

# THOUGHTS

UPON

## *Infant-Baptism.*

By the late Reverend and Learned

D. R. *J. E. R. TAYLOR,*

Sometime Bishop of Down and Connor.

To which are added

Several QUOTATIONS from other Learned

PÆDO-BAPTISTS,

Relating

To the Mode of BAPTISM, as practised  
in the first Ages of CHRISTIANITY,

WITH

Some few REMARKS.

---

*—As certain also of your own Poets have said,—*  
ACTS XVII. 28.

---

LONDON:

Printed for J. WARD, over-against the *Royal-Exchange.*  
M, DCC, LIV.

( Price Four-pence. )



# THOUGHTS

UPON

## *Infant-Baptism.*

**I**N a Controversy of such Importance to the Christian Religion, as that which relates to the Subject and Mode of Baptism, an Ordinance, by which Persons are appointed by the great Founder of Christianity to be initiated into the Profession of it, surely the Concessions of Men eminent for their Piety, Judgment and Learning, on either side, should be received with Candour, and be examined with great Seriousness, and Impartiality. And as this Dispute has been of late revived among us, by the Publication of a Pamphlet under the Title of, *Thoughts upon Infant-Baptism, extracted from a late Writer*, it has been judged by some, not at all improper to present the Public with some *more Thoughts* on this Subject, *extracted from another Writer*, even no less a *Writer* than the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Jeremiah Taylor*, late Lord Bishop of *Down and Connor*; wherein he has given us a Representation of the State of this Controversy, or what he calls, *A Scheme of Pleas for and against the Baptizing of Infants*; which may be found in his Discourse of the *Liberty of Prpbesying*: \*

A 2

where

\* §. 18. pag. 223. Edit. An. 1647.

where, speaking of the Denial of Baptism to Infants, this great Man proceeds thus:

“ Altho’ it be a Doctrine justly condemned by the most Sorts of Christians, upon great Grounds of Reason, yet possibly their Defence may be so great, as to take off much, and rebate the Edge of their Adversaries Assault. It will be neither unpleasant nor unprofitable to draw a short *Scheme of Plea* for each Party, the Result of which possibly may be, that tho’ they be deceived, yet they have so great Excuse on their side, that their Error is not impudent or vincible. The *Baptism of Infants* rests wholly \* upon this Discourse.

When God made a Covenant with *Abraham* for himself and his Posterity, into which the *Gentiles* were reckoned by Spiritual Adoption, he did for the present consign that Covenant with the Sacrament of Circumcision. The Extent of which Rite, was to all his Family, from the *Major domo*, to the *Proselytus domicilio*, and to *Infants* of eight Days old. Now the very Nature of this Covenant being a Covenant of Faith for its Formality, and with all faithful People for the Object; and Circumcision being a Seal of this Covenant, if ever any Rite do supervene to consign the same Covenant, that Rite must acknowledge Circumcision for its Type and Precedent. And this the Apostle tells us in express Doctrine. Now the Nature of a Type, is to give some Proportions to its Successor the Antitype, and they both being Seals of the same Righteousness of Faith, it will not easily be found where these two Seals have any such Distinction in their Nature or Purposes, as to appertain to Persons of differing Capacity, and not equally concern all. And this Argument was thought of so much Force by some of those excellent Men which were Bishops in the primitive Church, that a good Bishop writ an Epistle to *St. Cyprian*, to know of him whether or no it were lawful to *baptize Infants* before the eighth Day, because the *Type of Baptism* was ministred in that Circumcision; he in his Discourse supposing that the first

Rite

\* Principally and usually. Edit. 3. p. 1040.

Rite was a direction to the second, which prevailed with him so far as to believe it to limit every circumstance.

And not only this Type, but the Acts of Christ which were previous to the *Institution of Baptism*, did prepare our Understanding by such Impresses as were sufficient to produce such Persuasion in us, that Christ intended this Ministry for the actual Advantage of *Infants*, as well as of Persons of Understanding. For Christ commanded that Children should be brought unto him, he took them in his Arms, he imposed Hands on them and blessed them, and without question did by such Acts of Favour consign his Love to them, and them to a Capacity of an eternal Participation of it. And possibly the Invitation which Christ made to all to come to him, all them that are heavy laden, did in its Proportion concern *Infants* as much as others, if they be guilty of original Sin, and if that Sin be a Burthen, and presses them to any spiritual Danger or Inconvenience. And it is all the Reason in the World, that since the Grace of Christ is as large as the Prevarication of *Adam*, all they who are made guilty by the first *Adam*, should be cleansed by the second. But as they are guilty by another Man's Act, so they should be brought to the Font, to be purified by others, there being the same Proportion of Reason, that by others Acts they should be relieved, who were in danger of perishing by the Act of others. And therefore *St. Austin* argues excellently to this Purpose \*. “ ‘The Church,’” says he, “ who is the Mother, furnishes them with the Feet of others, that they may come; the Heart of others, that they may believe; the Tongue of others, that they may confess: That as the Disease was brought on them by the Sin of another, so thro’ the Confession of another, they should be restored.” And *Justin Martyr* † “ [In-

A 3 “ infants]

\* Accommodat illis mater Ecclesia aliorum pedes, ut veniant; aliorum cor, ut credant; aliorum linguam, ut fateantur: Ut quoniam quod ægri sunt, alio peccante prægravantur, sic cum sani fiant alio confitente salventur. *Serm. 10. de verb. Apost.*

† Αἰσῆνται ὃ τῶ δια τῆ βαπτισματικῆ ἀγαθῶν τὰ βέρον τῆ πί-  
611

“fants] are accounted worthy of those Benefits that accrue from Baptism, by the Faith of those that bring them to Baptism.”

But whether they have original Sin or no, yet take them *in puris naturalibus*, they cannot go to God, or attain to Eternity; to which they were intended in their first Being and Creation, and therefore much less since their Naturals are impaired by the Curse on human Nature, procured by *Adam's* Prevarication. And if a natural Agent cannot, *in puris naturalibus*, attain to Heaven, which is a supernatural End, much less when it is loaden with accidental and grievous Impediments. Now then since the only way revealed to us of acquiring Heaven is by Jesus Christ; and the first Inlet into Christianity, and Access to him is by Baptism, as appears by the perpetual Analogy of the New Testament, either *Infants* are not Persons capable of that End which is the Perfection of human Nature, and to which the Soul of Man in its being made immortal was essentially designed, and so are miserable and deficient from the very End of Humanity, if they die, before the Use of Reason; or else they must be brought to Christ by the Church Doors, that is, by the Font and Waters of Baptism.

And in Reason, it seems more pregnant and plausible, that *Infants* rather than Men of Understanding should be baptized: For since the Efficacy of the Sacraments depends upon divine Institution and immediate Benediction, and that they produce their Effects independently upon Man, in them that do not hinder their Operation; since *Infants* cannot by any Act of their own promote the Hope of their own Salvation, which Men of Reason and Choice may, by Acts of Virtue and Election; it is more agreeable to the Goodness of God, the Honour and Excellency of the Sacrament, and the Necessity of its Institution, that it should

ἔσει τῶν κεραιφερόντων αὐτὰ τῷ βαπτισματι. Resp. ad Orthodoxos.

N. B. This Book was not written by *Justin Martyr*, as it mentions *Irenæus* and *Origen*, who lived after his Time. Vide *Just. Martyr*, p. 441, 468. Edit. Colon.

in *Infants* supply the Want of human Acts and free Obedience. Which the very thing itself seems to say it does, because its Effect is from God, and requires nothing on Man's Part, but that its Efficacy be not hindered: And then in *Infants*, the Disposition is equal, and the Necessity more; they cannot *ponere obicem*, and by the same Reason cannot do other Acts, which without the Sacraments do advantage us towards our Hopes of Heaven, and therefore have more need to be supplied by an Act, and an Institution Divine and Supernatural.

And this is not only necessary in respect of the Condition of *Infants* incapacity to do Acts of Grace, but also in Obedience to Divine Precept. For Christ made a Law, whose Sanction is with an exclusive Negative to them that are not baptized, [*Unless a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven;*] If then *Infants* have a Capacity of being Co-heirs with Christ in the Kingdom of his Father; as Christ affirms they have, by saying [*for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*] then there is a Necessity that they should be brought to *Baptism*, there being an absolute Exclusion of all Persons unbaptized, and all Persons not Spiritual, from the Kingdom of Heaven.

But indeed, it is a Destruction of all the Hopes and Happiness of *Infants*, a denying to them an Exemption from the final Condition of Beasts and Infeciles, or else a designing of them to a worse Misery, to say that God hath not appointed some external or internal Means of bringing them to an eternal Happiness. Internal they have none; for Grace being an Improvement, and heightening the Faculties of Nature, in order to a heighten'd and supernatural End, Grace hath no Influence or Efficacy upon their Faculties, who can do no natural Acts of Understanding: And if there be no external Means, then they are destitute of all Hopes, and Possibilities of Salvation.

