
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.


Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



4324

bbb 33



PARENTS' GUIDE
TO
BAPTISM,
BY THE
Rev. JOHN WESLEY.

4324 556-33.

JOHN WESLEY *N*

“ON BAPTISM,”

AND

“ON GODFATHERS & GODMOTHERS.”

VERBATIM REPRINTS FROM SCARCE EDITIONS.

EDITED BY

H. W. HOLDEN,

CURATE OF GRASBY, BRIGG, LINCOLN.

“My Godfathers and Godmothers in my Baptism ; wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.”—*The Church Catechism.*

JOHN HODGES,

47, BEDFORD STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON.

1871.

Price Sixpence.

Cheap edition 3d.; or, for Parochial use, 12 for 1s. 6d., post free direct from the Editor.

JOHN HODGES, PRINTER, FROME.



P R E F A C E.

MANY years' experience in many parishes has taught me the value of this little book. Methodists will surely not discredit the words of their *Father*. That which Wesley taught in all his societies to the end of his life, cannot surely be *false* doctrine! That which he gave to his preachers as A PRESERVATIVE *against Unsettled Notions in Religion*, can hardly be "a soul destroying heresy!" That which he caused to be, by the preachers in connexion with him, "first carefully read, then to be recommended and explained to the several societies where they labour," must be, what it was said to be, "the truth as it is in Jesus." Prejudice will soften, ignorance submit to receive instruction, and an attentive ear be gained for the Church's teaching when it is presented in Mr. Wesley's own words. Churchmen also, those at least who have allowed their faith to be perverted, will be re-assured by one who among Evangelicals was the greatest Evangelical of them all, *i.e.*, one in faith as well as name; and may henceforth hold what they were taught in childhood with a firmer

PREFACE.

grasp and a more intelligent appreciation. And, in Wesley's *Thoughts on Godfathers and Godmothers*, both may learn that a primitive and excellent institution is severable from the abuses which we deplore—to which they, perhaps, have unhappily contributed—and dependent upon them for that blessing which it can be made to their children.

H. W. H.

All Saints' Day, 1870.

THE FOLLOWING IS WESLEY'S PREFACE PREFIXED TO THE EDITION OF 1773:—

TO THE READER,—*My design in publishing the following tracts, is not to reclaim, but to preserve; not to convince those who are already perverted, but to prevent the perversion of others. I do not, therefore, enter deep into the controversy. . . . I only recite, under each head, a few plain arguments, which, by the grace of God, may further confirm those who already know the truth as it is in Jesus.*

A TREATISE ON BAPTISM.

CONCERNING baptism I shall enquire, *what* it is : what *benefits* we receive by it : whether our Saviour designed it to remain *always* in his church : and who are the proper *subjects* of it ?

I. 1. What it is. It is the initiatory sacrament, which enters us into covenant with God. It was instituted by Christ, who alone has power to institute a proper sacrament, a sign, seal, pledge and means of grace, perpetually obligatory on all Christians. We know not indeed the exact time of its institution ; but we know it was long before our Lord's ascension. And it was instituted in the room of circumcision. For as that was a sign and seal of God's covenant, so is this.

2. The *matter* of this sacrament is water ; which as it has a natural power of cleansing, is the more fit for this symbolical use. Baptism is performed by *washing*, *dipping*, or *sprinkling* the person, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who is hereby devoted to the ever blessed Trinity. I say by *washing*, *dipping*, or *sprinkling* ; because it is not determined in scripture, in which of these

ways it shall be done, neither by any express *precept*, nor by any such *example* as clearly proves it; nor by the *force* or *meaning* of the word, baptize.

3. That there is no express *precept* all calm men allow. Neither is there any conclusive *example*. John's baptism in some things agreed with Christ's, in others differed from it. But it cannot be certainly proved from scripture, that even John's was performed by dipping. It is true, he baptized *in Enon, near Salim, where there was much water*. But this might refer to breadth rather than depth; since a narrow place would not have been sufficient for so great a multitude. Nor can it be proved, that the baptism of our Saviour, or that administered by his disciples, was by immersion. No, nor that of the eunuch baptized by Philip; though *they both went down to the water*: for that *going down* may relate to the chariot, and implies no determinate depth of water. It might be up to their knees, it might not be above their ankles.

