which we do declare and testify, by the Authority of God's Word, and a great Cloud of Witnesses, who all understand the Greek Tongue, (may be better than some of you do) that 'tis no Baptism at all, but a thing of Man's devising brought in, in the room of Christ's Baptism, and unjustly fathered upon him.

Sirs, How dare you, "*In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, say, I Baptize thee*", &c. when you do but *Rantize* the Person? for you neither dip the Person, nor wash him. Has the Holy Trinity given you any Authority so to do? For God's sake, for time to come, use the Names of those Persons by whose Authority it was first set on foot and given forth, till you can shew you have Authority from Jesus Christ to sprinkle, or pour a little Water upon the Face of a poor Infant, or an adult Person. Nor is it any marvel, when they did dip poor Children in Water, that some of them died, since they are not the true Subjects of Baptism; if they had, no doubt God would have preserved them, as well as he did those Babes whom once he required to be Circumcised. Can any believe God would command any such thing to be done, that should endanger the Life of a Child? that was doubtless a just Rebuke for the profanation of Christ's blessed Ordinance; he will one day, I fear, say, "*Who hath required this at your hands?*" Nay, and who knows what Judgments and Wrath may come upon this Land for the abominable abuse of the Sacred Institution of Baptism. God many times shews Men their Sin, by the punishment he brings upon them, if you are so fond of Humane Traditions and Innovations.

Objection: Why must the whole body be dipped, can't only one part be dipped?

Objection. But why must the whole Body be dipped? may not the Head be sufficient, that being the principal Part?

Answer. I must confess, in a late Discourse I had with a Minister of the Church of *England*, he pleaded for this, seeing he could not defend *Rantism*. But to give a direct Answer, pray consider whether it be the Person, (*viz.* the Man or Woman) or part of the Person that Christ commanded to be baptized; if not the whole Body, why might it not serve only to wash or dip the Hands? But if it were the Hands only, or the Feet, or the Head only that was to be Baptized, *i. e.* dipped, a small Vessel of Water would have served, and no need for *Christ* or *John* to have gone into Rivers and Places where there was much Water, to baptize.

2. It is not said, *John* baptized *him*, *i. e.* our blessed Savior, not part of him: But as the blessed Virgin bore *him* in her Womb, and brought *him* forth, and laid *him* in a Manger; so *John* baptized, or dipped *him*, that is, *his*

whole Body into Jordan, or in the River Jordan. Moreover, 'tis said, "They were baptized, both Men and Women" (Acts 8:12), (that is, the Bodies, the whole Bodies of those Men and Women) and not some Part or Members of them: If this be not granted, we shall be run into many strange Absurdities almost everywhere in reading the Scriptures.

3. To put this out of doubt, 'tis evident the whole Body ought to be dipped or baptized, because (as we shall shew in the next Chapter) Baptism is a Figure of the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, nay, called a *Burial*. Now a Person is not said to be buried, that is not totally covered in the Earth; no more can a Man be said to be baptized, except he be covered all over in the Water.

4. We have shewed how all the Learned agree, and positively assert, that Baptism was administered in the Primitive Times, by a total dipping the Body in Water. And indeed at first, when this Innovation of *Rantism* came in, they used to sprinkle the Body all over, being sure it was not one Part, but the whole Body that was to be baptized, and so they Rantized the whole Body. But you are gone here too, for you in (your Practice, and in your own Sense) Baptize but the Face only; so that all your People are unbaptized Persons, as evident as anything can be, take it how you will, if it should be granted. I mean, that Sprinkling is Baptism.

4 – Proving that Baptism is Dipping, Plunging, or Burying the whole Body in Water, In the Name, &c. from the Spiritual or Metaphorical signification of this Gospel-Ordinance or Administration.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

To make it appear yet more fully, that Baptism is not sprinkling, pouring, nor any other thing, than dipping, plunging, or covering of the Body in Water, we shall proceed to examine what it was ordained for by our Lord Jesus Christ, to hold forth, or to be a Sign or Representation of; for like as in the Holy Sacrament of the Supper, it behooves us to know, what the breaking of the Bread, and pouring forth of the Wine signifies, or are Figures of; so in like manner we ought (with as great care) to endeavor to know what is held forth, or represented to us, as the Holy Signs of the Blessed Sacrament of Baptism; for as all true Christians readily do confess and agree with us, that the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper is not, cannot be rightly nor truly administered, if the great Ends and Design of Jesus Christ, in the Institution of it, are not answered thereby, or what it was ordained and appointed to signify, plainly held forth and represented in its administration; but it is contrarywise a great abuse and profanation of it; and from hence we, and all true Protestants, always say, Let us keep to the exact words of the Institution, and manner of its first Celebration, that so the great Things signified, both by the breaking the Bread, and pouring forth the Wine, may clearly appear, and be represented in the Administration thereof.

Now then, this is that which we affirm, *viz.* That as the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained to hold forth the breaking of Christ's Body, and the pouring forth of his Blood; So in like manner the Sacrament of Baptism was instituted and appointed, to hold forth Christ was really dead, buried, and that he arose again for our Justification. And that this is so, we shall not only prove it from the plain Authority of God's Word, but by the joint Testimony of almost all famous Writers and Divines we have met with, Ancient or Modern. And indeed we cannot but be much affected with the great Love and Goodness of our Blessed Savior in the Institution of these two great Ordinances, it being his gracious Design and Condescension, hereby to hold forth, or preach, as I may say, to the very sight of our visible Eyes by these fit and proper Mediums, the glorious Doctrine of his Death, Burial, and Resurrection, which in the Ministration of the Word, is preached or held forth to the hearing of our Ears, that so we might the better and more effectually be established and grounded in the sure and steadfast belief thereof; which is indeed absolutely necessary to Salvation, as the Apostle doth plainly testify (1 Cor. 15:1-4),

Moreover, Brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also you received, and wherein you stand (ver. 1).

By which also you are saved, if you keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain (ver. 2).

For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how Christ died for our Sins, according to the Scripture (ver. 3).

And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures (ver. 4).

This being so, let none blame us for contending so earnestly for this Ordinance according to the Primitive Purity, or its Original Glory, wherein, according to the gracious Design of Jesus Christ we daily receive, in beholding the Administration of this Sacrament, (as well as in the *Lord's Supper* what is represented to us) such a blessed establishment in the Truth of the Doctrine of Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, as well as in many other Respects, the Profit and Use appears to us, no Ordinance being more significant, or ordained upon more weighty and glorious Purposes and Designs: for certainly, if we consider the grand Errors and Heresies of the present Age, so boldly maintained amongst us, (by those deceived People who cry up *the Light within* to be the True Christ; or that the Light or Power in that Person, called *Jesus of Nazareth*, distinct and apart from the Body that was Crucified, &c. is all the Christ they own) it will clearly convince us how gracious Christ was to appoint this Ordinance, besides the Word to confirm us in the Belief, that the True Savior was a Man, and that he did die, and was buried, and rose again, which we see in a Figure represented before our Eyes, in the administration of this Ordinance, And that this is signified in Baptism, we shall now prove;

First, From the Scripture.

Secondly, By the Consent and Agreement of a Cloud of Witnesses.

Baptism signifies the death, burial and resurrection of Christ.

1. The first Scripture is *Rom. 6*. "*Therefore we are buried with Christ in Baptism*": "He seems", say our late Annotators, "to allude to the manner of Baptizing in those warm Eastern Countries, which was to dip or plunge the Party baptized, and as it were to bury him for a while under Water."³⁹

Cajetan, upon this place, saith, "we are buried with him by Baptism into Death. By our Burying he declares our Death by the Ceremony of Baptism: because he that is baptized is put under Water, and by this carries a Similitude of him that was buried, who was put under the Earth now, because none are buried but dead Men—from this very thing that we are buried in Baptism, we are assimilated to Christ buried, or when he was buried."

The Assemblies Annotations on this place of Scripture say likewise thus,⁴⁰ "*i. e.* in this Phrase the Apostle seemed to allude to the ancient manner of Baptizing, which was to dip the Party baptized, and as it were to bury them under Water for a while, and then raise them up again out of it, to represent the Burial of the Old Man and our Resurrection to newness of Life": the same saith *Diodate*.

³⁹ [Pool's Annotat. on Rom. 6:3.](#)

⁴⁰ Assemblies Annotat.

Tilenus,⁴¹ a great Protestant Writer, speaks fully in this case;

Baptism, saith he, is the first Sacrament of the New Testament, instituted by Christ, in which there is an exact Analogy between the Sign and the Thing signified; the outward Rite in Baptism is threefold.

1. Immersion into the Water.
2. Abiding under the Water.
3. A Resurrection out of the Water.

The Form of Baptism, *viz.* internal and essential, is no other than the Analogical Proportion which the Signs keep with the Things signified thereby; for the Properties of the Water in washing away the Defilements of the Body, do in a most suitable Similitude set forth the Efficacy of Christ's Blood in blotting out of Sins; so dipping into the Water doth in a most lively Similitude set forth the Mortification of the old Man, and rising out of the Water, the Vivification of the new Man: "The same plunging into the Water", saith he, "holds forth to us that horrible Gulf of Divine Justice, in which Christ, for our sakes, was for a while in a manner swallowed up—abiding under the Water (how little time so ever) denotes his Descent into Hell⁴² even the very deepest of Lifelessness, which lying in the sealed or guarded Sepulcher, he was accounted as one dead; rising out of the Water, holds forth to us a lively Similitude of that Conquest which this dead Man got over Death—in like manner," saith he, "'tis therefore meet that we being baptized into his Death and buried with him, should rise also with him, and so go on in a new Life."—

St. Ambrose saith "*Water is that wherein the Body is plunged to wash all Sin away, there all Sin is buried*": we suppose he means 'tis a Sign of this, to shew that all Sin is buried.

Many other of the Ancient Fathers speak to the same purpose, as is observed by the famous Sir *Norton Knatchbul* in his Learned Notes printed at *Oxford*, 1677⁴³ (cited by *Dr. Du Viel*),

the sense and meaning of *Peter* (saith he) that Baptism, which now saves us by Water, that is, by the assistance of Water, and is Antitypical to the Ark of *Noah*, does not signify the laying down the Filth of the Flesh in the Water, but the Covenant of a good Conscience towards God, while we are plunged in the Water, which is the true use of Water in Baptism, thereby to testify our Belief in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ; so that there is a manifest *Antithesis* between these words *by Water*, and *by the Resurrection*; Nor is the Elegancy of it displeasing. As if he should say, the Ark of *Noah*, not the Flood, was a Type of Baptism, and Baptism was an Antitype of the Ark, not as Baptism is a washing away the Filth of the Flesh by Water, wherein it answers not at all to the Ark, but as it is the Covenant of a good Conscience towards God by the Resurrection of Christ, in the Belief of which Resurrection we are saved, as they were saved by the Ark of *Noah*: For the Ark and Baptism were both a Type and Figure of the Resurrection; so that the proper end of Baptism ought not to be

⁴¹ *Tilenus* in his Disput. p. 886, 889, 890 on Rom. 3:4.

⁴² Or Grave.

⁴³ See *Dr. Du Veil* on Acts 2.

understood as if it were a sign of the washing away of Sin, although it be thus oftentimes taken metonymically in the New Testament, and by the Fathers, but a particular signal of the Resurrection by Faith in the Resurrection of Christ, of which Baptism is a lively and emphatical Figure, as also was the Ark out of which *Noah* returned as from the Sepulcher to a new Life, and therefore not unaptly called by *Philo*, *the Captain of the new Creature*: And the Whales Belly out of which *Jonas*, after a burial of three days, was set at liberty: And the Cloud and the Red-Sea in which the People of *Israel* are said to have been baptized; that is, not washed, but buried; for they were all Types of the same thing as Baptism, *viz.* not the washing away of Sin, but of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, and our own; to which the Apostles, the Fathers, the Scholastics, and all Interpreters agree. The thing is so apparent as not to need any Testimonies. But because there are not a few who do not vulgarly teach this Doctrine, it will not be superfluous to produce some of these innumerable Testimonies, that I may not seem to speak without Book; and first let us begin with St. *Paul*, '*Know ye not that so many of you that have been baptized into Christ, were baptized into his Death? therefore we are buried with him in Baptism into Death*' (Rom. 6:3-4; Col. 2:12), &c. '*Else what shall they do that are baptized for the Dead, if the Dead rise not at all*' (1 Cor. 15:29)? As if he had said, if there be no Resurrection, Why are we baptized? In vain does the Church use the Symbol of Baptism if there be no Resurrection. The like Testimonies frequently occur among the Fathers⁴⁴—that believing in his Death we may be made Partakers of his Resurrection by Baptism. Baptism was given in Memory of the Death of our Lord; we perform the Symbols of his Death and Resurrection in Baptism.

We know but one saving Baptism, in regard there is but one Death for the World,⁴⁵ and one Resurrection from the Dead, of which Baptism is an Image.

Here *Paul* exclaiming,⁴⁶ they passed through the Sea, and were all baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea⁴⁷; he calls Baptism the Passage of the Sea; for it was a flight of Death caused by the Water.

To be baptized,⁴⁸ and so plunged, and to return up, and rise out of the Water, is a Symbol of the descent into the Grave, and return from thence.

Baptism is a Pledge and Representation of the Resurrection⁴⁹; Baptism is an Earnest of the Resurrection; Immersion is a Representation of Death and Burial. Innumerable are the Testimonies which might be added. But these I think sufficient to prove that Baptism is an Image of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, (from hence we acknowledge the Mystery of our Religion, his Deity and Humanity) and of all the Faithful who are baptized in his Faith, from Death to Sin, to newness of Life, which if they lead in this World, they have a most assured hope, that being dead they shall hereafter

⁴⁴ *Ignat.* Epist. ad Tral. id Epist. ad Philadelp.

⁴⁵ Justin Martyr.

⁴⁶ *Basil* the Great.

⁴⁷ Basil of Seleucia.

⁴⁸ Chrysostom. Ambros.

⁴⁹ Lactant. Bernard.

rise to Glory with Christ:—Which things if so, what Affinity is to be seen between a Burial and a Washing, that Christian Baptism should be thought to draw its Original from Jewish Lotions? for if it were true that the end of our Baptism were to signify a Washing, or Ablution; or if it were true, that the *Jews* of old did admit their Children or Proselytes into their Church, by the administration of any diving, as it is asserted by many Learned Persons of late Days; yet to prove that our Baptism is indeed an Image of Death, and Resurrection, not of washing, enough hath been said.

Thus far Sir *Norton Knatchbul*.⁵⁰

And indeed, what this great Man hath asserted, and clearly demonstrated, doth fully detect our Brethren, who argue for their Childish Rantism, affirming, Though Dipping was the Baptism that was practiced in the Primitive Time; yet it doth not from thence follow, that Dipping is essential to Baptism; they are the words of our late Annotators on Matt. 3:6. The Reason they give is, "*Because, the washing of the Soul with the Blood of Christ, the thing, say they, signified by Baptism, being expressed by Sprinkling, or pouring Water, as well as by Dipping, or being buried in Water.*"⁵¹

In Answer, we say with St. *Bernard*, viz. "*Immersion is a Representation of Death and Burial.*"

But saith the famous Dr. *Du-Veil*, "To substitute in the room of Immersion, either Sprinkling, or any other way of applying Water to the Body to signify the same thing, is not in the Power of the Dispensers of God's Mysteries, or of the Church, for that, (saith he) as *Thomas Aquinas* excellently well observes, '*It belongs to the Signifier to determine what Sign is to be used for the signification; but God it is, who by things sensible, signifies Spiritual things in the Sacrament.*'"⁵² To which let me add, Shall frail and silly Man seek out, or contrive new Rites, or Signs, having other significations than ever the great Lawgiver appointed or intended, and call them by his Name, viz. Ordinances or Sacraments of Christ? Will God, I say, ever, think you, suffer any Man, to invent, out of his own Brains, new Signs or Symbols of Divine Gospel-Mysteries, and father them upon him? What Ordinance hath he ordained to signify the sprinkling of the Blood of Christ? this cannot certainly stand with his Care, Wisdom, and Faithfulness; you may as well, no doubt, and be as far justified, to contrive some other proper and fit Signs or Figures of other Gospel-Mysteries, and call them Sacraments of Christ, as to change his Holy Institution of Immersion, or Dipping, designed and ordained by him, chiefly as it most clearly appears to represent his Death, Burial, and Resurrection into Sprinkling, or Pouring, and make it represent washing in, or sprinkling with the Blood of Christ, and then say, and not blush, It may serve as well.

Objection: Do you acknowledge that baptism signifies our being washed in the blood of Christ?

Objection. But do you not acknowledge Baptism to signify our being washed in the Blood of Christ?

⁵⁰ I take it to mean that the previous portion was a citation of his words. – Simon

⁵¹ [See Continuat. of Pool's Annotat. on Matt. 3:6.](#)

⁵² *Dr. Du-Veil, on Acts 2:38. p. 78. Aquinas.*

Answer. In Answer to this, we do say, in a more remote sense, Baptism doth hold forth our being washed or bathed in Christ's Blood, which we doubt not but is signified in that of Titus 3:5 by the washing of Regeneration; and in Heb. 10:22, Yet certainly Sir *Norton Knatchbul* is in the right, "*The proper end of Baptism*", saith he, "*ought not to be understood, as if it were a Sign of the washing away of Sin, although it be often-times taken thus Metonymically in the New Testament.*" This therefore, we say, Washing is not at all the main or principal thing, or such as is immediately, or primarily, but only remotely, and secondarily signified thereby. But the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, which is the Rise and Root, the Original and Meritorious Cause of all the Good we partake of, is the principal Thing signified hereby. But what advantage is it to you that are only for Rantism, for us to own Washing is signified by Baptism, since Sprinkling can, as you use it, in no proper manner represent Washing? But suppose it did answer in that, yet it cannot be Baptism, because it cannot, nor does it in any respect represent the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ; nor our death to Sin, and rising again in a Figure, to walk in newness of Life; which Baptism we have shewed was appointed to do, and therefore can be no other but Immersion, Dipping and Plunging, or covering the Body in Water, which doth resemble, and most lively hold forth the Things signified thereby to our sight.

Yea these Matters, *viz.* Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, are the cardinal or great Things to be considered; for as in the Lord's Supper remotely many Things may be signified to us, yet all the Things cannot plainly be represented to our Eyes; but such Things that are the more immediate Significations of it are the proper Cause of all the rest, *viz.* Christ Crucified, and our feeding on him by Faith, or the breaking of his Body, and the pouring forth of his Blood, are most lively set forth and represented to our visible sight: So in Baptism likewise, the main and more immediate Significations, which are the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of our Blessed Savior, with our death unto Sin, and vivification to a new Life, is clearly resembled, though the Fruit of his Death, and Remission of Sin, and Purging, &c. are consequently gathered from it also.

Calvin saith, "*Baptismum esse sepulturam, in quum nulli nisi jam mortui mortuo tradendi sunt*"⁵³; *i. e.* "That Baptism is a form or way of Burial, and none but such as are already dead to Sin, or have repented from dead Works, are to be buried."

Also Learned *Zanchy*, I find, writes thus on Col. 2:12, "Of Regeneration", saith he, "there are two parts, Mortification and Vivification, that is called a Burial with Christ, this a Resurrection with Christ; the Sacrament of both these", saith he, "is Baptism, in which we are overwhelmed or buried, and after that do come forth and rise again: It may not be said truly, but sacramentally, of all that are Baptized, that they are buried with Christ, and raised with him, but only of such as have true Faith."

Now we may appeal to all the World, whether *Zanchy* doth not clearly and evidently testify the same thing which we assert, *viz.* that Baptism is and can be no other than Immersion, or Dipping, since Sprinkling, all must confess, doth not represent, in a lively Figure, the Burial and Resurrection of Christ, nor our dying, or

⁵³ [Calvin. l. 4. c. 16.](#) [section 16 – Simon]

being dead to Sin, and Vivification to Newness of Life, saith he, Sacramentally, *i. e.* Analogically; and in respect of the near Resemblance, yet truly to be buried with, and raised with Christ. This, we say, cannot be said of them that are sprinkled only; for if in respect of Mortification, and Vivification, they may be denominated, buried, and raised with Christ, yet that outward Rite and Ceremony cannot of itself denominate them so much as Sacramentally buried and raised with Christ, for there is not so much as any likeness of such Things in it. But in true Baptism, *viz* total dipping the Body in Water, and raising it again, it is in a lively Figure held forth to our sight.

Moreover *Chrysostom* saith that the old Man is buried and drowned in the Immersion under Water; and when the Baptized Person is afterwards raised up from the Water, it represents the Resurrection of the new Man to newness of Life, and therefore concludes (saith my Author) that the contrary Custom, being not only against Ecclesiastical Law, but against the Analogy and Mystical Signification of the Sacrament, it is not to be complied with.

It has been too long, God grant Men Light to see their Error, and do so no more.⁵⁴

Also Dr. *Cave* saith that the Party baptized was “wholly immersed, or put under the Water, which was the almost constant and universal Custom of those Times, whereby they did most notably and significantly express the great Ends and Effects of Baptism; for, as in immersing there are in a manner three several Acts, the putting the Person into the Water, his abiding under the Water, and his rising up again, thereby representing Christ’s Death, Burial, and Resurrection; and in our Conformity thereunto, our dying to Sin, the destruction of its Power, and our Resurrection to a new course of Life. By the Person’s being put into the Water, was lively represented the putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, &c. by his being under it, which is a kind of Burial into Water, his entering into a state of Death, or Mortification, like as Christ remained for some time under the State or Power of Death; therefore it is said, ‘*as many as are baptized into Christ, are baptized into his Death*’, &c. And then, by his Emersion, or rising up out of the Water, is signified his entering upon the new course of Life; that like as Christ was raised by the Glory of the Father, so we should walk in newness of Life.”

“We are said” (saith *Paraeus*) “to die, and to be buried with Christ in Baptism—and further shews, that the external Act of being buried in Water in Baptism, is a lively Emblem of the Internal Work of Regeneration.”⁵⁵

“This”, saith *Augustin*, speaking of these things, “is by a Sacramental Metonymy, and the meaning of it is, not that one thing is changed really into another, but because the Sign doth so lively resemble the thing signified.”

Thus all Men may see how the Learned agree with us, that these Scriptures do hold forth Baptism to be a lively Resemblance of Christ’s Death, Burial and Resurrection, and not of the spiritual things signified only, *viz* our Mortification of Sin, and rising to Holiness in a way of likeness to Christ’s Death and Resurrection, but

⁵⁴ *Prim. Christianity*, p. 320.

⁵⁵ *Paraeus upon Ursin*, p. 375.

also the outward Rite or Form of Administration of the Sign itself—to be done in a way of likeness or lively Resemblance to them both; so that either our Brethren and other Pedo-Baptists must deny the Apostle speaks here at all of the Ordinance of Baptism, or else confess they have no Baptism; I mean none of Christ's Sacrament of Baptism, theirs not answering nor representing any such things that Baptism was appointed to do, and still does among those Christians and Churches who have it according to the Primitive Institution restored to them, and practiced by them.

We are, saith Mr. *Leigh* [buried with him in Baptism unto Death:] "Baptism", saith he, "is an Instrument not only of thy Death with Christ, which is the killing of Sin, but also of thy Burial with him, &c."⁵⁶ He alludes to the manner in which Baptism was then administered, which was to plunge them in Water; the plunging of them into Water which were baptized, was a Sign of their Death and Burial with Christ.

Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, late Bishop of *Down*, in his Plea for the Baptists saith,

This indeed is truly to be baptized, when it is both in the Symbol and in the Mystery; whatsoever is less than this, is but the Symbol only, a mere Ceremony, an *opus operatum*, a dead Letter, an empty Shadow, an Instrument without an Agent to manage, or force to actuate it.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Annotat. on *Rom.* 6:4.

⁵⁷ Dr. *Taylor*, in his Book of Proph. p. 242.

5 – Proving Baptism to be Immerging or Dipping, from those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms spoken of in Scripture.

That we might remove every stumbling-block out of the way, if possible, we shall shew you what those Metaphorical Baptisms spoken of in the Scripture do hold forth.

Way great Afflictions are called Baptism.

1. We read of the Baptism of Afflictions or Sufferings. *“I have a Baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished”* (Luke 12:50; Matt. 20:22-23; Mark 10:38)! From the literal Signification of the word *Baptizo*, viz. drown, immerge, plunge under, overwhelm, great Afflictions come to be called Baptism, and signifies, as *Votius*⁵⁸ shews, not every light Affliction, but that which is vehement and overwhelming, as there are Waves of Persecution and Tribulation mentioned in Scripture; so such as are drowned and overwhelmed by them may seem in a mystical way to be baptized; the reason of the Metaphor is taken from many deep Waters to which Calamities are compared; *“He drew me out of great Waters”*, saith *David* (Psal. 32:6). *“I am come into deep Waters where the Floods overflow me”* (Psal. 69:1-2) and hence great Afflictions are called Waves, or compared to the Waves of the Sea that overflow, *“Thy Waves and thy Billows are gone over me”* (Psal. 42:7). Christ spoke of his Suffering, who was as it were drowned, or drenched, or overwhelmed in Misery, no part free: every Suffering is not the Baptism of Suffering, but great and deep Afflictions, suffering unto Blood and Death, in opposition to a lesser degree or measure of them, being dipped and plunged into Afflictions.

Mr. *Wilson* on the Baptism of Affliction renders it “to plunge into Afflictions or Dangers as it were”, saith he, “into deep Waters”; so that it appears also from this Metaphorical Notion of Baptism, to baptize is to dip, or overwhelm, or cover the Body in Water.⁵⁹ See what our last and best Annotators positively affirm on Matt. 20:22, *“To be baptized, is to be dipped in Water, say they, Metaphorically; to be plunged in Afflictions. I am, saith Christ, to be baptized with Blood, overwhelmed with Sufferings and Afflictions; are you able so to be?”* &c.

Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

2. We read of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and Fire: *“I indeed baptize you with Water, saith John, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with Fire”* (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1; Luke 3:16). Now the Question is, What we are to understand to be meant by the Baptism of the Holy Ghost? whether the sanctifying Gifts and Graces of the Spirit are intended hereby, which all the Godly receive? or those extraordinary Gifts or miraculous Effusions of the Holy Ghost only, which many received in the Primitive Times?