But thanks be to God, he hath provided better, and told us accordingly, for he hath made a Promise of the Holy Ghost to *Infants* as well as to Men: *The Promise*

*is made to you and to your Children, said St. Peter; the Promise of the Father, the Promise that he would send the Holy Ghost: Now if you ask how this Promise shall be conveyed to our Children, we have an Express out of the same Sermon of St. Peter; Be baptized, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost\**: So that therefore because the Holy Ghost is promised, and Baptism is the Means of receiving the Promise, therefore Baptism pertains to them, to whom the Promise, which is the Effect of Baptism, does appertain. And that we may not think this Argument is fallible, or of human Collection, observe that it is the Argument of the same Apostle in express Terms: For, in the Case of *Cornelius* and his Family, he justified his Proceeding by this very Medium, *Shall we deny Baptism to them who have received the Gift of the Holy Ghost as well as we?* Which Discourse, if it be reduced to Form of Argument, says this; They that are capable of the same Grace are receptive of the same Sign: But then (to make the Syllogism up with an Assumption proper to our present Purpose) *Infants* are capable of the same Grace, that is, of the Holy Ghost; (for the Promise is made to our Children as well as to us, and *St. Paul* says the Children of believing Parents are holy, and therefore have the Holy Ghost, who is the Fountain of Holiness and Sanctification) therefore they are to receive the Sign and the Seal of it; that is, the Sacrament of Baptism.

And indeed, since God entered a Covenant with the *Jews*, which did also actually involve their Children, and gave them a Sign to establish the Covenant, and its appendant Promise, either God does not so much love the Church as he did the Synagogue, and the Mercies of the Gospel are more restrain'd than the Mercies of the Law, God having made a Covenant with the *Infants* of *Israel*, and none with the Children of Christian Parents; or if he hath, yet we want the Comfort of its Consignation; and unless our Children are to be baptized, and so intitled to the Promises of the New Covenant, as the *Jewish* Babes were

\* Acts ii. 38, 39.

were by Circumcision, this Mercy which appertains to *Infants* is so secret and undeclared and unconfigned, that we want much of that Mercy and outward testimony which gave them Comfort and Assurance.

And in Proportion to these Precepts and Revelations was the Practice Apostolical: For they (to whom Christ gave in Precept to make Disciples all Nations baptizing them, and knew that Nations without Children never were, and that therefore they were passively concerned in that Commission) baptized whole Families, particularly that of *Stephanas*, and divers others, in which it is more than probable there were some Minors, if not sucking Babes. And this Practice did descend upon the Church in after-Ages by Tradition Apostolical: Of this we have sufficient Testimony from *Origen*, “ For this, says he, the Church has received a Tradition from the Apostles, even to baptize little Children\* : . And *St. Austin*, “ This the Church has received on the Faith of her Ancestors †.” And generally all Writers (as *Calvin* says) affirm the same thing: For, “ there is no Writer so antient, who doth not for certain refer its Origin to the Time of the Apostles †.” From hence the Conclusion is, that *Infants* ought to be baptized, that it is simply necessary, that they who deny it are *Hereticks*, and such are not to be endured, because they deny to *Infants* Hopes, and take away the Possibility of their Salvation, which is revealed to us on no other Condition of which they are capable but *Baptism*. For by the Insinuation of the Type, by the Action of Christ, by the Title *Infants* have to Heaven, by the Precept of the Gospel, by the Energy of the Promise, by the Reasonableness of the Thing, by the infinite Necessity on the *Infant's* Part, by the Practice Apostolical, by their Tradition, and the universal Practice of the Church ;

\* Pro hoc Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem accepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare. *In Rom. 6. Tom. 2. pag. 543.*

† Hoc Ecclesia à majorum fide percepit. *Serm. 10. de verb. Apost. c. 2.*

‡ Nullus est Scriptor tam vetustus, qui non ejus originem ad Apostolorum sæculum pro certo referat. *4 Instit. cap. xvi. §. 8.*



Church ; by all these God and good People proclaim the Lawfulness, the Conveniency, and the Necessity of *Infants Baptism.*"

*Thus far the Doctor has proceeded in Defence of Infant Baptism. And here observe, he brings in those whom he commonly, tho' falsely calls Anabaptists, answering for themselves as follows.*

" To all this, the *Anabaptist* gives a soft and gentle Answer, That it is a goodly Harrangue, which upon strict Examination will come to nothing, that it pretends fairly, and signifies little ; that some of these Allegations are false, some impertinent, and all the rest insufficient.

For the Argument from Circumcision is invalid upon infinite Considerations. Figures and Types prove nothing, unless a Commandment 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 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 does to Circumcision ; but because there was in the Manducation of the Paschal Lamb, no Prescription of Sacramental Drink, shall we thence conclude that the Eucharist is to be minister'd but in one Kind ? And even in the very Instance of this Argument, supposing a Correspondence of 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 Childrens 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 left 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

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 is. For both which Reasons, it is requisite that the Persons 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. And the Case is clear in the Bishop's Question to *Cyprian* \*. For why shall not *Infants* be baptized just upon the eighth Day, as well as circumcised? If the Correspondence of the Rites be an Argument to infer one Circumstance, which is impertinent and accidental to the Mysteriousness of the Rite, why shall it not infer all? And then also Females must not be baptized, because they were not circumcised. But it were more proper if we would understand it right, to prosecute the Analogy from the Type to the Anti-type, 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 Adherencies 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 *νήπιοι ἐν σαρκαίᾳ*, Children in Malice; [*For unless you become like one of these little ones, you cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*] said our blessed Saviour: and then the Type is made complete. And this seems to have been the Sense of the Primitive Church; for in the Age next to the Apostles, they gave to all baptized Persons Milk and Honey, to represent to them their Duty, that though in Age and Understanding they were Men, yet they were Babes in Christ, and Children in Malice. But to infer the Sense of the *Pædo-baptists*, is so weak a manner of arguing, that *Austin*, what Device it was, (and Men use to be in

love

\* Lib. 3. Epist. 8. ad Fidum.

love with their own Fancies) at the most pretended it but as probable, and a meer Conjecture.

And as ill Success will they have with the other Arguments as with this. For from the Action of Christ's Blessing *Infants*, to infer that they are to be baptized, proves nothing so much as that there is great want of better Arguments. The Conclusion would be with more Probability derived thus; 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 Christ hath other ways of bringing them to Heaven than by Baptism, he passed his 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 that 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.

And therefore, let them be pressed with all the Inconveniences that are consequent to original Sin, yet either it will not be laid to the Charge of *Infants*, so as to be sufficient to condemn them; or if it could, yet the Mercy and absolute Goodness of God will secure them, if he takes them away before they can glorify him with a free Obedience; "What need their innocent Age make such haste to the Forgiveness of Sins\*?" was the Question of *Tertullian*; he knew no such Danger from their original Guilt as to drive them to a Laver, of which in that Age of Innocence they had no need, as he conceived. And therefore, there is no necessity of flying to the Help  
of

\* Quid ergo festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum  
*Lib. de baptismo, cap. 18.*

of others, for Tongue, and Heart, and Faith, and Pre-dispositions to Baptism; for what need all this Stir? As *Infants* without their own Consent, without any Act of their own, and without any exterior Solemnity, contracted the Guilt of *Adam's* Sin, and so are liable to all the Punishment which can with Justice descend upon his Posterity, who are personally innocent; so *Infants* shall be restored without any Solemnity or Act of their own, or of any other Men for them, by the second *Adam*, by the Redemption of Jesus Christ, by his Righteousness and Mercies apply'd either immediately, or how, or when he shall be pleased to appoint. And so St. *Austin's* Argument will come to nothing without any need of Godfathers, or the Faith of any Body else. And it is too narrow a Conception of God Almighty, because he hath ty'd us to the Observation of the Ceremonies of his own Institution, that therefore he hath ty'd himself to it. Many thousand ways there are by which God can bring any reasonable Soul to himself: But nothing is more unreasonable, than because he hath ty'd all Men of Years and Discretion to this Way, therefore we of our own Heads shall carry *Infants* to him that way without his Direction: The Conceit is poor and low, and the Action consequent to it is too bold and venturous, *Mysterium meum mihi & filiis domus meæ*: Let him do what he pleases to *Infants*, we must not.

Only this is certain, that God hath as great Care of *Infants* as of others, and because they have no Capacity of doing such Acts as may be in order to acquiring Salvation, God will by his own immediate Mercy bring them thither, where he hath intended them; but to say that therefore he will do it by an external Act and Ministry, and that confin'd to a Particular, *viz* this Rite and no other, is no good Argument, unless God could not do it without such Means, or that he had said he would not: And why cannot God as well do his Mercies to *Infants* now immediately, as he did before the Institution either of Circumcision or Baptism?