4. And as nothing can be determined from scripture precept or example, so neither from the force or meaning of the word. For the words baptize and baptism do not necessarily imply *dipping*, but are used in other senses in several places. Thus we read, that the Jews *were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea* (1 Cor. x. 2.); but they were not *plunged* in either. They could, therefore, be only *sprinkled* by drops of the sea-

water, and refreshing dews from the cloud: probably intimated in that, *Thou sentest a gracious rain upon thine inheritance, and refreshedst it when it was weary.* (Psalm lxxviii. 9.) Again, Christ said to his two disciples, *Ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with* (Mark x. 38.); but neither he nor they were *dipt*, but only *sprinkled* or *washed* with their own blood. Again we read, Mark vii. 4, of *the baptisms* (so it is in the original) of pots and cups and tables or beds. Now pots and cups are not necessarily *dipt* when they are washed. Nay, the Pharisees washed *the outsides* of them only. And as for *tables* or *beds* none will suppose they could be *dipt*: here, then, the word *baptism*, in its natural sense, is not taken for dipping, but for washing or cleansing. And, that this is the true meaning of the word *baptize*, is testified by the greatest scholars and most proper judges in this matter. It is true, we read of being *buried with Christ in baptism*. But nothing can be inferred from such a figurative expression. Nay, if it held exactly, it would make as much for *sprinkling* as for *plunging*: since in burying the body is not *plunged* through the substance of the earth, but rather earth is *poured* or *sprinkled* upon it.

5. And as there is no clear proof of *dipping* in scripture so there is very probable proof of the contrary. 'Tis highly probable the apostles themselves baptized great numbers, not by *dipping*, but

by *washing, sprinkling, or pouring water*. This clearly represented the cleansing from sin, which is figured by baptism. And the quantity of water used was not material: no more than the quantity of bread and wine in the Lord's supper. The jailor *and all his house were baptized* in the prison: Cornelius with his friends (and so several households) at home. Now is it likely that all these had ponds or rivers, in or near their houses, sufficient to plunge them all? Every unprejudiced person must allow the contrary is far more probable. Again, 3000 at one time and 5000 at another, were converted and baptized by St. Peter at Jerusalem; where they had none but the gentle waters of Siloam, according to the observation of Mr. Fuller, "There were no water-mills in Jerusalem, because there was no stream large enough to drive them." The place, therefore, as well as the number, makes it highly probable that all these were baptized by *sprinkling, or pouring*, and not by immersion. To sum up all, the manner of baptizing (whether by dipping or sprinkling) is not determined in scripture. There is no command for one rather than the other. There is no *example* from which we can conclude for *dipping* rather than *sprinkling*. There are probable examples of both; and both are equally contained in the *natural meaning* of the word.

II. 1. What are the *benefits* we receive by

baptism is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is, the washing away the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ's death. That we are all born under the guilt of Adam's sin, and that all sin deserves eternal misery, was the unanimous sense of the antient church, as it is exprest in the ninth article of our own. And the scripture plainly asserts that we were *shapen in iniquity and in sin did our mother conceive us. That we were all by nature children of wrath, and dead in trespasses and sins: that in Adam all died: that by one man's disobedience all were made sinners: that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; which came upon all men: because all had sinned.* This plainly includes infants; for they, too, *die*: therefore, *they have sinned.* But not by actual sin: therefore, by original: else what need have they of the death of Christ? Yea, *Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned (actually) according to the similitude of Adam's transgression.* This, which can relate to infants only, is a clear proof that the whole race of mankind, are obnoxious both to the guilt and punishment of Adam's transgression. But *as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, to justification of life.* And the virtue of this free-gift, the merits of Christ's life and death, are applied to us in baptism. *He gave himself for the*

church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water (Eph. v. 25, 26) by the word; namely, in baptism the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this our church prays, in the baptismal office, that the person to be baptized may be "washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his heavenly washing:" and declares in the rubric at the end of the office, "It is certain, by God's word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved." And this is agreeable to the unanimous judgment of all the antient fathers.