⁵⁸ Probably referring to Gisbertus Voetius (1589 - 1676). - Simon

⁵⁹ [See Continuation of Mr. Pool's Annotat. on Matt. 20:22.](#)

I know some are ready to make use of the Baptism of the Spirit to justify their Rite of Sprinkling or Pouring, because God is said to pour the Spirit upon his People, and to sprinkle them with clean Water, which we do grant does intend the Graces of the Holy Spirit.

But certainly if they did consider the ground and reason why Persons were said to be baptized with the Spirit, they would soon perceive this Argument would utterly fail them likewise, or stand them in no stead.

What it is to be baptized with the Spirit.

For we do affirm that every Believer who hath the Holy Spirit, cannot be said to be baptized with the Spirit; like as every one that is under Afflictions and Sufferings, cannot be said to be baptized with Sufferings, as we have shewed.

But in the first place, it is necessary to understand the difference between the Baptism commanded and the Baptism promised; the Baptism commanded is that of Water, the Baptism promised was that of the Spirit. Our Savior after his Resurrection gave forth his Commission to his Disciples, to *teach and baptize* (Matt. 28:19-20), and then "*being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the Promise of the Father, which, said he, ye have heard of me*" (Acts 1:4). What was that? why 'tis expressed in the fifth Verse, "*Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence*"; and this was made good to them on the day of *Pentecost* (Acts 2:1-3) which was no other than the Spirit in an extraordinary manner, or the miraculous Gifts thereof; these the Apostles and believing Jews received first, and in the tenth Chapter of the *Acts* the same extraordinary Gifts (Acts 10:46), or Baptism of the Spirit, the believing *Gentiles* received, I mean *Cornelius*, and those with him, for they "*spoke with Tongues and magnified God: and Peter saith, And as I spoke unto them, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the first; then, saith he, I remembered the word, &c. Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost*" (Acts 11:15-16).

Now no other Gifts of the Spirit than these great, and extraordinary, and miraculous Effusions of the Spirit we do conclude is or can be intended or meant by the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. And that you may see we are not alone in this Opinion, see what Dr. *Du Veil* saith on Acts 1:4-5, "*shall be baptized,*⁶⁰ the Greek word βαπτίζειν, says *Casaubon*, is to dip or plunge, as if it were to dye Colors; in which sense, saith he, the Apostles might be truly said to have been baptized; for the House in which this was done was filled with the Holy Ghost; so that the Apostles might seem to have been plunged into it, as in a large Fish-Pond."

Hence *Oecumenius* on Acts 2 saith,⁶¹ "a Wind filled the whole House, that it seemed like a Fish-pond, because it was promised to the Apostles, that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

To the same effect, saith another, as is noted in our Book of Metaphors, "Baptism is put for the *miraculous* Effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles, and other Believers in the Primitive Church, because of the Analogical Immersion or Dipping, for so *Baptizo* signifies; for the House where the Holy Spirit came upon the

⁶⁰ Dr. Du Veil on Act. 1:4, 5.

⁶¹ Oecumenius on Acts 2. 2.

Apostles was so filled that they were (as it were) drowned in it"⁶²; or the reason of the Metaphor saith he may be from the great plenty and abundance of those Gifts in which they were wholly immersed, as the Baptized are dipped under Water.

And it appears by what Mr. *Delaun* hath written and translated out of Tropical Writers,⁶³ that *Glassius* and others assert the same things.

And so likewise Mr. *Gosnold*, a worthy and learned Man, understood it, speaking of those Scriptures; "We have here cited", saith he, "these places diligently compared together, evidently shew that the Baptism of the Spirit is a distinct Baptism from that of Water, and hath no Reference at all to the inward sanctifying Graces of the Spirit; but notes out the most extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit that ever were given to the Sons of Men, therefore called the Baptism of the Spirit."⁶⁴

Objection: Since baptism of the Spirit was by pouring, why may not water baptism be administered so too?

Objection. But yet this Baptism however was by a pouring forth of the Spirit, and why may not Baptism be administered so?

Answer. 'Tis evident 'twas not by a sprinkling or dropping of the Spirit, and therefore no ways for your turn; and though it was by a pouring out, or a pouring forth of the Spirit, yet in such sort that the House in which they were is said to be filled, and so they immersed or baptized with it: But however, all confess this was but a Metaphorical Baptism, and therefore your Argument from hence at best is but far-fetched, and signifies nothing, for 'tis a strange way to go to the Metaphorical Notion of a word to prove a Practice that is contrary to the literal and proper Signification thereof. Moreover, if this be granted which we have hinted here, it may serve to detect the Error of some Men who own no other Baptism than that of the Spirit, and think that the ordinary Gifts and Graces of the Spirit is the Baptism of the Spirit, which there is no ground, as I can see, to believe; nor was there any other Baptism to continue to the end of the World, but that of Water without doubt, since the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was given only to the Apostles and Saints in the Primitive Time for the Confirmation of the Gospel, as these Scriptures shew (Mark 16:16-18, 20; Heb. 2:3-4). Therefore let such take care who say they have the true Baptism, and are baptized with the Spirit, lest they are found Liars, and to be indeed without any Baptism at all; for though the Saints before that great Effusion of the Spirit, nay before Christ was manifested in the Flesh, had the Holy Spirit, and some of them in a glorious manner; yet, as some learned Men observe, they were not said to be baptized with it: so likewise Believers in these days have the Spirit of Christ in the ordinary Gifts and Graces thereof, yea and the Promise of Christ is, that the Blessed Spirit the Comforter shall abide with us forever, yet are not we, nor any now baptized with it, nor have any (as I humbly conceive) since those miraculous and extraordinary Gifts ceased in the Church.

⁶² See Key to open Script. Metaphors, *lib.* 4. p. 36.

⁶³ *Philologia Sacra*, p. 190.

⁶⁴ *Treat. of Bapt.* p. 62.

Baptism of Israel in the cloud and in the sea (1 Corinthians 10).

Thirdly, There is another Typical or Metaphorical Baptism spoken of, *viz.* the Children of *Israel*, or the Fathers are said to be baptized to *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea (1 Cor. 10). Some have of late intimated, That the Rain that fell from the Cloud, sprinkled them as they passed through the Sea, and from hence would have Baptism to be Sprinkling: Truly, if that was a Baptism, *viz.* it raining upon them, the People may save their Money, and never go to Priest nor Minister more to Christen their Children, for 'tis but to carry them abroad when it rains, and they will be so baptized; and it will be as true a Baptism, no doubt: for the using the Name of *the Father*, &c. doth not make Baptism, though true Baptism can't be warrantably administered without mentioning the Names of the Sacred Trinity. But we must conclude, there was something else than that which these Men suppose in that Case, which caused the Apostle to say, "*Our Fathers were baptized unto Moses, in the Cloud, and in the Sea.*" It was doubtless a Type and plain Figure of Gospel-dipping, or burying in Water; for they were overwhelmed, 'tis evident, as it were, in the Cloud, and in the Sea.

And we must give our late *Annotators* their due at this turn also, for they speak much the sense of the Spirit of God in that place; pray take their own words, after they have given the sense of divers Learned Men upon the Text; this they fix upon us to be most probably the meaning of the Scripture;

Others, say they, most probably think, that the Apostle maketh use of this term, in regard of the great Analogy betwixt Baptism, (as it was then used) the Persons going down into the Waters, being dipped in them; and the *Israelites* going down into the Sea, the great Receptacle of Water, though the Waters at that time were gathered on heaps on either side of them; yet they seemed buried in the Waters, as Persons in that Age were when they were baptized.⁶⁵

—A very plain Figure doubtless, they having the Water on each side of them; and to which they might have added, the Watery Cloud over them, whether it broke down upon them or no, they were, as it were, buried in the Cloud and in the Sea; so that this Notion of Typical Baptism makes nothing for Sprinkling.

Conclusion.

And thus we hope we have fully evinced, and clearly proved, to all unbiassed Men, what Baptism is you have heard.

First, It is immerging, or dipping into the Water, from the proper, literal, and genuine signification of the word *Baptizo*.

Secondly, From the manner of Baptizing in the Primitive Times.

Thirdly, From the Spiritual Signification of the Holy Ordinances of Baptism, together with the great Design and End of Christ in the Institution of it.

⁶⁵ [See Continuation of M. Pool's Annotat. on 1 Cor. 10:1-2.](#)

Fourthly and lastly, From the Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms we read of in the Scriptures. We shall now proceed to speak of the Persons who are the true Subjects of Baptism in the next place.

6 – Proving Believers, or Adult Persons, only to be the Subjects of Baptism, from Christ’s great Commission, Matt. 28.

We having clearly evinced and proved what *Baptism* is, and that *Rantism* is not the Ordinance, ‘tis clearly another Act; nor is Baptism any other thing than *Immerging, Dipping, or Plunging* the Body all over in Water: And this being so, we may from the whole infer, that all those who have been only *sprinkled*, whether as Children, or Adult, are all Unbaptized Persons, and will certainly be so found in the Day of the Lord; let their Teachers affirm or say what they will for their calling it *Baptism*, does not make it to be so: for suppose the *Jews*, or the Offspring of *Abraham*, to whom God commanded Circumcision, instead of doing that Act, should have devised some other Thing in the room of it, as the pairing off the Nails of their Children at eight days old, and have given that Act the name of Circumcision, would that have made it Circumcision? And truly, they might have as good a Plea, no doubt, for such an Invention, considering how dangerous and grievous a thing Circumcision was to little Children, as the first Inventors of Sprinkling a little Water on the Face of a Babe could pretend unto, in changing *Baptism* into *Rantism*.

Now, in the next place it behoves us to enquire, who or what kind of Persons they are, that our Lord Jesus Christ hath required to be baptized; and there is no better way certainly to know this, than to go to the great Commission. “*All Power*”, saith Christ, “*is given to me in Heaven and Earth. Go ye therefore, teach all Nations, baptizing them*” (Matt. 28:18-19), &c.

1. First observe, that this Commission was given forth by Christ, just as he came out of the Grave, or rose from the Dead. Certainly what he said at other times, should with all care be minded, he being the Son of God; but much more now at this time. If God should have sent a Saint from the Dead, to let us know what we should do, would we not give all diligent heed to him? but much more to Jesus Christ.

2. In the second place, especially considering the Power and Authority he testifies the Father had given to him as *Mediator, viz.* to be Head and chief Governor of his Church; or King and Lawgiver in all Spiritual Things and Matters over the Souls and Consciences of Men, all Power to dispose of all things in Heaven and Earth, or Power over Men and Angels, *i. e.* Power to make and give forth Laws, Statutes, and Ordinances, how, and after what manner God ought by us to be worshipped in Gospel days, a Power that is given to him alone, whose Laws and Appointments none have any Power to dispense with, nor change or alter the Administration of to the end of the World; “*Go ye therefore, teach all Nations, baptizing them*”, &c.

3. Observe what is Antecedent to Baptism, “*Teach all Nations*”; there must be teaching, they must be first Taught, or made Disciples, for the word μαθητεύσατε, as is well known and confessed by all, doth signify, to disciplinize, or make Disciples, and next baptize them. And this also we find was his own practice, first to make Disciples, and then to baptize them. “*Jesus* (‘tis said there) *made and baptized more Disciples than John*” (John 4:1-2); it is not rantize them, and then teach or make Disciples of them, as the manner of some now-adays is, and for a long time has been.

Lord, that ever Men should be so bold and presumptuous, as once to attempt to alter or change anything of this Holy or Great Commission, or adventure to do Things contrary to what is given forth here by Jesus Christ, as King and Law-giver of the New Testament. *“What will they say when God rises up? What will they answer him when he visiteth them”* (Job 31:14)?

4. Note the Extent of the Commission here given by Christ to his Disciples, *“Go teach all Nations, baptizing them”*, *“Go into all Nations”*; or, as *Mark* has it, *“Into all the World”* (Mark 16:15), East as well as West, North as well as South, into Cold Countries as well as Hot, and make Disciples wherever you come, and *Baptize* them, &c. not *Rantize* them; not dip them in hot Climates, and sprinkle them in Cold.

5. Observe in whose Name they are required to baptize, viz. *“in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost”*; *“into the Name”*, so the Greek: In the Name doth not only import the naming of the Names of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but in the Authority, and into the Profession of the Blessed Trinity, of the one Divine Being, dedicating the Persons baptized (saith our Annotators) to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But how dare any presume to *Rantize* a Babe that is incapable to be taught or made a Disciple by teaching? In the Name of the Glorious Trinity, can they say and prove it, Christ hath given them any such Authority? I am sure they have no Warrant nor Authority so to do, from this Blessed Commission of Jesus Christ—It was by dipping of Adult Persons then—But it was *in an hot Country*,⁶⁶ say our late Annotators, *where at any time, without the danger of Persons Lives, it might be so done.*

Objection: Dipping may only be practiced when no danger is present for a person’s life.

Doth not our Blessed Savior’s Words immediately following fully answer this Objection,⁶⁷ and, *“Io I am with you always to the end of the World”*? Has not Christ Power to preserve, protect, and uphold all such Persons which he commands to be Baptized? Nay, can we think Christ would institute an Ordinance to destroy the Lives of any Persons? Besides, we know he has preserved thousands in this cold Climate; nay, and never did I hear of any one Person that received the least Hurt or Damage by being Baptized according to the Commission of Christ; though some have gone into the Water in the time of the great Frost, and at other Times of bitter Frost and Snow; nay, and Persons very Aged, and of both Sexes, and some that have been very weak and sickly—though our Adversaries have falsely reported to the contrary. But can they be so far left to themselves, to think this will be a good Plea for them, for changing this Ordinance of Jesus Christ, when he comes to call all Men to an account? certainly they will find themselves deceived.

⁶⁶ Objection.

⁶⁷ Answer.

Objection: Where it is possible, baptism may be by dipping and immersion, but it can't be necessary because God loves mercy rather than sacrifice.

*But say our late Annotators, "Where it might be, we judge it reasonable, and most resembling our burial with Christ, by Baptism into Death, but we can't think it necessary, for God loveth Mercy rather than Sacrifice."*⁶⁸

Answer. Sirs, wherefore do you judge it reasonable, and not necessary? Is it not necessary for you to do what Christ hath commanded, and when at no time there is any danger of the Lives of Persons? If you will follow your Master's Command, and only Baptize such who are made Disciples, viz. believing Men and Women; is it not necessary for you to do Christ's Work, as Christ has required? Is it necessary you should alter any of his Holy Laws, and make void one of the great Sacraments of the New Testament by your Traditions? I pray, my dear Brethren, consider more seriously of it.

From hence it is evident, that those who ought to be Baptized, are Disciples, and none else; and that a Disciple is one that is a Believer, one that is taught, or has learned of Christ; *"The Disciples were first called Christians in Antioch"* (Acts 11:26). "Not only", say our Annotators, "as Scholars were called amongst the Greeks from their Masters, viz. Platonists, Pythagoreans, to teach us whom we profess to learn of, and be instructed by, but to mind us of our Unction, for Christians are Anointed ones (1 John 2:27)"⁶⁹. Such Disciples are the true Subjects of Baptism.

"Yea, Christ" (saith Mr. Baxter) "in his Commission, directeth his Apostles to make Disciples, and then baptize them, promising, That *'he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.'*"⁷⁰

And in another Book of his, speaking of the same Commission,⁷¹ "This", saith he, "is not like some occasional mention of Baptism, but is the very *Commission* itself of Christ to his Disciples, for Preaching and Baptizing, and purposely expresseth their several Works, in their several Places and Order."

Their first Task is, *"To make Disciples"*, saith he, which are by Mark called *"Believers"*.

The second Work is, *"To Baptize them"*; whereto is annexed the Promise of Salvation.

The third Work is,⁷² *"To teach them"* all other things, which are after to be learned in the School of Christ. "To contemn this Order", (saith he) "is to contemn all Rules of Order: for where can we expect to find it, if not here?" I profess my Conscience is fully satisfied from this Text, that there is one sort of Faith even Saving, that must go before Baptism, the profession whereof the Minister must expect: What can any Baptist say more?

⁶⁸ [Pool's Annotat. on Matt. 28:20.](#)

⁶⁹ [Pool's Annotat. on Acts 11:26.](#)

⁷⁰ Baxter on Confirmation and Restauration, pag. 27.

⁷¹ See Mr. Tomes's Book, call'd Felo de se. Baxter's Dispute of Right to Sacraments, p. 149.

⁷² See Danvers on Baptism, p. 2, 3.

Let Mr. *Baxter* tell us what difference there is between contemning that Order Christ hath left in his great Commission, and a direct derogating from it, or acting quite contrary to it: And is not this so, *viz* to Rantize or Sprinkle, instead of Baptize and Sprinkle first, before they are taught or made Disciples? nay, and such too, who are not capable to be taught or made Disciples of: Is not this to flight, is not to contemn Christ's Order in his Commission? for since Christ appoints such, that by Teaching are made Disciples to be Baptized, he excludes all other the institution of Christ in this his Commission, being doubtless a perfect Rule; and those who do otherwise, follow their own Inventions.

I find Mr. *Danvers* cites Mr. *Perkins*, (I have not that Book of Mr. *Perkins*) speaking to this purpose, on the words of the Commission, "*Teach all Nations, baptizing them*", &c.

I explain these Terms, saith he, thus: Mark, first of all it is said, *Teach*; that is, make Disciples, by calling them to believe and repent. Here we are to consider the Order which God observes in making with Men a Covenant in Baptism.

First of all he calls them by his Word, and Commands *to believe, and to repent*. In the

Second place, God makes his Promise of Mercy and Forgiveness. And,

Thirdly, He Seals his Promise by Baptism. —They, saith he, that know not, nor consider this Order which God used in Covenanting with them in Baptism, deal preposterously, over-slipping the Commandment of Repenting and Believing.⁷³

It appears to me as if God will sometimes make Men speak the Truth whether they will or no, and confirm his own blessed Order, though they contradict their own Practice thereby.

Paraeus (the same Person saith) upon Matt. 3:5 shews, that the Order was, that Confession as a Testimony of True Repentance go first, and then Baptism for Remission of Sins afterwards.

What Commission our Brethren have got, who sprinkle Children, I know not, let them fetch a thousand Consequences, and unwarrantable Suppositions for their Practice, it signifies nothing, if Christ has given them no Authority or Rule to do what they do in his Name. Natural Consequences from Scripture we allow, but such which flow not naturally from any Scripture we deny; Can any think Christ would leave one of the great Sacraments of the New Testament, not to be proved without Consequences. For I am sure there is no Baptism to be administered before the Profession of Faith in the Commission, nor nowhere else in Christ's New Testament; and that Faith is required in the second place as pre-requisite unto Baptism, is very plain from Mark 16:16. They must be Believers, none are fit Subjects of Baptism, but they that believe, and are capable to believe; "*He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*", &c. not he that is baptized, and then believes. Take heed you do not invert Christ's Order; and if there is no Baptism to be found in the New Testament to be practiced before Faith, much less *Sprinkling* or *Rantism* is there required.

⁷³ *Danvers Book of Baptism*, p. 3, 4. Perkins.

7 – Proving Believers to be the only true Subjects of Baptism, from the Apostles Doctrine, and the Practice of the Primitive Churches.

Acts 2

We read that the Apostles, according to the Commission Christ gave them, preached the Gospel of the Kingdom, having received the Spirit from on high, and began at *Jerusalem* as he had commanded them, and so endeavored to make Men and Women Disciples, *i. e.* bringing them to the sense and sight of their Sins, and knowledge of their lost and miserable condition by Nature, as being unconverted and without Christ; and in Acts 2 where *Peter* preached the first Sermon that was preached after the Ascension of the Lord Jesus, “*And when they heard this (the Text saith) they were pricked in their Hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, what shall we do? then said Peter, REPENT AND BE BAPTIZED every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost*” (Acts 2:37-38), &c. “*And then they that gladly received the Word, were baptized; and the same day there was added to them about three thousand Souls*” (Acts 2:41).

Pray observe the Footsteps of this Flock, I mean the manner of the Constitution of this Church, it being the first Church that was planted in the Gospel-days, it was the Church at *Jerusalem*, and indeed the Mother-Church; for evident it is, all other Gospel-Churches sprang at first from this, and hence some conceive the Apostle calls this Church “*Jerusalem above, being the Mother of us all*” (Gal. 4:26), said to be above, not only because she was in her Constitution from Heaven, or by Divine and Evangelical Institution, but also might be said to be above in respect of Dignity or Privilege, being first constituted, and having the first Fruits of the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit poured out upon them; and besides, having all the great Apostles at first as Members with her; and hence ‘tis that all other Churches were to follow the Church of God that was in *Judea*, and were commended in so doing, and certainly ‘tis the Duty of all Churches so to walk unto the end of the World.

Acts 8

But to proceed, Acts 8, we find *Philip*, being by the Providence of God cast into *Samaria*, he preaches Jesus Christ to them, and “*when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both Men and Women*” (Acts 8:12): not till they were Disciples, and did believe, were any baptized: *Men and Women*, not Children; not them and their little Babes; if *Philip* had so done, he had acted contrary to his Master’s Commission. In the same Chapter we find he preached Christ to the *Eunuch* also, “*And they came to a certain Water; and the Eunuch said, See, here is Water, what doth hinder me to be baptized*” (Acts 8:36)? “*And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine Heart, thou mayst. And the Eunuch answered, and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God: And they both went down into the*

Water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him" (Acts 8:37-38)⁷⁴. There must be Faith or no Baptism, thou mayst or thou ought, 'tis lawful, or according to Christ's Law, *i. e.* his Commission. "A Verbal Profession is not sufficient"⁷⁵, say our late Annotators on this place. *Philip* in God's Name requires a Faith as with all the Heart, and not such as *Simon Magus* had, who is said to believe, and be baptized (Acts 8:13), this was (say they) the only thing necessary, either then or now if rightly understood.

"How was it known",⁷⁶ saith Mr. *Baxter*, "but by their Profession, that the *Samaritans* believed *Philip* preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, before they were baptized both Men and Women and, saith he, *Philip* caused the *Eunuch* to profess before he would baptize him, that he believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God."

Acts 10, 16 and 18

Moreover, in the tenth of the Acts we find *Cornelius* and those with him were first made Disciples by *Peter's* preaching, and the Spirit's powerful Operation, and then were baptized (Acts 10:45, 47-48); "*Who can forbid Water* (saith he) *that they should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as me? And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*"; that is, by the Authority of Christ according to the Commission (Acts 16:31-33). So in Acts 16 when the poor trembling Jailor was made a Disciple, *i. e.* did believe with his whole House on the Lord Jesus Christ, he was with his whole House baptized; so "*Lydia believed and was baptized*" (Acts 16:14), the like in Acts 18, *Crispus "believing on the Lord, and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized"* (Acts 18:8).

The Chief Ruler believed with all his House and were baptized, he believed, his House believed, the Jailor believed, all runs in their believing, all must by believing be made Disciples, or not be baptized.

Luther saith that "in Times past, the Sacrament of Baptism was administered to none except it were to those that acknowledged and confessed their Faith, and knew how to rehearse the same, and why are they now?"⁷⁷

See Mr. *Baxter* in his sixteenth Argument against Mr. *Blake*, "if there can be no Example given in Scripture of any one that was baptized without the Profession of a saving Faith or any Precept for so doing, then must we not baptize any without it. But", saith he, "the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the Consequent."⁷⁸

1. "I have", saith he, "shewed you, *John* required the Profession of true Repentance, and that his Baptism was for Remission of Sins."

⁷⁴ Acts 8:37 is a textual variant which is why most modern English translations leave it out or place it within square brackets.

⁷⁵ [Pools Annotat. on Acts 8:37.](#)

⁷⁶ [Baxter on Confirmat. p. 27.](#)

⁷⁷ *Luther*, Tom. 3. fol. 168. cited by Mr. *Danvers*, p. 8. on Baptism.

⁷⁸ *Baxter's* 2d Disputation, p. 149.

2. "When Christ layeth down the Apostolical Commission, the Nature and Order of the Apostles Work, it is first to make them Disciples, and then to baptize them in the Name," &c.

That it was saving Faith that was required of the Jews and professed by them is plain in the Text (Acts 2:38).

The *Samaritans* believed, and had great Joy, and were baptized (Acts 8:8, 12), &c.

"The Condition upon which" (saith he) "the *Eunuch* must be baptized was, if he believe with all his Heart" (Acts 8:37).

Paul was baptized after Conversion (Acts 9:18).

The Holy Ghost fell on the Gentiles before they were baptized (Acts 10:44).

Lydia's Heart was opened before she was baptized, and was one the Apostle judged faithful (Acts 16:14).

So he goes over with all the Scriptures we have mentioned, proving they were Believers, and none else, that all along in the New Testament were baptized; 'tis strange to me that the Man should have such clear Light and plead for the Commission, and the Practice of the Primitive Christians, and yet dare attempt to sprinkle Children, having neither a Command from Christ, or a Precedent from the Apostles for any such thing.

Objection: Believers baptism was only in the Apostles' time when the church was in its infancy.

Objection. I know 'tis objected Baptism was administered only to Believers in the Apostles time, but that was the Infancy of the Church.

Answer. I am not a little troubled to hear any Man to argue after this manner; for though it be granted in the Apostles days the Church was newly constituted, and so might be said to be new born; yet to say that was the Infancy of the Church, (as Infancy imports in our common Acceptation, Weakness or Imperfection) is a false and foolish Assertion.

1. Because that was in truth the time of the Churches greatest Glory, Perfection and Beauty, and very soon after the Apostles fell asleep, the Church, though she grew older, yet she decayed, and Corruptions crept in; the Church might in that respect be compared to a glorious Flower, that as soon as ever it is blown and quite put forth it is in its Glory, and let it stand a while and it soon fades, and loses much of its Luster and Beauty; even so did the Church of God: and it was foretold also by the Apostles, it would so after their departure come to pass, by the entering in of grievous Wolves who should not spare the Flock (Acts 20), *i. e.* the Church; nay, the Spirit of Antichrist, (*Paul* saith,) or "*Mystery of Iniquity*", did "*even then work*" in the Apostles days (2 Thess. 2:7). And St. *John* speaks to the same purpose, "*Little Children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists, whereby we know that this is the last time*" (1 John 2:18): and indeed all generally believe the Church continued not a pure Virgin to Christ much longer

than one hundred Years after his Death; now then shall any presume to say that was the Infancy of the Church, as if the Church arrived to clearer Light, Strength, and Glory in after-Times.