However, there is no danger that *Infants* should perish for want of this external Ministry, much less for

prevaricating Christ's Precept of *Except a Man be born again, &c.* For first the *Water* and the *Spirit* in this Place signify the same Thing; and by *Water* is meant the Effect of the Spirit, cleansing and purifying the Soul, as appears in its parallel Place of Christ baptizing with the Spirit and with Fire. For although this was literally fulfilled in *Pentecost*, yet morally there is more in it, for it is the Sign of the Effect of the Holy Ghost, and his Productions upon the Soul; and it was an Excellency of our blessed Saviour's Office, that he baptizes *all* that come to him with the Holy Ghost and with Fire, for so *St. John*, preferring Christ's Mission and Office before his own, tells the *Jews*, not Christ's Disciples, that Christ shall baptize them with Fire and the Holy Spirit, that is, *all that come to him, as John the Baptist did with Water*; for so lies the Antithesis: 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* says the same Thing; for when he had said that Baptism saves us, he adds by way of Explication, [*not the washing of the Flesh, but the Confidence of a good Conscience towards God*] plainly saying, that it is not Water, or the purifying of the Body, but the cleansing of the Spirit, that does that which is supposed to be the Effect of Baptism. And if our Saviour's exclusive Negative be expounded by Analogy to this of *Peter*, as certainly the other parallel Instance must, and this may, then it will be so far from proving the Necessity of *Infants* Baptism, that it can conclude for no Man that he is obliged to the Rite; and the Doctrine of the Baptism is only to derive from the very Words of Institution, and not to be forced from Words which were spoken before it was ordained. But to let pass this Advantage, and to suppose it meant of external Baptism, yet this no more infers a Necessity of *Infants* 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, &c.\** and yet we do not think these Words sufficient Argument to communicate

\* John v. 53.

communicate them. If Men 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 Expression. And *Simeon Thessalonicensis* derides *inertem Latinorum λεπτολογία*, as we express it, the lazy trifling of the *Latins*, who dream of a Difference. Βάβαι τῆς ἀλογίας ἅμα καὶ ἀτοπίας. Καὶ διὰ τί βαπτίζεις; O the Unreasonableness and Absurdity! For why do you baptize them? Meaning that, because they are equally ignorant in Baptism as in the Eucharist, that which hinders them in one, is the same Impediment in both.\* And therefore they were honest that understood the Obligation to be parallel, and performed it accordingly, and yet because we say they were deceiv'd in one Instance, and yet the Obligation (all the World cannot reasonably say but) is the same; they are as honest and as reasonable that do neither. And since the antient Church did, with an equal Opinion of Necessity, give them the Communion, and yet Men now-a-days do not, why shall Men be more burthen'd with a Prejudice and a Name of Obloquy, for not giving the *Infants* one Sacrament, more than they are disliked for not affording them the other? If *Anabaptists* shall be a Name of Disgrace, why shall not some other Name be invented for them that deny to communicate *Infants*, which shall be equally disgraceful, or else both the Opinions signify'd by such Names, be accounted no Disparagement, but receive their Estimate according to their Truth?

Of which Truth, since we are now taking Account from Pretences of Scripture, it is considerable that the Discourse of *St. Peter*, which is pretended for the intitling *Infants* to the Promise of the Holy Ghost, and by Consequence to Baptism, which is supposed to be its Instrument and Conveyance, is wholly a Fancy, and hath in it nothing of Certainty or Demonstration, and not much Probability. For besides that the thing itself is unreasonable, and the Holy Ghost works by the heightning and improving our natural Faculties

\* See Edit. 3. p. 1044.

culties, and therefore is a Promise that so concerns them as they are reasonable Creatures, and may have a Title to it, in Proportion to their Nature, but no Possession or Reception of it, 'till their Faculties come into Act; besides this, I say, the Words mention'd in St. *Peter's* Sermon (which are the only Record of the Promise) are interpreted upon a weak Mistake: *The Promise belongs to you and to your Children*, therefore *Infants* are actually Receptive of it in that Capacity. That's the Argument; but the Reason of it is not yet discover'd, nor ever will, for [*to you and your Children*] is to you and your Posterity, to you and your Children when they are of the same Capacity, in which you are effectually receptive of the Promise: And therefore *Tertullian* calls *Infants*, *designatos sanctitatis, ac per hoc etiam salutis*, the Candidates of Holiness and Salvation, those that are designed to it\*. But he that whenever the Word [*Children*] is us'd in Scripture shall by [*Children*] understand *Infants*, must needs believe that in all *Israel* there were no Men, but all were *Infants*; and if that had been true, it had been the greater wonder they should overcome the *Anakims*, and beat the King of *Moab*, and march so far, and discourse so well, for they were all call'd the Children of *Israel*.

And for the Allegation of St. *Paul*, that *Infants* are holy, if their Parents be faithful, it signifies nothing, but that they are holy by Designation, just as *Jeremy* and *John Baptist* were sanctify'd in their Mother's Womb, that is, they were appointed and designed for holy Ministries; but had not received the Promise of the Father, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, for all that Sanctification; and just so the Children of christian Parents are sanctified, that is design'd to the Service of Jesus Christ, and the future Participation of the Promises.

And as the Promise appertains not (for ought appears) to *Infants* in that Capacity and Consistence, but only by the Title of their being reasonable Creatures, and when they come to that Act of which by Nature they have

\* See Edit. 3. p. 1045.

have the Faculty; so if it did, yet Baptism is not the Means of conveying the Holy Ghost. For that which *Peter* says, *Be baptized, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost*, signifies no more than this; First be baptized, and then by the Imposition of the Apostles Hands (which was another Mystery and Rite) ye shall receive the Promise of the Father. And this is nothing but an Insinuation of the Rite of Confirmation, as is to this Sense expounded by divers antient Authors, and in ordinary Ministry the Effect of it is not bestow'd upon any unbaptized Persons; for it is in order next after Baptism; and upon this Ground *Peter's* Argument in the Case of *Cornelius* was concluding enough, *a majori ad minus*: Thus the Holy Ghost was bestow'd upon him and his Family, which Gift by ordinary Ministry was consequent to Baptism. (not as the Effect is to the Cause, or to the proper Instrument, but as a Consequent is to an Antecedent, in a Chain of Causes accidentally, and by positive Institution depending upon each other) God by that Miracle did give Testimony, that the Persons of the Men were in great Dispositions towards Heaven, and therefore were to be admitted to those Rites, which are the ordinary Inlets into the Kingdom of Heaven. But then from hence to argue, that wherever there is a Capacity of receiving the same Grace, there also the same Sign is to be minister'd, and from hence to infer *Pædo-Baptism*, is an Argument very fallacious upon several Grounds. First, because Baptism is not the Sign of the Holy Ghost, but by another Mystery it was conveyed ordinarily, and extraordinarily, it was conveyed independently from Mystery, and so the Argument goes upon a wrong Supposition. Secondly, If the Supposition were true, the Proposition built upon it is false: for they that are capable of the same Grace, are not always capable of the same Sign; for Women under the Law of *Moses*, although they were capable of the Righteousness of Faith, yet they were not capable of the Sign of Circumcision: For God does not always convey his Graces in the same manuer, but to some mediately, to others immediately; and there is no better



Instance in the World of it, than the Gift of the Holy Ghost (which is the Thing now instanced in this Contestation) for it is certain in Scripture, that it was ordinarily given by Imposition of Hands, and that after Baptism; (And when this came into an ordinary Ministry, it was called by the antient Church Chrism, or Confirmation) but yet it was given sometimes without Imposition of Hands, as at *Pentecost*, and to the Family of *Cornelius*; sometimes before Baptism, sometimes after, sometimes in Conjunction with it.

And after all this, lest these Arguments should not ascertain their Cause, they fall on complaining against God, and will not be content with God, unless they may baptize their Children, but take Exceptions that God did more for the Children of the *Yews*. But why so? Because God made a Covenant with their Children actually as *Infants*, and consign'd it by Circumcision: Well; so he did with our Children too in their Proportion. He made a Covenant of spiritual Promises on his Part, and spiritual and real Services on ours; and this pertains to Children when they are capable, but made with them as soon as they are alive, and yet not so as with the *Yews* Babes; for as their Rite consign'd them actually, so it was a national and temporal Blessing and Covenant, as a Separation of them from the Portion of the Nations. a Marking them for a peculiar People, (and, therefore, while they where in the Wilderness, and separate from the Commixture of all People, they were not at all circumcised) but as that Rite did seal the Righteousness of Faith, so by Virtue of its Adherency, and Remanency in their Flesh, it did that Work when the Children came to Age. But in *Christian Infants* the Case is otherwise; for the New Covenant being establish'd upon better Promises, is not only to better Purposes, but also in distinct manner to be understood; when their Spirits are as receptive of a spiritual Act or Impres, as the Bodies of *Yewish* Children were of the Sign of Circumcision, then it is to be consign'd. But this Business is quickly at an End, by saying, that God hath done no less for ours, than for their Children;

dren; for he will do the Mercies of a Father and Creator to them, and he did no more to the other: but he hath done more to ours; for he hath made a Covenant with them, and built it upon Promises of the greatest Concernment; he did not so to them. But then for the other Part, which is the Main of the Argument, that unless this Mercy be conigned by Baptism, as good not at all in respect of us, because we want the Comfort of it; this is the greatest Vanity in the World: For when God hath made a Promise pertaining also to our Children (for so our Adversaries contend, and we also acknowledge in its true Sense) shall not this Promise, this Word of God be of sufficient Truth, Certainty, and Efficacy to cause Comfort, unless we tempt God, and require a Sign of him? May not Christ say to these Men, as sometime to the *Jews*, *A wicked and adulterous Generation seeketh after a Sign, but no Sign shall be given unto it?* But the Truth of it is, this Argument is nothing but a direct Quarreling with God Almighty.