2. By baptism we enter into covenant with God; into that *everlasting* covenant which he hath commanded for ever. (*Psal. cix. 11.*) That new covenant, which he promised to make with the spiritual Israel; even to *give them a new heart and a new spirit, to sprinkle clean water upon them* (of which the baptismal is only a figure), *and to remember their sins and iniquities no more*: in a word, *to be their God*, as he promised to Abraham, in the evangelical covenant, which he made with him, and all his spiritual offspring. *Gen. xvii. 7, 8.* And as circumcision was then the way of entering into this covenant, so baptism is now: which is therefore styled by the apostle (so many good interpreters render his words,) *The stipulation, contract, or covenant of a good conscience with God.*

3. By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ, its head. The Jews were admitted into the church by circumcision, so are the Christians by baptism. For *as many as are baptized into Christ, in his name, have hereby put on Christ, Gal. iii. 27.* That is, are mystically united to Christ, and made one with him. For *by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, (1 Cor. xii. 13.)* Namely, *the church, the body of Christ. (Eph. iv. 12.)* From which spiritual, vital union with him, proceeds the influence of his grace on those that are baptized; as from our union with the church, a share in all its privileges, and in all the promises Christ has made to it.

4. By baptism we who were *by nature children of wrath*, are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith; being “grafted into the body of Christ’s church we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.” This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, *John iii. 5. Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* By water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again: whence it is also called by the apostle, *The washing of regeneration.* Our church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism, than Christ himself has done. Nor does

she ascribe it to the *outward* washing, but to the *inward* grace, which added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused, which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God, by long-continued wickedness.

5. In consequence of our being made children of God, we are heirs of the kingdom of heaven. *If children* (as the apostle observes) *then heirs, heirs with God, and joint-heirs with Christ*. Herein we receive a title to and an earnest of *a kingdom which cannot be moved*. *Baptism doth now save us*, if we live answerable thereto, if we repent, believe and obey the gospel. Supposing this, as it admits us into the church here, so into glory hereafter.

III. 1. But did our Saviour design this should remain *always* in his church? This is the third thing we are to consider. And this may be dispatched in few words, since there can be no reasonable doubt, but it was intended to last as long as the church into which it is the appointed means of entering. In the *ordinary* way, there is no other means of entering into the church or into heaven.

2. In all ages the outward baptism is a *means* of the *inward*; as outward circumcision was, of the circumcision of the heart. Nor would it have availed a Jew to say, I have the inward circumcision, and therefore do not need the outward too, that soul was to be cut off from his people. He

had *despised*, he had broken God's everlasting covenant, by despising the seal of it, *Gen. xvii. 14.* Now the seal of circumcision was to last among the Jews as long as the law lasted, to which it obliged them. By plain parity of reason, baptism which came in its room, must last among Christians, as long as the gospel covenant into which it admits, and whereunto it obliges all nations.

3. This appears also from the original commission which our Lord gave to his apostles, *Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them—And lo I am with you alway even unto the end of the world.* Now as long as this commission lasted, as long as Christ promised to be *with them* in the execution of it, so long doubtless were they to execute it and to baptize as well as to teach. But Christ has promised to be *with them*, that is by his Spirit, in their successors, to the end of the world. So long, therefore, without dispute, it was his design that baptism should remain in his church.

IV. I. But the grand question is, Who are the proper subjects of baptism? Grown persons only, or infants also? In order to answer this fully, I shall first, Lay down the grounds of infant-baptism, taken from scripture, reason, and primitive, universal practice, and secondly, answer the objections against it.

2. As to the grounds of it; if infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism: seeing in the *ordinary* way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved, that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and that hereby they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation. It is true, the second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offence of the first. But the benefit of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed: through baptism in particular, which is the *ordinary* means he hath appointed for that purpose: and to which God hath *tied us*, though he may not have tied *himself*. Indeed, where it cannot be had, the case is different: but extraordinary cases do not make void a standing rule. This, therefore, is our first ground: *infants* need to be washed from original sin: therefore they are proper subjects of baptism.

3. *Secondly*, If infants are capable of making a covenant, and were and still are under the evangelical covenant, then they have a right to baptism, which is the entering seal thereof. But infants are capable of making a covenant, and were and still are under the evangelical covenant.