But, 2. Had not the Gospel-Church in that Age the extraordinary Apostles with it, like to whom never any rose after to succeed them; nay such who were conversant with the Lord Jesus after he rose from the Dead (Acts 1:3), and spoke to him mouth to mouth, and did eat and drink with them? as *Peter* saith (Acts 10:41).

3. Had not the Church then extraordinary Gifts, nay, such an infallible Spirit and Presence of Christ with her, that her Sons could clearly discern Spirits, and know when they speak, and when the Spirit spoke in them? "*Now speak I, not the Lord.*"

4. Was not that Church set up to be a Pattern, or perfect Copy, after which all succeeding Churches were to write? can we think that others ever attained to the like, much less to greater Light and Knowledge than they? These things considered, fully shew the folly and weakness of this Assertion and Objection.

But if Believers were the only Subjects of Baptism in the Primitive Time, and this was according to the Commission of Christ and Practice of those days, how came this Order and Administration to be altered and changed, I mean by whose Authority? nay, and which is worst of all, if that Infant-Baptism may be deemed to be a Divine Rite, or an Ordinance of God, since 'tis not recorded in the Scripture, nor practiced in the Apostles Time, it renders not only the Gospel-Church weak and imperfect, but Christ himself unfaithful, or less faithful than *Moses*, who was but the Servant, and yet lest nothing dark or unwritten which God commanded him, but did do everything exactly according to the Pattern shewed him in the Mount.

Nay, and by the same Argument (since Infant-Baptism was not instituted by Christ, not practiced in the Primitive Church) and yet may be admitted as a Divine Ordinance of Christ, and so practiced by Christians; why may not all, or many other Rites and Sacraments owned and maintained in the *Romish* Church, be admitted also? But,

Objection: Infant-Baptism is nowhere forbidden.

Objection. I have heard some say, Is it anywhere forbid?

Answer. To which I answer, where are such things as Crossings, Salt, Spittle, and Sureties, &c. forbid? At this Door what Inventions and Innovations may not come in, or be admitted, of such a dangerous Consequence is this, that it would undo us all!

Objection: Adults were baptized at the first preaching of the Gospel, but afterwards their children had a right to baptism.

Objection. But say you at that time, *i. e.* at the first preaching the Gospel and planting Churches, Adult Persons were baptized only because they were before they believed either Jews or Heathens; but when they believed and were baptized, their Children had a right to Baptism likewise.

Answer. This is soon said, but hardly, nay not at all to be proved. For it cannot be their Children's right without Authority or Command from Christ: for if we should grant all our Brethren say concerning *Abraham's*

Seed, and of their Children's being in Covenant, this will not justify their Practice of baptizing them, if they argue thus till Dooms-day, except Christ hath left them a Precept, or his Church a Precedent so to do; for *Abraham's* Seed, though they were such a thousand times over, had no right to Circumcision until he received the word of Command to circumcise them from the great God. Nor had *Lot*, and other godly Men in that day, any right to that Ceremony who were not of *Abraham's* Family, because God limited his Command to himself, his Sons, and Servants, or such who were bought with Money, and so came into his House.

Secondly, We desire it may be considered that the History we have of the Gospel-Church in the Apostles days from the first planting of the Church at *Jerusalem*, till *St. John* received his Revelations, contains more than fifty Years, and there was no fewer than three thousand Persons baptized at once in that first Church; so that we may conclude there were many thousands of Believers who doubtless had many Children born unto them during the time of the Gospel contained in the History we have recorded in the New Testament, and yet we read not of one of their Children upon the account of federal Holiness, and their Parents covenanting with God, baptized; and can any be so blind as to think the holy God would have left this thing so in the dark without the least hint or intimation, had it been any of his Mind or Counsel that Believers Seed should be baptized? I am sure they cannot say it, without reflecting upon the Faithfulness, Care, and Wisdom of God.

8 – Proving Believers the only true Subjects of Baptism from the special ends of this holy Sacrament.

What the special end and use of Baptism is, comes next in order to be considered, wherein it will more fully and clearly appear that no Infant in Non-Age⁷⁹ ought by any means to be baptized.

Baptism is a sign inward grace, that is, union in Christ's death, burial and resurrection.

First of all, it was ordained to be a Sign or figure unto the Baptized of some inward Spiritual Grace, viz. of the Person's Death unto Sin, and Vivification to a new Life "*buried with him in Baptism*", i. e. Christ doth certainly expressly relate immediately (if not wholly) in those Texts of Scripture (Col. 2:12; Rom. 6:4) to that outward Sign it self, as that in which there is a plain Representation of the Mystery and inward Grace, we are said to be buried and risen both in Signification, and also in lively Representation of the inward and spiritual Burial and Resurrection with Christ.

The sign and the thing signified as a motive and reason.

Secondly, Here is mention made of the Sign, and of the Thing signified. And as for that which is spoken of under this Expression, "*Buried in Baptism*", 'tis delivered as a *Medium* (saith one) whereby, as a Motive whereunto, and as a Reason wherefore, as an Image and Representation, wherein we are both to read, and remember, and also practice and perform that other; for, do but mark (Romans 6:3-6), "*how shall we that are dead to Sin, (i. e. should be) live any longer therein? Know ye not, that as many of you as were baptized into Christ*", i. e. into, or in token of an Interest in him, and of a Oneness and Fellowship with him by Faith, "*are baptized into his Death?*" i.e. in token of such a Communion with the Power of his Death, as to kill Sin, and crucify the old Man, so "*that henceforth we should not serve Sin?*" therefore hence it is, saith he, that in Baptism, (i. e. the outward Sacrament) we are "*buried with him*", i. e. outwardly, visibly, bodily in Water "*into his Death*", i. e. in token and resemblance of our dying unto Sin by virtue of his Death? That we should be ever practically mindful of this, "*That like as Christ rose again after he was dead, so we should rise to a new Life; for if we have been planted together in the likeness of his Death*", (i. e. signally in outward Baptism, spiritually, and really in the inward Work of Death unto Sin, &c, performed by the Spirit upon the Soul) "*we shall be also in the likeness of his Resurrection.*"

Christ's burial and resurrection is a motive and argument for our spiritual death and resurrection.

Thirdly, This Burial and Resurrection that is immediately expressed by these words, "*Buried with him in Baptism, wherein ye are also risen with him*" (Col. 2:12), is made a Motive, Argument, and Incitement to the spiritual Death and Resurrection; for therefore are we persuaded to die to Sin and live righteously, because in

⁷⁹ That is, "a period of youth" or "lack of maturity". <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nonage> - Simon

Baptism we are buried in Water, and raised again, in token that we ought so to do; and to this end are we baptized, and buried, and raised therein, and so interested into all the other Benefits of Christ's Death, Remission of Sins, and Salvation, viz. that we should die to Sin and live holily, and to the end also that we may thereby be put in mind so to do.

Baptism teaches us to die to sin.

Now if this Death and Burial in Baptism be to this end, viz. to teach us, and shew us how we must die to Sin: Then I infer two things,

First, That the burial in Baptism, here spoken of, is not the Death to Sin; for the Motive, and things we are moved to do, are two; and so are the Sign, and the Thing signified.

Secondly, That Infants are not capable Subjects of Baptism: for this Sacrament calls for Understanding, and Judgment, and Senses to be exercised in all that partake thereof, or else the whole work will be altogether insignificant. Therefore, saith one, "to carry a poor Babe to Baptism, is as much as to carry it to hear a Sermon."—"A Sign", as *Pareus* observeth, "is some outward thing appearing to the Sense, through, which some inward thing is at the same time apprehended by the Understanding."

"Therefore," saith Mr. *Perkins*, "the preaching of the Word, and the administration of Sacraments are all one in substance; for in the one the Witness of God is seen, and in the other heard."⁸⁰

Baptism shows the believers union with Christ.

Secondly, Another end of Baptism is, that it might be a signal Representation of a Believers Union with Christ, hence called a being baptized into Christ, and a putting on of Christ.

"As many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, and are all one in Christ Jesus", saith Mr. *Baxter*, and "are *Abraham's* Seed, and Heirs according to Promise (Gal. 3:27-29)."⁸¹

This speaks the Apostle of the probability grounded on a credible Profession, &c.

"*And further*", saith he, "our Baptism is the Solemnizing of our Marriage with Christ, and 'tis a new and strange kind of Marriage where there is no Profession of Consent."

Now if this be true which Mr. *Baxter* affirms, and I see no cause to doubt of it; (most worthy Men, as well as Scripture, agreeing in this case with him) how absurd and ridiculous a thing is the Invention of Infant-Baptism, since all Men know they are not capable to signify their Consent of Marriage with Christ; if anything in the World cuts in pieces the very Sinews of Infants Baptism 'tis this; for there is a Contract made between both Parties before the Solemnization of Marriage; and how can a Babe of two or ten days old do that? 'tis a

⁸⁰ *Perkins* Case of Consc. p. 177.

⁸¹ *Baxter* on Confirm. p. 32.

strange Marriage if it be not done, though more strange indeed without the other. But may be some will say 'tis a Marriage by Proxy or Sureties, as Princes sometimes are married.

Answer. Sometimes there has been some such like Action done I must confess: But does not the Prince actually consent so to be married? But all this while, who has required anything of this at our Hands? Are not Sureties in Baptism a mere human Invention? and have not our Brethren cast it away as such?

Baptism is a sign of the Covenant on God's part.

The third end of Baptism, as Mr. *Perkins* observes, is this, *viz.* 'Tis a Sign to Believers of the Covenant on God's part of the washing away of our Sins in the Blood of Christ; "we see", saith he, "what is done in Baptism, the Covenant of Grace is solemnized between God and the Party baptized; and in this Covenant something belongs to God, and something to the Party baptized." Are Infants capable thus to covenant with God? though we doubt not but it is so in some good sense between the Almighty and a Believer, who is the only Subject, *i. e.* there is indeed a mutual Stipulation on both Parties in that Solemnity, but an Infant can do nothing herein.

"Baptism", saith *Bullinger*, "is an Agreement or Covenant of Grace which Christ enters into with us when we are baptized"⁸², &c.

Baptism testifies to the genuineness of repentance for the remission of sins.

Fourthly, Baptism is called the Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins; one end of this Ordinance therefore is this, *viz.* To testify the Truth of our Repentance, and to engage us thereby to bring forth Fruits meet for amendment of Life.

"As their Sins are not forgiven them",⁸³ saith Mr. *Baxter*, "till they are converted; so they must not be baptized for the Forgiveness of Sins, till they profess themselves converted, seeing to the Church *non esse & non apparere* is all one. Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, is the sum of that preaching that makes Disciples (Acts 20:21). Therefore both these must by Profession seem to be received, before any at Age are Baptized."

And that no other, say I, besides them at Age ought to be baptized, by this very Argument is very clear and evident.

Bullinger, as he is quoted by Mr. *Baxter*, I find speaketh thus, *viz.*

To be baptized in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, saith he, is by a Sign of Baptism, to testify that we do believe in Christ for the Remission of Sins: First, mark, it is not only an Engagement to believe

⁸² *Bullinger upon Acts 2:38.*

⁸³ *Baxter on Confirm. p. 30, 31.*

hereafter; but the Profession, saith he, of a present Faith. Secondly, And that not a common Faith, but that which hath Remission of Sin.⁸⁴

Farewell to Infant Baptism; a present Faith is required of such that are to be baptized, nay, and more, a present profession of it too. Infants have neither Faith, nor can they profess it, *Ergo* they are not to be baptized.

Baptism signifies regeneration.

Fifthly, Another End of Baptism is, (as one well observes) to evidence present Regeneration; whereof, saith he, it is “a lively Sign or Symbol—Hence ‘tis called *the Washing of Regeneration*; what signifies the Sign, where the Thing signified is wanting? Baptism is frequently called the *Laver of Regeneration*, it being a Sign or Figure of it to the Person Baptized.”⁸⁵

“Christ hath instituted no Baptism,” saith Mr. *Baxter*, “but what is to be a Sign of present Regeneration; but to Men that profess not a Justifying Faith, it cannot be administered as a Sign of Regeneration.”

Therefore he hath instituted no Baptism to be administered to such. Does not this Argument make void the Baptism of Infants, as well as Adult Unbelievers, by the Ancients? Let Mr. *Baxter* take it again, but with a very little alteration. “*Christ hath instituted no Baptism but what is to be a Sign of present Regeneration; but to little Babes that profess not a justifying Faith, it cannot be administered as a Sign of present Regeneration, therefore he hath instituted no Baptism to be administered to Infants.*” The stress of the Argument lies in the Institution of Christ, in that no Baptism is instituted and commanded by Christ, but what is a Sign of present Regeneration, not Future; therefore Infant-Baptism can be no Baptism of Christ.

Baptism is the covenant of a good conscience before God.

Sixthly, Baptism is called, “*An Answer of a good Conscience, by the Resurrection of Christ*” from the Dead (1 Pet. 3:21); or “*the Covenant of a good Conscience by the Resurrection of Christ*”, (as saith Sir Norton *Knatchbul*, in his Learned Notes printed at *Oxford*, 1677) “*in the belief of which Resurrection we are saved*”, saith he, “*as they were saved by the Ark.*” But now Infants cannot Covenant thus, nor Witness thus in Baptism by a Belief of the Resurrection, (which saith the said famous Learned Man) Baptism is an emphatical Figure, or a particular Signal of, to the Person baptized.

See what our Late Annotators speak upon the place;

In Baptism, say they, there is a solemn Covenant, or mutual Agreement between God and the Party baptized, wherein God offers, applies, and seals his Grace, stipulating or requiring the Parties acceptance of that Grace, and devoting himself to his Service; and when he, out of a good Conscience doth engage and promise this, which is to come up to the terms of the Covenant, that may be properly called *the Answer of a good Conscience*—it seems, say they, to be an allusion to the

⁸⁴ Bullinger on Acts 2:38.

⁸⁵ Tit. 3:5. Baxter in his *Disput. with Mr. Blake*, p. 117. as quoted by Mr. Danvers.

manner of Baptizing, where the Minister asked the Party to be Baptized concerning his Faith in Christ; and he accordingly answered him, Dost thou believe? I believe (Acts 8:37), &c.⁸⁶

Now, are Children capable to do any of this? Can they covenant with God? Can they answer a good Conscience, by believing the Resurrection of Christ? or can Baptism appear to be a Symbol of it to them? No, nor indeed can *Rantism* be so to any other, I mean to the Adult.

Baptism is the entrance to the Visible Church and all other Ordinances and Privileges thereof.

Seventhly, Baptism hath another End and Use assigned to it, *viz.* That the Party baptized may have an orderly entrance into the Visible Church, and so have a right to partake of all other Ordinances and Privileges thereof, as *breaking of Bread*, &c. This hereafter I shall make fully appear; nor is it any other thing than is generally owned by Christians, and eminent Men; but Infants cannot be admitted to those Privileges, *viz.* to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, &c. and therefore ought not to be baptized; for he that has right to one, cannot be denied the other, by any Ground or Authority from God's Word.

⁸⁶ [Pool's Annotat. on Tit. 3:5.](#)

9 – Containing several other Arguments, proving, why not Infants, but Believers only, are the true Subjects of Baptism.

Argument I: If there is only command to baptize believers, then infants should not be baptized.

If there is no word of Institution, or anything in the Commission of Christ for Baptizing Infants, but of Believers only, then not Infants but Believers only ought to be Baptized.

But there is no word of Institution, or anything in the Commission of Christ, for baptizing Infants, but of Believers only; *Ergo*, not Infants, but Believers only are the Subjects of Baptism.

The Major Proposition is undeniable: for if Infants may be baptized “*in the Name*”, &c. without any Authority from Christ, or word of Institution, or the least intimation of it in the great Commission, what Innovation can we keep out of the Church? This is enough to cause any Protestant to renounce his Religion, and cleave to the Romish Communion, who asserts the Church’s Power is such, that without a word of Institution, she may do the Lord knows what.—Nor do they, as far as I can find, assert Infant-Baptism from the Authority of the Scripture; but from the Power Christ has left in the Church, in which they seem more honest than some Protestants, that pretend to maintain this Rite, by plain Scripture-proof, without the least shadow or intimation of any such thing, to the palpable Reproach of the Christian Religion.

As to the Minor, ‘tis evident, and owned by the Learned, that those who are enjoined to be baptized, in the Commission, are first to be taught, or made Disciples (Matt. 28:19): But Infants cannot be made Disciples, being incapable of teaching; therefore there is nothing in that Commission of Infant-Baptism: If they have any other word of Institution or Commission, let them produce it, we profess we know of none.

Objection: The Disciples were commanded to “baptize all nations” and children are part of the nations.

Objection. Christ commanded his Disciples to “*baptize all Nations*”; Children are part of the Nations, therefore may be baptized: Thus you see we have Authority to baptize Children from the great Commission.

Answer. Let me have the same liberty to argue, and see what will follow, *viz.* Christ commanded his Disciples to baptize all Nations; but *Turks, Pagans, and Infidels*, with their Children, are part of the Nations, *Ergo, Turks, Pagans, and Infidels*, and their Children, may be baptized also. Sir, I will appeal to you, is not this Inference as good and as justifiable as yours? Come put it to your Consciences; Can you suppose any should be baptized by virtue of the words of Christ in the Commission, but Disciples only?

Objection: Infants are disciples, and therefore may be baptized.

Objection. Well, what though that be so? yet we affirm, that Infants are Disciples, and therefore may be baptized.

Answer. What if we shall grant you that Infants are Disciples, (which we can never do, it being utterly false) yet they are not such Disciples that Christ in the Commission requires to be baptized, because they were to be made Disciples, by being taught; and that Infants cannot be said to be, we are sure.

The Lord Jesus hath plainly excluded Infants in his Commission from this Administration, according to ordinary Rule; for in that he commands them to *Baptize Disciples*, upon preaching first to them, it follows, that none but such who are so taught, and so by teaching made Disciples, are by virtue of the Commission, to be baptized; Infants, after an ordinary rate are incapable of understanding the Gospel, when preached, and therefore are incapable of being made Disciples thereby, and there is no other way, according to ordinary Rule, of being made Disciples but by that means: And this the Apostles could easily understand, as knowing that under the term Disciple, in common speech, and in the whole New Testament, those only are meant, who being taught, professed the Doctrine preached by such a one as *John's* Disciples, Christ's Disciples, and the Disciples of the Pharisees, &c. and accordingly the Apostles administered Baptism. And in that Christ appoints, these to be Baptized, we say, he excludes all others; for the Institution, Commission, and Commandment of Jesus Christ, is most certainly the only Rule, according to which we are to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, and all other Holy Things; and they that do otherwise, open a Door to all Innovations, and follow their own Inventions, and are guilty of Will-worship. If you should say, Infants are Disciples *seminally* in and by their Parents: as if Believers could beget Believers, or Disciples of Christ by natural Generation, is absurd and ridiculous, the Christian Church being not made up of Persons by mere Humane Birth, but Spiritual Regeneration. And to say that Infants are born Disciples by the relation to the Covenant, and so have the Seal set on them, without any precedent Teaching, is but an unapproved Dictate; as if a Title to Baptism were in its Nature a Seal of the Covenant, which the Scripture nowhere affirms; nor is there any Rule for baptizing of Persons because of Relation to the Covenant, since Baptism wholly depends upon a positive Institution.

Objection: Since circumcision belonged to infants, and it is called a yoke laid upon the necks of the disciples, therefore, infants are disciples.

Objection. But you further argue, that Infants are called Disciples. Because the Yoke laid upon the Necks of the Disciples, was Circumcision (Acts 15:10); and Circumcision belonged to Infants, *ergo*, Infants are Disciples.

Answer. To this we Answer, That there is no color of Ground or Reason of giving the Name of Disciples from that Text to Infants: for though true, they are called Disciples, upon whose Necks the false Brethren would have put that Yoke of Circumcision; yet what's this, since Adult Believers of the Gentiles also were required by the Jews to be circumcised, as *Timothy* (Acts 16:3). And though it be granted that they would have had Infants, as well as the converted Gentiles, to be circumcised, yet the putting the Yoke of Circumcision, is not actual Circumcision in the Flesh; for that the Jews, as well as their Children, were able to bear for many Ages. But the Yoke of Circumcision is the necessity of it upon Men's Consciences, and therewith to oblige them to keep the whole Law of *Moses*, or they could not be saved; and this was not that which they would have put upon Children, but upon the Disciples, *i. e.* the faithful Brethren in Christ Jesus.

Argument II: If Faith and Repentance is required, then none are to be baptized but believers.

If Faith and Repentance be required as prerequisite of all them that are to be baptized; then none but Believers ought to be baptized—but Faith and Repentance is required of all such; *Ergo*, &c.

The Major Proposition cannot be denied, without a palpable violation of Christ's Precept, and by the same Rule that Infants may be baptized, notwithstanding this absolute prerequisite, Unbelievers may, invalidate the Rule of Christ, or render it defective, and you give all away to the Enemy. The Minor has been sufficiently proved.

"If thou believest, thou mayest", else he might not (Acts 8:37); that it seems was absolutely necessary, *"Repent, and be baptized every one of you"* (Acts 2:36-37), and, those of the Church of *England* say the same thing.

In the Rubric, *What is required of Persons that are to be baptized?* that's the Question.

Answer, Repentance, whereby they forsake Sin; and, Faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the Promise of God made to them in that Sacrament.

Argument III: There is no precedent that any besides those who professed faith and repentance were baptized.

If there be no Precedent in the Scripture, (as there is no Precept) that any besides such who professed Faith and Repentance, were baptized; then none but such ought to be baptized: but there is no Precedent that any besides such who professed Faith and Repentance were baptized; *Ergo*, none but such ought.

Had Infant-Baptism been any Appointment or Institution of Christ, we should certainly either have had Precept or Example in the Scripture to warrant the same; but in as much as the Holy Scripture is wholly silent therein, there being not one Example, or the least Syllable to be found for any such Practice, we may be sure it is none of Christ's Ordinance.

If our Brethren have any Precedent or Example for it, let them shew it, for we declare and testify, there is none as we know of.

And that there is neither Precept nor Example for Infants Baptism, we have it confessed by many of them who were for it.

Erasmus saith, "It is nowhere expressed in the Apostolical Writings, that they baptized Children." And again, upon Rom. 6, "Baptizing of young Infants was not", saith he, "in use in St. *Paul's* Time."⁸⁷

⁸⁷ Union of the Church.

Calvin also confesses, "it is nowhere expressly mentioned by the Evangelists, that any one Child was baptized by the Hands of the Apostles."⁸⁸

Ludovicus Vives saith, "None of old were wont to be baptized but in a grown Age; and who desired it, and understood what it was."⁸⁹

The *Magdeburgenses*, as I find them quoted by Mr. *Danvers*, do say, that concerning the baptizing of the Adult, both Jews and Gentiles, we have sufficient Proof from the *2d, 8th, 10th, and 16th* Chapters of the *Acts*; but as to the baptizing of Infants they can meet with no Example in Scripture.⁹⁰

Dr. *Taylor* saith,

It is against the perpetual Analogy of Christ's Doctrine to baptize Infants; for besides that, Christ never gave any Precept to baptize them, nor ever himself, nor his Apostles (that appears) did baptize any of them: All that either he or his Apostles said concerning it, requires such previous Dispositions to Baptism, of which Infants are not capable, and those are Faith and Repentance. And not to instance in those innumerable places that require Faith before Baptism there needs no more but this one of our blessed Savior: "*He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned*": plainly thus Faith and Baptism will bring a Man to Heaven; but if he hath no Faith, Baptism shall do him no good: so that if Baptism, saith he, be necessary, so is Faith much more; for the want of Faith damns absolutely, it is not said so of the want of Baptism.⁹¹

Argument IV: Paul declared the whole counsel of God, but did not declare Infant Baptism.

If *Paul* declared the whole Counsel of God unto the Churches and Primitive Christians, and yet never declared or made known to them Infants Baptism. Then Infants Baptism is none of the Counsel of God. But *Paul* did declare unto the Churches and Primitive Christians the whole Counsel of God, but never declared anything to them of Infants Baptism. *Ergo*.

The Major Proposition can't fairly be denied: and as to the Minor, see Acts 20:27, "*For I have not shunned*", saith he, "*to declare unto you all the Counsel of God.*" It appears by the Context, that he concluded he could not be pure from the Blood of all Men, if he had not been faithful in this matter, *i. e.* in making known all the whole Will of God to them. *Paul* was the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and he spoke these words to a Gentile Church, *viz.* the Church at *Ephesus*, and therefore it is the more remarkable, God hath by his Mouth made known all things that are necessary for us to know or understand of his Counsel, or our Duty. See our late Annotators on this Verse.

⁸⁸ 4th Book of Instit. c. 16.

⁸⁹ De Civit. Dei, lib. 1. cap. 27.

⁹⁰ Magdeb. in Cent. 1. l. 2. p. 496.

⁹¹ Lib. Proph. p. 239.

God's Decree to save all that believe in Christ, or the whole Doctrine of Christianity, as it directs to an holy Life; whatsoever God requires of any one in order to a blessed Eternity: this is that which (say they) the *Pharisees* rejected, Luke 7:30 and so do all wicked and ungodly Men, who refuse to take God's Counsel, or to obey his Command.⁹²

Now Baptism is that part of God's Counsel which the *Pharisees* rejected against themselves. Moreover in Chap. 19 it appears he opened and explained that great Ordinance to those Christians at *Ephesus*, at the first Plantation of the Church there, but not a word of their Duty to baptize their Infants; nor was there any reason he should, it being none of God's Counsel.

Argument V: Whatever is necessary to faith and practice is in the Scriptures, but Infant Baptism is not.

If whatsoever is necessary to Faith or Practice, is left in the written Word, or made known to us in the Holy Scripture, that being a complete and perfect Rule, and yet Infant-Baptism is not contained or left therein, then Infant-Baptism is not of God. But whatsoever is necessary to Faith or Practice, is left in the written Word, or made known to us in the Holy Scripture, &c. and yet Infant-Baptism is not contained therein. *Ergo*, Infant-Baptism is not of God.

That the Holy Scripture contains in it all things that are necessary for us to believe and practice in order to Eternal Life, is acknowledged by all worthy Men both Ancient and Modern; and that Infants Baptism is not contained in the holy Scripture we have proved.