Now, since there is no Strength in the Doctrinal Part, the Practice and Precedents Apostolical and Ecclesiastical, will be of less Concernment, if they were true as is pretended; because Actions Apostolical are not always Rules for ever: it might be fit for them to do it, *Pro loco et tempore*, as divers others of their Institutions, but yet no Engagement past thence upon following Ages; for it might be convenient at that Time, in the new Spring of Christianity, and until they had engaged a considerable Party, by that Means to make them Parties against the *Gentiles* Superstition, and by way of Pre-occupation to ascertain them to their own Sect when they came to be Men; or for some other Reason not transmitted to us, because the Question of Fact itself is not sufficiently determin'd. For the Insinuation of that Precept of baptizing *all Nations*, of which Children certainly are a Part, doth as little Advantage as any of the rest, because other parallel Expressions of Scripture do determine, and expound themselves to a Sense that includes not all Persons absolutely; but of a capable Condition, as *Praise the Lord, all ye Nations,*  
*sing*

*sing unto God ye Kingdoms of the Earth,\** and divers more.

As for the Conjecture concerning the Family of *Stephanus*, at the best it is but a Conjecture, and besides that, it is not prov'd that there were Children in the Family; yet if that were granted, it follows not that they were baptized, because by [*whole Families*] in Scripture is meant all Persons of Reason and Age within the Family; for it is said, of the Ruler at *Capernaum*, *That he believed, and all his House †*. Now you may also suppose, that in his House were little Babes, that is likely enough; and you may suppose that they did believe too before they could understand; but that's not so likely. And then the Argument from baptizing *Stephen's* Household may be allowed just as probable. But this is unman-like to build upon such slight airy Conjectures.

But Tradition by all Means must supply the Place of Scripture, and there is a pretended Tradition Apostolical, that *Infants* were baptized: but at this we are not much moved; for we, who rely upon the written Word of God as sufficient to establish all true Religion, do not value the Allegation of Traditions: and however the World goes, none of the reformed Churches can pretend this Argument against this Opinion; because they who reject Tradition when it is against them, must not pretend it at all for them. But if we should allow the Topic to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as it can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the Testimony of *Origen*, for from him *Austin* had it. For as for the Testimony pretended out of *Justin Martyr*, it is to no Purpose, because the Book from whence the Words are cited is not *Justin's*, who was before *Origen*, and yet he cites *Origen* and *Irenæus*. But who please may see it sufficiently condemned by *Sixtus Senensis*, *Biblioth. Sanct. l. 4. verbo Justinus*. And, as for the Testimony of *Origen*, we know nothing of it; for every Heretic and interested Person did interpolate all his Works

\* Psal. xvii. 1. and lxxviii. 32.

† John iv.

Works so much; that we cannot discern which are his and which not.\*

Now a Tradition Apostolical, if it be not consign'd with a fuller Testimony than of one Person, whom all After-ages have condemn'd of many Errors, will obtain so little Reputation amongst those, who know that Things have upon greater Authority pretended to derive from the Apostles, and yet falsely, that it will be a great Argument that he is credulous and weak, that shall be determin'd by so weak Probation in Matters of so great Concernment. And the Truth of the Business is, as there was no Command of Scripture to oblige Children to the Susception of it, so the Necessity of *Pædo-Baptism* was not determined in the Church till in the eighth Age after Christ; but in the Year 418, in the *Milvitan* Council, a Provincial of *Africa*, there was a Canon made for *Pædo-Baptism*; never till then! I grant it was practis'd in *Africa* before that Time, and they, or some of them, thought well of it; and though that be no Argument for us to think so, yet none of them did ever before pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a Precept of the Gospel. St. *Austin* was the first that ever preach'd it to be absolutely necessary, and it was in his Heat and Anger against *Pelagius*, who had warmed and chafed him so in that Question, that it made him innovate in other Doctrines possibly of more Concernment than this. And although this was practis'd antiently in *Africa*, yet that it was without an Opinion of Necessity, and not often there, nor at all in other Places, we have the Testimony of a Learned *Pædo-Baptist*, *Ludovicus Vives*, who, in his *Annotations* upon St. *Austin*, *De Civit. Dei*, l. 1. c. 27. affirms, "That it was the Practice of the primitive Times to baptize none but the Adult †."

But, besides, that the Tradition cannot be proved to be Apostolical, we have very good Evidence from Antiquity, that it was the Opinion of the primitive Church, that *Infants* ought not to be baptized; and  
this

\* See Edit. 3. p. 1047.

† Neminem nisi adultum antiquitùs solere baptizari.

this is clear in in the sixth Canon of the Council of *Neocæsarea*; The Words are these, *περὶ κυφορέσης ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι ὅπως βέλεται· εἰδὲν γὰρ κοινονεῖν ἢ τίκτουσα τῷ τικτομῆναι. διὰ τὸ ἐκάστῃ ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δεικνυσθαι*: The Sense is this, a Woman with Child may be baptized when she please; for her Baptism concerns not the Child. The Reason of the Connection of the Parts of that Canon is in the following Words, Because every one in that Confession is to give a Demonstration of his own Choice and Election: Meaning plainly, that if the Baptism of the Mother did also pass upon the Child, it were not fit for a pregnant Woman to receive Baptism; because in that Sacrament there being a Confession of Faith, which Confession supposes Understanding, and free Choice, it is not reasonable the Child should be consign'd with such a Mystery, since it cannot do any Act of Choice or Understanding.

And to this Purpose are the Words of *Balsamon*, speaking of this Decree, and of Infants unborn not to be baptized, he says, "The unborn Babe is not to be baptized, because he neither is come to Light, nor can he make Choice of the Confession, that is, of the Articles to be confess'd in Divine Baptism\*." To the same Sense are the Words of *Zonaras*, "The Embryo or unborn Babe does then need Baptism, when he can chuse †."

The Canon speaks Reason, and it intimates a Practice which was absolutely Universal in the Church, of interrogating the Catechumens concerning the Articles of Creed: Which is one Argument that either they did not admit *Infants* to Baptism, or that they did prevaricate egregiously in asking Questions of them, who themselves knew were not capable of giving Answer.

But the former was the more probable, according to the

\* Οὐ δύναται φωτιθῆναι διὰ το μηκέτι εἰς φῶς ἰλθεῖν, μηδὲ προαίρεσιν ἔχει τῆς ὁμολογίας τῆς δεῖς βαπτίσματος. In compend. Can. tit. 4.

† Ἐμῆρον χρήζει βαπτίσματος ὅτε προαιρέσθαι δυνήσεται. See Edit. 3. p. 1047.

the Testimony of *Walfridus Strabo* \*, “ It is to be noted,  
 “ says he, that in those first Times the Grace of Baptism  
 “ was wont to be given to those only, who by their In-  
 “ tegrity of Mind and Body, were arrived to this,  
 “ that they could know and understand what profit was to  
 “ be had by Baptism, what was to be confess’d and be-  
 “ lieved in Baptism, and what is the Duty of them  
 “ who are born again in Christ.”

But to supply their Incapacity by the Answer of a Godfather †, is but the same Unreasonableness acted with a worse Circumstance. And there is no sensible Account can be given of it; for that which some imperfectly murmur concerning Stipulations civil, performed by Tutors in the Name of their Pupils, is an absolute Vanity. For what if by positive Constitution of the *Romans* such Solemnities of Law are requir’d in all Stipulations, and by Indulgence are permitted in the Case of a notable Benefit accruing to Minors, must God be ty’d, and Christian Religion transact her Mysteries by Proportion and Compliance with the Law of the *Romans*? I know, God might if he would have appointed Godfathers to give Answer in behalf of the Children, and to be *Fide-jussors* for them; but we cannot find any Authority or Ground that he hath, and if he had, then it is to be suppos’d he would have given them Commission to have transacted the Solemnity with better Circumstances, and given Answers with more Truth. For the Question is ask’d of believing in the present. And if the Godfathers answer in the Name of the Child, [*I do believe*] it is notorious they speak false and ridiculously; For the *Infant* is not capable of believing, and if he were, he were also capable of dissenting, and how then do

§ Notandum deinde primis temporibus illis solummodo Baptismi gratiam dari solitam qui et corporis et mentis integritate jam ad hoc pervenerunt, ut scire & intelligere, possent quid emolumenti in Baptismo consequendum, quid confitendum atque credendum, quid postremò renatis in Christo esset servandum. *De rebus Eccles. c. 26.*

† Quid ni necesse est (sic legit Franc. Junius in notis ad Tertul.) sponsores etiam periculo ingeri, qui & ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possint, & proventu malæ indolis falli? *Tertul. lib. de baptis. cap. 18.*

do they know his Mind? And therefore *Tertullian* † gives Advice that the Baptism of *Infants* should be deferr'd 'till they could give an Account of their Faith. And the same also is the Counsel of \* *St. Gregory*, Bishop of *Nazianzum*, although he allows them to hasten it in case of Necessity: for though his Reason taught him what was fit; yet he was overborn with the Practice and Opinion of his Age, which began to bear too violently upon him; and yet in another Place he makes mention of some to whom Baptism was not administer'd, διὰ νηπιότητα, by reason of Infancy: To which, if we add, that the Parents of *St. Austin*, *St. Hierom*, and *St. Ambrose*, although they were Christians, yet did not baptize their Children before they were Thirty Years of Age; and *St. Chrysostome*, who was instituted and bred up in Religion by the famous and beloved Bishop *Melitus*, was yet not baptized till after he was twenty Years of Age; and *Gregory Nazianzen*, though he was the Son of a Bishop, yet was not christened till he came to Man's Age †; it will be very considerable in the Example, and of great Efficacy for destroying the supposed Necessity or Derivation from the Apostles.