The custom of nations and common reason of mankind, prove that infants may enter into a covenant, and may be obliged by compacts made by others in their name and receive advantage by

them. But we have stronger proof than this, even God's own word (*Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12.*) *Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord—your captains, with all the men of Israel; your little ones, your wives and the stranger—that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God.* Now God would never have made a *covenant* with *little ones*, if they had not been capable of it. 'Tis not said *children* only but *little children*, the Hebrew word properly signifying infants. And these may be still, as they were of old, obliged to perform in after-time, what they are not capable of performing at the time of their entering into that obligation.

4. The infants of believers, the true children of faithful Abraham, always were under the gospel covenant. They were included in it, they had a right to it, and to the seal of it: as an infant-heir has a right to his estate, though he cannot yet have actual possession. The covenant with Abraham was a gospel covenant: the condition the same, namely faith: which the apostle observes was *imputed unto him for righteousness*. The inseparable fruit of this faith was obedience; for by faith he left his country, and offered his Son. The benefits were the same; for God promised, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee*: and he can promise no more to any creature; for this includes all blessings, temporal and eternal. The Mediator is the same; for it was *in his seed*,

that is, in *Christ* (*Gen.* xxii. 18. ; *Gal.* iii. 16.) that *all nations* were to be *blessed*: on which very account the apostle says, *The gospel was preached unto Abraham.* (*Gal.* iii. 8.) Now the same promise that was made to him, the same covenant that was made with him, was made *with his children after him,* (*Gen.* xvii. 7 ; *Gal.* iii. 7.) And upon that account it is called *an everlasting covenant.* In this covenant children were also obliged to what they knew not, to the same faith and obedience with Abraham. And so they are still: as they are still equally entitled to all the benefits and promises of it.

5. Circumcision was then the seal of the covenant; which is itself therefore figuratively termed, *The covenant.* (*Acts* vii. 8.) Hereby the children of those who profest the true religion, were then admitted into it, and obliged to the conditions of it, and *when the law was added,* to the observance of that also. And when the old seal of circumcision was taken off, this of baptism was added in its room; our Lord appointing one positive institution to succeed another. A new seal was set to Abraham's covenant: the seals differed, but the deed was the same; only that part was struck off which was political or ceremonial. That baptism came in the room of circumcision, appears as well from the clear reason of the thing, as from the apostle's argument, where after *circumcision* he mentions *baptism,* as that wherein God

had *forgiven us our trespasses*: to which he adds, the *blotting out the handwriting of ordinances*, plainly relating to circumcision and other Jewish rites; which as fairly implies that baptism came in the room of circumcision, as our Saviour's styling the other sacrament *the passover* (Col. ii. 11, 12, 13; Luke xxii. 15) shews that it was instituted in the place of it. Nor is it any proof that baptism did not succeed circumcision, because it differs in some *circumstances*, any more than it proves the Lord's supper did not succeed the passover, because in several circumstances it differs from it. This then is a second ground. Infants are capable of entering into covenant with God. As they always were, so they still are under the evangelical covenant. Therefore they have a right to baptism, which is now the entering seal thereof.

6. *Thirdly*. If infants ought to *come* to Christ, if they are capable of admission into the church of God, and consequently of solemn, sacramental dedication to him, then they are proper subjects of baptism. But infants are capable of coming to Christ, of admission into the Church, and solemn dedication to God.

That infants ought to *come* to Christ appears from his own words. *They brought little children to Christ, and the disciples rebuked them. And Jesus said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven*, Matt. xiv. 13, 14. St. Luke expresses it

still more strongly (chap. xiv. 18.) *They brought unto him even infants that he might touch them.* These children were so little, that they were brought to him. Yet he says, Suffer them to come unto me: so little, that he *took them up in his arms*; yet he rebukes those who would have hindered their coming to him. And his command respected the future as well as the present. Therefore his disciples or ministers are still to suffer infants to come, that is to be brought unto Christ. But they cannot now come to him, unless by being brought into the church; which cannot be but by baptism. Yea and of such, says our Lord, *is the kingdom of heaven*; not of such only, as were like these infants. For if they themselves were not fit to be subjects of that kingdom, how could others be so, because they were like them? Infants therefore are capable of being admitted into the church, and have a right thereto. Even under the Old Testament they were admitted into it by circumcision. And can we suppose they are in a worse condition under the gospel, than they were under the law? And that our Lord would take away any privileges which they then enjoyed? Would he not rather make additions to them? This then is a third ground. Infants ought to come to Christ, and no man ought to forbid them. They are capable of admission into the church of God. Therefore they are proper subjects of baptism.