"The holy Scriptures", saith *Athanasius*, "being inspired from God, are sufficient to all Instructions of Truth."⁹³

Isychius saith, "Let us which will have anything observed of God, search no more but that which the Gospel doth give unto us."⁹⁴

"All things", saith *Chrysostom*, "be plain and clear in the Scripture; and what things so ever be needful, are manifest there."⁹⁵

If there be any thing needful to be known or not to be known, we shall learn it by the Holy Scriptures; if we shall need to reprove a Falsehood, we shall fetch it from thence; if to be corrected, to be chastened, to be exhorted, or comforted; to be short, if ought lack, that ought to be taught or learned, we shall also learn it out of the same Scriptures.

Augustin saith, "Read the Holy Scriptures, wherein ye shall find fully what is to be followed, and what to be avoided."⁹⁶

⁹² [Pool's Annotat. on Acts 20:27.](#)

⁹³ *Athanasius* against the Gentiles.

⁹⁴ *Isychius* lib. 5. 6. 16. on *Levit.*

⁹⁵ *Chrys.* on 2 Thes. & 2 Tim. 3.

⁹⁶ *Aug.* to the Brethren in the Wildern.

And again he saith, "In these therefore, which are evidently contained in the Scriptures, are found all things which contain Faith, manner of living, Hope and Love."⁹⁷

"Let us seek no farther than what is written of God our Savior, lest a Man would know more than the Scriptures witness."⁹⁸

Luther saith, "there ought no other Doctrine to be delivered, or heard in the Church, besides the pure Word of God, that is the Holy Scriptures, let other Teachers, and Hearers, with their Doctrine be accursed."⁹⁹

Basil saith, "that it would be an Argument of Infidelity, and a most certain sign of Pride, if any Man should reject any things written, and should introduce things not written."¹⁰⁰

"Let this", saith *Calvin*, "be a firm *Axiom*, that nothing is to be accounted the Word and Will of God to which place should be given in the Church, but that which is contained in the Law and Prophets, and after in the Apostolical Writings."¹⁰¹

"It is", saith *Theophilact*, "the part of a Diabolical Spirit to think anything Divine, without the Authority of the Holy Scripture."¹⁰²

Bellarmino saith, "that though the Arguments of the *Anabaptists*, from the defect of Command or Example, have a great force against the *Lutherans*, for as much as they use that Rite everywhere, having no Command or Example theirs is to be rejected; yet is it of no force against *Catholics*, who conclude the Apostolical Tradition is of no less Authority with us than the Scripture; for the Apostles speak with the same Spirit with which they did write; but this of baptizing of Infants is an Apostolical Tradition, &c."¹⁰³

And lastly, to close with this Argument, take what Mr. *Ball* saith,

We must for every Ordinance look to the Institution (saith he) and neither stretch it wider, nor draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it; for he is the Institutor of the Sacraments, according to his own pleasure, and 'tis our part to learn of him both to whom, how, and for what end the Sacraments are to be administered; in all which we must affirm nothing but what God hath taught us, and as he taught us.¹⁰⁴

If this worthy Man speak Truth, as be sure he did, and his Doctrine be embraced, certainly our Brethren must never sprinkle, nay baptize, one Child any more.

⁹⁷ *Lib. 2. of Christian Doctrine, c. 3.*

⁹⁸ In his 198 Epistle to *Fortunat*.

⁹⁹ Luther upon Gal. 1:9.

¹⁰⁰ *Basil* in his Sermon *de side*.

¹⁰¹ [Calvin. I. 4. Instit. c. 8.](#) [section 8 – Simon] Sermon 8.

¹⁰² *Theoph. lib. 2. Paschal.*

¹⁰³ *Bellarmino*. in his Book *de Bapt.* l. 1. c. 8.

¹⁰⁴ Mr. *Ball* in his Answer to the *New-England Elders, p. 38, 39.*

Argument VI: No one was commended by God for baptizing any child nor reproved for the neglect thereof, therefore, Infant-Baptism is not of God.

If no Man or Woman at any time or times were by the Almighty God, Jesus Christ, nor his Apostles neither commended for baptizing any one Child or Children, nor reproved for neglecting to baptize such; then Infants Baptism is not of, nor from God.

But no Man or Woman was at any time or times either commended by the Almighty God, &c. for baptizing any one Child or Children, nor reproved for neglecting to baptize such. *Ergo*, Infants Baptism is not of, nor from God.

This Argument remains good and unanswerable, unless they can shew us that there is some Gospel-Ordinance and universal Duty enjoined on Men, that no Man or Woman was ever commended for doing it, nor reproved for neglecting it: when they can shew that, this Argument will be invalid.

Argument VII: Infant Baptism makes Jesus Christ less faithful and clear than Moses.

That Doctrine that reflects upon the Honor, Care and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ our blessed Mediator and glorious Law-giver, or renders him less faithful than *Moses*, and the New Testament in one of its great Ordinances, nay Sacraments to lie more dark and obscure in God's Word than any Law or Ordinance of the Old Testament did, cannot be of God. But the Doctrine of Infants Baptism reflects upon the Honor, Care, and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, &c. or renders him less faithful than *Moses*, and the New Testament in one of its great Ordinances, nay Sacraments to lie more dark and obscure in God's Word than any Law or Ordinance of the Old Testament. *Ergo*, Infants Baptism cannot be of God. The Major certainly none will deny.

The Minor is easily proved: Can anything reflect more upon the Honor of Christ, &c. than this? as if he should neglect to speak out his Mind and Will to us plainly, or be so careless about it, that sorry Man is forced to try his Wit to supply what is defective and wanting in this Matter in Christ's Word; for he is strangely left of God and benighted, who will not confess Infant Baptism to need much of humane Craft and Cunning to make it out from Christ's New Testament; and when he has done all, he leaves it as doubtful as he found it in the Judgment of indifferent Persons. Did *Moses* deal thus with the Children of *Israel*? No, no. How careful was he to deliver every Law, Statute, and Ordinance exactly, particularly the Law of the Passover! Do but read how careful and circumspect he was in that, in all respects and matters relating to it. Nay, and the Wisdom of God was such, to leave nothing then in the dark, but gave order that all Things might be made plain, *that he that run might read it*, and he that did read, might know the Duty, *i. e.* the Statute or Ordinance (though in many things they might need instruction how in a right Spirit to be found in it, and what it signified). But I dare affirm, no Man who reads the New Testament, from the beginning of *Matthew* to the end of the *Revelations*, a thousand times over, shall ever from that Holy Word, or any place or part of it, find it to be his Duty to baptize his Child; the Word of God is powerful in convincing Men of their Duties, as well as of their Sins; but in this it fails, it has no Power to convince Men's Consciences. The Faith of Persons must stand in the Wit and

Subtily of Men, in respect of *Infant-Baptism*, and not in the Power of God, and efficacy of his blessed Word. Let some shew us the Person, who only by reading the New Testament was convinced of Infant-Baptism; though, 'tis true, divers by reading of the Writings of Learned Men, and their subtle and sophistical Arguments, (for so I must call them) have been persuaded to believe it to be of God.—Yet, after all, some of them have plainly signified the great Ground and Argument they build upon, is this, *viz.* Because such and such Learned, Godly, and Wise Men, assert it to be a Truth of Christ. So that it appears very clear, they build their Faith herein, not upon the Authority of God's Word, but upon the Credit and Authority of Men. But certainly it must needs, as I said, reflect upon the Honor and Faithfulness of Christ, to conclude Infant-Baptism to be of God: for can any think the Lord Jesus would leave so great an Ordinance, or Sacrament, of the New Testament, so obscure and dark in his Sacred Word, had it been his Mind that Believers should baptize their Children, since the Apostle magnifies Christ's Faithfulness, who is the Son, above that of *Moses*, who was but the Servant? "*And Moses verily was faithful in all his House as a Servant, for a Testimony of those things which were to be spoken after*" (Heb. 3:5). "*But Christ as a Son over his own House*", &c. (Heb. 3:6) and therefore "*was counted worthy of more glory than Moses*" (Heb. 3:3).

The different grounds proposed for Infant-Baptism.

Besides, do but consider what Darkness and Confusion the Asserters of Infant-Baptism seem to be in, about the Proof and Right they say Children have to it.

1. Some of them say, it depends wholly upon the Authority of the Church.
2. Others dare not baptize them, but as Believers and Disciples, and therefore affirm they have Faith, &c.
3. Others can't believe this; and therefore though they likewise baptize them as Believers, yet get Sureties to stand for them.
4. Others say, they have a Right by the Faith of their Parents: some are for baptizing all Children, others none but the Children of Believers.
5. One says, if either of their Parents are *Believers they may be baptized*; some say both Father and Mother, both must be godly Persons and in the Covenant of Grace, or else the Child has no Right to be baptized. No marvel when Men have lost their way, they are thus lost in a Wilderness.

Argument VIII: That ordinance to which no promise for obedience or punishment for neglect is made, is no ordinance of God; such is Infant-Baptism.

That Ordinance God has made no Promise to Persons in their Obedience thereto, nor denounced any Threatening or Punishment on such who slight, neglect, and contemn it, it is no Ordinance of God. But God has made no Promise to Persons who baptize their Children, nor denounced no Threatening or Punishment on those who slight, neglect and contemn it. *Ergo*, Infant-Baptism is no Ordinance of God.

Let any such who assert Infant-Baptism, shew us a Promise to the Obedient herein, or a Threatening denounced against the Disobedient thereto, and we will say no more. There are Promises made to Believers in their being baptized, that's evident; and Punishments threatened on such who reject the Counsel of God in that respect, the like there is in respect of any other Gospel-Ordinance, but none of this in the Case of Infant-Baptism.

10 – Wherein the great Arguments, and pretended Scripture-Proofs for Infant-Baptism, concerning the Covenant Circumcision, and Infants Church-membership, are Examined, and Answered.

One main and great Argument the Pedobaptists bring for that practice is this, *viz.*

I. Argument from the Covenant made with Abraham.

Children of Believers are in Covenant, as well as their Parents. The Covenant made with *Abraham* was the Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant, to which the Seal of Circumcision was annexed; and as Circumcision belonged to the Children of the Faithful under the Law, so Baptism belongs to the Children of the Faithful under the Gospel, or else the Privileges under the Gospel would be less than those were under the Law.

Answer. There hath been enough said, over and over, by Mr. *Tombs*, Mr. *Danvers*, and many others, to detect and utterly vanquish the weakness of this Argument.

As, first, it hath been proved, that the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* and his Seed, doth not intend his Carnal Seed according to the Flesh; but his Spiritual Seed, or such who had the Faith of *Abraham*. And one would think the Apostle might be believed in his expounding that Text, *viz.* “*To Abraham and to his Seed were the Promises made, He saith not, And to Seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ*” (Gal. 3:16). Compare this with v. 29, “*If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.*” And again, in Rom. 9:7-8, he saith, “*Neither because they are the Seed of Abraham, are they all Children; but in Isaac shall thy Seed be called. That is, they which are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God: but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed.*”

Could the Apostle in plainer words have detected the Error of these Men, if he had met with them in his day? ‘Tis true, he did meet with some, *viz.* the *Jews*, or *Abraham’s* natural Seed, who were so blind as thus to argue from the Covenant made with *Abraham*; and concluded, they were the true Seed and Children of God, because they were the Offspring of *Abraham* according to the Flesh. But as *John Baptist* first endeavored to undeceive them, when he saw the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* coming to his Baptism—by saying, “*Think not to say with in your selves, ye have Abraham to your Father*”, &c. So in the next place, our Blessed Savior himself, in John 8 likewise shewed them their great Error and Mistake herein, and that they might be the Children of the Devil, notwithstanding they were the Seed of *Abraham* according to the Flesh, and thought themselves safe as being in that Covenant made with him.

The Covenant of Grace there made with *Abraham* and his Seed, extends to none but the Holy and Elect Seed, to none but the Spiritual Seed, to such who are Christ’s, or true Believers in Christ only. Now if the Covenant of Grace comprehends none of *Abraham’s* carnal or fleshly Seed, but the spiritual Seed only, to what purpose is there so many Sheers of Paper printed by Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Sidenham*, &c. to prove the carnal Seed of

Believers to have right to the Seal of the Covenant? Their Business is to prove all Believers Children to be in the Covenant in the first place, or all they say is nothing.

But, Secondly, if they could prove all the Children of Believers to be in that Covenant made with *Abraham*, yet it doth not from thence follow neither, that therefore their Children may be baptized, unless they can shew the Lord Jesus hath enjoined them so to be, because Baptism wholly depends upon the Authority of Christ's Institution, or positive Prescription. 'Tis not enough for any to say, if Children are in Covenant, they may be baptized. Who tells them so? Hath Christ anywhere required it? doth he say they ought, or that it belongs to them? Had it been *Abraham's* Duty to circumcise his Children, because they were in Covenant with him, before God gave him a positive Law so to do; certainly, had he done it without any Command of God, and have called it God's Ordinance, he had ceased being called any more *Faithful Abraham*. Come, Sirs, your Consequences and Conclusions you have so long made a noise of, will make no Gospel-Precept, nor hold equal weight with the Ballance of the Sanctuary.

For, thirdly, pray consider, Were there not divers in the Covenant of Grace, *i. e.* in that Spiritual, or Gospel-Covenant God made with *Abraham*, in that very day and time that the Law of Circumcision was given forth? and yet they were not, from that Ground, to be circumcised, nor were they at all circumcised, because God did not command them so to be? Was not *Lot* a Godly Man, and in the same Covenant of Grace? together with *Melchisedec* and others I might mention? These were in Covenant, and yet without the Seal, as you call it; we do not read they were circumcised. And do you not think that many of the Females of *Abraham's* offspring were in that Covenant of Grace? yet they had no right to Circumcision, the Seal (as you called it) of the Covenant, because none but Males were required or commanded to be circumcised. Suppose *Abraham* should have gone without a Command or Word from God, and have Circumcised his Females, and have reasoned after the rate you do, *viz.*

My Female children are in Covenant; and since the Covenant belongs to them, the Seal of the Covenant belongs to them, which is, Circumcision, therefore I will circumcise them also; would God have allowed him to do any such Act, think you? You will reply, I am sure that God would never have born with *Abraham* in doing any such thing, because he must have done it without a Command.

And, pray, how can you think he will bear with you in Baptizing Children of Believers, since you have no more Command from God so to do, than *Abraham* had to Circumcise his Female Children?

You reply, They are in Covenant, and therefore to them belongs the Seal of the Covenant; even so say we, his Females might be in the same Covenant, and yet you would have condemned such an Act in him, though grounded upon the very same foot of an Account, which you stand upon your own Justification in, and acknowledge no Fault, but contrarywise blame, nay, reproach us for holding an Error, because we cannot do and practice as you do in this case, without any Authority from God's Word.

4/y. To prove further, that the Right of Circumcision wholly depended upon the absolute Will, Pleasure, and Sovereignty of God, as Baptism now doth; and that his Will, and not ours, nor any Consequence that may be drawn from being in the Covenant, can give a Person a right thereto, without his Command or allowance; 'tis

to be considered, that there were those commanded to be Circumcised, who were not (as there is probable ground to believe) in that holy and blessed Covenant of Grace, God said his Covenant should not be established with *Ishmael*, but with *Isaac*, yet he was Circumcised (Gen. 17:20-21, 25; Gal. 4:29-30). The same might be said of *Esau*, and thousands more of *Abraham's* Carnal Seed: It was, it appears from hence, God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure that gave right to Circumcision, and not being in the Covenant.

Was not circumcision a seal of the Covenant of Grace then as baptism is now?

Question. But was not Circumcision a Seal of the Covenant of Grace under that Dispensation, as Baptism is now a Seal of the same Covenant under this Dispensation?

Answer. No, for Circumcision was only a Seal to *Abraham's* Faith, or a Confirmation of that Faith he had long before he was Circumcised; but so it could not be said to be to any Infant that had no Faith. It was indeed a Sign put into the Flesh of Infants; but a Sign, and Seal too only to *Abraham*, witnessing to him that he had a Justifying Faith; but to the Truth of the Promises, there was 'tis evident, a two-fold Covenant made with *Abraham*,

1. That he should be the Father of many Nations, and that the Land in which he was a Stranger should be given to his Seed; these Promises seem to relate to his Carnal Seed.

2. That he should be the Father of the Faithful (Rom. 4:11), Heir of the World (Rom. 4:13), and that in him, and in his Seed all the Families of the Earth should be blessed, that is, Jesus Christ (Gal. 3:16). Now none could receive Circumcision as such a Seal to them, but *Abraham*, because none before circumcised had such a Faith, which entitled them to such singular Promises: The Apostle in the fourth of the *Romans* shews, that *Abraham* was not justified by Works, nor by Circumcision, but by Faith, which he had long before he was circumcised; and so but a Seal or Confirmation of that Faith he had before, and to assure him of the Truth of the Promises made to him and to his Carnal and Spiritual Seed.

You ought not therefore to call Circumcision a Seal to any but to *Abraham*, neither ought you to call it a Seal of any other thing to him than what the Scripture calls it a Seal of, viz. "*And he received Circumcision a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had being yet uncircumcised*" (Rom. 4:11).

And that you may see we are not alone in this matter, see what *Chrysostom* and *Theophilact*, as I find them quoted by Mr. *Danvers*;

It was called a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, because it was given to *Abraham* as a Seal and Testimony of that Righteousness which he had acquired by Faith. Now this seems to be the Privilege of *Abraham's* alone, and not to be transferred to others; as if Circumcision in whomever it was were a Testimony of Divine Righteousness; for it was the Privilege of *Abraham* that he should be the Father of all the Faithful, as well uncircumcised as circumcised, being already the Father, having Faith in Uncircumcision, he received first the sign of Circumcision, that he might be the Father of the Circumcised. Now because he had this Privilege, in respect of the Righteousness which he had

acquired by Faith, therefore the sign of Circumcision was to him a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith; but to the rest of the Jews it was a sign that they were *Abraham's* Seed, but not a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, as all the Jews also were not the Fathers of many Nations.¹⁰⁵

Moreover, it is evident a Seal is a Confirmation of that which a Person hath made over to him, and it doth insure him of it. Now to call Circumcision a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, 'tis all one as to say all that were circumcised, were assured of all the Blessings of that Covenant, then must all that were circumcised be pardoned and saved; and so also would it follow in the case of Baptism, were that acknowledged to be a Seal to all those that are baptized of the new Covenant. But in a word, we know nothing called a Seal of the New Covenant, but the holy Spirit, which the Saints were said to be sealed with after they believed, unto the day of Redemption (Eph. 1:13; 4:30); God by setting his Seal upon us assures us that we are his, and that we shall have Eternal Life.

Baptism is called a Figure, but nowhere a Seal and a Sign or Figure proper only to such who have Understanding to discern the Spiritual things and Mysteries that are represented thereby, and wrought in them.

Objection: The Promise and Covenant of God was to Abraham and his natural offspring.

Objection. Say what you will, the Promise and Covenant of Grace was to *Abraham* and his natural Offspring.

Answer. Why do you not believe the Apostle who tells you the quite contrary, and that he "*said not of Seeds as of many, but to thy Seed, which is Christ*" (Gal. 3:16)?

But you will have it as you say, see what absurd Consequences will follow and arise from your Notion: And first take what *Calvin* saith,¹⁰⁶ 'Tis manifest, saith he, that the Promise understood of Spiritual Blessings pertained not to the Carnal Seed of *Abraham*, but to the Spiritual, as the Apostle himself saith, for if you understand the Carnal Seed, saith he, then that Promise will belong to none of the Gentiles, but to those alone who are begotten of *Abraham* and *Isaac* according to the Flesh (Rom. 4:8-9);¹⁰⁷ by this it appears you go about to shut out your selves and Children too from having any part in that Covenant made with *Abraham*.

Secondly, If God made the Covenant of Grace with *Abraham* and his Carnal or Fleshly Offspring, and so with all Believers and their Children, then all their Offspring must have saving Grace bestowed upon them and a new Heart, because these things are some of the chief Blessings contained in the new Covenant.

Now do you see that all the Children of Believers have the Grace of God bestowed upon them, so that they are new Creatures? certainly no, for as *Abraham* had his *Ishmael*, and *Isaac* his *Esau*, and *David* his *Absalom*, so have most or many Believers wicked and ungodly Children, and so they live and die to the great Grief of

¹⁰⁵ Chrysost. Theophilact. Pag. 117.

¹⁰⁶ [Calvin on Gen. 17:7.](#)

¹⁰⁷ Estius. Anno Gen. 17:7.

their Souls: You can't think that God fails in his Promise, and that the Covenant of Grace is not so firm and sure as the Scripture declares it to be, one of them will follow, or you must conclude your selves mistaken in your Notion:

But certainly they cannot miss of Grace if Mr. *Blake* is right; for, saith he, "*Christianity is hereditary; that as the Children of a Noble-Man are Noble, the Child of a Free-Man free, of a Turk a Turk, and of a Jew; a Jew so¹⁰⁸ the Child of a Christian is a Christian.*"¹⁰⁹ We will grant him they are so called, but withal must tell him, the Children of Christian People are by Nature the Children of Wrath as well as others.

Fourthly, This would render Grace to be a Birth-Privilege, as Mr. *Danvers* observes, and Regeneration tied to Generation, contrary to the Scripture and all good Doctrine; as if a Believer doth not only beget a Child in natural Generation, but a Saint also.

Fifthly, Then the Apostle spoke not true in saying the "*Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God*", *i. e.* of the Promise (Rom. 9:8).

Sixthly, And it also would follow, that all the whole Offspring of Believers shall be saved, without you will assert the Doctrine of *James Arminius*, that there is a falling away from Grace.

Seventhly, And would it not follow also, that all the Children of Believers know God, and need not be taught, "*saying, Know the Lord, for*" (you know who saith) "*they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them*" (Jer. 31:34); that is, all those who are in the New Covenant, which you say all Believers Children are, even in the same *Covenant of Grace* made with *Abraham*.

Eighthly, And then it follows also that the Covenant of Grace and Spiritual Blessings made with *Abraham*, is tied up to Believers and their Seed only; and if so, what will become of all poor Unbelievers and their perishing Offspring?

Objection: Doesn't baptism replace circumcision?

Objection. But does not Baptism come in the room of Circumcision, the one being a Figure of the other?

Answer. There is no ground so to believe, since the Scripture gives not the least hint of any such thing.

1. For first, if it had, then when Baptism came in and was in force, Circumcision must have ceased immediately: but after Baptism was commanded and administered, we find Circumcision in being, and was not disannulled till the Death and Resurrection of our Savior. Now it would have vanquished, as Shadows do, as soon as Baptism the Antitype came in force, had it been a Type or Figure of Baptism, or come in the room of it.

¹⁰⁸ If he had said, Those who are born of the Spirit are spiritual, he had spoken Truth.

¹⁰⁹ *Agr. Blake, p. 6.*

2. If Baptism had come in the room of Circumcision, then the Church of God under the Gospel would have been just like the National Church of the Jews, *viz.* made up of the Fleshly Seed; but the Apostle shews the contrary, it consists of lively Stones, that is, a spiritual and not a carnal Seed (1 Pet. 2:4-7).

3. Then Males only and no Females would have been baptized; because none but Male Children were to be circumcised, as God commanded.

4. Circumcision was administered on *Abraham's* natural Seed without any Profession of Faith; but none are to be admitted to Baptism but by a Profession of Faith, Repentance and Regeneration.

The first Birth, or being born in a fleshly way by Carnal Generation, gave *Abraham's* natural Seed a Right to Circumcision; whereas the Spiritual Birth or Regeneration gives a Right only to Baptism according to Christ's Commission, as we have proved.

5. 'Tis evident Circumcision figured forth another thing, *viz.* the Destruction of the Body of Sin by Jesus Christ, and the Circumcision of the Heart, and therefore not Baptism, &c.

Very full and most excellently you have to this Point Dr. *Taylor*, who saith,

That the Argument from Circumcision is invalid upon infinite Considerations: Figures and Types prove nothing, unless a Command go along with them, or some Express to signify such to be their purpose; for the Deluge of Waters, and the Ark of *Noah* were a Figure of Baptism, said *Peter*; and if therefore the Circumstances of the one should be drawn to the other, we should make Baptism a Prodigy rather than a Rite. The Paschal Lamb was a Type of the Eucharist, which succeeds the other, as Baptism doth to Circumcision; but because there was in the Manducation¹¹⁰ of the Paschal Lamb, no Prescription of Sacramental Drink, shall we thence conclude that the Eucharist is to be administered but in one kind? And even in the very instance of this Argument, supposing a Correspondence of the Analogy between Circumcision and Baptism, yet there is no Correspondence of Identity; for although it were granted, that both of them did consign the Covenant of Faith, yet there is nothing in the Circumstance of Children's being circumcised that so concerns that Mystery, but that it might very well be given to Children, and yet Baptism only to Men of Reason, because Circumcision lests a Character in the Flesh, which being imprinted upon Infants did its work to them when they came to Age; and such a Character was necessary, because there was no word added to the Sign; but Baptism imprints nothing that remains on the Body, and if it leaves a Character at all, it is upon the Soul, to which also the Word is added, which is as much a part of the Sacrament, as the Sign itself: for both which Reasons it is requisite that the Parties baptized should be capable of Reason, that they may be capable both of the word of the Sacrament, and the impress made upon the Spirit; since therefore the Reason of this Parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to infer a necessity of complying in this Circumstance of Age any more than in the other Annexes of the Type; then the Infant must also

¹¹⁰ This word means "the act of eating" or "The belief that eating the bread of Eucharist is eating the actual flesh of Jesus." <https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/manducation> - Simon

precisely be baptized upon the eighth day, and Females must not be baptized, because not circumcised: but it were more proper if we would understand it right to prosecute the Analogy, from the Type to the Antitype by way of Letter, and Spirit, and Signification. And as Circumcision figures Baptism, so also the Adjuncts of the Circumcision, shall signify something spiritual in the Adherences of Baptism; and therefore as Infants were circumcised, so spiritual Infants shall be baptized, which is spiritual Circumcision; for therefore Babes had the Ministry of the Type, to signify that we must, when we give our Names to Christ, become Children in Malice, and then the Type is made complete, &c.¹¹¹

Thus far the Doctor.

Question: Why may not children be baptized as they were circumcised heretofore?