But however, 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 these are Faith and Repentance; and not to instance in those innumerable Places that require Faith before this Sacrament, there needs no more but this one saying of our Blessed Saviour, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned* †; plainly

† Lib. de baptif. prope finem, cap. 28. itaque pro personæ cujusque conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipue tamen circa parvulos . . . Fiant christiani cum Christum nosse potuerint.

\* Orat. 40. quæst. in S. Baptisma.

† See Edit. 3. p. 1048.

† Mark xvi.

ly thus, Faith and Baptism in Conjunction will bring a Man to Heaven; but if he have not Faith, Baptism shall do him no good. So that if Baptism be necessary then, so is Faith, and much more; for want of Faith damns absolutely: it is not said so of the want of Baptism. Now if this decretory Sentence be to be understood of Persons of Age, and if Children by such an Answer (which indeed is reasonable enough) be excus'd from the Necessity of Faith, the want of which regularly does damn, then it is sottish to say, the same Incapacity of Reason and Faith shall not excuse from the actual Susception of Baptism, which is less necessary, and to which Faith and many other Acts are necessary Predispositions, when it is reasonably and humanely receiv'd. The Conclusion is, that Baptism is also to be deferr'd till the time of Faith: And whether *Infants* have Faith or no, is a Question to be disputed by Persons that care not how much they say, nor how little they prove.

1. Personal and actual Faith they have none; for they have no Acts of Understanding; and besides, how can any Man know that they have, since he never saw any Sign of it, neither was he told so by any one that could tell? 2. Some say they have imputative Faith; but then so let the Sacrament be too, that is, if they have the Parents Faith or the Church's, then so let Baptism be imputed also by Derivation from them, that as in their Mother's Womb, and while they hang on their Breasts, they live upon their Mother's Nourishment, so they may upon the Baptism of their Parents, or their Mother the Church. For since Faith is necessary to the Susception of Baptism (and they themselves confess it by striving to find out new kinds of Faith to dawb the Matter up) such as the Faith is, 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. And whatsoever can be said to take off from the Necessity of actual Faith, all that, and much more may be said to excuse from the actual Susception of Baptism. 3. The first of these Devices was that of *Luther* and his Scholars, the second of



*Calvin* and his ; and yet there is a third Device which the Church of *Rome* teaches, and that is, that *Infants* have habitual Faith : But who told them so ? How can they prove it ? What Revelation, or Reason teaches any such thing ? Are they by this Habit so much as disposed to an actual Belief without a new Master ? Can an *Infant*, sent into a *Mahometan* Province, be more confident for Christianity when he comes to be a Man, than if he had not been baptiz'd ? Are there any Acts precedent, concomitant, or consequent to this pretended Habit ? This strange Invention is absolutely without Art, without Scripture, Reason or Authority : But the Men are to be excused, unless there were a better. But for all these Stratagems, the Argument now alledged against the Baptism of *Infants* is demonstrative and unanswerable.

To which also this Consideration may be added, that if Baptism be necessary to the Salvation of *Infants*, upon whom is the Imposition laid ? To whom is the Command given ? to the Parents or to the Children ? Not to the Children, for they are not capable of a Law ; not to the Parents, for then God hath put the Salvation of innocent Babes into the Power of others ; and *Infants* may be damned for their Father's Carelessness or Malice. It follows that it is not necessary at all to be done to them, to whom it cannot be prescribed as a Law, and in whose behalf it cannot be reasonably intrusted to others with the appendant Necessity ; and if it be not necessary, it is certain it is not reasonable, and most certain it is nowhere in Terms prescribed, and therefore it is to be presumed, that it ought to be understood, and administered according as other Precepts are, with Reference to the Capacity of the Subject, and the Reasonableness of the Thing.

For I consider, that the baptizing of *Infants* does rush us upon such Inconveniencies which in other Questions we avoid like Rocks, which will appear if we discourse thus.

Either Baptism produces spiritual Effects, or it produces them not : If it produces not any, why is such Contention about it ? what are we the nearer Heaven if we

are

are baptized? and if it be neglected, what are we the farther off? But if (as without all peradventure all the *Pædo Baptists* will say) Baptism does do a Work upon the Soul, producing spiritual Benefits and Advantages; these Advantages are produced by the external Work of the Sacrament alone, or by that as it is helped by the Co-operation and Predispositions of the *Suscipient*.

If by the external Work of the Sacrament alone, how does this differ from the *opus operatum* of the *Papists*, save that it is worse? For they say the Sacrament does not produce its Effect but in a *Suscipient* disposed by all Requisites and due Preparatives of Piety, Faith, and Repentance; tho' in a Subject so disposed, they say the Sacrament by its own Virtue does it; but this Opinion says it does it of itself without the Help, or so much as the Co-existence of any Condition but the meer Reception.

But if the Sacrament does not do its Work alone, but *per modum recipientis*, according to the Predispositions of the *Suscipient*, then because *Infants* can neither hinder it, nor do any thing to further it, it does them no Benefit at all. And if any Man runs for Succour to that exploded *αρησφύγεται*, that *Infants* have Faith, or any other inspired Habit of I know not what or how, we desire no more Advantage in the World, than that they are constrained to an Answer without Revelation, against Reason, common Sense, and all the Experience in the World.

The Sum of the Argument in short, is this, tho' under another Representment.

Either Baptism is a meer *Ceremony*, or it implies a *Duty* on our Part. If it be a Ceremony only, how does it sanctify us, or *make the Comers thereunto perfect*? If it implies a *Duty* on our Part, how then can Children receive it, who cannot do Duty at all?

And indeed, this way of Ministration makes Baptism to be wholly an outward Duty, a Work of the Law, a carnal Ordinance, it makes us adhere to the Letter, without regard of the Spirit, to be satisfied with Shadows, to return to Bondage, to relinquish the Mysteriousness, the Substance and Spirituality of the Gospel. Which Argument is of so much the more Consideration.

because under the Spiritual Covenant, or the Gospel of Grace, if *the Mystery* goes not before the *Symbol* (which it does when the Symbols are Seals and Consignations of the Grace, as it is said the Sacraments are) yet it always accompanies it, but never follows in order of Time: And this is clear in the perpetual Analogy of Holy Scripture.

For Baptism is never propounded, mentioned or enjoined, as a Means of Remission of Sins, or of Eternal Life, but something of Duty, Choice and Sanctity is joined with it, in order to Production of the End so mentioned; *Know ye not that as many as are baptized into Christ Jesus, are baptized into his Death* \*? There is the Mystery and the Symbol together, and declared to be perpetually united, ἡμεῖς ἐβαπτισθημεν, all of us, who were baptized into one, were baptized into the other; not only into the Name of Christ, but into his Death also: But the meaning of this, as it is explained in the following Words of *St. Paul*, makes much for our Purpose: For to be baptized into his Death, signifies *to be buried with him in Baptism, that as Christ rose from the Dead, we also should walk in newness of Life* §: That's the full Mystery of Baptism; for being baptized into his Death, or which is all one in the next Words †, ἐν ὁμοιωματι τῆς θανάτου αὐτοῦ, *into the likeness of his Death* ‡, cannot go alone; if we be so planted into Christ, we shall be partakers of his Resurrection, and that is not here instanced in precise Reward, but in exact Duty, for all this is nothing but *Crucifixion of the old Man, a destroying the Body of Sin, that we no longer serve Sin.*

This, indeed, is truly to be baptized both in the *Symbol* and the *Mystery*: Whatsoever is less than this, is but the *Symbol* only, a *meer Ceremony*, an *opus operatum*, a dead Letter, an empty Shadow, an Instrument without an Agent to manage, or Force to actuate it.

Plainer yet; *Whosoever are baptized into Christ have put on Christ, have put on the new Man*: But to put on this new Man, is *to be formed in Righteousness, and Holiness, and Truth.* This whole Argument is the very Words  
- of

\* Rom. vi. 3.

§ ver. 4.

† ver. 5.

‡ ver. 6.

of St. Paul. The Major Proposition is dogmatically determined, Gal. iii. 27. The Minor in *Ephes. iv. 24*. The Conclusion then is obvious; that they who are not formed new in *Righteousness, and Holiness, and Truth*, they who remaining in the present Incapacities cannot walk in newness of Life, they have not been baptized into Christ, and then they have but one Member of the Distinction, used by St. Peter, they have that Baptism which is a putting away the Filth of the Flesh; but they have not that Baptism, which is the Answer of a good Conscience towards God, which is the only Baptism that saves us\*; And this is the Case of Children; and then the Case is thus.

As *Infants* by the Force of Nature cannot put themselves into a supernatural Condition, (and therefore say the *Pædo-Baptists*, they need Baptism to put them into it:) so if they be baptized before the use of Reason, before the Works of the Spirit, before the Operations of Grace, before they can throw off the Works of Darkness, and live in Righteousness and newness of Life, they are never the nearer: From the Pains of Hell they shall be saved by the Mercies of God, and their own Innocence, tho' they die in *puris naturalibus*, and Baptism will carry them no further. For that Baptism that saves us, is not the only washing with Water, of which only Children are capable, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God, of which they are not capable 'till the Use of Reason, 'till they know to chuse the Good, and refuse the Evil.