7. *Fourthly.* If the apostles baptized infants,

then are they proper subjects of baptism. But the apostles baptized infants, as is plain from the following consideration. The Jews constantly *baptized* as well as circumcised all *infant proselytes*. Our Lord therefore commanding his apostles, to *proselyte* or *disciple* all nations by *baptizing* them, and not forbidding them to receive infants as well as others, they must needs baptize children also.

That the Jews admitted proselytes by baptism as well as by circumcision, even whole families together, parents and children, we have the unanimous testimony of their most ancient, learned and authentic writers. The males they received by baptism and circumcision; the women by baptism only. Consequently the apostles, unless our Lord had expressly forbidden it, would of course do the same thing.

Indeed the consequence would hold from circumcision only. For if it was the custom of the Jews, when they gathered proselytes out of all nations, to admit children into the church by circumcision, though they could not actually believe the law or obey it: then the apostles, making proselytes to Christianity by baptism, could never think of excluding children, whom the Jews always admitted (the reason for their admission being the same) unless our Lord had expressly forbidden it. It follows, the apostles baptized infants. Therefore they are proper subjects of baptism.

8. If it be objected, there is no express mention in scripture of any infants whom the apostles baptized: I would ask, Suppose no mention had been made in *The Acts* of those two women baptized by the apostles, yet might we not fairly conclude, that when so many thousands, so many entire households were baptized, women were not excluded? Especially since it was the known custom of the Jews to baptize them? The same holds of children: Nay more strongly, on the account of circumcision. Three thousand were baptized by the apostles in one day, and five thousand in another. And can it be reasonably supposed, that there were no children among such vast numbers? Again, the apostles baptized many families: nay, we hardly read of one master of a family, who was converted and baptized, but his whole family (as was before the custom among the Jews) were baptized with him. Thus the *jailor's household, he and all his; the household of Caius, of Stephanus, of Crispus*. And can we suppose, that in all these households, which we read, were without exception baptized, there should not be so much as one child, or infant? But, to go one step further. St. Peter says to the multitude, Acts ii. 38, *Repent ye and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins. For the promise is to you, and to your children*. Indeed the answer is made directly, to those who asked, *What shall we do?* But it reaches farther than to

those who asked the question. And though children could not actually *repent*, yet they might be baptized. And that they are included appears, 1. Because the apostle addresses to *every one* of them, and in *every one*, children must be contained. 2. They are expressly mentioned, *The promise is to you and to your children.*

9. *Lastly.* If to baptize *infants* has been the general practice of the Christian church in all places and in all ages, then this must have been the practice of the apostles, and consequently, the mind of Christ. But to baptize infants has been the general practice of the Christian church, in all places and in all ages. Of this we have unexceptionable witnesses. St. Austin for the Latin church (who flourished before the year 400), and Origen for the Greek (born in the second century), both declaring, not only that the whole church of Christ did then baptize infants, but likewise that they received this practice from the apostles themselves. (*August. de Genesi Lib. 10 c. 23. Orig. in Rom. 6.*) St. Cyprian likewise is express for it, and a whole council with him. (*Epis. ad Fidum.*) If need were we might cite likewise Athanasius, Chrysostom, and a cloud of witnesses. Nor is there *one instance* to be found in all antiquity, of any orthodox Christian, who denied baptism to children when brought to be baptized: nor any one of the fathers, or antient writers, for the first eight hundred years at least, who held it

unlawful. And that it has been the practice of all regular churches ever since is clear and manifest. Not only our own ancestors when first converted to Christianity, not only all the European churches, but the African too and the Asiatic, even those of St. Thomas in the Indies, do and ever did baptize their children. The fact being thus cleared, that infant baptism has been the general practice of the Christian church in all places and in all ages, that it has continued without interruption in the church of God for above seventeen hundred years, we may safely conclude, it was handed down from the apostles, who best knew the mind of Christ.