Question. But why may not Infants be baptized now as well as Children were circumcised heretofore?

Answer. You may as well ask, why *Nadab* and *Abihu* might not have offered *strange Fire* (Lev. 10:1-2), or why might not the *Priest* carry the *Ark* in a *Cart*.—The Reason why they ought to do neither of those things were, because God commanded them not so to do. In like manner, say we, Children must not be baptized, because God hath given no Command to do it. Circumcision was expressly commanded, both as to the Subject, Time, Age and Sex, which was as you have heard, the Male Children at eight days old (Gen. 17:10, 12, 14), with a severe Penalty of the Parents Disobedience.

But there is not one hint, or the least color of ground for the baptizing of Infants in all the New Testament, as hath been proved; and yet the Gospel is, as one observes, as express in the matter of Baptism, as first, touching the Subject *Men and Woman*: Secondly, As to the Time, *viz.* when *they believe*: Thirdly, As to the Qualifications of Baptism, *i. e.* *Faith and Repentance*: Fourthly, As to the end and use of it, to *signify the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ*, with our Death unto Sin, and rising again to newness of Life. Can any think the Servant should be so careful to give Directions from God in every case about the circumcising of Children under the Law, and the Son of God not to be as express in all parts of instituted Worship and our Duties under the Gospel? This can't be thought; see what the Apostle saith, which we before hinted (Heb. 3:5-6).¹¹²

¹¹¹ *Dr. Taylor Bishop of Down, p. 228.*

¹¹² [Chapter 9, Argument VII.](#) – Simon

Objection: Children were members of the Jewish Church with their parents and they are still so.

Objection. "But Children were Members of the Jewish Church as well as Adult Persons",¹¹³ since Mr. Smythies, and so say other Pedo-Baptists, as Mr. Baxter, and many more; and since they were comprehended with their Parents in that Church-state, they are so still under the Gospel, and therefore to be baptized.

Answer. That Children were then admitted Members of the Jewish Church is granted, and 'tis as evident that God hath now quite pulled down that House of his, (I mean that National Church-state) and broke up House-keeping, and turned the Bond-Woman and her Son, (*i. e.* the Fleshly Seed, Servants and Infants) all out of doors; the natural Branches are broken off, and God hath now built him a new, a glorious, and more spiritual House, into which he admitted none as his Household-Servants to dwell in his Spiritual Family, but Believers only, or such as profess so to be: "*Ye also*" (saith Peter) "*as lively Stones, are built up a Spiritual House*" (1 Pet. 2:5), &c. and that the old House, the Jewish Church-state, with all the Appurtenances, Rites, and Privileges of it, is pulled down, and a new one built, into which Infants are not to be admitted, is very evident from what the Apostle speaks. "*For the Priesthood being changed; there is made of necessary a Change also of the whole Law*" (Heb. 7:12), which must needs include Circumcision with all the Appurtenances and Privileges belonging to it. And therefore as Infants Church-membership came in with the Law of Circumcision, so it went out and was disannulled with it; they were, 'tis true, of the Household of old, but it was by a positive Law: Shew us the like now and you do your business, or else you say nothing; *For evident it is that what Privileges so ever are given to any Persons by an Act of Parliament, which said Law was to continue in force for so long a time and no longer, when that time is expired and another Parliament makes a new Law, wherein many things are contained that were in the first, but those certain Privileges given to those Persons in the former Law, are left out in this latter Act, it would not be a folly for any of them to plead those Privileges by virtue of a Law that is gone, and now not in force. Or if a Man should have a Legacy bequeathed to him by the Will and Testament of his Friend, and yet afterwards his Friend sees cause to make another Will, which is his last Will and Testament, and in the last Will leaves him quite out and gives him no such Legacy, it would be a foolish thing for him to sue for the Legacy left him in the first Will, which is void in Law by his Friends last Will and Testament.* Just so it is here; there was an old Law wherein Infants were admitted to the Privileges of being Members of the National Church of the Jews, and so also it was in the old or former Will and Testament; but that Law was to continue but till Christ came, and now he has made a new Law wherein Infant-Church-membership is quite left out, and the Lord Jesus has made another Will, his last Will and Testament, wherein the old Privilege is not bequeathed to Infants: Now is it not folly in you to plead for that old Privilege that was in the former Testament? you must find your Infant-Church-membership in the New Testament, as must also the Seventh-day-Sabbath-Men the old Jewish Sabbath¹¹⁴, or else they and you too say nothing, but render yourselves weak and strangely be-clouded: and certain I am, there is now no Institution, no Law, no

¹¹³ Mr. Smythies Unworthy Communicant, p. 88.

¹¹⁴ For though a time for the Worship of God is moral, yet the seventh day of the Week was a mere positive Law, given only to the People of Israel.

Prescription, no Rule, no Example for keeping the Seventh-day-Sabbath in the new Law, in the new and last Will and Testament of Jesus Christ; nor no Institution, no Law, no Precept, no Example contained therein for Infant-Church-membership, no not the least hint or intimation that Infants should be "*fellow-Citizens with the Saints, and of the Household, of God*", neither are they so to be accounted till they believe, and are to do Service in the House: for though we account our Children of our Family notwithstanding they can't do any Service therein, yet that is no Argument they may be Members of God's Church, unless by any Law or Institution God has made them so to be. The Household of God is called "*the Household of Faith*", or a Family that consists of Believers; therefore unless you can prove Infants to be Believers, they are not of this House; for all that are to have admission there must be Believers, or profess themselves so to be,¹¹⁵ as Mr. *Baxter* acknowledges, or else no place for them there, which Infants cannot do.

Objection: Jews and their children were broken off, but the Gentiles and their children were ingrafted in their place.

Objection. But it is still objected, that as the Jews and their Children were broken off, so the Gentiles and their Children are ingrafted in their room, as Rom. 11:20, "*because of Unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by Faith*", &c.

Answer. We answer, that the Reason why the Jews and their Children were broken off, was not because they had not believing Parents, for *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* were still the Parents of them all, they were *Abraham's Seed*, according to the Flesh, when they were broken off as well as before; but the true reason was, because the terms of standing in the Church were now *altered*: For before the Gospel-Dispensation came, they stood Members of the old Jewish Church, though as much unbelieving for many Generations, as they were when they were broken off; but now *Abraham's Church-state* is at an end, and all the Privileges and Immunities cease, the *Jewish Church* must give way to the Gospel-Church, the *Messiah* being come, and about to build him up a new and more glorious and spiritual House, into which none are of right to enter but such as are *professing Believers*; for the old House or Jewish Church-state was not intended to abide *forever*, but only until the time of *Reformation*, and then the Law must be changed, yea the Covenant changed, which they not believing, nor closing in with, were broken off, they being willing to abide in the old House still, and to remain Church-Members upon the account of a mere fleshly and natural Birth, crying out, *Abraham* is our Father,¹¹⁶ *and we are his Seed*, and are free, and never were in Bondage, wherefore they were broken off, and that whether they would or not, by reason of their Unbelief; that is, because they would not believe Christ was the true *Messiah*, and that the old Covenant and all the Privileges thereof were flying away, the Substance and true Antitype of all those Shadows being come, *viz.* the Lord Jesus Christ.

So that thus they were broken off by Unbelief, *and thou and thine*, O Gentile Believer, *stand by Faith*, mark it, "*thou standest by Faith*"; not by virtue of any Birth-Privilege whatsoever, but by Faith, thy standing is by Faith; yet not thy Seed by thy Faith, but thou thy self by thine, and they by their own; Faith is that by which

¹¹⁵ *Baxter* on Confirmation.

¹¹⁶ Rom. 8. [Unsure what the reference has to do with the text – Simon]

(thou standing and not thy Seed) has right to stand in the Church, and not they; but if thy Seed have Faith, and thou hast none, they have right in the Church, and thou shalt be excluded.

Most certain it is, that under the Law the natural Seed or Progeny of *Abraham*, were all holy with an External, Ceremonial, or Typical Holiness, and consequently they were then all admitted to an external Participation of Church-Privileges.

But remarkable to this purpose is that Passage of the Apostle, "*Wherefore henceforth know we no Man after the Flesh*" (2 Cor. 5:16); it seems then, that hitherto there had been a knowledge taken of Persons after the Flesh; and 'tis as plain there was, that because the Jews were of the natural or fleshly Seed of *Abraham*, they were therefore all of them admitted to the Privilege of an external Church-membership, while others were exempted. But we see the Apostle resolves *henceforth* to disclaim any such *cognizance* of them, or any others upon the account of a mere fleshly Descent: And to this very purpose immediately subjoins in the following Verse, "*Therefore if any Man be in Christ, he is a new Creature: old things are passed away, all things are become new*"; the old Church, and old Church-membership, Rites, Ordinances and Privileges, and a new Church-state, new Ordinances, a new Seed, and new way of Introduction unto the Participation of the Privilege of Church-membership now under this new and more glorious Dispensation, *viz.* the Gospel: Nothing but a new Creature will serve the turn; for God expects that they "*that worship him, do now worship him in Spirit and in Truth*" (John 4:24); the Privilege of being admitted into God's House, and to stand before his Presence in the actual Celebration of Gospel-Ordinances, being now entailed only upon the Spiritual Seed, even such "*who as lively Stones are built up a spiritual House, a holy Priesthood to offer up spiritual Sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ*" (1 Pet. 2:3-5); or such at least as make a visible Profession thereof.

And therefore, when this new and more spiritual Dispensation was about to be actually introduced and established, *John* who was the Harbinger of it gives sufficient notice thereof; and to this purpose deals plainly with the Jews, *i. e.* the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees* that came to be baptized of him, and tells them upon this account, "*Think not to say within your selves, We have Abraham to our Father: For I say unto you, that God is able of these Stones to raise up Children to Abraham. And now also is the Ax laid unto the root of the Trees: Therefore every Tree that bringeth not forth good Fruit, is hewn down, and cast into the Fire*" (Matt. 3:9-10). It cannot be denied but that they had *Abraham* to their Father as much now as before, only the terms of their standing in that Church was now changed; so that every Tree now of whatsoever natural Stock or external Production, that bringeth not forth good Fruit, must be hewn down; and the reason is rendered for that, Now the Ax is laid to the root of the Trees, mark it, *now* 'tis so; it was not so before, the Ax was never till *now* laid thus unto the root of the Trees: which must needs be understood in reference to that Birth and Fleshly Privilege spoken of before, which they had so long boasted of, as the whole Context shews. But now God is resolved to make other manner of work of it under the Gospel-Dispensation than he did before. Now the root of the Trees are struck at, a Bar put, natural Descent or Extraction from a Religious Root, (*i.e.* Godly Parents) will not now serve turn, as in time past it did, to give any true Right or Title to Church-Privileges. Moreover, if God now will not suffer any of the natural Branches to abide on their own natural Stock, *viz.*

Abraham, be sure he will not admit any Gentiles, that are not natural Branches of *Abraham*, to be grafted into the good Olive, without Faith and Regeneration.

Objection: If the children of believer don't receive baptism then this makes them less privileged than children under the Law.

Objection. But if Children may not be baptized, this makes the Privilege of Believers Children under the Gospel less than was theirs under the Law; for their Children were admitted Members of the visible Church by Circumcision; and we cannot but conclude, that our Privileges for ourselves and for our Children, are at least as large, great and comfortable as theirs, and therefore our Infants are to be baptized.

Answer. To this we reply, that we do not doubt but that our Privileges, in respect of the Covenant of Grace, and all Spiritual Blessings are as great and comfortable as theirs were; but the Covenant of Grace, the Blessings and Divine Privileges thereof, were neither made to the Jews natural Posterity, nor to ours; and although Circumcision was a Privilege in some respect to the Jews above what the Heathens had, yet it is termed by the Apostle an intolerable Yoke; "*Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Necks of the Disciples, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear*" (Acts 15:10)? Their Children were not circumcised as Children of Believers, and so sealed with a new Covenant-Seal, as being made new Covenant-Children thereby; Circumcision did not confer Grace, nor make them Heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven, it was therefore no more than an external Privilege to the natural Lineage and Seed of *Abraham*, as a typical and shadowy thing, whereby his Posterity was to be marked, to distinguish them from all the Nations of the Earth, and to keep that Line clear, from whence Christ according to the Flesh was to come, and to be a Sign in their Flesh to put them in mind that God would perform the Promise of the *Messiah* made to *Abraham*, and also to oblige them to keep the Law; for he that was circumcised was a Debtor to keep the whole Law.

Hence it was the Jewish Christians, instead of looking upon Circumcision to be a Privilege upon a spiritual account, could not but acknowledge it a great Mercy they were delivered from it; and hence 'tis the Apostle exhorts the Saints to "*stand fast in that Liberty in which Christ had made them free, and not be entangled again in the Yoke of Bondage*" (Gal. 5:1-4).

Neither ought such a thing (as Mr. *Danvers* observes) to be any more esteemed the loss of a Privilege than our not enjoying literally a *Holy Land, City, Temple*, a Succession of High-Priests, and Priesthood, by Generation or Lineal Descent. (For you know their Children were *Priests successively* in their Generations, a *Levite* begat a Priest or Minister, as well as they and other Tribes begat Church-Members.)

Now though all these outward Privileges are gone, yet our Privileges being more spiritual, are greater both to ourselves and Offspring; they looked for Christ to come as held forth under many dark Types and Shadows, we are assured he is come and has accomplished what was foretold of him, "*We behold in the Glass of the Gospel as with open face the Glory of the Lord*" (2 Cor. 3:18); all those Types are explained and spiritualized to us, *viz.* Circumcision, the Worldly Sanctuary, Tabernacle, the Candlestick, Table, Shew-bread, Cherubims, Mercy-seat, &c. which things and many more were Figures for the time then present, and were Shadows of good things to come, but the Body or Substance of them is Christ, who hath put an end to them, and must we

now needs find out some other carnal or external Rites to come in the room or stead of these or some of these, or else think our Privileges are less than theirs? whereas indeed our Privileges it appears are enlarged, and far greater than theirs were, and hence they longed many of them to see those things that we see, &c. Instead of being a fleshly Nation we are a *holy Nation*, a *holy City*, a *spiritual* and *holy Temple*, a *Royal Priesthood*, and *holy* (not carnal) Church-Members; *Church-Members* by *Regeneration* not by *Generation*, not by the *first Birth*, but by the *new* and *second Birth*; if we and our Children have not the same Privileges don't let us complain, whereas God hath been more rich and bountiful to us, we and our Children sit under the clear and glorious Revelation and Ministrations of the Gospel, can we or ours be losers by this Change? Alas! as far as Christ excels *Moses* and *Aaron*, the Gospel the Law, the Antitype the Type, the spiritual Birth the carnal, the extent of all Nations the Confines of *Judea*; so far, saith one are we better and not worse, and our Privileges not lesser but far greater; our Children have great advantages in having such Parents and Ministers to instruct them, to pray for them, and to set before them a good Example; besides, as soon as capable, they with others have the Gospel preached clearly to them, and Grace offered and tendered universally to all far and near, with "*Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the Waters*" (Isa. 55:1), &c. The Spirit also is in a glorious manner communicated, to enable them and others to believe now in the Gospel-days. The Law was hard, "*Do this, and live*"; and Circumcision laid them under a Bond to do and keep all that God in his Law required, yea and under a Curse if "*they continued not in all things that were there enjoined*" (Deut. 27:26; Gal. 3:10), which brought them into miserable Bondage and Captivity; but now 'tis but to "*believe, and thou shalt be saved*": "*the Spirit*" saith, the Scripture "*was not yet given*"—to wit, in that manner nor measure as afterwards, "*because Christ was not yet glorified*" (John 7:39).

So that it is no Absurdity to grant that the Jews might have Privileges in some things more than we; and yet our Case and Condition with our Children, to speak simply, better than theirs, though the Covenant of Grace is not enlarged nor lessened in respect of the substance of it; the Promises of Grace are still belonging to the Elect, to those that were given to Christ, to Believers, and to no other, nor never were; but the Privileges we have above them do abundantly recompence the defect of those Privileges of theirs, whether real or supposed: And the truth is, Privileges are so arbitrary and various, depending so much upon the Sovereignty of God, that he gives them as he thinks good, and oft-times takes them away without assigning any special Reason of it; so that no Arguments can be drawn safely, as our Brethren do, *viz.* God gave such a Privilege to the Jews, therefore we must have such a Privilege too, except we can prove it is God's Will it should be so. This Argument therefore is of no force, without an Institution, here we are again, and here we will stand; Circumcision wholly depended upon a positive Law; 'tis in vain therefore to attempt to prove, that because the Jews had a Privilege to circumcise their Children, therefore we must have a Privilege to baptize our Infants, since they had a Command to do what they did, and we have none; besides, we have shewed there is no Scripture that proves the Baptism of Infants is a Privilege granted by the Lord in lieu of Circumcision, it being indeed no Duty or Privilege at all.

Lastly, before I close with this, take what Mr. *Danvers* says,¹¹⁷

If it should be taken (saith he) for granted, that Circumcision was a Seal of the New Covenant belonging to all the Children of *Israel*; then would not the baptizing of the Children of Believers answer it, neither amount to so great a Privilege, nor be equivalent to it for these Reasons:

1st, There were all the Families and Tribes of *Israel* (and all proselyted Strangers) with their Children, without distinction of good or bad, to be circumcised: But here only one of a City, and two of a Tribe; for Believers are but thin sown, and the Children of Unbelievers and wicked Men are to receive no such benefit in the Judgment of many.

And, *2dly*, You would be very short in another respect, as being at an utter uncertainty when you have a right Subject; for if the Parent is an Hypocrite, or no elect Person, which is out of your reach to understand, you cannot know whether the *Child* be fit for *Baptism*; for the Seed of a wicked Man you must not meddle with by any *means*; whereas there was not the least doubt or scruple in *Israel* as to the Subject, for the Father being one of *Abraham's* Seed and circumcised, it was an infallible mark they were right.¹¹⁸

And, *3dly*, neither can the Child when he is grown up have any certain knowledge that such a Ceremony had past upon him in Infancy, he having no infallible mark thereof; whereas the circumcised Infant had an infallible Character and Mark in his Flesh, to assure him that he had received that Rite.

Objection: What hope do we have of our infants if they are not to be baptized nor that they are church members?

Objection. But what hope can we have of our Infants if they must not be admitted unto Christian Baptism, nor reputed as Members of the common Body and Church of the Faithful?

Answer. We answer; *First*, if the hope of the Parent for the Child's Salvation be grounded upon the Administration of an external Rite or Ordinance in Infancy, then neither had the *Patriarchs* for above two thousand Years any hope of their Children, since they had neither Circumcision, Baptism, nor any other External Rite, which we find otherwise by *Noah's* Prophecy (Gen. 9:26-27).

Secondly, We ask, whether God hath left it in the Power of the Parent to save or destroy the Soul of his Child, which your Doctrine doth import?

Thirdly, We demand what hopes are intended, and by what Scriptures the same are annexed to the Administration of an Ordinance in Infancy?

¹¹⁷ *Danvers on Bapt.* p. 180.

¹¹⁸ Besides, they are at a loss to know what to do if the Father only, or the Mother only is a Believer.

Fourthly, We do say there is a ground of hope in Believers in behalf of their Children, which is grounded upon plain Scripture without baptizing them.

Fifthly, Doth Baptism confer Grace or regenerate the Child? Though some have ignorantly asserted that, yet we find many of you of another mind.

Sixthly, This Argument seems to carry in it this Conclusion, *i. e.* That Christian People by Infants Baptism are assured according to Gospel-grounds of the Salvation of their Children: But there is no Proof for it, it is but a Fancy, and we suppose 'tis not received as a Truth by many that oppose us in this Point.

11 – Wherein many other pretended Scripture-Poofs and Arguments for the baptizing of Infants are answered, as that, Suffer little Children to come unto me, &c. and, Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the Kingdom of God, &c.

The next main Proof that is brought for Infant-Baptism, is taken from Matt. 19:14, "*Suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me: for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*"

Objection: The Kingdom of Heaven belongs to infants, therefore, baptism must also belong to them.

*Objection.*¹¹⁹ The Kingdom of Heaven belongs to Infants, which is the greater; therefore, say you, Baptism belongs to them also, which is the lesser.

Answer. 1. That the Kingdom of Heaven belongs to little Children we have no cause to doubt: But that they have a right to Baptism therefore, is denied; May not our Brethren infer from the greater to the lesser thus as well, viz. "*Infants belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, which is the greater; therefore to them belongeth the Lord's Supper, which is the lesser*": and sure we are, that those who are fit Subjects of Baptism ought not to be denied the Sacrament of Bread and Wine. How often must we tell you that Baptism wholly depends, as to Subject, Time, End, and manner of Administration, on the words of Institution? 'tis a positive Law, we must go to the Pleasure, and Will, and Design of the Law-maker: what may not Men infer after this sort?

2. Were these little Children be ye sure the Children of Believers? If you can't prove this, what signifies all you say? and how this can be made appear I see not; for though Christ was then in the Coast of *Judea*, yet that they were Children of Godly Parents is a great Question.

3. If it should be granted they were Believers Children, yet it doth not appear how little these Children were, we have no account of their Age. And as the Learned observe, the Greek word doth not always signify a little Child or Infant, as appears by 2 Tim. 3:15 where the same word is used, they might be such who might be capable of teaching as far as we know.

But since Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, Bishop of *Down*, hath so fully answered this Objection, pray take what he saith upon the place.

From the Action of Christ's blessing Infants, saith he, to infer that they were baptized, proves nothing so much, as there is a want of better Arguments: for the Conclusion would with more probability be

¹¹⁹ Christ blessed little Children, 'tis not said he baptized them: Nay, 'tis said he baptized not any with his own hands, John 4:1-2, therefore no Infants.

derived thus, *i. e.* Christ blessed Children and so dismissed them, but baptized them not, therefore Infants are not to be baptized. But let this be as weak as its Enemy, yet that Christ did not baptize them, is an Argument sufficient, that he hath other ways of bringing them to Heaven than by Baptism; he passed an Act of Grace upon them by Benediction and Imposition of Hands. And therefore although neither Infants, nor any Man, *in puris naturalibus*, can attain to a Supernatural End without the addition of some Instrument, or Means of God's appointing, ordinarily and regularly; yet where God hath not appointed a Rule nor an Order, as in the case of Infants we contend he hath not, the Argument is invalid.

And as we are sure God hath not commanded Infants to be baptized; so we are sure God will do them no Injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help, *viz.* if the Parents baptize them not.

Many thousand ways there are, by which God can bring any reasonable Soul to him; but nothing is more unreasonable than because he hath tied all Men of Years and Discretion to this way, therefore we of our own Heads shall carry Infants to him that way, without his directions: the Conceit is poor and low, and the Action consequent to it is bold and venturous; let him do what he please with Infants, we must not. Thus far the Doctor.¹²⁰

A second Scripture brought formerly by Doctor *Featly*, and of late by divers others, is that in John 3:5, "*Except a Man be born again of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*"

Objection: There is no other way to regenerate infants than by baptism, therefore, they should be baptized.

Objection. There is no other way to regenerate and save Infants but by this of Baptism, and so to add them to the Church, therefore they ought to be baptized.

"In some", *saith Mr. Isaac Ambrose*, "the new Birth is wrought before Baptism, as in the Eunuch, &c. in others is the new Birth wrought in Baptism, which indeed is the Sacrament of the new Birth, and Seal of Regeneration, but howsoever in Pedit-Baptism, we see the outward Seal, yet we seal not the manner of the inward working, for this also is the secret of the Spirit."¹²¹

Answer. There is no pretended Proof for Infant-Baptism brought by the Asserters of it, that I wonder at more than this, especially considering how fully and excellently they are detected by several able Men of their own Party, yet notwithstanding it seems to abide as a standing Doctrine in the National Church, as witness their Catechism—"Baptism, wherein I was made a Member of Christ, a Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." Pray see how excellently the late famous *Stephen Charnock* detects this Error;

It is not, *saith he*, *External Baptism* (speaking of Regeneration) many Men take Baptism for Regeneration, the Ancients usually give it this term: One calls our Savior's Baptism his

¹²⁰ *Dr. Taylor*, p. 230.

¹²¹ *Ambros.* New Birth in p. 13.

Regeneration—this confers not Grace, but engageth to it: outward Water cannot convey inward Life. How can Water, an external thing, work upon the Soul in a physical manner? Neither can it be proved, that ever the Spirit of God is tied by any Promise, to apply himself to the Soul in a gracious Operation, when Water is applied to the Body. If it were so, that all that were baptized were regenerated, then all that were baptized should be saved, or else the Doctrine of Perseverance falls to the ground. Baptism is a means of conveying this Grace, when the Spirit is pleased to operate with it; but it doth not work as a physical Cause upon the Soul as a Purge doth upon the Humours of the Body: for 'tis the Sacrament of Regeneration, as the Lord's-Supper is of Nourishment. As a Man cannot be said to be nourished without Faith, so he cannot be said to be a new Creature without Faith: Put the most delicious Meat into the Mouth of a dead Man, you do not nourish him, because he wants a Principle of Life to concoct or digest it. Faith only is the Principle of spiritual Life, and the Principle which draws Nourishment from the Means of God's Appointment. Some indeed say, that Regeneration is conferred in Baptism upon the Elect, and exerts itself afterwards in Conversion; but how so active a Principle as a Spiritual Life, should lie dead and asleep so long, even many Years, which intervene between Baptism and Conversion, is not easily conceivable.¹²²

Thus far Mr. *Charnock*: others we find to agree with him herein.

Amesius saith, "outward Baptism cannot be a Physical Instrument of infusing Grace, because it hath it not in any wise in itself."¹²³

*Our late Annotators agree directly with these*¹²⁴; nay, *Dr. Owen saith*, that "the Father of Lies himself could not well have invented a more pernicious Opinion, or which might pour in a more deadly Poison into the Minds of Sinners."¹²⁵

If Baptism were meant here, then no Man can be saved without being baptized.

But none does the business better than the Learned Bishop *Taylor*;

"For", saith he, "the Water and Spirit in this place, signifies the same thing; and by Water is meant the Effects of the Spirit cleansing and purifying the Soul, as it appears in its parallel place, Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost and with Fire: for although this was literally fulfilled in the day of *Pentecost*; yet morally there is more in it; for it is the sign of the Effect of the holy Spirit, and his Productions upon the Soul: And you may as well conclude, that Infants must also pass through the Fire, as through the Water. And that we may not think this a trick to elude the pressure of this place, *Peter saith* the same thing: For where he saith that Baptism saves us, he adds by way of Explication ('*not the washing away of the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God*') plainly saying that it is not Water, or the purifying of the Body, but cleansing of the

¹²² *Charnock* on Regener. last sol. p. 75.