And from thence I consider a-new, That all Vows made by Persons under others Names, Stipulations made by *Minors*, are not valid, 'till they, by a supervening Act, after they are of sufficient Age do ratify them. Why then may not *Infants* as well make the Vow *de novo*, as *de novo* ratify that which was made for them *ab antiquo*, when they come to Years of Choice †? If the *Infant* Vow be invalid 'till the *Manly* Confirmation, why were it not as good they staid to make it 'till that time, before

C 3 which,

\* 1 Pet. iii. 21.  
in Matth.

† Vide *Erasmus in præfat. ad Annotat.*

which, if they do make it, it is to no Purpose? This would be considered.

And in Conclusion, our Way is the surer Way; for not to baptize Children 'till they can give an Account of their Faith, is the most proportionable to an Act of Reason and Humanity, and it can have no Danger in it: For to say that *Infants* may be damned for want of Baptism, (a Thing which is not in their Power to acquire, they being Persons not yet capable of a Law,) is to affirm that of God, which we dare not say of any wise and good Man. Certainly it is much derogatory to God's Justice, and a plain Defiance to the infinite Reputation of his Goodness.

And, therefore, who ever will pertinaciously persist in this Opinion of the *Pædo-Baptists*, and practise it accordingly, they pollute the Blood of the everlasting Testament, they dishonour and make a Pageantry of the Sacrament, they ineffectually represent a Sepulture into the Death of Christ, and please themselves in a Sign without Effect; making Baptism like the Fig-tree in the Gospel, full of 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.

Thus far the *Anabaptists* may argue, and Men have disputed against them with so much Weakness and Confidence, that they have been encouraged in their Error, more by the accidental Advantages we have given them by our weak Arguings, than by any Truth of their Cause, or Excellency of their Wit\*. But the Use I make of it as to our present Question is this: That since there is no direct Impiety in the Opinion, nor any that is apparently consequent to it, and they with so much Probability do, or may pretend to true Persuasion, they are with all Means, Christian, Fair, and Humane, to be redargued, or instructed; but if they cannot be persuaded they must be left to God, who knows every Degree of every Man's Understanding, all his Weaknesses and Strengths,

\* Οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν δόγμασι πλὴν ἰχθὺν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ἑμιτέρων σαδροῖς ταύτην θηρῶντες, as *Naxianzen* observes of the Case of the Church in his Time,

Strengths, what Impress each Argument makes upon his Spirit, and how unresistible every Reason is; and he alone judges his Innocency and Sincerity; and for the Question, I think there is so much to be pretended against that which I believe to be the Truth, that **THERE IS MUCH MORE TRUTH THAN EVIDENCE ON OUR SIDE**; and therefore, we may be Confident as for our own Particulars, but not too forward peremptorily to prescribe to others, much less damn, or to kill, or to Persecute them that only in this Particular disagree.”

Thus, I have presented the Reader with the Arguments for and against *Infant-Baptism*, as this learned Man hath furnished us with them; and must confess that the *Baptists* are much obliged to his Lordship; that he has with so much Candor and Fairness represented them, in their Answer. And tho’ he has not in his personating the *Baptists*, possibly expressed his own Opinion, but to shew what they had to say for themselves; yet this is evident, which I observe to the Praise of Almighty God, that by acting the *Baptist*, he hath argued himself into a very calm and Christian Temper towards them. He ends with more Softness than he began. In the Beginning he treats their Opinion as very cruel and dangerous, but in the End he speaks of it as a thing *doubtful*, and that *there is no direct Impiety in it, nor any that is apparently consequent to it*; yea, that they may with much *Probability* pretend to true Persuasion\*.

I shall offer a Word or two by way of remark on what the Doctor here says, when he comes freely to speak his own Mind on the Whole.

“ Thus far, says he, the *Anabaptists* may argue, and  
 “ Men have disputed against them with so much *Weak-*  
 “ *ness and Confidence*, that they have been encouraged in  
 “ their Error more by the accidental Advantages we  
 “ have given them, than by any Truth of their Cause,  
 “ or Excellency of their Wit.” And a little after he says,  
 “ For

\* In the third Edition of this Work published in the Year 1674, it was thought fit to add a Reply, to these Arguments, such as it is. If the Reader is inclined to consult the Weight of this Reply, he will find it introduced p. 1051 of that Edition.

“ For the Question, I think there is *so much to be said*  
 “ against that which I believe to be Truth, that there is  
 “ MUCH MORE TRUTH THAN EVIDENCE ON  
 “ OUR SIDE.”

How far the Doctor is to be justified in charging his Brethren with injuring their Cause, by the *weak* manner in which they have attempted its Defence, I will not pretend to say. I own, I think, the Reflection is too severe, and upon due Examination the Defect will rather appear in the Cause itself; and if so, it will be very difficult to find *strong* Arguments to support it. Nor will I, any more than the Doctor, impute the Advantages the *Anabaptists* have obtained to the *Excellency of their Wit*. 'Tis sufficient for them that, by the Grace of God, they have Wit enough to discern the Truth, and so much Honesty and Courage as to confess and maintain it; and that they are ready, according to the Measure of their Abilities, to defend it in the Face of great Opposition. But, however insufficient they may be themselves for this Defence, they pay due Honour to the Memory of this great Man, who has done it so well for them. They think it indeed a very extraordinary Assertion of the Doctor, that the *Pædo Baptists* have *more Truth than Evidence* on their Side. On which I shall only remark, That as for the poor *Anabaptists* they are content to acknowledge that they pretend to be in Possession of no more Truth than they have Evidence from Scripture to support. But as from the same Evidence they see Cause to dissent from the *Pædo-Baptists*, both in Opinion and Practice with respect to the *Mode* in which this Ordinance of Christ is to be administered, as well as the *Subject* of it, I shall, for their Vindication, produce the Testimony of this learned Prelate, with some of those which other eminent modern Writers have given us in favour of this their Practice, and in Opposition to their own.

And first I will begin with this very learned Doctor Taylor, who, in his *Ductor dubitantium, treating of Ecclesiastical Custom*, says, “ A Custom in the Administration of a Sacrament introduced against the Analogy and  
 “ Mytery,

“ Mystery, the Purpose and Signification of it, ought  
 “ not to be complicit with. I instanced before in a  
 “ Custom of the Church of *England*, of sprinkling Wa-  
 “ ter upon Infants in their Baptism; and I promised to  
 “ consider it again, *Baptizabant enim veteres, non ma-*  
 “ *nibus suis aquam, baptizando aspergentes, sed trina im-*  
 “ *merfione hoc evangelia sequentes, ascendit ex aqua ergo*  
 “ *descenderat; ecce immerfio non asperfio*, said *Jeremy the*  
 “ *Patriarch of C. P.* \* *Straightway Jesus went up out*  
 “ *of the Water*, saith the Gospel: *He came up, therefore*  
 “ *he went down; behold an Immersion, not an Asperfion.*  
 “ And the antient Churches following this of the Gospel,  
 “ did not in their Baptisms sprinkle Water with their  
 “ Hands, but immersed the Catechumen or the Infant.”

The Bishop, having then introduced several Autho-  
 rities to confirm the antient Practice of Immersion, pro-  
 ceeds thus, “ All which are a perfect Conviction, that  
 “ the Custom of the antient Churches was not Sprink-  
 “ ling, but Immersion, in pursuance of the Sense of the  
 “ Word in the Commandment, and the Example of our  
 “ blessed Saviour.—Now this was of so sacred account  
 “ in their Esteem, that they did not account it lawful to  
 “ receive him into the Clergy, who had been only  
 “ sprinkled in his Baptism, as we learn from the Epistle  
 “ of *Cornelius* to *Fabius* of *Antioch*, *μη̄ ἐξὸν ἦν τὸν ἐν κλίνῃ*  
 “ *διὰ νόσον περιχιθέντα ὡσπερ καὶ οὗτος εἰς κληρὸν τινα*  
 “ *γενέσθαι*, *It is not lawful that he who was sprinkled in*  
 “ *his Bed by reason of Sickness, should be admitted into*  
 “ *holy Orders* §. Nay it went further than this, they  
 “ were not sure that they were rightly christned yea or  
 “ no, who were only sprinkled, as appears in the same  
 “ Epistle of *Cornelius*, in *Eusebius*, *εἶγε καὶ λέγειν τὸν*  
 “ *τοιούτον εἰληφέναι*, which *Nicephorus* thus renders (*If at*  
 “ *least such a sprinkling may be called Baptism*) And this  
 “ was not only spoken in diminution of *Novatus*, and In-  
 “ dignation against his Person; for it was a formal and a  
 “ solemn question made by *Magnus* to *St. Cyprian*, *An*  
 “ *habendi sint Christiani legitimi, eo quod aqua salutari*  
 “ *non loti sunt sed perfusi; Whether they are to be esteem-*  
 “ *ed.*

\* Resp. 2. Cap. 4.

§ Apud Euseb. Lib. 6. cap. 43.



“ ed right Christians, who were only sprinkled with Wa-  
 “ ter, and not washed or dipped \*. He ( i. e. Cyprian )  
 “ answers, that Baptism was good when it was done  
 “ *Necessitate cogente, et Deo Indulgentiam suam largiente,*  
 “ in the case of necessity, God pardoning and necessity  
 “ compelling. And this is the Sense and Law of the  
 “ Church of *England*; not that it be indifferent, but  
 “ that all Infants be dipped, except in the case of Sick-  
 “ ness, and then sprinkling is permitted.”