10. To sum up the evidence; if outward baptism be generally, in an *ordinary* way necessary to salvation, and infants may be saved as well as adults, nor ought we to neglect any means of saving them: if our Lord commands such to *come*, to be *brought* unto him, and declares, *of such is the kingdom of heaven*: if infants are capable of making a covenant, or having a covenant made for them by others, being included in Abraham's covenant, (which was a covenant of faith, an evangelical covenant) and never excluded by Christ: if they have a right to be members of the church, and were accordingly members of the Jewish: if suppose our Lord had designed to exclude them from baptism, he must have expressly forbidden his apostles to baptize them (which none dares

to affirm he did) since otherwise they would do it of course, according to the universal practice of their nation: if it is highly probable they did so, even from the letter of scripture, because they frequently baptized whole households, and it would be strange if there were no children among them; if the whole church of Christ for seventeen hundred years together baptized infants, and were never opposed till the last century but one, by some not very holy men in Germany. Lastly, If there are such inestimable benefits conferred in baptism, the washing away the guilt of original sin, the ingrafting us into Christ, by making us members of his church, and thereby giving us a right to all the blessings of the gospel: it follows, that infants, may, yea, ought to be baptized, and that none ought to hinder them.

I am, in the last place, to answer those objections, which are commonly brought against infant-baptism.

I. The chief of these is: "Our Lord said to his apostles, Matt. xxviii. 19, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.* Here, Christ himself put *teaching* before *baptizing*. Therefore infants being incapable of being *taught*, are incapable of being *baptized*."

I answer, I. The order of *words* in scripture, is no certain rule for the order of *things*. We read in St. Mark i. 4, John *baptized in the wilder-*

ness, and preached the baptism of repentance. And ver. 5, *They were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.* Now either the order of words in scripture does not always imply the same order of things; or it follows, that John baptized before his hearers either *confessed* or *repented*. But 2, the words are manifestly mistranslated. For if we read, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them—teaching them to observe all things,* it makes plain tautology, vain and senseless repetition. It ought to be translated (which is the literal meaning of the words) *Go and make disciples of all nations by baptizing them.* That infants are capable of being made proselytes or disciples has been already proved. Therefore this text, rightly translated, is no valid objection against *infant baptism.*

2. Their next objection is, “The scripture says, *Repent and be baptized; Believe and be baptized.* Therefore repentance and faith ought to go before baptism. But infants are incapable of these. Therefore they are incapable of baptism.”

I answer, repentance and faith were to go before circumcision, as well as before baptism. Therefore if this argument held, it would prove just as well that infants were incapable of circumcision. But we know God himself determined the contrary, commanding them to be circumcised at eight days old. Now if infants were capable of being circumcised, notwithstanding that re-

penitance and faith were to go before circumcision in grown persons, they are just as capable of being baptized ; notwithstanding that repentance and faith are in grown persons to go before baptism. This objection, therefore, is of no force : for it is as strong against circumcision of infants as infant baptism.

3. It is objected, thirdly, " There is no command for it in scripture. Now God was angry with his own people, because they did that, which he said, *I commanded them not*, Jer. vii. 31. One plain text would end all the dispute."

I answer, 1. We have reason to fear it would not. It is as positively *commanded* in a very *plain text* of scripture, that we should *teach and admonish one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing to the Lord with grace in our hearts*, Eph. v. 14, as it is to *honour our father and mother*. But does this put an end to all dispute ? Do not these very persons absolutely refuse to do it, notwithstanding a plain text, an express command ?

I answer 2. They themselves practise what there is neither *express command*, nor clear example for in scripture. They have no *express command* for baptizing women. They said indeed, " Women are implied in *all nations*." They are ; and so are infants too : but the command is not *express* for either. And for admitting women to the Lord's supper, they have neither express command, nor

clear example. Yet they do it continually, without either one or the other. And they are justified therein by the plain reason of the thing. This also justifies us, in baptizing infants, though without *express command*, or clear *example*.