¹²³ *Amesius* in Bell. Enervat. Tom. 3. l. 2. c. 3.

¹²⁴ [Pool's Annotat. on John 3:5.](#)

¹²⁵ *Dr. Owen* in his Theol. l. 6. c. 5. p. 477.

Spirit that doth that which is supposed to be the Effect of Baptism. But to suppose it meant of external Baptism, yet this no more infers a necessity of Infant-Baptism, than the other words of Christ infer a necessity to give them the holy Communion, '*Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*' (John 6:53); and yet we do not think these words a sufficient Argument to communicate with them: if any Man therefore will do us Justice, either let them give both Sacraments to Infants, as some Ages of the Church did, or neither: for the Wit of Man is not able to shew a disparity in the Sanction, or in the *Energy* of its Expressions. And therefore they were honest that understood the Obligation to be parallel, and performed it accordingly; and yet because we say they were deceived in one Instance, and yet the Obligation (all the World cannot reasonably say but) is the same they are honest and reasonable that do neither: and sure the Ancient Church did with an equal Opinion of necessity give them the Communion, and yet now adays Men do not; Why should Men be more burdened with a Prejudice and a name of Obliquity for not giving Infants one Sacrament, more than you are disliked for not affording them the other?¹²⁶

Thus far Dr. *Taylor*. If what these great Men say is not sufficient utterly to invalidate this pretended Proof of Infant-Baptism, we know not what to say.

The Proof from whole Households examined.

A third Proof they bring to prove the baptizing of Babes, is taken from those places that speak of the baptizing of whole Households, as the Jailor and his House, *Lydia* and her House, &c.

Objection: Whole Households were baptized, therefore some children were also baptized.

Objection. Whole Households we read were baptized, therefore some Children were in the Primitive Time baptized.

Answer. To which we answer, that the Consequence is not natural from the Antecedent, unless you can prove there were no whole Households but in which were some little Babes; make that appear, and this is the best Argument you can bring.—But the contrary is very evident; for how many hundred Households or Families are there in this City in which there are no little Children, but all Adult Persons? which being so, how uncertain is your Inference?

Secondly, But suppose there were Children in those Households (for usually in Scripture by a Figure which is called *Synecdoche*) the whole is put for part, or a part for the whole.

Hence we read *Jerusalem*, and *all Judea*, and *all the Regions about Jordan went out to be baptized of John*; that is, many of those places in *Jerusalem*, *Judea*, and in those Regions.

So 'tis said, That "*Elkanah, and all his House went up to offer unto the Lord yearly Sacrifice*" (1 Sam. 1:21-23), &c. yet, *vers.* 22, 'tis as expressly said, that "*Hannah and her Child went not up*", who were part of his House,

¹²⁶ Dr. *Taylor's* Liber. of Proph. p. 231.

yet 'tis said all his House (or Household) went up. Exod. 9:6 'tis said, "*All the Cattle of Egypt died*", that is, all that were in the Field, see Exod. 14:26, 28; 9:26. I could give you many other Examples of the same nature wherein the whole is taken but for part; And from hence 'tis that *Dr. Hammond* grants, that no concluding Argument can be deduced from the baptizing whole Households, to baptize Children; and therefore, in his Judgment, Arguments drawn from hence are better waved, than made use of by the Defenders of Infant-baptism. And certainly the Doctor judges but rationally therein (saith a worthy and Learned Man) because "*a clear Word of Institution* (or plain Precedents) *ought to be the ground of the practice of all Gospel-Ordinances*", especially in the case of Baptism, one of the great Sacraments of the New Testaments.

Thirdly, We will see in the next place what the Holy Ghost hath left on Record concerning those whole Households that are said to be Baptized.

The Philippian Jailor and his household (Acts 16:33).

First, The Jailor's Household (Acts 16:33). "*He was Baptized, and all his*". Whether he had any Children 'tis a great Question; [*his*] may refer to his Wife, Servants, and Domestic Friends and Relations, &c. However, 'tis expressly said, that "*Paul and Silas spoke unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his House*"; certainly they did not preach to little Babes: And, *Vers. 34*. 'tis said, "*He rejoiced, believing in God with all his House*". Observe, (1.) he and all his House had the Gospel preached to them. (2.) He and all his House believed: And (3.) he and all his House rejoiced; as well as 'tis said, "*He and all his were baptized.*"

Can there be any Reason given, saith Mr. *Gosnold*, why [*his*] *vers. 33* should be larger than [*all his House*] *vers. 32, 34* these two Verses being a Key to the *33d* Verse, (saith he) and *this Household* a Key to all the other?

Crispus and his household (Acts 18:8).

The *second* Household is that of *Crispus* (Acts 18:8), "*And Crispus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue, believed in God with all his House: and many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized.*" All that is said of his Household, is, that they "*believed*"; besides, the scope of the Text shews, none were baptized, but such who first believed; and they, we say, and none but they, are true Subjects of Baptism, that believe.

Stephanus and his household (1 Corinthians 1:16).

The *third* Household, is the Household of *Stephanus*; "*I baptized*", saith *Paul*, "*the Household of Stephanus*" (1 Cor. 1:16). And, he saith, "*the House of Stephanus was the first Fruits of Achaia, and that they had addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints*", which little Children were not capable to do (1 Cor. 16:15).

Lydia and her household (Acts 16:14-15).

The *fourth* Household is that of *Lydia* (Acts 16:14-15). Whether this good Woman was a *Maid, Widow, or Wife*, is uncertain: If she had been a married Woman, 'tis much there is no mention made of her Husband: Besides, she is reckoned the Head of the Family [*her*] Household; which would not have been, saith Mr. *Gosnold*, if at this time she had a Husband. Grant, saith he, she were a Widow, yet she might have no Children; or if any, they might be grown up; and to such Children we deny not Baptism upon profession of

Faith. Besides, she was at this time from her own Dwelling, and that many miles distant, for she was of the City of *Thyatira*; but now was at the City of *Philippi*, where she was a merchandizing, being a seller of Purple. Grant she had Children, how unlikely a matter is it, saith he, that she should carry them about with her, trading so many miles distant? But, finally, to resolve the Doubt, the last Verse of this Chapter, calls them of the House of *Lydia* Brethren; "*They entered into the House of Lydia; and when they had and when they had seen the Brethren, they comforted them, and departed*" (Acts 16:40). Who now can conclude rationally, that any Children were in any of these Households? 'Tis a hard case Men are forced to fly to such weak and unlikely grounds to prove their practice; but as the Proverb goes, *A poor Shift is better than none at all.*

The Promise is to you and to your Children (Acts 2:39).

The next Proof they bring to prove Infant-Baptism, is from Acts 2:39, "*The Promise is to you, and to your Children*", &c.

The *Pedo-baptists* would fain¹²⁷ have this Promise to be a Promise of External Privilege, and such as gives Children of Believers a right to Baptism: but that there is no such thing in the least to be proved from this place, we shall make appear by opening the Text.

First, 'Tis evident that *Peter* preached this Sermon to the Jews, and to many of them who had a hand in murdering the Lord of Life and Glory: And this he laid home, and pressed upon their Consciences very close; and they "*being pricked in their Hearts, cried out, Men and Brethren, what shall we do*" (Acts 2:37)? If it be thus, we are lost Men and undone. No: as if *Peter* should say, Do not despair, upon your Repentance there is Mercy for you. "*Then said Peter unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Spirit—For the Promise is unto you*". Ay, this is good News indeed, they might say; But what will become of our Children, our Offspring? for we have wished that his Blood might not only be upon ourselves, but also upon our Children. Well, what though? let not this terrify you, neither as to drive you into despair; for the Promise is not only to you who repent, &c. but to your Children, or Offspring also; your Posterity shall not be lost, for the Promise is unto them as it is to you, *viz.* if they repent; and not only to them of your Race or Posterity, but also to all "*that are afar off*", meaning the Gentiles, who were said to "*be sometimes afar off*" (Eph. 2:13). But now if they would know who of their Children, and those who were afar off, the Promise was made unto: In the close of the Verse, he resolves them in these words, "*Even to as many as the Lord our God shall call.*"

The Promise therefore here evident, is that of the Spirit, and all the Divine Graces and Blessings of it, which was promised, and first tendered unto the *Jews* and their Offspring, upon unfeigned Repentance, and turning to God; or being effectually called and brought over, to close in with the Tenders of Mercy; and then to the *Gentiles*, who in like manner should be wrought upon, or effectually called: This Promise was not made to their Children, as Believers Seed, nor to them, or any other, uncalled by the Lord, but with this express Proviso, "*Even so many as the Lord our God shall call.*" Which Calling, or effectual Work of Grace upon their

¹²⁷ That is "willingly". <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fain> - Simon

Souls, made them capable Subjects of Baptism: Nor are the words, “*to you and your Children*”, mentioned as an acknowledgment of a Privilege to them above others, being *Abraham’s Seed* according to the Flesh, but by reason doubtless of their Wish, “*His Blood be on us, and on our Children*” (Matt. 27:25).

Nor is there the least intimation given of a right to Baptism to them, or their Children, as the Children of Believers, but as an Exhortation to them and theirs, to “*repent, and be baptized*”, as their Duty, for their Benefit and Soul-advantage, the Promise being not mentioned; as though of itself it gave a title to Baptism, either to them or their Offspring, without Repentance. But as a Motive, why both they and their Children should actually repent, and be baptized, *i. e.* because in so doing, they would be in the way of obtaining Remission of Sin, and receive the Holy Spirit, the two grand Branches of the Promise here mentioned. Which Duty of Repentance little Children being not capable of performing, are not therefore according to this direction of the Apostle the *proper Subjects* of such an Ordinance.

“By Children”, here saith, a Learned Man, “is not meant their Infants, but the Posterity of the *Jews*”: And so Dr. *Hammond* grants it, and therefore confesseth this place a very inconclusive Argument for Infant-Baptism.

And, says he, though by Children be here meant the Posterity of the *Jews*, yet not the natural or carnal Seed neither, but the Spiritual; as appears by the last words in the verse, viz. “*Even to as many as the Lord our God shall call.*”

So that it is very evident, that this Text is grossly abused, by such as infer from hence a title to *Baptism*, for Children of Believers, by virtue of a Promise to them as such; whereas it is manifest from the whole scope of the Context, that it is only an encouragement to the *Jews* against Despair, by reason of their crucifying the Son of God, letting them know that yet there was hope of Mercy and Pardon for them and their Children, upon the respective Repentance of both, or either of them. And to the same purpose our late Annotators I find give it, speaking of this Text.¹²⁸

The Proof for Infant-Baptism—(“*Else were your Children unclean*”, 1 Corinthians 7:14) answered

A *Fifth* pretended Scripture-proof for Infant-Baptism, is taken from 1 Cor. 7:14, “*Else were your Children Unclean, but now are they Holy.*”

Objection: The children of believers are federally holy and thus are to be baptized.

Objection. *From hence ’tis asserted*, That the Children of Believers are holy with a Federal or Covenant-Holiness, and therefore to be baptized.

Answer. To this we answer, That the same sort of Holiness which is ascribed to the Children, is to be understood in reference to the unbelieving Husband, or the unbelieving Wife, who are both said to be sanctified by their respective Yoke-fellows; which cannot be meant of a federal or a Covenant-holiness, but

¹²⁸ [Pools Annot. on Acts 2:39.](#)

that which is matrimonial: For if we must understand it of a Covenant-holiness, then it will follow, that the unbelieving Wife, or unbelieving Husband may, upon the same ground lay claim to Baptism as well as their Children, which yet your selves will not grant. Besides, it is evident from the words themselves, in which the Term *Husband* and *Wife* are twice used, which shews, that the Holiness is from the conjugal Relation, and cannot be meant of any other than Legitimation. And the term *Unbeliever* is also twice used, and said to be Sanctified, which can have no other sense but this, that the unbelieving Yoke-fellow is sanctified, or made meet in respect of conjugal use, to his or her Yoke-fellow: And so though the one be an Unbeliever, yet they might comfortably enough live together in lawful Wedlock. See our late Annotators; *"I rather think (say they) it signifies brought into a State that the Believer, without Offence to the Law of God, may continue in a married Estate with such a Yoke-fellow"*¹²⁹; for else, saith the Apostle, your Children were unclean, that is, would be accounted illegitimate. But now this being determined, that the Husband is thus sanctified to the Wife, and the Wife to the Husband, though the one be an Unbeliever, hence it follows, *"that your Children are holy"*; that is, lawfully begotten, which is the only sense opposite to the Determination (1 Cor. 7:12-13). It was, 'tis plain, about this matter those Saints at *Corinth* wrote to the Apostle, and therefore according to the scope of the place it cannot intend anything else. And as for the use of the word Holy for Legitimate, that it is in this sense used else-where in the Scripture is evident from Mal. 2:15 where a Seed of God, or a Godly Seed, can be understood in no other sense than that of a lawful Seed, in opposition to those born by Polygamy.

Neither ought any Man to infer *Federal Holiness* to be intended here, unless he can prove from some other Text in the New Testament any such Holiness to be in Children, *i. e.* because Parents are Believers and in the Covenant of Grace, their natural Seed must therefore be so esteemed, and have the like Right to Gospel-Baptism as the Children under the Law had to Circumcision, which is nowhere to be found in all the New-Testament, but the quite contrary, as has been proved; and therefore this Interpretation ought not to be admitted, but utterly to be rejected in regard of what the Apostle *Peter* asserts (2 Pet. 1:20).

How false and ridiculous therefore is that which Mr. *Smythies* hath lately affirmed: *"Whenever"*, saith he, *"God enters into Covenant with the Parent, he enters into Covenant with the Children of that Parent; that is, the Children were included in the Covenant, and the Blessings of that Covenant belonged to the Children as well as to the Parent."*¹³⁰ They that will build their Faith upon such kind of Men deserve to be deceived, who speak what they please, and prove nothing; as if this was so because Mr. *Smythies* says it. I must charge it upon him as false Doctrine, (1.) As being quite contrary to the Nature of the Gospel-Dispensation and Constitution of the New Testament-Church, wherein the Fleshly Seed are rejected and cast out in respect of Church-Privileges and Ordinances. (2.) What is this but to entail Grace to Nature, and Regeneration to Generation? in opposition to what our Savior saith (John 3:3), and *Paul* (Eph. 2:1-2). (3.) It also contradicts all Men's Experience. How palpable is it that Godly Men have wicked Children now adays as well as in former times? What, wicked Children, and yet in the Covenant of Grace! Or, were they in it, and are they now fallen out of it? What a Covenant then do you make that sure and everlasting Covenant of Grace to be?

¹²⁹ [Pool's Annotat. on 1 Cor. 7:14.](#)

¹³⁰ *Smythies* Non-communicant, p. 88.

Besides, we have many learned Men and Commentators of our Mind upon this Text, as Mr. *Danvers* observes and quotes them.¹³¹

Austin saith, "it is to hold without doubting; whatsoever that Sanctification was, it was not of Power to make Christians and remit Sins."

Ambrose upon this place, saith, "the Children are holy because they are born of lawful Marriage."

Melancthon in his Commentary upon this same Text saith thus,

Therefore *Paul* answers, that their Marriages are not to be pulled asunder for their unlike Opinions of God; if the impious Person do not cast away the other; and for comfort he adds as a Reason, The unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the believing Wife. Meat is sanctified; for that which is holy in use, that is, it is granted to Believers from God; so here he speaks of the use of Marriage to be holy, and to be granted of God. Things prohibited under the Law, as Swine's Flesh, and a Woman in her Pollution, were called unclean. The Connection of this, if the use of Marriage should not please God, your Children would be Bastards, and so unclean: But your Children are not Bastards, therefore the use of the Marriage pleaseth God: And how Bastards were unclean in a peculiar manner the Law shews, Deut. 23.

Camtrarius in his Commentary upon this place also saith, (for the unbelieving Husband *hath been* sanctified, an unusual change of the Tense, that is)

sanctified in the lawful use of Marriage; for without this, saith he, it would be that their Children should be unclean, that is, infamous and not *legitimate*, who so are holy, that is, during the Marriage are without all blot of Ignominy.

Erasmus saith likewise,

Infants born of such Parents as one being a Christian, the other not, are holy legitimately; for the Conversion of either Wife or Husband doth not dissolve the Marriage which was made when both were Unbelievers.

What Reason now had Dr. *Featly* and others to contemn this Exposition of the Text, considering what we and so many Learned Men have declared as touching this matter? for a more fuller Answer read Mr. *Danvers*, p. 166, 167, 168, 169.

But after all, should it be allowed that the Holiness in this Text is indeed to be taken for a *Federal* or *Covenant-Holiness*, yet we cannot therefore grant that this is a sufficient Proof for Infant-Baptism; for let the Holiness be what it will, whether *Moral*, *Federal*, or *Matrimonial*, neither of these is anywhere assigned to be a ground of baptizing Infants; the Institution,¹³² Commission, and Practice of the Apostolical Church being

¹³¹ Mr. *Danvers* Treat. of Bapt. p. 165, 166.

¹³² Baptism only a positive Law; who the Subjects of it, are depends wholly upon the Will of God, &c.

that alone that can warrant the same: 'Tis God's Word only, not Men's Reason, conceited Grounds and Inferences, that can justify a Practice, or make a Gospel-Ordinance; if all therefore was granted which you affirm of the Covenant made with *Abraham* of Circumcision and *Federal-Holiness*, yet Infant-Baptism is gone, unless you can prove God hath from this ground commanded you to baptize your Children, or that they were for this Reason admitted to Baptism in the Apostles Time (for all your Arguments from thence prove as strongly, that your Infants may partake of the Lord's-Supper, &c.). But that anything less than a Profession of Faith and Repentance is or can be a sufficient ground for baptizing any Person, young or old, we do deny, since the New Testament is the only Rule or perfect Copy, by the Authority of which we ought to act and perform all Duties of instituted Worship, and administer Sacraments, &c. which are more positive Precepts, and depend only upon the Will and Pleasure of the Law-maker. So much to this pretended Proof of Infant-Baptism.

A proof from Mark 16:16.

A sixth Proof of Infant-Baptism is grounded upon Mark 16:16, "*He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.*"

Now they affirm that Infants are Believers, and therefore are to be baptized.

Mr. *Smythies* Argument, that Infants are Believers.

Mr. *Smythies* says,

Infants are Believers in a sense, or else they could not be saved, nor have right to the Promises of Christ in the Gospel; and if they are in any sense such Believers as are entitled to Salvation, they are such Believers as have a right to Baptism; if the Estate belongs to a Child in the Cradle, the Indentures and Seals of that Estate belong to him likewise: the Child of a Believer may as well be called a Believer, as the Child of a Proselyte was called a proselyte: if God gives Children but the denomination of Believers, it is sufficient to entitle them to Baptism.

Thus Mr. *Smythies*.

But how does it appear that Infants are Believers in any sense? is there any Argument or Scripture brought by this Man to prove them so to be? if he can prove they have Faith and do believe in Christ, he will do more than all the Men that ever lived on Earth could do, I mean Children, as such in common and in an ordinary way, to be Believers. True, nothing is too hard for God to do: he that can make an Ass to speak, can as well cause a Babe to believe: But how does it appear God has given them either the Habit of Faith, or the Act of Faith, or Faith in any sense to render them to be Believers? But 'tis intimated "*they are Believers by their Parents Faith*": why may not their Parents Baptism serve as well as their Parents Faith, and they receive the Lord's Supper for them in their Names also, and that be imputed to the Children by virtue of their Parents Faith? And what "*though the Estate belongs to the Child in the Cradle, together with the Indenture and Seals of that Estate*"; Is it required the Child in the Cradle should therefore set his Seal to the Indenture? is that requisite, or would it make the Estate the more firm or sure to him? But when you can prove Grace and

Salvation to be *Hereditary*, and that the Father's being a Believer and a godly Person, all his Children must needs be such too, you do your business.

Faith nor Baptism is not required of Infants, yet they may be saved
Secondly, But why do you say Children must be Believers, or else they can't be saved? who told you so? Because Faith in Adult Persons is required as necessary in them, if they are saved. Can't God save poor Infants without they also do believe? has God told you he cannot, or will not save them except they believe? I must confess I wonder at your Ignorance and daring Boldness: "God", as Dr. *Taylor* observes, "*may have many ways to magnify his Grace through Jesus Christ to them which we know not of*"¹³³; and what have you to do with the Secrets of God? who made you one of his Privy-Council? you may as well say, unless they repent they cannot be saved from Christ's words (Luke 13:3, 5), and that they must be obedient and take up the Cross, for these things are required of Adult Persons that would be saved as well as believing.

Thirdly, Prove that God has given Children the Denomination of Believers; or if it was granted he hath, would it therefore follow they may be baptized? certainly no, for we read of many who were said to believe (John 2:23; 8:30, 31, 44), they had some kind of Faith, and so in some sense had the denomination of *Believers*, and yet had no right to Baptism, for such ought to have a true Faith, or to believe with all their Hearts, as *Philip* said to the *Eunuch* (Acts 8), who are fit Subjects of that Ordinance, or have a sufficient Title to it: and would not that believing (in any sense) you speak of, that entitles them to Salvation, give them as good a right to the Lord's-Supper as to Baptism? Come, Sir, you can't infer a right to an Ordinance from what grounds you please. Baptism depends wholly, I say again, upon the Authority of a positive Law, and express words of Institution¹³⁴; and none but such who are made Disciples by preaching, or who do actually believe, ought from thence to be baptized.

What Confusion is here among the Pedo-Baptists?

I wonder what Faith 'tis you supposed to be in Infants? is it the *Faith of the Church*, as Though *Aquinas* asserts, which is entailed upon all within the pale thereof? Or is it an *Imputative Faith* from the Parents in Covenant, as *Musculus* and others maintain? Or, is it *the Faith of the Gossip or Surety*, as many of your Church say, *i. e.* others believe for them? Have they a *justifying Faith*, as Mr. *Baxter* intimates? or a *dogmatical Faith* only, as in Mr. *Blake's* Sense? Some, as Mr. *Danvers* observes, say 'tis a *Physical*, some a *Metaphysical*, and some a *Hyperphysical* Faith. Some say they are born Believers, others say they are made Believers by Baptism. Now when you tell us what Faith they have, we shall the better understand you, and give you an Answer.

A Personal and actual Faith, saith Dr. *Taylor*, they have not, for they have no Acts of Understanding; besides, how can any Man know they have Faith, since he never saw any sign it, neither was he told so by any that could tell. *Secondly*, saith he, Some say they have Imputative Faith: But then so let the

¹³³ Dr. *Taylor*, p. 230.

¹³⁴ I am forced to repeat this often, because there is the like occasion given, and it is a full Answer to all such Inferences.

Sacraments be too, that is, if they have the Parents Faith or the Churches, then so let Baptism be imputed also by derivation from them: And as in their Mother's Womb, and while they hang upon their Mothers Breasts, they live upon their Mothers Nourishment; so they may upon the Baptism of their Parents, or their Mother the Church: for since Faith is necessary to the susception¹³⁵ of Baptism (and they themselves confess it, by striving to find out new kinds of Faith to daub the matter;) such as the Faith, such must be the Sacrament: for there is no proportion between an actual Sacrament, and an Imputative Faith, this being in immediate and necessary order to that.

This saith the Bishop.

We know there are some argue stiffly for Infants having habitual Faith; but as the said Doctor saith, *Are there any Acts precedent, concomitant, or consequent to this pretended Habit?* this strange Invention, saith he, is absolutely *without Art, without Scripture, Reason, or Authority*. But the Men are to be excused, unless they had any better Arguments to defend their Practice; they are forced to confess the Truth in the main, *viz.* That Faith is required of Persons to be baptized, and therefore they do what they can to prove Infants do believe. But I will conclude this with what the said Doctor further saith,

And if any Man runs for Succor to that exploded *Cresphugeton*, that Infants have Faith, or any other inspired Habit of I know not what, or how, we desire no more advantage than that they are constrained to answer without Revelation against Reason, common Sense, and all the Experience in the World.¹³⁶

¹³⁵ Meaning, reception. – Simon

¹³⁶ Dr. Taylor, p. 242.

12 – Containing an Answer to several other Arguments brought for Infant-Baptism.

Objection: Infant-Baptism is proved by consequences.

Objection. 1. Though there is no plain Scriptures for Infant-Baptism, yet it may be proved by Consequences; you, it appears, deny direct Consequences from Scripture to be mandatory, and so obliging, and of Divine Authority.¹³⁷

Answer. We affirm, that in all positive or instituted Worship (such as Baptism is) which wholly depends upon the mere Will and Pleasure of the Law-giver, it is absolutely necessary there should be an express Command, or plain and clear Examples, though in other respects we allow of natural Deductions and Consequences from Scripture for the confirming and enforcing of Duties, and for the Comfort and Instruction of God's People. But as there is neither express Command nor Example for Infant-Baptism; so it can't be proved by any Consequence or Inference, that naturally and genuinely¹³⁸ rises from any Scripture, as we have proved, nor does draw any such Consequences to prove it.

Objection: The New Testament says nothing against Infant-Baptism.

Objection. 2. *But* there is nothing in all the New Testament against Infant-Baptism, *saith* Mr. Smythies. If indeed our Savior had declared that Infants should not be baptized, or if we had read of the Apostles Refusal of them; then, &c. There is no hint from any express word dropped from Christ, *saith* Mr. Sidenham, or his Apostles, nor any Phrase which doth forbid such an Act.

Answer. We will answer with *Tertullian*:

For this is a certain Rule, *saith* he, if it be said 'tis lawful because the Scripture doth not forbid it; it may equally be retorted, it is therefore not lawful, because the Scripture doth not command it.