And, having afterwards observed, that *Aquinas* con-  
 cludes from the Multitudes who were baptized by the  
 Apostles, that they Administered this Ordinance by sprink-  
 ling: he says, “ This is but a Conjecture, and hath no  
 “ Tradition, and no Record to warrant it; and therefore  
 “ altho’ in cases of Need and Charity, the Church of  
 “ *England* does not want some good Examples in the  
 “ best of Times to countenance that Permission; yet we  
 “ are to follow her Command, because that Command  
 “ is not only according to the Meaning and Intent of the  
 “ Word βαπτίζετε in the Commandment, but agrees  
 “ with the Mystery of the Sacrament itself, *For we are*  
 “ *Buried with him in Baptism,* saith the Apostle, *In*  
 “ *aqua tanquam in sepulchro caput immergentibus vetus*  
 “ *homo sepelitur, & submergitur, deinde nobis emergenti-*  
 “ *bus novus resurgit inde: †* So *St. Chrysostome,* The  
 “ old Man is Buried and Drowned in the Immersion un-  
 “ der Water; and when the baptized Person is lifted up  
 “ from the Water, it represents the Resurrection of the  
 “ new Man to Newness of Life. In this Case therefore  
 “ the contrary Custom, not only being against an eccle-  
 “ siastical Law, but against the Analogy and mysterious  
 “ Signification of the Sacrament. is not to be complied  
 “ with, unless in such Cases that can be of themselves  
 “ sufficient to justify a Liberty in a Ritual and Ceremony,  
 “ that is a Case of necessity.” ‡

2. *The Assembly of Divines,* in their Annotations OR  
 those Words of the Apostle [*Buried with him in Bap-*  
*tism*]

\* Epist. 76.

† In illud. Johan. 3. Nisi quis renatus, &c.

‡ See *Taylor's Ductor Dubitantium,* Book III. chap. 4. Rule 15  
 p. 644. Edit. An. 1696.

*tism* \*] express themselves in this Manner: “ In this  
 “ Phrase, (say they) the Apostle seemeth to allude to the  
 “ antient manner of Baptism, which was to dip the Par-  
 “ ties baptized, and as it were to bury them under the  
 “ Water for a while, and then to draw them out of it,  
 “ and lift them up, to represent the Burial of our old Man,  
 “ and our Resurrection to Newness of Life.”

3. Doctor *Barrow*, in his Treatise on the *Doctrine* of  
 the Sacraments, discoursing on that of Baptism, says,  
 “ The Action is *baptizing* or *immersing in Water*; and  
 “ that the *Mersion in Water*, and the *Emission* thence,  
 “ doth figure our Death to Sin, and receiving a new  
 “ Life.”

4. Dr. *Hammond*, in his Paraphrase on *Rom. 6. 3.* says,  
 “ ’Tis a thing that every Christian knows, that the *Im-*  
 “ *mersion* in Baptism refers to the Death of Christ. The  
 “ putting the Person baptized *into* the Water, denotes  
 “ and proclaims the Death and Burial of Christ, and signi-  
 “ fies our undertaking in Baptism, that we will give  
 “ over all the Sins of our former Lives (*which is our be-*  
 “ *ing buried together with Christ, or baptized into his*  
 “ *Death*) that so we may live that regenerate new Life  
 “ (answerable to Christ’s Resurrection) which consists in  
 “ a Course of all Sanctity, a constant Christian Walk all  
 “ our Days.” See also his Paraphrase on *Col. ii. 12.*

5. *Archbishop Tillotson*, in his Sermon on *2 Tim. ii. 19.*  
 says, “ Antiently those who were baptized put off their  
 “ Garments, which signified the putting off the Body of  
 “ Sin, and were immerfed and buried in the Water, repre-  
 “ senting their Death to Sin; and then did rise up again  
 “ out of the Water, to signify their Entrance upon a new  
 “ Life. And to these Customs the Apostle alludes, when  
 “ he says, *How shall we that are dead to Sin, live any*  
 “ *longer therein? Know ye not, that as many of us as were*  
 “ *baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his*  
 “ *Death? Therefore we are buried with him in Baptism,*  
 “ &c. *Rom. vi. 2.—6. †.*”

6. Dr. *Fowler*, late Bishop of Gloucester, in his Book  
 entitled, *The Design of Christianity †*, gives us this Para-  
 phrase

\* *Rom. vi. 4. 5.*    † See also his Sermon, on *Col. i. 2*    ‡ Sect.  
 2. ch. 8.

phrase on Rom. 6. 4. *Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism, &c.* "That is, says he, Christians being plunged into the Water in Baptism, signifies their undertaking and obliging themselves in a Spiritual Sense to dye, and to be buried with Jesus Christ (which Death and Burial consist in an utter renouncing and forsaking of all Sins) that so, answerably to his Resurrection, they may live a holy and godly Life."

7. Dr. Cave, in his *Primitive Christianity*, tells us, "The Party to be baptized was wholly immersed, or put under Water, which was the almost constant and universal Custom of those Times, whereby they did notably, and significantly express the three great Ends and Effects of Baptism. For, as in Immerision, there are in a manner three several Acts, *The putting the Person into the Water, his abiding there for a little Time, and his rising up again;* so by these were represented Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection. And in Conformity thereunto, our dying unto Sin, the Destruction of its Power, and our Resurrection to a new Course of Life," &c.\*

8. Dr. *Towerson*, in his *Explication of the Catechism of the Church of England*, Page 20. treating on the Sacrament of Baptism, says, "One other Particular there is, wherein I have said the Water of Baptism to have been intended as a Sign, and this is, in respect of that manner of Application, which was sometimes used. I mean, *the Dipping or Plunging* the Party baptized in it; a Signification which St. Paul will not suffer those to forget, who have been acquainted with his *Epistles*. For, with Reference to this manner of baptizing, we find him affirming, *That we are buried with Christ by Baptism into Death, that like as Christ was raised up from the Dead by the Glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in Newness of Life, &c* Rom. vi. 4. To the same Purpose, or rather yet more clearly does the Apostle discourse, Col. ii. 12. where he tells us, *That as we are buried with Christ in Baptism, so we do therein rise also with him thro' the Faith of the Operation*

\* P. I. ch. 10.

“ *ration of God, who hath raised him from the Dead. For*  
 “ what is this but to say, That as the Design of Baptism  
 “ was to oblige Men to conform so far to Christ’s Death  
 “ and Resurrection, as to die unto Sin, and to live again  
 “ unto Righteousness, so was it performed by the *Cere-*  
 “ *mony of Immersion*, that the Person *immersed* might, by  
 “ that very Ceremony, which was no *obscure Image of a*  
 “ *Sepulture*, be minded of the precedent Death; as in  
 “ like manner, by his coming again *out* of the Water,  
 “ of his rising from that Death to Life, after the Exam-  
 “ ple of the Institutor thereof?” And after he adds.—  
 “ Now what the Practice of those Times was, as to this  
 “ Particular, will need no other Proof than their *resorting*  
 “ *to Rivers*, and other such like Receptacles of Water  
 “ for the Performance of that Ceremony, as that too  
 “ because there was *much Water there*. For, so the  
 “ Scripture doth not only affirm concerning the Baptism  
 “ of *John*, but concerning that which our Saviour ad-  
 “ ministered in *Judæa*. *Math. iii. 5, 6, 13. John iii.*  
 “ *22.*” Then he instances in *Philip’s* baptizing the *Eu-*  
 “ *nuch*, *Acts viii. 38*. Says he, “ The Words of *St. Luke* be-  
 “ ing that both *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went down into a  
 “ certain Water, which they met with in their Journey,  
 “ in order to the baptizing of the latter. For what need  
 “ would there have been either of the *Baptist’s* resorting  
 “ to *great Confluxes* of Water, or of *Philip’s*, or the *Eu-*  
 “ *nuchs* going down into this, were it not that the Baptism  
 “ both of the one and the other were to be performed by  
 “ *Immersion?*”

Again, a little further he says,—“ Therefore there is so  
 “ much the more Reason to represent the Rite of *Immer-*  
 “ *sion*, as the only legitimate Rite of Baptism, because  
 “ the only one that can answer the Ends of its Institu-  
 “ tion, and those things which were to be signified by it;  
 “ so especially if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of  
 “ great Force) the general Practice of the primitive  
 “ Church was agreeable thereto, and the Practice of the  
 “ *Greek Church* to this very Day, &c.”

9. Dr. *Burnet*, late Bishop of *Salisbury*, in his Exposition  
 of the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*, mentioning

D

the

the Commission of our Saviour, says, “ By the first *teaching* or *making of Disciples*, that must go before Baptism, is to be meant the convincing the World that *Jesus* is the *Christ*, the true *Messias*, anointed of God; with a Fulness of Grace, and of the Spirit without measure, and sent to be the Saviour and Redeemer of the World. And when any were brought to acknowledge this, then they were to baptize them, to initiate them into this Religion, by obliging them to renounce all Idolatry and Ungodliness, as well as all secular and carnal Lusts; and they led them into the Water, and with no other Garments but what might cover Nature, they at first laid them down in the Water, as a Man is laid in a Grave, and then they said those Words, *I baptize or wash thee* in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; then they raised them up again, and clean Garments were put on them. From thence came the Phrases of *being baptized into Christ's Death*, of *being buried with him by Baptism into Death*; of our *being risen with Christ*, and of our *putting on the Lord Jesus Christ*; of *putting off the old Man*, and *putting on the New*. After Baptism was thus performed, the baptized Person was to be instructed in all the Specialties of the Christian Religion, and in all the Rules of Life that Christ had prescribed \*.”