If it be said, "But there is a *command* (1 Cor. xi. 28.) *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread*: the word *man* in the original signifying indifferently either men or women." I grant it does in other places; but here the word *himself* immediately following, confines it to men only. "But women are implied in it, though not exprest." Certainly; and so are infants in *all nations*.

"But we have scripture *example* for it: for it is said in *the Acts, The Apostles continued in prayer and supplication with the women*." True, in prayer and supplication; but it is not said, *in communicating*. Nor have we one clear example of it in the Bible.

Since, then, they admit women to the communion, without any *express command* or *example*, but only by consequence from scripture, they can never shew reason why infants should not be admitted to baptism, when there are so many scriptures which by fair consequence shew they have a right to it, and are capable of it.

As for the texts wherein God reproves his people for doing *what he commanded them not*: that phrase evidently means, what he had for-

bidden ; particularly in that passage of Jeremiah. The whole verse is, *They have built the high places of Tophet, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not.* Now God had expressly forbidden them to do this ; and that on pain of death. But surely there is a difference between the Jews offering their sons and daughters to devils, and Christians offering theirs to God.

On the whole, therefore, it is not only lawful and innocent, but meet, right and our bounden duty, in conformity to the uninterrupted practice of the whole church of Christ from the earliest ages, to consecrate our children to God by baptism, as the Jewish church were commanded to do by circumcision.

Nov. 11, 1756.

SERIOUS THOUGHTS

CONCERNING

GODFATHERS AND GODMOTHERS.

I. IN the antient church, when baptism was administered, there were usually two or more *sponsors* (so Tertullian calls them, an hundred years after the death of St. John) for every person to be baptized. As these were *witnesses* before God and the church, of the solemn engagement those persons then entered into, so they *undertook* (as the very word implies) to watch over those souls in a peculiar manner, to instruct, admonish, exhort and build them up in the faith once delivered to the saints. These were considered as a kind of spiritual parents to the baptized, whether they were infants or at man's estate, and were expected to supply whatever spiritual helps were wanting, either through the death or neglect of the natural parents.

II. These have been retained in the Christian church from the earliest times, as the reason for them was the same in all ages. In our church they are termed (by a proper and expressive name) *godfathers* and *godmothers*. And it is appointed,

“That there shall be for every male child to be baptized, two godfathers and one godmother ; and for every female, one godfather and two godmothers.”

III. But it is objected against these, 1. That there is no mention of godfathers and godmothers in scripture ; 2. That many undertake this without ever considering what they undertake, or once seriously thinking how to perform it ; and 3. That no serious man would undertake it, because it is impossible to perform it.

IV. I answer, *first*, It is undoubtedly true, godfathers and godmothers are not mentioned in scripture. And therefore it cannot be said, they are absolutely necessary, or that baptism cannot be administered without them. But yet it may be said they are highly expedient. For when they are prudently chosen, they may be of unspeakable use to the persons baptized, and a great relief and comfort to the parents of them.

V. I answer, *secondly*, It is too true, that many undertake this solemn office, without ever considering what they undertake ; giddy, ignorant persons (if not openly vicious) who never once seriously think how to perform it. But whose fault is this ? It is not the fault of the church, which carefully guards against this very thing, by ordering, “That

none but communicants be admitted to be godfathers or godmothers." Now communicants we may presume to be serious persons, who will both consider and perform what they undertake. It is altogether the fault of those foolish parents, who will on any account whatever, either desire or suffer those to be sponsors for their children, that do not take care of their own souls. It is these inconsiderate and cruel men, who have no compassion for their own flesh, that deprive their children of all the benefits of this wise institution, and bring a scandal on the institution itself, by their wicked abuse of it. I, therefore, earnestly exhort all who have any concern, either for their own or their children's souls, at all hazards to procure such persons to be sponsors, as truly fear God. Regard not whether they are rich or poor: and if they are poor, see that it be no expense to them. You will then tear up by the roots one of the most plausible objections which can be made against this primitive custom.