That which is done in the Worship and Service of God without any express Word dropped from Christ or his Apostles, nor any Phrase which doth signify it is his Will and Mind it ought to be done, is unlawful and no better than Will-worship. Must Christ forbid Infant-Baptism? must he declare in plain words they ought not to be baptized, or else may they, ought they to be baptized? Is this good Divinity with Mr. *Smythies*? Certainly this Man can't long keep out of the Romish Communion: Hath our Savior declared indeed that you shall not have Crucifixes, Beads, Altars, and that you shall not use Salt, Spittle, Oil, or Chrism in Baptism? that ye shall not go on Pilgrimages, nor pray for the Dead? Hath Christ, I say, or his Apostles, as you read, forbid these things, and many more of like nature? Or, did God forbid *Nadab* and *Abihu* to offer *strange Fire*, who were destroyed for doing it (Lev. 10:1-2)? Did God forbid *Abraham* to circumcise his Female Children, or forbid him to circumcise his Male Children on the ninth day? and might he therefore do these things—because God did nowhere tell him he should not do so? The like might be said concerning Bowing at the naming of the Name

¹³⁷ Mr. *Sidenham*'s Treatise.

¹³⁸ The [scanned version](#) is at this point unclear. – Simon

of Jesus, Cross in Baptism, *Surplice* in reading the Service, Kneeling at the Sacrament, set Forms of Prayer; you do these things because not forbidden, and why not *admit* of other *Rites* and *Innovations* as well as these? Moreover, what express word against Infants receiving the Sacraments? Besides, are Bells forbidden to be baptized? hath Christ said indeed, ye shall not baptize Bells? is it therefore lawful to baptize them? You will object, May be that *Bells* are not fit nor capable Subjects of such an Ordinance? But why are they not? wherein are they incapable? Can you not sprinkle a little Water upon a Bell, and use the words of Institution in as solemn a manner as you do when you sprinkle a Child (baptize it as you say)? But are they incapable because there is no word of Institution, nothing from the Mouth of Christ or his Apostles, to justify such a Practice? We say the same in respect of your baptizing Children; and if you say, Bells are not capable of the use and end of Baptism; we have proved the like concerning Infants. If God had pleased, he could have made them by an Institution capable of some sacred usefulness, yea capable of Relative Holiness or Consecration, as *Aaron's Bells*; Nay, and since we read of "*Bells of the Horses that should be Holiness to the Lord*" (Zech. 14:20). Why may not that Text be a Proof that Bells in Churches should be baptized, and so made holy likewise? There are those you know who plead for that Practice (and have baptized them for many Ages) and they say there is as much ground from Scripture to do that, as there is to baptize Children, both depending, as they will tell you, upon the Authority of the Church.

Sad it is that such a Gap as this should be opened to all or any Inventions or Traditions of Men: remember who it was that said, "*Add thou not to his Word.*" That God has in all Ages testified his Abhorrence of Will-worship, and that from this very reason, because he commanded them not: *'tis evident "they have built the high places of Tophet"*, &c. "*which I commanded them not, neither came it into my Heart*" (Jer. 7:31). For this cause God threatened Judgments upon *Israel*; "*They have set their Threshold by my Thresholds, and their Post by my Posts, wherefore I have consumed them*" (Ezek. 43:8).

God discovers his severe Displeasure against them, not for neglecting any part of his Worship that he had commanded them, but for their Presumption in adding other things thereto, calling them his Ordinances, which he had not appointed nor commanded them. Will-worship (Sir) is an horrible Sin, when he who is to perform the Duty shall dare to appoint the Laws: Implying a peremptory purpose of no further observance, than may consist with the allowance of his own depraved Judgment and Self-Interest; whereas true Obedience must be grounded on the Authority of that Power that commands not the liking or approbation of the Subject. Some Men will obey so far as it consists with their Interest, and alter, add to, or diminish from, as they see good.

1. This savors of horrible Pride: Shall Man prescribe unto God ways how he shall be worshipped?
2. Moreover, this of *Will-worship* was that very Sin that overthrew the Nation of *Israel*; see Isa. 24:5-6, "*They have changed the Ordinances*", &c.
3. And it also is said to wound the Heart of God, namely, their superstitious and corrupt Mixtures in his Worship (Ezek. 6:9). And,

4. This renders the Service of Men abominable, when they make void the Commands of God by their Traditions, and all they do to be in *vain*, for so saith our Savior, “*In vain they worship me, teaching for Doctrine the Commandments of Men*” (Matt. 15:9).

Objection: Our Savior took little children in His arms, but does not admit them into His Church?

Objection. 3. “But is it to be imagined”, saith Mr. *Smythies*, “that our Savior, who took little Children up in his Arms, should allow no Ordinance for them by which they should be admitted into his Church?”

Answer. Must he needs baptize them because he took them up in his Arms? and because he blessed them, must he receive them into his Church? We have proved that they are not capable Subjects of Gospel-Church-membership, neither did our Savior baptize any with his own Hands (John 4:1-2), therefore not those Children he took up into his Arms; nor is this any proof in the least, *i. e.* that Christ must allow them an Ordinance, because he shewed them the favour to take them up into his Arms. ‘Tis *said he looked upon the young Man, and loved him*; must he therefore make him a Member of his Church, whether he was still qualified for it or not? Christ shewed many great Favours unto divers Persons, that we do not read he admitted into his Church. He may shew one Favour to you, and yet deny you another which you may not be capable of receiving.

“Young Children”, saith *Luther*, “hear not, nor understand the Word of God, out of which Faith cometh; and therefore if the Commandment be followed, Children ought not to be baptized.”¹³⁹

Besides, they might be Children able to receive Instruction as far as you know, for such we take some times up into our Arms. *Tertullian*, speaking of this place, saith,

Indeed the Lord said, do not ye hinder them to come unto me, let them come therefore, while they grow to Years, let them come while they learn, and while come, let them be taught; let them become Christians, when they are able to know Christ: Why doth innocent Age hasten to the Remission of Sins? Men will deal more warily in Worldly Affairs; so that they who are not trusted with an Earthly Inheritance are trusted with an Heavenly one; let them ask for Salvation that thou mayst appear to have given it to him.¹⁴⁰

See our further Answer to this Text, *Chap. 9.*

¹³⁹ *Luther* in Postil.

¹⁴⁰ *Tertullian* in his Book of Bapt. *Cap. 18.*

Objection: Infants were commonly baptized before the Great Commission and thus is something common.

Objection. 4. "But Infants were commonly baptized before. How can we", saith Mr. *Smythies*, "imagine that our Savior sent to baptize Nations in which Infants before had commonly been baptized, and yet intend they should be excluded?"

Answer. This is a new kind of Argument, but proves nothing.

For first, 'Tis denied that Infants by any Command of God were ever baptized in any Nation, no not amongst the Jews, much less among the Gentile Nations; but if they had been baptized before, he might as well have inferred (and much better) Infants Right to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and have said, Can we imagine Christ would have excluded them from that, considering they were before admitted to the Passover (which there is no great cause to question.)

But secondly, We reason thus; If they were before baptized, either they were baptized as it was a Jewish Rite and Custom, or else as an Heathenish one: If Baptism of Infants before was a Jewish Rite, it was either appointed of God, or else a Tradition of their own: If it was a Tradition of their own, can you suppose our Savior would go about to own and establish a Jewish Innovation, or one of their human Traditions? and if it were an Appointment of God, it is very much that no Man ever found it out before in all the Old Testament.

But thirdly, If there had been any such legal Ordinance, it had been abrogated, with all other Jewish Ceremonies, "*which stood (as the Apostle shews) in Meats and Drinks, and divers Washings, and Carnal Ordinances imposed on them until the time of Reformation*" (Heb. 9:10). All those divers Washings that were under the Law it is evident ceased in the Establishment of the new Testament; and therefore how abominable false is that which Mr. *Smythies* says concerning Gospel-Baptism?

Objection: The Jews were accustomed to baptize proselyte parents and children.

Objection. 5. "Our Savior", (says he *Pag.* 88.) "took this Ordinance from the Custom of the Jews, who were wont¹⁴¹ to baptize those who forsook Heathenism and embraced the true Religion. And whenever they made Proselytes, they did not only baptize the Parent, but the Child likewise."

Answer. Did any Man assert till now the Baptism of Christ to be a Legal Rite, or rather that it sprung from Human Tradition? for 'tis evident the Jews were not required to baptize them by any Appointment of God: for Circumcision was the Rite by which Proselytes (who were Males) were added to the Jewish Church.

Besides, doth not our Savior plainly intimate, that *John's* Baptism was directly from Heaven, and not of Men? And if Baptism had been so frequently practiced amongst the Jews, wherefore did they say to *John*, "*Why dost thou baptize, if thou art not that Christ, nor Elias*" (John 1:25)? But doth not Christ say, that the Doctrine

¹⁴¹ That is, "accustomed" and "used". <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/wont> - Simon

he taught, he received from the Father who sent him? not from *Moses* nor the Jews: "*I have not spoken (saith he) of myself; but the Father which sent me, gave me Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak*" (John 12:49). Now Baptism is positively called a Principle of his Doctrine (Heb. 6:1-3), it was he that instituted it and gave it forth, as a pure Gospel-Ordinance (Matt. 28:19-20), as the alone Sovereign Lord and Lawgiver of his Church. Moreover, if all those divers Washings and carnal Ordinances amongst the Jews are abolished, as you heard before; how came this supposed Jewish Rite to escape? These things considered, we may perceive 'tis Ignorance through Tradition that makes a Pedo-baptist, or rather a No-Baptist, *and not Ignorance* (as he affirms) *through length of time that makes an Anabaptist* (falsely so called) *Pag. 91*. But 'tis the knowledge of God's Word, through the help of the Spirit, by which they, whom he so calls, come to cast off that unwritten Tradition of *Babes Rantism*, and to own no Baptism but that which Christ hath commanded, and was practiced in the Apostolical Church.

And whereas he affirms the baptizing of Children was all along used in the Primitive Church by the Holy Martyrs, &c.

We answer, it was never practiced till the Church came to adulterate the holy Institutions of Christ, and fell away to Error and Superstition.

"For", saith *Curcellaeus*, "in the two first Centuries after Christ, Infant-Baptism was altogether unknown; but in the third and fourth it was allowed by some few; in the fifth and following Ages, it was generally received into Custom."¹⁴²

And if the Custom of the Church is enough to justify Infant-Baptism, it will oblige us as to receive many other Traditions or Ceremonies likewise.

Objection: But there are divers very learned Men who hold Infant-Baptism.

Objection. 6. But there are divers very learned Men who hold Infant-Baptism.

Answer. And are there not many very learned Men who are against baptizing them? who say 'tis an Invention of Men and no Ordinance of Jesus Christ? Besides, were not the Pharisees and Lawyers learned Men, who "*rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized*" (Luke 7:30)? God's purpose is to confound the Wisdom of Man. If Learning once comes to be made an *Idol* of, God may leave those learned Men to themselves, and let them grope in Mid-day as in the Night, notwithstanding all their Light, Knowledge, and Learning.

Besides, there are learned Men of all Opinions, many learned *Cardinals, Priests, and Jesuits* in the Church of *Rome*, yet you will not make that an Argument to believe *Transubstantiation*, and other Errors maintained by them.

¹⁴² *Curcellaeus* institut. Relig. Christian. I. 1. c. 12.

Objection. 6. But there are many very holy and pious Men, yea Pastors of Churches, that are for the baptizing of little Infants: Nay, and why should so few learned Men be of your way if it were a Truth, for most speak against those of your Persuasion?

Answer. 1. The more cause of Grief. But what though I must tell you God's Word is to be your Guide, and not Men: every Man must give an account to God for himself.

Moreover, some Godly Men who have had great Light, and were glorious Reformers too in their day, yet lay short of some great Things and Duties; as *Jehosaphat*, &c. "*who did not remove nor pull down the high Places*" (2 Chron. 20:33; 1 Kings 22:43).

2. Light and Knowledge of Divine Truths have broken forth *gradually*. When Reformation first begun, those godly Men labored to restore the doctrinal part of the Gospel, and yet great Corruptions remained in point of Discipline (which Errors God hath since by degrees discovered.)

3. Had the best and late Reformers (for such you will find at last the Baptists to be in point of the Administrations of God's House and holy Temple) been generally learned Men, 'tis very like this Truth would have been more readily received among such (I mean learned Persons) than we see now it is, so hard a thing is Self-denial.

4. Moreover, the base Reproaches cast upon the true way of Baptizing, hath doubtless laid a great many of good Men under Temptations, there being hardly any one Truth that has been rendered more odious and contemptible than Baptizing, (*i e.* dipping of Men and Women in Water) though 'tis generally acknowledged by all, that no other Action then that was practiced in the Gospel-days in the Administration of this Ordinance.

5. Some say those Errors or unsound Principles (as I look upon them to be) maintained by divers Baptists (who I doubt not are godly Christians) have likewise hindered the Reception and Promulgation of this blessed Gospel-Institution among many worthy Persons,¹⁴³ and kept them may be from endeavoring their Satisfaction herein; though 'tis strange that should be a stumbling Block to any, since there were many Christians in the Apostles Times, who in many things did dissent and differ (in as great matters) one from another: besides, there are Men almost of all Persuasions that hold those very Principles.

6. Others think the Remissness of some of the Baptized Churches about taking care of their Ministers hath contributed something to it also: for nothing lies more clear in God's Word, "*than that those who preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel*"; yea, have a comfortable Maintenance, *i. e.* that they may be wholly sequestered to the Work of the Ministry (and be in a capacity to give to others, 1 Cor. 9:7-12, and so shew themselves Examples in Hospitality); and that their poor Wives and Children after their Decease (Matt. 10:10), may not be exposed to Want and Poverty. But I am glad to see it (Luke 9:3), our Churches are now

¹⁴³ For the Doctrine of Free-will; Falling away totally from a state of true Grace, &c. are not looked upon as capital Errors, *viz.* such as will exclude Men out of the Kingdom of Heaven.

daily enlightened into this indispensable Duty, and do endeavor to reform accordingly; and would they also labour to follow the Primitive Saints *“in singing of Psalms, and Hymns, and spiritual Songs”* (Eph. 5:18-19), I do not doubt but it would add to their Comfort and Glory (Col. 3:16), and many more than now do would join with us.¹⁴⁴

7. But to proceed: Be sure the Examples of the best Men under Heaven will never be a Plea sufficient for any in the day of Judgment, in doing anything in God’s Worship that he has not commanded (or given grounds for the Observation of) or in their neglecting doing of that which he hath expressly required. Shall any be allowed at the last day to plead thus, *viz.* such and such good Men and able Ministers did say this was a Truth and my Duty? surely no.

8. When Reformation is required of Men in so great a case as this, *viz.* that which tends to the razing the whole Constitution or standing of their Church, which has been also of such a long continuation; it calls for great Resolution, Courage, and Self-denial, which is hard for some Men to arrive at; considering also what great Persons and Reformers have been on their side; and they not seriously minding the words of the wise Man, where he says, that *“the Path of the Just is as a shining Light, that shineth more and more to the perfect day”* (Prov. 4:18); the Church as it was then *“looked out of the Wilderness but as the Morning, and but as fair (comparatively) as the Moon”* (Song 6:10); but since (blessed be God) greater Light hath broken forth, yea to such a degree that now she seems to be come forth *“as clear as the Sun”*, &c. And sad it is to see Men content themselves to walk only in that Light those worthy Christians had in the Morning of the Reformation, and refuse to follow and embrace a higher and more clear, and Sun-shining Glory. They might be accepted then, since their Day did not afford greater Manifestations of Truth in those respects; but it may not excuse our Brethren, nor may they be accepted in following them, since Truth is broke forth more perspicuously in these latter times.

Objection: The Anabaptists lie under great reproaches.

Objection. The People called Anabaptists lie under great Reproaches, as if you baptized People naked.

*Answer.*¹⁴⁵ ‘Tis no more than our Savior foretold should befall his own People and faithful Followers, *“They shall speak all manner of Evil against you falsty for my Name sake”* (Matt. 5:11), &c. I am not ignorant what odious Lies and Reproaches have been cast upon us in respect of baptizing Men and Women naked: whereas ‘tis notoriously known to be utterly false and abominable, which thousands can testify to the contrary, who are of different Persuasions to us, who daily see Persons of both Sexes baptized by us, always in very comely and decent Garments, provided on purpose upon that account.

¹⁴⁴ Some good Christians are not willing to take up one Ordinance, and so join in with the Baptists, and thereby lose another which they believe is as great, and a most sweet and Soul-consolating one.

¹⁴⁵ Dr. *Featly* and Mr. *Baxter* formerly contracted no small Guilt and Shame to themselves upon this respect; see *Dipper dipped*, writ by *Featly*.

Objection: Anabaptists were stigmatized and refuse to obey kings and oaths. What about the Munster-Story?

Objection. You have been formerly stigmatized and accused, as if you were against Magistrates, or refuse to obey Kings, and such as are in Authority; and refuse lawful Oaths: What say you to the Munster-Story?

Answer. These things our Enemies know to be false and vile Slanders, our Confessions of Faith from time to time do witness the contrary; What People plead for Subjection to Government and Magistrates which God has set over us, more than we always do? And as touching that old *Munster-Story* of *John of Leyden*, &c. they that read the best Histories of that business, may find many things to be false which are charged against those *Anabaptists*: besides, the Story of them was either written (as some have very well observed) by the malicious Papists, their old mortal Enemies; or else by envious Protestants, who are willing to take up any base Reports, and improve those Stories to blast the Reputation of the whole Party. Alas, I could here soon recite some Writings of inveterate Spirits, who have in as base a manner vilified and calumniated the *Episcopals*, nay and the *Presbyterians*, and *Independents* also, giving Instances both in respect of their vile Principles and Practices. Certainly 'tis a shame for any good Men to take up a Charge against so great a Party of godly Christians from the venomous Pens of such shameless Persons.

But suppose the *Munster-Story* as to matter of Fact were true, and that some of those *Anabaptists* were very ill Men, and guilty of several immoral Actions, and held great Errors, yet how unreasonable and uncharitable a thing is it to render all those People of that Persuasion in those times, and also since to be as bad and as like guilty? especially considering that the Principle and Practice of baptizing believing Men and Women in itself is so harmless a thing, and no ways tends to lead Persons to such Evils? For by the same Rule might not the best and most holy Church and People in the World, or ever were in the World, be censured and reproached, and neither the Church of the Jews, nor the Gospel-Church in the Apostles days escape, since in the first there were very ill Persons, as *Chora*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, and many others, and in the last a *Judas*, a *Diatrophes*, an *incestuous Person* (1 Cor. 5:1-2), who was guilty of worse or more shameful Fornication than what was amongst the Gentiles, as the Apostle affirms? Besides, as Mr. *Danvers* observes, those of the same Opinion in former times are acknowledged to be godly and good Men, or have an honorable Character given them, and this too by the ample and authentic Testimony from their greatest Enemies; he cites *Reinerius*¹⁴⁶, the *Bloody Inquisitor* of those in *France*, and *Baronius*, and *Cassander* of those in *Germany*; nay, and Mr. *Baxter* himself, who, though he has been found free enough in his Reproaches, yet to give him his due, is pleased to witness to our Innocence in this Nation, take his own words: saith he,

That *Anabaptists* are godly Men that differ from us in a Point so difficult, that many of the Papists and Prelatists have maintained, that it is not determined in the Scripture, but dependeth upon Tradition of the Church: And I know as good and sober Men of that Mind, as of theirs who are most against them, &c. And again he saith, that *Augustin*, and many Children of Christians were baptized at Age; and that the Controversy is of so great difficulty, that if in all such cases none that differ be

¹⁴⁶ Reinerius (or Rainerius) Saccho (1200s – c. 1263). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reinerius_Saccho - Simon

tolerated, we may not live together in the World or Church, but endlessly excommunicate or prosecute one another.¹⁴⁷

But blessed be God we need not the Testimony of Men, having the Testimony *of our own Consciences* (which is our rejoicing) as the Apostle saith, *“that in Simplicity and godly Sincerity, not by fleshly Wisdom, but by the Grace of God, we have had our Conversation in the World”* (2 Cor. 1:12). Though there may be some of our Communion who may be under Guilt and gross Enormities, and mistaken Principles and Notions, to our great Grief and Sorrow (as well as amongst other Communities of godly Christians) but Charity will cover a multitude of Faults.

Objection: But you lay too much stress upon Baptism?

Objection. 8. But you lay too much stress upon Baptism?

Answer. What some may do, I know not, but I am sure generally, we lay no more stress upon it than we ought; we say, it is a Duty incumbent upon all Believers—a holy Ordinance of Christ, one of the great Sacraments of the New Testament, and they that reject it, do reject part of the Counsel of God. Yet we do not lay such stress upon it, as some do upon Infant Baptism. We do not say, Men cannot be saved, unless they be baptized; provided they do not sin against their light and clear convictions of their own Consciences. ‘Tis evident there are those who have asserted, That Infants that die unbaptized, shall not, cannot be saved; which certainly is abominable to affirm: For were it our duty to baptize our Children, yet can any think, that the omission of our duty to them herein, can exclude them the Kingdom of Heaven? but ‘tis evident it is not required, they are not the subjects of it.

Objection: Nowhere is it said that women received the Lord’s Supper, in the same way we should baptize infants.

Objection. ‘Tis nowhere said, that Women received the Lords Supper, yet ‘tis given to them: Why may not Infants be Baptized as well, though there is nothing mentioned of their being Baptized in the Scripture.

Answer. To this we Answer, That there is ground enough from the Scripture, for Women who are baptized Believers, to receive the Lord’s Supper; *“Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat”* (1 Cor. 11:28), saith the Apostle, viz. Man or Woman. For so the Greek word *ἀνθρώπος* signifies. *“There is one Mediator between God and Man”* (1 Tim. 2:5). Is not Woman as well as Man intended there? *“If there come into your Assembly a Man having a Gold Ring”* (Jas. 2:2), &c. *“A double-minded Man is unstable in all his ways”* (Jas. 1:8). Are not Women as well as Men, comprehended and meant in those places as well as Men, though not expressed?

¹⁴⁷ Baxter in his Book Principle of Love, p. 7.

2. Were not Women as well as Men (who believed) Baptized (Acts 8:12)? Were not Women Disciples, and commanded to be made discipline by the preaching of the Gospel in the Commission (Matt. 28:19-20), as well as Men?

And are not Males and Females all one in Christ Jesus? Is not this a mere trifling Vanity, and naught but a piece of Foolery and Deceit, to “*darken Counsel with words without Knowledge*” (Job 38:2)?

Women were Baptized; we read of *Lydia*, an honorable Woman that was Baptized. And when they “*heard this*”, ‘tis said, “*they were baptized both Men and Women*” (Acts 8:12). And they that were required to be Baptized, and did partake of that Ordinance, “*continued together in the Apostles Doctrine, and in Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread and Prayer*” (Acts 2:42). This sufficiently proves Women received the Lord’s Supper.

When shall we see the like proof for *Babes Baptism*?

Were not Women Members of the Church and does not the Holy Supper belong to all Regular Members thereof? This Objection seems to represent these Men like a person almost drowned, who catches hold of any little Twig, or Flag, to help him: But, Brethren, these things will never do your business.

Objection: Baptists have no ground to baptize children grown in Christendom as those in the New Testament were converts from Judaism or Paganism.

Objection. If we have no Scripture-Example to baptize Infants: no more have you for the baptizing such Persons as you do baptize, *viz.* those of Age, whose Parents were baptized and educated from their Youth in the Christian Religion; for evident it is, those we read of in the New Testament who were baptized, were such who were newly Converted either from *Judaism, or Paganism, to Christianity.*

Answer. What though we have no Example in the Scripture of any besides such you speak of that were baptized, (that being the very beginning of that Gospel-Administration) yet is not the Commission a perfect Rule to succeeding Ages, as well as it was to that present Age? Evident it is that by virtue of the Commission, none were to be baptized but such as are discipled, or first taught, before admitted to that Ordinance. If the person be a Believer, we have no ground to refuse him, because his Parents were *Jews or Heathens*; so we have no reason to receive others at all the more, because their Parents were Christians.

2. Can you prove that difference as to the state of the Parents (in respect of what you speak of) doth give you a warrantable ground to act contrary to the order and nature of the great Commission (Matt. 28:19-20)? By the authority of which, the Apostles did baptize (and all Ministers ought to administer the same Ordinance to the end of the World.) The nature and order of the Commission cuts this Objection to pieces: For if the person be a Disciple, a Believer, he is to be baptized, let his Parents be Jews, Heathens, or Christians, ‘tis all one. If you had the like grounds to baptize Infants, we should contend no longer with you.

3. When you can prove the Faith of the Parents, or their subjection to the external Rite of Baptism, adds any spiritual advantage to their Children, or such as gives them a right to Baptism, we will give up the Controversy.—

Objection: How can baptism be by dipping if some were baptized in houses?

Objection. But whereas you say, Baptism was always done by dipping the Body all over in Water, how can that be, since some were baptized in Houses?

Answer. I answer, That is a fancy, a thing asserted without the least shadow of ground, though no less Men than our late worthy Annotators seem to affirm this very thing; for notwithstanding the *Jailor*, and those of his, were baptized the same hour of the Night (Acts 16:23), &c. Yet can any suppose they could not go out of the House so late? might there not be a Pond, or some River near? whithersoever they went, or wheresoever it was done, it is no matter, they were baptized; which has been sufficiently proved to be Immersion, or dipping the Body in Water.

Objection: There were a multitude of children baptized to Moses in the cloud and in the sea (1 Corinthians 10:2).

Objection. But say what you will, the Baptism of Infants is of God; for there was a multitude of Children of old baptized to *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea (1 Cor. 10:2).

Answer. We have shewed you that was but tropically called Baptism; and also that Baptism is a pure New-Testament Ordinance; though 'tis like that (as some Learned Men have said) might be a Type of this Ordinance, they being as it were buried or overwhelmed in the Sea, and under the Cloud. But if that may justify Infant Baptism, it will allow you to baptize Unbelievers also; for there was a multitude of mixt People who went through the Sea with *Israel*, besides much Cattel, "*And a mixt multitude went up also with them, and Flocks, and Herds, even very much Cattel*" (Exod. 12:38). All these were doubtless baptized metaphorically and typically, as well us Children under the Cloud, and in the Sea; therefore this can be no proof for Infant-Baptism.

13 – Shewing the evil Consequences, Absurdities, and Contradictions, that attend Infant-Baptism, as 'tis Asserted and Practiced.

Objection: What harm is there in Infant-Baptism?

Objection. But what harm is there in Baptizing of Children? is it not an innocent thing? can it do the Child any hurt?