10. The late Dr. Nicholson, Archdeacon of Carlisle, in his Letter to Sir William Dugdale, concerning the Font at Bridekirk in Cumberland, as it is published in the Additions to Mr. Camden's *Britannia*, takes notice, that *there is fairly* represented on the Font a Person in a long sacerdotal Habit, dipping a Child into the Water. And he presently remarks on it thus: “ Now, Sir, I need not acquaint you, that the Sacrament of Baptism was antiently administered by *plunging* into the Water, in the Western as well as Eastern Parts of the Church, and that the Gothic Word **ΔΑΝΗΓΑΝ** Mark. i. 8. and Luke iii. 7. 12. the German Word *Cauffen*, the Danish *Dobe*, and the Belgic *Doopen*, do as clearly make out that Practice, as the Greek Word *βαπτίζω*.” †

\* On Article 27. p. 300.

† Gibson's Edit. of Camden's Brit. Ann. 1695, p. 841, under Note 2.

11. Mr. *Burkitt* in his Notes on *Rom. vi. 4.* observing the Argument to move us to die unto Sin, drawn *here* from our Baptism; *We are buried with him by Baptism unto Death,* “The Apostle,” says he, “alludes no doubt to the ancient Manner and way of baptizing Persons in those hot Countries, which was by Immersion, or putting them under Water for a time, and then raising them up again out of the Water; which Rite had also a mystical Signification, representing the *Burial* of our old Man *Sin* in us, and our Resurrection to Newness of Life.”

12. The learned Dr. *Whitby*, in his *Paraphrase and Commentary* on the New-Testament, writes thus on *Rom. vi. 4.* where it is said, *We are buried with him in Baptism:* “It being expressly declared here, and *Col. ii. 12.* that *we are buried with Christ in Baptism,* by being buried under Water: And the Argument to oblige us to a Conformity to his Death, by dying to Sin, being taken hence, and this *Immersion* being religiously observed by all *Christians* for thirteen Centuries, and approved by our Church, and the Change of it into *Sprinkling,* even without any Allowance from the *Author* of this Institution, or any Licence from any *Council* of the *Church,* being that which the *Romanist* still urgeth to justify his refusal of the *Cup to the Laity;* it were to be wished that this Custom might be again of general Use, and *Aspersion* only permitted, as of old, in case of the *Clinici,* or in present danger of Death.”

13 The Reverend Mr. *Richard Baxter*, in his *Paraphrase* on the *New-Testament,* in his Note on *Mat. iii. 5.* says, “We grant that Baptism then was by Washing the whole Body: And did not the Difference of our cold Country as to that hot one, teach us to remember [*I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice*] it should be so here.” He adds on *Rom. vi. 4.* “Therefore in our Baptism we are *dipped* under the Water, as signifying our Covenant-profession, that as he was buried for Sin, we are dead and buried to Sin; that as the glorious Power of God raised him from the Dead, so we should rise up to live to him in Newness and Holiness of Life.”

“Life.” Again, on 1 Cor. xv. 29.—“If the Dead rise  
 “not, to what Purpose do we in Baptism profess our  
 “Belief of the Resurrection, and resign our Bodies a liv-  
 “ing Sacrifice to die when Christ requireth it, and this in  
 “Hope of a Resurrection signified by our rising from  
 “under the Water.” Again, on Col ii. 12. *Buried*  
*with him in Baptism.*—“For so your Baptism sig-  
 “nifieth, in which you are put under the Water, to sig-  
 “nify and profess, that your old Man, or fleshly Lusts,  
 “is dead, and buried with him; and you rise thence to  
 “signify and profess, that you rise to Newness of Life  
 “and heavenly Hopes, thro’ the Belief of God’s Works  
 “that raised Christ from the dead.” And once more, on  
 1 Pet. iii. 21. he says, —“Salvation from the Deluge  
 “by the Ark prefigureth our Salvation in the Church  
 “from God’s Wrath by Baptism, and that thro’ the Pow-  
 “er of Christ’s Resurrection, to which we begin our Con-  
 “formity, when we are raised to Holiness by his Spirit,  
 “as we rise out of the Water in Baptism.” But there  
 would be no End of Testimonies of this sort.

14. I shall therefore conclude what I have laid before the  
 Reader, with one extracted from Mr. *Bower’s* History of the  
 Popes, Vol. 2. p. 110. Where speaking of the Murder  
 of *Proterus*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, in a Baptistery, where  
 he had taken Sanctuary, he has the following Note.  
 “Baptisteries were antiently Buildings distinct from the  
 “Church, consisting of a Porch, where the Catechumens  
 “renounced Satan, and made their Confession of Faith;  
 “and an inner Room where the Ceremony of Baptism  
 “was performed. The Baptisteries were very capacious,  
 “because the stated Seasons for Baptism recurring but  
 “seldom, great Multitudes were usually baptized at the  
 “same time. We sometimes read even of Councils  
 “meeting and sitting in Baptisteries\*. Some modern  
 “Writers have confounded the *Baptistery* and the *Font*,  
 “which, however, were antiently very different things;  
 “the Baptistery being the whole Building, and the *Font*  
 “only the Fountain or Pool, in which Persons were im-  
 “mersed

\* Vide Du Fresne Comm. in Paul. Silentiar. et Concil. Chalced.  
 Act. 1.

“ immersed at the time of their Baptism. For Baptism-by  
 “ Immersion was undoubtedly the Apostolical Practice,  
 “ and was never dispensed with by the Church, except  
 “ in Case of Sickness, or when a Sufficient Quantity of  
 “ Water for Immersion could not be procured. In both  
 “ these Cases, Baptism by Aspersion or Sprinkling was  
 “ allowed, but in no other. In the Primitive Times,  
 “ there were no Baptisteries; and yet Baptism was Ad-  
 “ ministred even then, as appears from *Justin Martyr*, \*  
 “ and *Tertullian* † in a Place distinct from the Church,  
 “ probably in any Place where there was Water; for in  
 “ those Days, it mattered little, as we learn from *Ter-*  
 “ *tullian*, ‡ whether a Man was baptized in the Sea, or  
 “ in a Lake, in a River, or in a Fountain, in the *Jor-*  
 “ *dan*, or in the *Tiber*.”

Many more eminent Writers might have been produ-  
 ced, from whom the Force of Truth has drawn Conces-  
 sions of the like-kind, in this Controversy. And while  
 some have even dared to deny, that the Practice of Im-  
 mersion is to be found in the New-Testament, and others  
 have ventured to ridicule it, these Writers are highly to  
 be commended for the Fairness of their Acknowledge-  
 ments; yet it is at the same time a mournful Considera-  
 tion, that so many pious and learned Men should have  
 such Convictions of the Truth, and yet not have Resolu-  
 tion enough to put it in practice themselves, and attempt  
 a general Reformation about it.

But, after all, it is to the sacred Scriptures the *Bap-*  
*tists* desire to appeal, and by the unerring Rule that is  
 to be found there, every true Protestant professes to be  
 determined. Baptism is on all hands acknowledged to  
 be the initiating Ordinance into the Christian Profession,  
 and therefore it is highly reasonable to expect, that both  
 the *Subject* and the *Mode* should be declared in the most  
 express Terms in the Institution. And if *Infants* were to  
 be the Subjects, and *Aspersion* or *Sprinkling* the Mode, is  
 it not very extraordinary, that there should not be one ex-  
 press Precept for either in the whole Gospel? Strange  
 that

\* Justin. Apol. 2.

† Tertull. de Bapt. de Coron. Mil. c. 3.

‡ Tertull. de Bap. c. 4.



that our Saviour himself, who was the great Exemplar, should not have been baptized at this Age, and in this Manner! And still more strange, that the New-Testament should not furnish us with one Apostolical Example of this Practice! That even when the City of *Samaria* received the Gospel, we should be expressly informed, that *they were baptized both Men and Women*; but that not one Word should be said about *Children*; though, if it were a Fact, that any of them were baptized, there could not have been a more proper Opportunity to have mentioned it!

If therefore, upon a fair Examination, it shall appear, that the Commission of Christ directs, that Men should be first taught, and that a Profession of Repentance and Faith is required throughout the New-Testament, in order to qualify Candidates for Baptism; And if *Enon* and *Jordan*, and Places where there was *much Water*, were chosen for the Administration of this Ordinance; if the Administrator and the Candidates *went both down into the Water*, if the latter were *buried with Christ* in it, and rising to a New Life, they *came up out of it*; if this, I say, appears to be the Case, in the Scripture Account, the impartial Reader is to consider, whether to Change both the *Subject* and the *Manner* of Administration, is not to destroy the very Essence of the Institution: And what Power on Earth can produce a sufficient Authority to do so?



F I N I S.