VI. For, *thirdly*, There is no reason why any truly serious man should scruple to undertake the office. If you suppose godfathers and godmothers undertake what is impossible to perform, you entirely mistake. And your mistake lies here: you think they undertake what they do not. Do not you think the sponsors themselves undertake or promise, that the child shall "renounce the

devil and all his works, constantly believe God's holy word, and obediently keep his commandments?" In truth, they neither undertake nor promise any such thing. When they answer, "I renounce them all: this I steadfastly believe: I will;" (obediently keep God's holy will and commandments) they promise nothing at all; they engage for nothing: it is another person that promises all this. Whatever is then promised or undertaken, it is not by them, but by the child. It is *his* part, not *theirs*. So the church tells you expressly; "This infant must for *his* part promise." It is *he* promises in these words, not *they*. So again, "*This child* hath promised—to renounce the devil, to believe in God, and serve him." If it be said, "But why are those questions inserted, which *seem* to mean what they really do not?" I answer, I did not insert them, and should not be sorry had they not been inserted at all. I believe the compilers of our liturgy inserted them because they were used in all the antient liturgies. And their deep reverence for the primitive church made them excuse some impropriety of expression.

VII. What, then, is *your* parts, who are sponsors for the child? This likewise is expressly told you. "It is *your* part to see that this infant be taught, so soon, as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise, and profession *he* hath here made by you. You shall call upon him to hear sermons,

and shall provide that he may learn the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health; and that this child may be virtuously brought up, to lead a godly and a Christian life."

VIII. Can anything then be plainer, than what you do not, and what you do undertake? You do not undertake that he shall renounce the devil and serve God: this the baptized himself undertakes. You do undertake to see that he be taught what things a Christian ought to know and believe. And what is there in this which is impossible? Which any serious person may not perform?

IX. If, then, you that are parents will be so wise and kind to your children, as to wave every other consideration, and to choose for their sponsors those persons alone who truly fear and serve God; if some of you who love God, and love one another, agree to perform this office of love for each other's children: and if all you who undertake it perform it faithfully, with all the wisdom and power God hath given you: what a foundation of holiness and happiness may be laid, even to your late posterity? Then it may justly be hoped, that not only you and your house, but also the children which shall be born, shall serve the Lord.

ATHLONE, August 6, 1752.



By the same Author. In crown 8vo. Price 4s.

John Wesley in Company with High Churchmen.

Fourth Edition. Revised and Enlarged.

Amongst the additional matter, which amounts to nearly one-fourth of the original work, will be found the maintenance by Wesley and the early Methodists of "Religious Houses," Spiritual Retreats, Mortuary Celebrations, the Daily Eucharist, &c., &c., and his own disavowal of his conversion in 1738.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"A very strong, if not a complete, identity of view is established between the great Church Reformer of the last century and the Ritual revivers of the present century."—*Irish Church Society's Journal*.

"When we first took up the volume, and saw the list of subjects, we feared the author had been over bold. We have been forced to change our opinion."—*The New York Church Record*.

"The various quotations given from Mr. Wesley's works are so contrary to what has been the general opinion of his belief, and at the same time so well authenticated, that the book should be carefully studied by every Churchman and every Wesleyan who wishes to arrive at an unprejudiced opinion."—*Church Opinion*.

"If Methodists believed in the personal infallibility of John Wesley, the argument of this book would be conclusive."—*The Watchman*.

"Few, even amongst Methodist readers who give the book a candid consideration, can fail to see that the author has, in all main points, made out his case."—*Manchester Courier*.

"As an argumentum ad hominem the book is simply unanswerable."—*The Union Review*.

"There is not a syllable of abuse in this book."—*The Methodist Recorder*.

"A book like this ought to settle the question between the Church and the Methodists."—*Literary Churchman*.

"It entirely destroys the fiction of the Wesleyans, that their founder was a High Churchman only up to the date he called his conversion."—*English Churchman*.

Cheaper issue, price 3d.

"The Wesleyan Controversy."

A Correspondence between JAMES H. RIGG, D.D., Editor of the *London Quarterly Review*, and Principal of the Wesleyan Training College, Westminster, and H. W. HOLDEN, Curate of Grasby, Brigg, Lincoln. With the transcription from the original editions of Mr. Wesley's writings of some passages, which, after his death, were suppressed.

"Well worth reprinting. The correspondence is very diverting. But it is valuable as well."—*The Literary Churchman*.

JOHN HODGES, 47, Bedford Street, Covent Garden, London.