Answer. The harm will be to the Parents and Ministers, who do that in Christ's Name, which they have no Authority from him to do. If it do any harm to Infants, 'tis not till they are grown up, and then it may be a means to blind their Eyes, and cause some of them to conclude, they in Baptism became the Children of God, were regenerated, made Christians, Members of Christ, and Heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven; and cause others to think they were then rightly baptized, and so to look after no other Baptism. Whereas, poor Souls, they are all unbaptized Persons, having never had any Baptism at all but *Rantism*.

Pray see what Mr. *Danvers* hath said upon this Respect.¹⁴⁸

1. But is it no harm to alter Christ's Order in the Commission, who requires Faith and Repentance to precede, or go before Baptism; or first to make them Disciples by Teaching, and then to Baptize them? And for Men to invert this Order as to baptize them, & then teach them Repentance and Faith, sure it must be an evil and hurtful thing so to do.
2. Is it not an evil thing to change the true subjects of Baptism, who are Believing and Understanding Men, to ignorant Babes, who neither know good nor evil?
3. Is it not an evil thing to frustrate the sacred and spiritual ends of Baptism, which are many, as you have heard; and by administering it to poor Babes, render it wholly an Insignificant thing?
4. Is it not an evil and a shameful thing to change *Baptism* into *Rantism*, from Dipping the whole Body, to Sprinkling or pouring a little Water upon the Face, and to pronounce an Untruth in the Name of the Lord, saying, I baptize thee "*in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and holy Spirit*", you not doing the thing? nor have any Authority so to do, nor to baptize Children at all, much less to sprinkle them.
5. Is it not an evil and harmful thing, and a great error to say, Baptism takes away Original Sin? whereas nothing can do that, (nor Actual Sin neither) but the Blood of Christ (Heb. 9:12-13; 1 John 1:7).
6. Is it not a foolish thing and a Lie, to say, Children have Faith, and are Disciples, who are not capable of Understanding? to assert a thing that no Man has any ground to believe, nor can't, without offering violence to his Reason?

¹⁴⁸ Mr. *Danver's* Book of Baptism, p. 212, 213, 214.

7. Is it not a weak thing, to open a Door into the Church, which Christ hath shut up?

8. Is it not weak and an absurd thing to say, that Infants can't be Saved except they be Baptized, partly because Christ saith, "*Except a Man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God*" (John 3:3), Baptism, as some of you say, taking away Original Sin? As if it were in the power, and at the will of the Parents to save or damn their Children. For this is intimated by this Notion of yours; If the Parents or Friends baptize the Child, it shall (if it die in its Infancy) be saved; but if they, nor no other, endeavor to get it Baptized, the Child is lost, and must perish.—

"How can outward Water", saith Mr. *Charnock*, "convey inward-Life? How can Water, a material thing, work upon the Soul in a Physical manner? Neither can it be proved, That ever the Spirit of God is tied by any Promise, to apply himself to the Soul in its Gracious Operations, when the Body is applied to the Water."¹⁴⁹

(He says, Water applied to the Body.) Because the adult Person (who sat under the preaching of the Word) cannot be saved without Regeneration. Can't God save poor dying Infants, unless the same change by the Spirits Operations pass upon them? Is not God *a free Agent*? may he not do what he pleases, and magnify his Grace to poor dying Infants, through the Blood of his Son, in other ways than we know of? Do not secret things belong to him, what Vanity is there in the minds of some Men?

8. Has God ordained Baptism to be an Ordinance to save the Souls of any Persons, either the Adult or Infants? is the *Opus operatum* of Baptism, think you, a likely way or means to beget or bring forth Children to Christ, or make Disciples of them? Baptism signifies no thing (it being but a Sign) where the inward Grace signified by it is wanting.

9. Is it not strange that you should say, That none but the Children of Believers ought to be Baptized? And that Baptism is absolutely necessary to Church-Communion, or an initiating Ordinance? And yet commonly take into your Churches, such Persons (that are converted) whose Parents were very wicked and ungodly Persons as any in the Parish, and so lived and died (as far as you know); and yet do you not account their Baptism to be sufficient?

10. Is it not an hurtful and evil thing, to defile and pollute the Church, by bringing in the Fleshy Seed which Christ hath cast out?

11. Is it not an evil and dangerous thing to lay a foundation of Ignorance and Profaneness, and to confound the World and Church together, which ought to be separated? and to make the Church National, which ought to be Congregational?

12. Is it not an harmful and evil thing to establish Human Traditions, and make them of equal Authority with Christ's sacred Institutions, and reproach them who will not against their Consciences, do the same things?

¹⁴⁹ Charn. on Regenerat. p. 75.

13. Is it not an evil and harmful thing to plead for Infant Baptism, or rather *Rantism*, and make it a bone of Contention amongst Christians, and so hinder the Unity of Churches and godly Christians? For was that Rubbish gone, what a glorious Harmony would follow, even such a Day as would make all our Souls rejoice? for he is blind who can't see that that Relic is the cause of our sad Divisions.
14. Is it not an evil and false thing to say, Persons may have Grace and Regeneration before they know God, or are called by his Word and holy Spirit?
15. Is it not a strange thing to say, Persons may be visible and lawful Members of the Gospel-Church before Conversion; and to deny them one Sacrament, and yet give them another?
16. Is it not a false thing to say, Persons may believe and be saved by the Faith of others?
17. Is it not an evil thing and a contradiction to say, Baptism is a Symbol of present Regeneration, and yet apply it to Ignorant and Unconverted Babes, wholly incapable of Regeneration, in whom none of the things signified thereby, do, or can appear?
18. Is it not a false thing and a contradiction to say, that Baptism is a lively Figure of Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, and yet do nothing but sprinkle, or pour a little Water upon the Face; by which act, all must confess nothing of such things can thereby be represented?
19. Is it not a strange and foolish thing to say, Baptism is *an Ordinance of the Solemnization of the Souls Marriage with Christ, and to say, 'tis a strange Marriage where nothing is professed of a Consent; and yet administer it to Babes wholly incapable so to do?*
20. Is it not a foolish thing to cry out against Traditions, and all Inventions of Men, and yet strive to uphold and maintain them? And doth not these things hinder that glorious Reformation we all long for, and encourage *Papists*?
21. Is it not strange Men should say, all the Children of Believers are in Covenant, and that there is no falling from a State of Grace; but that the New Covenant is so well ordered in all things, and sure, that it will secure all that are indeed in it unto Eternal Life; and yet many of these Children, who they say, were in this Covenant, perish in their Sins, dying Unregenerate?
22. We will conclude this Chapter, as Mr. *Danvers* does with the words of Dr. *Taylor*.

“And therefore”, saith he, “whoever will pertinaciously persist in his Opinion of Pedo-Baptism, and practice it accordingly, they pollute the Blood of the everlasting Covenant; they dishonor and make a Pageantry¹⁵⁰ of the Sacrament; they ineffectually represent a Sepulcher into the Death of Christ, and please themselves in a Sing without effect: Making Baptism like the Fig-Tree in the Gospel, full of

¹⁵⁰ This means “splendid display”, “mere show”, “empty display”. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pageantry> – Simon

Leaves, but no Fruit. And they Invoke the Holy Ghost in vain, doing as if one should call upon him to illuminate a Stone or a Tree.”¹⁵¹

¹⁵¹ Dr. *Taylor Lib. Proph. p. 244.*

14 – Proving Baptism a great and glorious Ordinance, and that 'tis initiating or an In-let into the Church.

The last thing I shall do, is to prove Believers Baptism a very great and glorious Ordinance, though much despised by Men, nay by many Professors of this Age.

Principle of Christ's Doctrine and a Great Ordinance.

First of all, 'Tis a *Principle of Christ's Doctrine*, nay, a *Foundation-Principle*, viz. of a true Gospel-Church-State; so that according to the Apostolical and Primitive-Institution, a Church cannot be truly gathered without it.

Secondly, It appears to be a great Ordinance, if we consider the Commission of Christ.

1. *Consider with what Authority our Savior gave it forth; "All Power is given to me in Heaven and Earth: Go ye therefore, teach all Nations, baptizing them" (Matt. 28:18-19), &c.*

2. In that it was one of the last things he gave in charge to his Disciples before he went to Heaven. And,

3. In that he joins it to Teaching, expressing no other Gospel-Ordinances besides, though he gave other Commandments to them (Acts 1).

4. In that no Ordinance is to be administered in a more solemn manner than this is, viz. *"in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit"* (Matt. 28:19).

We are hereby obliged to believe in, adore, and worship the whole Trinity.

Thirdly, No Ordinance in all the New-Testament was ever so graced, nor honored with such a Presence as this was at the Baptism of Christ; the three Persons manifest their Presence at this Solemnity, *"the Heavens were opened, and a voice heard, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased"* (Matt. 3:16).

1. The Father seals it and honors it.
2. The Son is there, and subjects to it, shewing what an honorable respect he has to it; nay and came many Miles upon no other Business but to be baptized (as we read of).
3. The Spirit also *"descended like a Dove, and rested upon him"*; the Holy Ghost puts his Seal upon it, and in a glorious manner owns it.

And then our Savior saith, it became him to be obedient to it; 'tis, it seems, a becoming Ordinance, it became the Master, and doth it not become the Servant to submit to it? It was not too low for him, and is it too low for thee?

He said also it was a fulfilling of all Righteousness; that is, it became him to fulfil all the Commands of his Father, or do his whole Will, which it appears he could not have done unless he had been baptized.

And in that of being a Pattern or Example to us, those who neglect it, neglect a most righteous thing, and do not fill up after their Master.

Fourthly, 'Tis called a "*justifying of God*", and our Disobedience herein a "*rejecting the Counsel of God*" (Luke 7:29-30).

Fifthly, It appears a great Ordinance, in that the highest, nay the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit can't exempt a Person from his Obedience hereto, as appears in *Cornelius's* case. Nay, the greater Gifts and Graces a Person hath, the more fit a Subject he is of this Ordinance (as *Peter's* words do import, Acts 10:47).

Sixthly, Consider the great things and Mysteries held forth hereby, *viz.* the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, and our dying to Sin, and Duty to walk in newness of Life, it preaches the Gospel to our very sight in a very lively Figure; and therefore a great Ordinance.

Seventhly, 'Tis a Badge of Christian Profession; and an Ordinance, as Mr. *Baxter* observes, of the Solemnization of the Souls Marriage-Union with Christ.

Eighthly, Consider the great Promises made to those who are obedient to it, amongst other things, "*Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the World*" (Matt. 28:20). And again, "*He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*" (Mark 16:16). If a Prince shall offer a Rebel his Life in doing two things, would he neglect one of them, and say this I will do, but the other is a trivial thing, I'll not do that? Surely no, he would not run the hazard of his Life so foolishly.

And then in Acts 2:38, "*Repent, and be baptized every one of you for Remission of Sin, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Spirit*": See what great Promises are made to Believers in *Baptism*.

Ninthly, Nay, and *Cornelius* was warned from Heaven to send for *Peter*, and, saith the Lord, he "*shall tell thee what thou shalt do.*" Now one thing that is expressed, and I think 'tis all that *Peter* told him he should *do* (besides believing on the Lord Jesus) was to "*be baptized*". Certainly these things demonstrate Baptism to be a great Ordinance; 'tis miraculously confirmed from Heaven (as it were) so to be.

Baptism is an initiating ordinance.

Tenthly, and lastly; Baptism is an *initiating Ordinance*, no regular or orderly coming into the Church of God but at this door; and this we shall make appear, therefore a great Ordinance.

First, 'Tis said "*they that gladly received the Word, were baptized; and the same day there were added to them about three thousand Souls*" (Acts 2:41): those who were added unto this Church were first baptized; and observable 'tis, that as this was the first Gospel-Church that was gathered after the Ascension of Christ: so it is set forth as a Pattern to all other Churches (1 Thess. 2:14); for as others were enjoined, so they were commanded for following the Church of God that was in *Judaea*.

Secondly, All along in the New Testament, where we read of the first Plantations of the Churches, we find that all those who became Members respectively, were first upon their Profession of Faith baptized before they were received as Members thereof; as Acts 8; 10; 16; 18.

Thirdly, We read of none that were received into the Fellowship of any Church that were not first baptized.

Fourthly, Because those who were baptized, were said to be baptized into Christ; “*Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ*” (Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3), &c. *That is, into his Church or Mystical Body, as our late Annotators intimate*,¹⁵² incorporated, ingrafted or planted into Christ, and so to be made Members of his Mystical Body by Baptism.

“*By one Spirit we (are said) all to be baptized into one Body*” (1 Cor. 12:13). “*By one Spirit*”, that is, by the Authority and Appointment of the Spirit, and by the Guidance, Conduct, and Leadings of the Spirit; not that all that are true Members of the Church are baptized with the holy Spirit, since the Baptism of the Spirit denotes (as we have elsewhere proved) the extraordinary Gifts or Effusion of the Holy Ghost, which was received in the Apostles days, and which continued not in the Church. “*And have been all made to drink into one Spirit.*” In these words he alludes to the Ordinance of the Supper, which you may as well say, is a spiritual eating and drinking only, as so to speak of Baptism; because ‘tis said *by one Spirit we are all baptized*, ‘tis not said *with one Spirit*. Besides, should any assert that the Apostle means the Baptism of the Spirit, and that the ordinary Gifts and Graces of the Spirit is the Baptism of the Holy Spirit; then it would follow that there are two Baptisms left in the Church, which seems to be contrary to what *Paul* saith (Eph. 4:5).

Fifthly, Because the Lord Jesus hath joined Faith and Baptism together in the Commission, and both were taught as beginning or fundamental Principles of his Doctrine, or part of those first Rudiments that belongs to every Babe in Christ, or Christian Man and Woman (Heb. 5:12; 6:1-2), and all those six Principles, as our late Annotators affirm¹⁵³, are initiating, and so they must be; for if they are Fundamentals, they must either be Fundamentals of Salvation, or else of Church-Communion: Now Baptism cannot be a Fundamental of Salvation, therefore of Church-Communion, how necessary ‘tis to lay a sure Foundation no Man can be ignorant.

Objection: Only some of the church of Romans were baptized (Romans 6:3).

Objection. It is objected from Rom. 6:3 that but some only of the Church of the *Romans* were baptized, because the Apostle saith, “*as many of you as were baptized*”, &c. from thence they would conclude some of them were not.

Answer. Did the whole Church of the *Romans* reckon themselves, think you, to be dead to Sin, and bound to live no longer therein? If so, then Baptism, which was a Symbol of those things, belonging to them all; “*As many as are baptized into Christ, were baptized into his Death*” (Rom. 6:3), &c. *i. e.* in token of it: And that they all should become New Creatures, it is as if he should reason thus;

As many of us as are baptized, must know this, that we were baptized into Christ’s Death, and therefore must die to Sin, and live a new Life. But we have all been baptized or buried with Christ in Baptism into his Death; therefore we must all die to Sin, and live a new Life.

¹⁵² [Pool's Annotat. on Rom. 6:3.](#)

¹⁵³ [Pool's Annotat. on Heb. 6:1-2.](#)

Did the Apostle intend hereby, do you think, to press them all to die to Sin, and live to God? if so, that Argument he uses (you may assure your selves) reached them all, which it could not do if they had not all been baptized.

Sixthly, Baptism is an initiating Ordinance, appears, because the way of in-churching Disciples, or Men and Women, was one and the same in all the Churches of the Saints; if some were not received till Baptized, there were no unbaptized Persons ever received at all. But some were not received till baptized, *Ergo*. The Reason is not only, because the way and order of the Administration of that Ordinance were one and the same in every Church, and so Confusion avoided; but also because there is the like parity of Reason, why all should and ought to be baptized, as there is for some, since the Ordinance is initiating, and so a great Privilege, and all have right to the thing signified thereby: Besides, those who believe, are required and commanded to be baptized; and that which is the Duty of one Disciple as a Disciple, is the Duty of every Disciple; and by that Argument you may excuse one Man from one Sacrament, *viz.* Baptism, you may excuse another from the Lord's Table, upon a pretense he doth not see it to be his Duty, and yet admit him, and continue him a Member.

And that Baptism is an initiating Ordinance, we have all Christians of all Persuasions one with us, they generally assert the same thing.

Justin Martyr, speaking of the Lord's Supper, saith,

This Food we call the *Eucharist*, to which no Man is admitted, but only he that believeth in the Truth of our Doctrine, being washed in the Laver of Regeneration for Remission of Sins, and liveth as Christ hath taught.¹⁵⁴

That is, none were admitted to the Lord's Supper, but such who were first baptized.

The same is hinted by a late famous Writer concerning *Cyprian*, and other eminent Fathers, about the *2d* & *3d* Centuries, *viz.*

No unbaptized Persons were admitted to the Communion of the Church.

Let them, saith *Austin*, (that is, the *Catechumens*) pass through the Red Sea; that is, be baptized: and let them eat Manna, that is, the Body and Blood of Christ.

This shews the practice of the Church in his Days.

Ursinus saith,

Baptism is a Sacrament of entrance into the Church, whence it cometh, that the Supper is presented to none except first baptized.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ Second Apology to *Ant. Pius* the Roman Emperor, c. 8. §. 5.

¹⁵⁵ *Ursin.* in his Catechism.

Dr. *Cave*, speaking of the Lord's Supper, saith,

From this Sacrament are excluded all unbaptized Persons, and such who live in any known Sin, &c.¹⁵⁶

"Baptism is", saith Dr. *Ames*, "a Sacrament of Initiation."¹⁵⁷

Elton on Col. 2:11 saith also,

That Baptism is the Sacrament of Incision, or engrafting into Christ, sealing up our setting into Christ, which is only once done, never after to be done again, &c.

Mr. *Strong* says,

Baptism is a Sacrament of Initiation, and the Ordinance of visible admission into the Church.¹⁵⁸

And as it is a Sin, saith he,

to keep them out whose Right it is; so it is a Sin also to admit them that have no Right, because the Ordinance of Christ is abused and misplaced.

The *Assembly* say in their Catechism,

That Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ;—for the *solemn admission* of the Party baptized into the Visible Church, &c.¹⁵⁹

"Every Soldier that must be admitted into an Army", saith Mr. *Baxter*, "must be admitted, by listing, as a solemn engaging Sign—So everyone that hath right to be solemnly admitted into the Visible Church, must orderly be admitted by Baptism."¹⁶⁰

And again he saith,

We have no Precept or Example of admitting visible Members any other way; therefore all that must be admitted visible Members, must be baptized.

I might write a Book of things of this Nature, as touching the Sentiments of worthy Writers, being generally all of the same Belief and Practice; howsoever in other things they may differ from us, and one from another; nor will those of the Church of *England*, *Presbyterians*, or *Independents*, admit any as Members into their Communion, as to partake of the Lord's Supper, except they have been baptized in their sense, they calling Sprinkling, or Pouring, *Baptizing*; which we deny to be the Ordinance.

¹⁵⁶ *Antiq Christianae*, p. 374.

¹⁵⁷ *Marrow of Div. p. 181 Elton* on Col. 2:11. p. 291.

¹⁵⁸ *Discourse of the Covenant*, p. 226

¹⁵⁹ *Assemb. Catechism*. [Westminster Larger Catechism, Q. 165 – Simon]

¹⁶⁰ *Plain Scripture Proof*, p. 24.

Objection: How can you deny a godly person who has lively faith into the church?

Objection. How dare you deny a Man admittance into the Church, who is truly Godly, and hath a lively Faith? If he hath a right to Christ, who is signified in the Lord's Supper, may be denied the Sign, because he is not baptized?

Answer. How dares any Man, who fears God, attempt to do anything contrary to the Holy Pattern left in Christ's New Testament? If Baptism was appointed to be an Initiating Ordinance into God's House, 'tis not only a Man's Piety that will serve the turn, he must come into the Church at the Door Christ hath ordained, or not come in at all. If *Lot* should have offered himself to come into *Abraham's* Family, (which was then God's Church) do you think *Abraham* would have admitted him, (though he was a Righteous Man) unless he would first consent to be Circumcised (which was an Initiating Ordinance at that time)? Certainly, no; though he should say he was not convinced of Circumcision, yet that would not have excused him: God's Laws are not to be dispensed with to gratify the Ignorance of Men. 'Tis a Question whether *Uzzah* knew he ought not to put forth his Hand to support the Ark: Yet for doing that thing, God smote him with Death. Ignorance will not be a sufficient Plea for doing God's Work (2 Sam. 6:6-7), in other manner than he has appointed.

How dares any Man, who loves and desires to honor the Lord Jesus, violate his Holy and Great Commission (Matt. 28) or act and do contrary thereto, who requires all Disciples to be baptized? derogating from the Rule in one thing, opens a Gap to other Disorders, and it renders Christ's Institution a petty and indifferent thing: you may as well dispense (with the neglect, or) with the ignorance of Men in the Lord's Supper, as well as so to do in respect of Baptism; and let them abide Members who refuse to break Bread with the Church, and yet would continue Members, pretending ignorance; perhaps they will tell you, they can answer the End of that Ordinance in breaking their common Bread, &c.

Objection: Doesn't the Apostle say that the Romans received those weak in the faith (Romans 14:1)?

Objection. But doth not the Apostle say, "*Such as are weak in the Faith, receive you*" (Rom. 14:1), &c.

1. It cannot be meant received into the Church, because they that the Apostle there speaks of, were in the Faith, or visible Profession of the Gospel, and were Members of the Church, though they were weak ones, or but Babes in Christ.
2. The weakness there meant, was about eating Meats, and observing days, &c. which were in themselves but indifferent things: And will you render the great Sacrament of Baptism like to them? It was no Sin to eat, or not to eat, but so it is not to be subject, or not subject to Christ's Ordinances.
3. The receiving there intends doubtless no more than this, to let them abide in their Affections, or receive them as poor weak Children to nourish and pity them, and not to censure and judge hardly of their doubtful thoughts.

But to conclude, since my honored Friend and Brother, Mr. *William Kiffen*¹⁶¹, hath but lately wrote so excellent a Book upon this very Subject, I shall say no more to it, but refer the Reader for his further satisfaction to that Treatise. But to proceed to a little Improvement: If Baptism be so great an Ordinance as it seems it is, this may reprove all such who slight and despise it, and may stir up all to an honorable esteem of it, and to move such who are convinced of it, speedily to submit thereunto.

Let me conclude all with one use of Caution to my Brethren, that are baptized as Believers, and yet take liberty to walk in Communion with such Churches as dissent from them, in respect of this Ordinance, and sprinkle Babes.

I am more concerned about you, than any other People; because you seem to pull down with one Hand, that which you Build with the other. Our Brethren with whom you Walk, may be more Excusable than you can be, because they are faithful (I would hope) to their Light; they will not have communion with any Persons, whom they judge in their Consciences are Unbaptized; but you believe those who have been only Sprinkled in Infancy, are all Unbaptized Persons, or otherwise why were you Baptized afterwards? Who can justify you in this Practice? I am persuaded our Brethren cannot, will not do it, if they rightly consider the light or dictates of your Consciences in this Matter: 'tis not what they are in their own Sense, but what they are in your Judgment. Speak, are they Baptized? Or, is not that they call Baptism, in your Consciences a Nullity? Nay, worse, a Tradition of Men? nay, a profanation of the Sacrament of Baptism? How then can you justify your selves in such a Practice? I have as much charity for our Brethren, I hope, as most of you have, and love and honor them, yet dare not transgress or invert Christ's holy Laws, and Gospel-Order; and therefore take heed what you do. If there were no Baptized Churches with whom you might have Communion, somewhat might be said in your Justification. (For upon a case of necessity that may be lawful, or be permitted to be done, which otherwise is utterly unlawful.) Besides, I hear some of you (daily confess) they believe they are not such Orderly Churches as the Baptized Congregations are, (and that is the sum of what I say and believe concerning them) why then do you chose to have Fellowship with them? Ought you not to follow the best and highest Reformation, and clearest Discovery of God, and to be in the most perfect and complete Order of the Gospel you are able to arrive to the knowledge of? Yet are not you contented to lie short in doing this according to the Sentiments of your Minds and Understandings? Is this the way to that longed-for Reformation? Is not Truth and Righteousness to be joined with Peace and Love? Nay, and doth not my Love run out to our Brethren in a cleaner Channel than yours, (who resolve my Affections shall never pilot my Judgment or Understanding?) I have as great reason to love and honor some of the Congregational Way, as any one Man this day in *England*; it pleasing God to work upon my Soul, I hope, effectually, when very young under the Ministry of one that is of that Persuasion, who is yet living, and none of the meanest Ministers, now Preaching near this City; whose Name is dear to me, and one I do honor, (and ever shall) as long as I live in the World. Yet nevertheless, my blessed Lord and Savior, and his Truth, lies nearer my Heart. I speak the more upon this account, not only to deliver your Souls from Temptations, and disorderly Walking; but also,

¹⁶¹ William Kiffin (1616–1701), a Particular Baptist and a signer of the 1689 Confession of Faith. – Simon

because I know it grieves many very gracious Persons, and weakens the hands of those who carry on the Work of God amongst us; and seems to me to obstruct the further Glory and Reformation of the Church. Yet I am for such Communion with our Brethren, as we may warrantably promote, as to Pray and Preach together, and to love and encourage Grace and Holiness in one another.

I'll say no more, I have done; only remember that excellent saying of the Apostle, "*Now I pray you, Brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances as I delivered them to you*" (1 Cor. 11:2). Would to God I could say so of you. 'Tis not enough to keep the Ordinances of Christ, but so to keep them as at first delivered to the Saints. Let us go forward, and not decline, or seem to draw back in our Zeal and Testimony for the Truth. Let us walk as we have attained; God may bring our Brethren to see wherein they come short, as well as wherein they know they are got before others. I hope, what I have written will be received in good part, and none will be offended; for I can appeal to God, the searcher of all Hearts, I have done all that I have done or writ in this Treatise, in the integrity and uprightness of my Heart, and in sincere love to Christ and his despised Ordinances, and to discharge my Conscience; hoping a Blessing will attend it, and that it will redound to his Glory, and the profit of his Church; and if so, I matter not what Censures I lie under: For, *my Record is on high, and my Witness is in Heaven* (Job 16:19). I am contented to be anything or nothing, (if I know my own deceitful Heart) that God may be All in all; to whom be Praise and Glory, by Jesus Christ, now and for evermore. *Amen.*

FINIS.
